THE BELGAE OF GAUL AND BRITAIN
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INTRODUCTION: HISTORY OF THE PROBLEM

As British archaeology developed during the nineteenth century it became clear that for some time before the Roman conquest the culture of the Bronze Age had over a large part of Britain given place to a civilisation using iron, and possessed of a distinctive and surprisingly beautiful art of its own. This Early Iron Age was evidently one of Celtic ascendancy, and in view of the theories then prevalent concerning the arrival of Celts in the Bronze Age, the name given to it by Sir A. W. Franks was ‘Late Celtic.’ This British culture was seen to be intimately related with that which the French were then calling ‘Marnien’ after the Department found to be richest in its cemeteries, and the Swiss ‘La Tène,’ after the pile-settlement on Lake Neuchâtel which has since become the accepted eponym of the whole Celtic civilisation of Europe from V B.C. into the period of the Roman Empire.

In England the relics of this civilisation at first seemed to be rarer in the south-eastern counties than further to the north and west. However, in 1890, Sir Arthur (then Mr.) Evans published his monumental study of the famous urnfield at Aylesford in Kent, which showed that while bearers of ‘Late Celtic’ culture had already reached remoter parts of Britain, as shown by the chariot-burials of Yorkshire and the lake-villages and cave-dwellings of Somerset and Devon, it was brought in many ways to its highest

---

1 This paper has a separate Index, printed after the General Index to this Volume.
2 It will be the normal practice of this paper to refer to centuries by Roman numerals alone, preceding the letters B.C. or A.D. Thus ‘the nineteenth century’ of the text here will appear as ‘XIX A.D.,’ while ‘V B.C.’, a few lines below, represents ‘the fifth century B.C.’
development by later comers in the south-east. These people cremated instead of inhuming their dead, and bestowed their ashes in shapely urns, often with a pedestal foot, made on the potter's wheel. Of these he traced the history by way of immediate prototypes in Normandy, through rather remoter ancestors in the cemeteries of the Marne, to an origin in the Illyro-Italic culture-province at the head of the Adriatic, where the initial types of the series had been produced in imitation of bronze vessels in and before V B.C. Further, he showed the ornamental style of such metalwork as the Aylesford ribbed bucket to be relatively late, by tracing the whole development of La Tène art back to its origin in the adaptation of certain classical motives, such as the palmette, by the Celts of V B.C. in west-central Europe, where the traditions then existing were those of the preceding four centuries, which we know as the Hallstatt period. His conclusion was to date the Aylesford urnfield after 150 B.C., and a well-known passage of the Commentaries was naturally suggested, in which Caesar recorded the settlement of the 'maritime part' of Britain by invaders from 'Belgium.' Indeed, the south-eastern counties, where pottery of Aylesford type was found to be localised, evidently formed at the end of the Early Iron Age a distinct cultural province, with affinities in northern Gaul.

Various correlations might be offered in ethnology and date between its inhabitants and those of different districts of 'Late Celtic' culture in the north and west. But, in spite of Romilly Allen's 'Celtic Art' (1904) and the appreciation for which it stood, as a historical whole the Early Iron Age 25 years ago was difficult to envisage. Too little excavation and comparative work had yet been done, and the air was constantly darkened by the controversial arrows of Celtic philologists. Hence it is hardly surprising that Dr. Rice Holmes found himself bound, in his magisterial Ancient Britain and the Invasions of Julius Caesar (1907), to treat his archaeological material with caution and the writings of ethnologists and philologists with more than caution. Thereafter, while Mr. Reginald
Smith’s publication\(^1\) in 1912 of the remarkable Welwyn grave-groups stabilised anew Evans’ main conclusions concerning the Aylesford culture and its Continental connexions, many difficulties remained.

Though Caesar states that the immigrants from Belgium retained their old tribal names, the known Belgic tribal names in Britain did not coincide with the distribution of the Aylesford culture. The British Atrebates, clearly of Belgic stock, belonged to Berkshire and northern Hampshire, while the name of the whole aggregation of Gaulish tribes, the Belgae, was borne in Britain by what looked like a single tribe stretching from the Hampshire to the Somerset coast. This area, the later Wessex, had been unvisited by Caesar, and was not found to contain Aylesford pottery. It had, however, its own characteristics. Somerset appeared to belong to a wholly different ‘Late Celtic’ province, typefied by the Glastonbury lake-village. The chalk country east of it seemed to be a backward region until, late in the La Tène period, a new culture appeared there, characterised less by ‘Late Celtic’ artistic products than by cremation and a new series of pottery, frequently wheel-made, in which the leading type bore a distinctive beaded rim. Though this series was clearly somehow related to that of Aylesford, the relation was not first-hand: for one thing, the characteristic Aylesford pedestal urn was absent. However, the two cultures seemed largely contemporary, and immediately previous to the Roman conquest, as certain foreign imports and the associated native coin-types, long ago analysed by Sir John Evans, helped to show.

It seemed, therefore, that there were two distinct areas, each of which might in this period be called ‘Belgic,’ though for reasons as different as in fact their archaeological material was. On the other hand, the ‘Late Celtic’ culture or cultures of the rest of Britain seemed to have different and earlier affinities, of which that emphasised by Déchelette between the Glastonbury material and that of Brittany was perhaps the most striking. Some hint of relative chronology

\(^1\) Arch. lxiii, pp. 1–30.
between Glastonbury and ‘Belgic’ bead-rim pottery was afforded by the Hengistbury Head excavations of 1911–12,¹ and in vol. ii of the Glastonbury Report (1917) it was suggested that the Glastonbury people were extirpated by Belgic conquerors not long before the Roman invasion. But unhappily no true bead-rim pottery was recognized in Somerset.

Here matters stood until after the war. When in 1923 Dr. Cyril Fox reviewed the distribution of the Aylesford culture in his Archaeology of the Cambridge Region he was able to define its northern limits, but remained dubious about the identity of its bearers. But two years later the whole enquiry was placed on a fresh footing by Mr. Bushe-Fox’s Report on the urnfield at Swarling in Kent, a new cemetery of the Aylesford culture. Mr. Smith’s appended analysis of the brooches established the important fact that the earliest possible date for any of the graves was about 75 B.C., and that most of them were definitely later, running in fact down to the Roman conquest in A.D. 43. These limits of date are to be applied generally to the whole Aylesford-Swarling culture, and the result agrees with Dr. Brooke’s revision of Evans’ work on the associated coins. By a clever combination of archaeological and historical evidence, the spread of the culture from Kent to its full extent is traced, and its bearers are confidently identified with Caesar’s Belgic immigrants, largely under the rule of the dynasty of the Catuvellaunian tribe which culminated in the great King Cunobelinus. The whole scheme is indeed remarkably compact.

For the historical Belgae and Atrebates of the lands further west a wholly different history is proposed. Their arrival from Gaul is argued to be subsequent to Caesar’s expeditions of 55–54 B.C., and associated with the name of the Atrebatic prince Commius, who is known to have fled to Britain after the Gallic Wars, presumably with a large number of such irreconcilable enemies of Rome. Commius and his sons struck inscribed coins in Britain, and the numismatic evidence and that of the bead-rim pottery

¹ Report, 1915.
have, it is suggested, each their place in the reconstruction of this second Belgic immigration, which in fact forms, at least in outline, a scheme as compact as the other.

Events in the last five years have increased the volume but not essentially altered the features of the evidence assembled by Mr. Bushe-Fox. He was, however, inevitably concerned in the Swarling Report with what is actually only one group of the evidence required for studying the Belgic question as a whole.

As well, therefore, as following in his footsteps and those of Sir Arthur Evans where the Aylesford-Swarling culture is concerned, we ought to attempt a more detailed study of the contemporary material of Wessex, in particular the distinctive bead-rim pottery. Further, the justification for thus isolating each of these two cultural areas requires defining and confirming in the light of increased knowledge of other Iron Age provinces; and lastly, the quest for the origins of each on the Continent deserves enlargement to the stature of a regular survey—in so far as the available evidence permits—of the formation of the Belgic stock on the mainland of Europe and the evolution of such peculiar elements as are to be found in its culture, both before and immediately after Caesar's conquest of Gaul.

In this last regard, it is known that part of what became the province of Gallia Belgica was occupied in V-II B.C. by the great La Tène culture of the Marne, while in the north of it a degenerate form of late Hallstatt culture lingered on among the marches of the northernmost Celts and the Germans who were moving down from the north-east. Finally a German or partly German influx swamped the old Marne culture, and produced a mixed civilisation, in which cremation was practised and the immediate prototypes of the Aylesford pedestal-urns were made. This characterised the Belgae whom Caesar found and conquered, whose German blood it was that differentiated them from the rest of the Gauls. The details of all this are as yet to some extent obscure. Obviously a companion survey to that of the Aylesford culture must be attempted for Belgic Gaul in the period before
the Roman conquest, and after it the possibility of a second Belgic migration to Britain must be considered in the light of the relation between the bead-rim pottery of Wessex and the contemporary wares of Belgic Gaul, which has never yet been studied.

The lines on which we have accordingly tried to review the Belgic question on both sides of the Channel, bringing where possible the evidence of archaeology and written sources together, will best here be understood from the following analysis of the parts into which we have divided our essay.
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NOTE ON CHRONOLOGICAL TERMS.

(i) On the Continent

The first half of the Early Iron Age, the Hallstatt period, is conventionally dated from 1000 or 900 to 500 B.C. The dating of its subdivisions is irrelevant to this article: its terminal date varied in different districts, as will appear in the course of this study. It was in the middle Rhineland that it was first superseded by the culture of the La Tène period, and it seems to us that this process may there be dated safely in the quarter-century 500-475 B.C. In the Marne district we must recognize a final subdivision of the Hallstatt period, the 'Final Hallstatt,' 'Hallstatt II b,' or 'Jogassien,' which had a duration of some 50-60 years centred on 500 B.C., and was superseded by La Tène culture roughly between 475 and 450 B.C.

For the subdivisions of the La Tène period the fourfold division of Reinecke is here, broadly speaking, adhered to, in preference to the threefold division of Déchelette: a slightly lower absolute dating than that originally proposed by Reinecke seems to us desirable, and our chronological scheme may thus be roughly expressed in tabular form as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hallstatt. Rhineland:</th>
<th>Up to 500-475 B.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marne: Jogassien up to 475-450 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>La Tène A. Rhineland:</th>
<th>500-475 to about 400 B.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marne: 475-450 to about 400 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>La Tène B.</th>
<th>About 400 to about 250 B.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>La Tène C.</th>
<th>About 250 B.C. to about 100 B.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>La Tène D.</th>
<th>About 100 B.C. to the Roman Conquests.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(ii) In Britain

In Britain this scheme is not in the same way applicable. One of us (C.F.C.H. in *Antiquity*, v, 60 ff.) has recently pointed out that the three main divisions of our Iron Age culture are as much regionally as chronologically distinct and their dates in different regions overlap. This will be expounded in the course of this study: in general, the terms of the Continental scheme will be employed for Britain only in indicating correlations of approximate date between British and Continental material. The main chronological point with which we shall here be concerned is the establishing in Britain of La Tène D or 'La Tène III' culture by the Belgae, which took place at dates in the first century B.C. which vary for each district affected and will be indicated in the body of the work accordingly. On the undesirable term 'La Tène IV' see footnote on p. 244.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

*Antiq. Journ.* ... *Antiquaries Journal.*
*Arch.* ... *Archaeologia.*
*Arch. Journ.* ... *Archaeological Journal.*
I
THE ANTECEDENTS AND FORMATION OF THE BELGIC TRIBES OF GAUL


The first epoch of the European Iron Age was that of the Hallstatt culture, conventionally dated between 900 and 500 B.C., which at the time of its greatest extension stretched from far down the Danube on the east, right across to Central France, the Seine, and the lower Rhine. While the people of its eastern provinces, in which the eponymous site of Hallstatt itself is situated, are usually thought to be Illyric, most of its western area was undoubtedly peopled by the ancestors of one branch or another of the Celtic stock. Their
expansion westward and north-westward from the Alpine region seems to have been preceded by earlier movements of closely related peoples still in the Bronze stage of civilisation, who had probably in many cases been dislodged from homes in central Europe by the bearers of the Hallstatt iron sword; consequently, by the time these last had spread to their furthest Continental limits, they and their precursors had diffused over quite a large part of Western Europe some degree of kinship to the full Celtic strain as later recognised. The lands along the Atlantic seaboard were the chief exception, where the Neolithic and Bronze Age tradition of the non-Celtic peoples of the west was still persisting.

The stage was thus set in the Hallstatt period for the achievements of the Celts in the centuries that were to follow. The energy which brought those achievements about sprang mainly from reaction to two vital movements from without, one civilising, the other destructive. The civilising movement was, of course, the cultural influence of the Mediterranean, which Greek colonisation and the advance of Italy caused to penetrate western and central Europe to a degree impossible in the old days of its slower progress up the reaches of the Danube. The destructive force was the great southward drive of the Germans from the Baltic. Their more easterly diffusion is not here our concern, but the tribes that took a more westerly course and passed from Hanover down the valley of the Lippe, reached by the end of VIII B.C. the right bank of the lower Rhine. Here was a population of Celtic affinity and Hallstatt culture, whose burial rite was cremation in barrows, and on these people the German tribes before long began heavily pressing. In the country round Dortmund and Duisburg cemetery after cemetery shows how their Hallstatt culture was superseded. Instead of cinerary urns in the old central European tradition and the frequently associated bronze razors, we find the German biconical urn and the distinctive German razor; these are constantly thrust in to form secondary interments in the big saucer-shaped barrows that covered the
FIG. I. MAP OF NORTHERN GAUL AND WESTERN GERMANY, SHOWING THE MAIN PHYSICAL FEATURES OF THE COUNTRY

Certain sites mentioned in the text are also shown.
burials of the older inhabitants. This practice, in fact, marks the transition to the regular Germanic flat graves.

Among the outstanding characteristics of the German invaders is the tradition in pottery known as the Harpstedt style: the full chronology of its successive stages has not been universally agreed on, but there can be little doubt that in VII B.C. the Germans were not only establishing themselves as far to the north-west as the Zuyder Zee, but from their main territory on the lower Lippe were crossing the Rhine, as well as appearing as far south as the Ruhr. All this region has ever since remained Teutonic.

Further south, in the country round Köln, the Celts maintained their Hallstatt culture till towards the end of VI B.C., but in the years following 550 the invaders began pushing up the Rhine, and all was soon over. A gap in the archaeological material follows; we may recall that the Germans liked to have a wide belt of deserted land outside their areas of settlement, cleared of their enemies though not inhabited by themselves.¹ In this case the Rhineland from the region of Köln southwards to about the line Andernach-Mechernich-Eschweiler-Aachen apparently remained thus depopulated until La Tène times. This southern boundary is, in fact, the foot of the wooded highlands of the Ardennes and the Eifel (see Fig. 1); into these the Germans did not yet penetrate, and from this time onwards many hill-forts mark the Celtic marches on either side of the middle Rhine, as also further east in Central Germany.

The last two centuries of the Hallstatt period thus saw the establishment of the Germans all over the flat lands round the lower Rhine. But, as constantly happens in such cases, their northern culture began at once to be influenced in varying degrees by that of the people they had found in possession, and to this process there no doubt corresponded an inevitable commingling of blood. Northward from the Lippe and towards the Frisian coasts there was little to modify their racial tradition, but on the lower Rhine

¹ Tacitus, *Germania*, see pp. 175 and 237 below.
itself and in the Low Countries at its delta there is evidence for an overlap and admixture of cultures, and a fusion between Celt and German seems gradually to have been brought about. It was anyhow a backward region, and as in central and north-east Holland the 'Early Germanic' pottery of this period lasts without much change on into Roman times, when its makers turn out to be the Frisii and the Batavi of the historians, so within the future frontier of the Empire what the Dutch call 'Gallo-German' wares attest the persistence of the tribes of mingled stock until they too emerge into the fuller light of history.

But meanwhile of course in the crucial years of VI B.C. the whole area of German penetration between the Eifel and the North Sea became a centre of dispersal for great numbers of the surviving Celts, who in fact thus began the series of big Celtic migrations that so changed the face of Europe.

Three main routes were open to them: they could either fall back upon their kinsmen further up the Rhine, they could pass south-west into and across France, and they could cross the sea to Britain. South-eastern Britain is naturally easy of access from the Continent, and in fact the lands on either side of the narrow seas have always had the closest affinity in their successive cultures; immigration from the Low Countries now reached as far north as Scarborough, passed up the rivers of the eastern fenlands, penetrated the Thames basin, and spread all over the chalk country of the south.

It was not the first nor the only wave of Celtic immigration: some of the nearly-related groups of Late Bronze Age people, noticed above, had already reached Britain, to say nothing of Ireland, and indeed our Early Iron Age movements, which may conceivably have begun even before 600 B.C., seem to have overlapped them; for these were apparently centuries of almost continuous migration into Britain from all the north-western European seaboard. Though there must have been variations of blood, and though some traces of Germanic admixture came in from the Low Countries, it was this whole complex of move-
ments that began to create Celtic Britain, and in particular these late Hallstatt migrations that gave the south-east of the island its first Iron Age culture. On the mainland, the south-westerly route across France was followed by an important group of the Lower Rhenish Celts. At Haulzy, in Champagne, their earliest graves are VII, but the bulk belong to VI B.C., and while some stayed here the majority pushed rapidly on to the basins of the Garonne and Adour and the Pyrenees, and beyond again to north Spain, where before 500 B.C. they were undoubtedly established. The dislocation thus effected on the Atlantic seaboard had reactions that seem possibly also to have reached the British Isles; but meanwhile the ever-growing pressure of the Germans up the Rhine was crowding yet more Celts southwards into the mountainous country round its middle reaches, and repercussions of these movements may have been felt as far south as the Alps. Out of this area of disturbance, a new westward or north-westward movement reached Champagne, and by fusion with such Lower Rhenish refugees as those of Haulzy and other neighbouring elements the last brief phase of the Hallstatt culture in this part of Europe was produced. Though at Haulzy the funeral rite had been cremation, it now changes to inhumation, foreshadowing the universal practice of the Celts in the centuries to come; the typical cemetery is Les Jogasses near Chouilly, and the date of this ‘Final Hallstatt’ culture is the half-century roughly centred on 500 B.C. Its area is separated by the great woodland barrier of the Ardennes from the relatively barbarous country of Celto-German admixture in the Low Countries to the north, which consequently remained a cultural backwater.

2. THE FIRST LA TÈNE CIVILISATION, AND THE APPEARANCE OF THE PEDESTAL-URN ON THE MARNE

It was far otherwise on the middle Rhine. Here a new leaven was already at work in the late Hallstatt civilisation of the Celts. The Greek colony of Massilia
had been founded about 600 B.C., and Mediterranean trade was soon in a better position to penetrate western Europe. Under its influence there appeared out of the ferment produced by the German invasions the first flower of La Tène culture and art among the Celts. By the middle of V B.C. its first phase (La Tène A) had reached its height, as seen in the great Chieftains' Graves (Furstengräber) of the middle Rhine and the Moselle, where inhumation was now for the first time adopted. Once more, too, there were westward movements into Champagne: the people of Les Jogasses were either soon absorbed or else crossed over to Britain, where identical pottery appears on such sites as All Cannings Cross, and marks the completion of the complex movement we have already outlined, which made south-eastern Britain a Celtic country of Late Hallstatt character. Champagne thus became, no less than the middle Rhineland, a country of La Tène civilisation, frequently named after the river Marne, which was in contact along the Saône and Rhone valley with the Greek civilisation of Massilia and the Mediterranean.

The lands later known as Belgic Gaul are those between the Marne and Seine and the Rhine. We now see that at the beginning of the La Tène period in V B.C. they fall into two halves. South of the Ardennes we have the pure Celtic Marne culture, unmenaced by German aggression, and in touch both with the nodal region of Celtic development in the Rhineland and with the fertilising influence of the Greek Mediterranean. North of that mountain barrier, as we pass westward from the wholly German districts round the confluence of the Rhine and Lippe, and southward from the no less German country towards the Frisian coast, we find a backward and rather obscure population of mixed Celtic and German blood, among whom the debased Hallstatt and Harpstedt traditions continue to live on. As we get further west and south-west into present-day Belgium, the German element wanes, and what there is of Hallstatt culture would seem to be Celtic, though Bronze Age elements can sometimes be seen to persist, and even the
Neolithic tradition of flint-working was apparently not extinct.

Upon this backward land, subject, as the region of similar culture on our side of the North Sea was not, to the continued possibility of German pressure from the east, the freshly flourishing La Tene civilisation beyond the tangled uplands of its southern marches had little or no effect. Though there is at Eygenbilsen¹ near Maastricht a splendid early 5 B.C.

![Figure 2: Pottery, Holland: 1 and 3, Weert, Limburg; 2, Tienraaij, Limburg; Belgium: 4-6, La Panne, Flandre Occidentale (p. 185). Scale about 1/6](image)

chariot-burial in the full transition to La Tene culture, it is an isolated phenomenon. Such cultural influences as were able to pass northward up the Rhine corridor on the east were absorbed by their more direct recipients, the Lower Rhenish Germans. Pottery in the Low Countries is poor and not very common, and continues to be made in the old 'Gallo-German' manner (Fig. 2, nos. 1–3).²

¹Dechelette, Manuel iv, pp. 575, 936, 940, 1112. Nederlands Vroegste Beschaving, pl. ii, nos. 3, 2, 9. For nos. 4–6 from Leiden Mus.: after Holwerda, Belgium, see p. 185.
South of the Ardennes the difference is striking. Though at Les Jogasses the 'Final Hallstatt' pottery embodies, for all its superiority, a dying tradition, the La Tène craftsmanship which superseded it on the Marne presented its new and distinctive character fully from the first.

Among the various ceramic forms we there meet in the graves, some of them chariot burials, of La Tène A, as at Somme-Bionne, La Gorge-Meillet, Le Mesnil-lès-Hurlus, etc., the most characteristic is the angular pedestal-urn (Fig. 3).

The other forms of La Tène A pottery in Champagne are also largely angular or 'carinated,' and it is this character which points most directly to a metal prototype. Now, carination is not a pure La Tène feature, and does not, in fact, outlast La Tène A on pedestal-urns, but it is widely characteristic of Hallstatt pottery, so that the origin of carinated pottery is rather to be sought in the metal vessels imported into the Celtic area in the late Hallstatt period. Of these, the bronze situla is the most common, and was also widely copied, both in metal and clay. The situla was beaten out of a single sheet of metal, the edges being riveted down the side, and had a characteristic high shoulder, often sharply carinated (Fig. 4, 3). Here, then, is an obvious model for our carinated pottery, on which Sir Arthur Evans, in his monograph on the Aylesford cemetery, laid great emphasis in searching for prototypes in metal and clay in the rich material from Este and the rest of the Illyro-Italic province referred to above. But the situla has neither a tall cylindrical neck nor a hollow pedestal-base, both of which are characteristic of La Tène A carinated pottery.

In the La Tène A period, the most characteristic imported bronze vessel is the Graeco-Italian beaked

---

1 Dechelette, Manuel iv, 967, fig. 659, 1-3, 7; B. M. Early Iron Age Guide, p. 70, Pl. v, 2, 7, 12; S. Reinach, Album du Musée de St. Germain, Pl. xxiv.
2 e.g. Saint Martin du Pré, Marne, Rev. Arch., xxviii, 28, fig. 4, 1.
3 e.g. Les Jogasses, Marne, Bull. Arch., 1925, p. 50, fig. 1, 1.
5 p. 151: Arch., lii, 343 ff.
flagon (*Schnabelkanne*), often beaten out of a single sheet of metal, usually with a rounded shoulder, and always with a cylindrical neck (Fig. 4, 1). This form, again, was copied by the potters, e.g. in the Tessin valley. However, though the shoulder of the flagon may be quite sharply carinated, such forms are rare, though they were also copied in clay (Fig. 4, 4). Moreover, the beaked flagon never has a pedestal-base. Now, at Saint-Jean-sur-Tourbe (Marne) and

---

**FIG. 3. CARINATED PEDESTAL-URN, LE MESNIL-LÈS-HURLUS, MARNE (4)**

---

1 These are now thought to have reached the Celtic area by way of Massilia and the Rhone valley: see J. M. de Navarro, *Massilia and Early Celtic Culture,* *Antiquity,* ii, 423 ff.

2 The best accounts of these vessels are in Dechelette, *Manuel,* iv, 36-40, in *B. M. Early Iron Age Guide,* pp. 19, 56, and in the latest work, Jacobsthal and Langsdorff, *Die Bronzeschnabelkannen* (1929).

3 Ulrich, *op. cit.,* ii, taf. viii, 1; xxii, 4; xxxv, 2; xxxvi, 7.

4 Castanetta, Ticino: Jacobsthal and Langsdorff, *op. cit.,* p. 94, taf. 18, 129; Bouzouville, Lorraine, *Arch. lxix,* 1-12.

5 Hallstatt, after Jacobsthal and Langsdorff, *op. cit.,* taf. 27, 138.

6 *Rev. Arch.* 1885, ii, 201, Pl. xxi.
Waldalgesheim\(^1\) graceful bronze vessels have been found with a long tubular spout and spreading hollow base, decorated with rows of embossed circles, in imitation of rivets on earlier models (Fig. 4, 2). These vases appear to be of Celtic manufacture, probably at a slightly later date than phase A, and the form was also imitated in clay\(^2\) (Fig. 4, 5). It would appear that the carinated Marne pots derive their

---

\(^1\)A U H V, III, i, Pl. 1-2; cf. Dechelette, Manuel, iv, 966, fig. 654, 1-2.

\(^2\)Arbedo, Tessin, after Ulrich, Dechelette, Manuel, iv, fig. 654, 3.
high pedestal-bases from this type of bronze vessel, and the rows of incised circles sometimes found on the necks of the pots, and clearly imitating the rivets of the prototype, support this view.¹

So, in general, a consideration of the various types of bronzes shows that the Celts, in expressing these metal forms in their special class of carinated pottery, slavishly copied no one metal prototype, but harmoniously combined features derived from at least three forms of bronze vessels. The early La Tène carinated pottery is thus inspired by various types of bronzes from south of the Alps—above all, by the carinated situlae (late Hallstatt) and the beaked flagons (La Tène A)—and their form was further influenced by the pear-shaped vases of Saint-Jean type; thus Evans was clearly right not to limit their inspiration to any one metal prototype,² though in fact he rather exaggerated the importance of the Este material.

Carinated pedestal-urns belong to La Tène A, and in Phase B are succeeded by more graceful forms with the curved shoulder more natural to clay. Hence, by a process of normal devolution, is produced the characteristic pear-shaped pedestal-urn of the Marne culture. In IV b.c. Celtic art developed further its highly individual character, and its genius for the curve asserted itself more definitely in the Marne pottery. In the decorative design of the best vessels, which were painted, spiral patterns tend to replace such angular conceptions as the Greek fret,³ and it becomes commoner for the carination of the shoulder and the sharp offset of the neck and pedestal to be modified into an attractive S curve. Fig. 5, 1 (p. 172), shows a typical pedestal-urn of La Tène B (400–250 b.c.) from Somme-Suippe, in which this development is clearly seen.

This period saw a great expansion of La Tène culture.

¹ Arch. liii, 342, Pl. xii, 2. ² Arch. lli, 348. ³ Dechelette, Manuel, iv, 969, figs. 660–1; B. M. Early Iron Age Guide, p. 71, Pl. vi, 4–5.
3. CELTIC MOVEMENTS OF IV B.C.: BRITAIN AND THE WEST

Between the Vosges and the Ardennes the country pierced by the Nahe, Saar, and Moselle valleys offers a comparatively easy passage between the Rhineland and the Marne valley across Lorraine, over the Meuse and the heights along it, and piercing or skirting the forest tongue of the Argonne (see Fig. 1, p. 159). This way the most vital movements had come to bring about the formation of the Marne culture. Back along the same route there went a contrary movement about 400 B.C.: the great Rhenish Chieftains’ Graves of La Tène A cease, and the ensuing culture more closely resembles that of the Marne, whence many of its elements now seem to have been brought.

Simultaneously, Celts were trooping eastwards into Danubian lands, and in Switzerland, where Hallstatt civilisation had hitherto lingered, others developed and expanded that of La Tène. In IV B.C. came the Celtic invasion of North Italy, and to the west the movement, spreading across France, was superseding and incorporating the previous inheritors of the Hallstatt tradition. When Hannibal crossed the Rhône in 218 B.C., he found the Celts established right down to the Mediterranean coast.

The Atlantic seaboard, as a matter of fact, was earlier reached. Brittany has always kept up a marked individuality, and when La Tène culture there supervened upon the immemorial megalithic tradition, its expression became in several ways distinctive. There were two reasons for this. Firstly, the inevitable tendency in the Atlantic coast-lands was against the absorption unmodified of Central European influence. Secondly, while the La Tène culture of central Europe was all the time drawing vitality from its Mediterranean contacts, the west had Mediterranean contacts of its own.

The early history of the western tin trade is obscure, but at first it followed the old sea route from the Straits of Gibraltar up the whole length of the Atlantic coasts: when the Greek navigators found
this blocked for them by the Carthaginian monopoly, a land route was opened up between Massilia and Corbilo at the mouth of the Loire, whence ships, sailing by way of Ushant, reached Cornwall and its tin mines. La Tene culture, to the growth of which trade made such important contributions, was thus in the west somewhat specialised. For instance, we find in La Tene B that the fine pottery of Brittany is not painted like that of the Marne, but expresses the same artistic style in incised decoration; while north Spain, which the Celts had reached before the passing of the Hallstatt culture, has had to be given a label of its own for this period, and as its civilisation cannot properly be called La Tène at all, it has required the clumsy title of ‘post-Hallstatt.’

It is from this north Spanish tin district that Celtic invasion has been claimed to have reached that of Cornwall in IV B.C. This much can at least confidently be affirmed, that movements into Cornwall and Devon from the south certainly took place at this time, to say nothing of previous centuries: that whoever earlier immigrants may have been, these people were certainly Celts: and that while the influence of Spain is indeed present, that of Brittany is soon dominant in their La Tène culture as we find it from now onwards in our south-western counties.

It spread thence northwards over all the more accessible country adjacent to the Severn. And all the while the entire south-eastern quarter of the island remained rooted in the Hallstatt culture which had been implanted there before the middle of V B.C.; some La Tène influence indeed came across the Channel, as shown for instance by brooches, but on the whole the holders of the best land in Britain were sturdily backward. Though the new south-western immigrants soon reached the chalk scarp of Wessex, and pushed past it towards the north-east, they could never scale it, unless they penetrated into Dorset, which is still a doubtful point. The truth is that south-eastern Britain was reflecting, as ever, the conditions in the Low Countries, which were isolated from the La Tène civilisation south of the Ardennes.
So there was no quickening influence to pass thence across the narrow seas, and though further south La Tène culture now embraced the whole basin of the Seine, yet seafaring was not vigorous enough to bring over to Britain anything very vital from the focus of Celtic civilisation on the Marne.

But to that civilisation we must now return, to trace the development in III B.C. from La Tène B to C (the 'La Tène II' of Dechelette), which is already in some ways a degeneration.

4. THE DEVELOPMENTS OF III B.C. AND THE ADVANCE OF THE GERMANS TO THE MIDDLE RHINE

The various movements we have now sketched had established a practically homogeneous culture right across Europe north of the Alps, from the Seine basin across the Rhine and far down the Danube to the south-east; different districts, indeed, show some degree of individuality—in pottery, for instance, the pear-shaped, cone-necked urns (really of Hallstatt ancestry) round the middle Rhine, and the rather bulkier variants of the same type common in the great Helvetic territory between the Main and the Alps: but at the beginning of La Tène C, about 250 B.C., the homogeneity is fairly marked. There is no need to rehearse the well-known typology of swords and scabbards and their hilts and shapes, or of brooches, whose recurved feet now begin to be attached to their bows: illustrations from pottery are here our main concern, and La Tène C pedestalled vessels from Central Europe, e.g. from Manching in Bavaria and Wiesoppenheim near Worms show fairly close similarity to contemporary forms on the Marne (Fig. 5, 2), more particularly in a curious feature—a 'stepping' of the pedestal-base—which requires some consideration.

Its beginning is seen on the fine painted urn from the 'Fosse des Trois Guerriers' at Sogny, recently

1 Dechelette, Manuel iv, 986, fig. 3 Schumscher in P.Z. vi, p. 263, Abb. 9, no. 5.
FIG. 5. POTTERY: 1, SOMME-SUIPPE (MARNE); 2, SOMME-BIONNE (MARNE); 3, PROSNES (MARNE); 4, MONTFERCAUT (MARNE); 5-6, MONT BEUVRAY (SAÔNE-ET-LOIRE) (4)
(1, p. 168; 2-4, p. 173; 5-6, p. 254)
excavated by M. A. Thierot, which one at least of the associated brooches dates late in La Tène B.\(^1\)

Reinecke\(^2\) points out that the S. German middle La Tène pottery, with cordons, mouldings and stepped pedestals, is all based on metal prototypes. The only metal prototypes he mentions, however, are bronze situlae, of which he quotes contemporary examples from the Tessin cemeteries, which, in his opinion, gave rise to the (more or less) carinated forms of middle La Tène pottery in S. Germany.\(^3\)

But, as we have seen above (p. 165), clay imitations of situlae—and indeed of practically all other imported bronzes—had been made since the late Hallstatt period north of the Alps, and are certainly not a novel product of La Tène C. Reinecke is searching for, but fails to produce, a metal prototype for his La Tène C pedestal-urn,\(^4\) which shows the early form of the stepped pedestal-base seen fully developed on pedestal-urns from Somme-Bionne\(^5\) and Prosnès\(^6\) (Fig. 5, 2, 3) and the carinated bowl from Montfercaut\(^7\) (Fig. 5, 4). Now, after IV B.C. at the latest, the La Tène C–D bronze vessels imported north of the Alps are jugs of the Aylesford type,\(^8\) buckets,\(^9\) etc., none of which have a pedestal-base, so that we may rule out the direct influence of metal prototypes. There remains the possibility that the stepped pedestal was derived from imported Hellenistic pottery forms. Italo-Greek craters certainly occur in South France, Spain and South Russia,\(^10\) but there is no evidence that they reached further north into the Celtic area in which the stepped pedestal-base is found.\(^11\) It thus appears very unlikely that either imported bronzes or pottery vessels had any appreciable influence on the formation

---

\(^1\) Rev. Anthrop., Oct.–Dec., 1930, p. 383 and fig. 2 (fosse 13).
\(^2\) A U Η V, v, p. 292.
\(^3\) e.g. ibid, taf. 51, no. 935–6.
\(^4\) Ibid., v, taf. 51, no. 933.
\(^5\) B. M. Early Iron Age Guide, p. 70, fig. 64.
\(^6\) Morel, La Champagne Souterraine, texte p. 107, Pl. 23, 9.
\(^7\) Morel, ibid, texte p. 9, Pl. 1, 7; B. M. Early Iron Age Guide, p. 74, Pl. vi, 8.
\(^8\) Dechelette, Manuel, iv, 955, fig. 652; B. M. Early Iron Age Guide, p. 126, fig. 137.
\(^9\) Dechelette, Manuel, iv, 649 ff, figs. 648–50.
\(^10\) Dechelette, Manuel, iv, 506–7.
\(^11\) These remarks have been kindly checked by Mr. J. M. de Navarro, who has made a special study of the Italo-Greek imports in the area under consideration.
of the stepped pedestal, and we are thus led to believe that it is in reality a spontaneous elaboration by the Celts of the plain pedestal-base of La Tène A–B (Fig. 5, i).

In its fully developed form, the stepped pedestal is restricted to the Marne culture. It had a short life, and no influence of it can be detected on the local pedestal-urn of La Tène D (Figs. 8, 10). Typologically, it is in itself a degeneration, since it interrupts the flowing curve and artistic unity of the pear-shaped pedestal-urn. Later in La Tène C, a few pedestal-urns were made with double stepping of the base, carrying the incongruity a stage further, and the type only finally disappeared some time before the end of II b.c. along with the pure Marne La Tène C culture itself. That culture, remote now from the fertilizing Graeco-Italian influences of V b.c., was in fact appreciably degenerate.

In one very important regard especially the Marne province had fallen behind Central Europe. The potter’s wheel was in III b.c. still unknown west of the Moselle, though it had appeared even as early as La Tène A in north-east Bavaria and south and south-west Bohemia, and in IV and III b.c. the westward distribution of its use covered all South Germany and the Rhineland. This fact must have due weight, though of course hand-made wares continued to be very prevalent, and the use of what the Germans call a Blockscheibe, a sort of hand turn-table marking an intermediate stage before the appearance of the true potter’s wheel (Drehscheibe), has also to be taken into account.

The truth seems to be that though the Tirol was to a large extent a backwater in La Tène times, the new invention came very early across the east Alpine passes from the head of the Adriatic along the ‘amber route,’ and was gradually diffused over Central Europe. The backwardness of the Marne people in this regard may be taken as an index of their degeneration compared with the bulk of their kindred further east, at least in La Tène C, when richly furnished graves get definitely rarer in their district, and all
interments are poorer in pottery than in the preceding two centuries.

With the Marne culture thus in some degree in decline, a fresh southward move was made after or about the middle of III B.C. by the Germans of the north. Their advance up the Rhine had been checked since V B.C. by the vigorous Celtic population of the Eifel and Westerwald massifs and the middle Rhine valley that they guard, which, along with the Nahe, Saar, and lower Moselle valleys and the adjoining highlands, the Hunsrück and the rest, then formed culturally and racially one homogeneous area. In La Tène A this had been the land of the Fürstengräber, and we have already seen how these were succeeded in La Tène B by a culture in closer touch with the Marne in spite of its still distinctively Rhenish character. The whole of this region was invaded by the Germans in the middle or latter part of III B.C. The uninterrupted stretch of Celtic culture across Europe was thus broken. The typical Celtic inhumations cease, and after a significant gap the established rite is found to be cremation in the German fashion.

Of course what happened was that the two races fused. As there was no further racial dislocation in this district before I B.C., it was clearly this fusion that produced the tribe found there by Caesar and brought by him under Roman rule. This tribe was the Treveri. There has been some doubt whether or no Caesar included the Treveri among the Belgae; it will appear most probable that he did not, and this is reasonable, for while their racial formation was thus effected in III B.C., we have to wait another century or more for that of the true Belgae. The mixed Celtic and German origin to which they owned belonged also to the Treveri, but the considerably earlier date of the fusion that produced the latter made a good deal of difference: for it gave the Celtic element a longer time before the Roman conquest in which to re-assert itself. In language and in character, Caesar's

---

1 Cf. the same phenomenon in the Köln area referred to above, p. 160, and also p. 237 below.

2 See pp. 237-8 below.
Treveri are Celts, and despite the new elements introduced by the German invaders, their culture managed successfully to preserve the continuity characteristic of the Rhineland.

However, this irruption was an important event for the neighbouring Celtic peoples. The great Helvetic territory south of the Main began to find itself in a closer contact with the Germans which was to prove momentous. And it was likewise momentous for the Celts of the Marne. For of the Ardennes barrier which separated them from the Germans, the Eifel and Hunsrück are merely eastward continuations, and Germanic stock was now established there and across some at least of the routes connecting them with the Rhine. Along those routes there must have come repercussions of the new blow of invasion, and they may have been widely felt. It is surely significant that the same half-century is marked by a fresh arrival of Celts from northern Gaul in Britain.

5. BRITAIN IN III AND II B.C.

The solid block of Celts of the old Hallstatt tradition was still impenetrable all over the south-east of the island, and the new immigrants had to go further afield to find the territory they wanted. Their main body found it in the wolds of east Yorkshire, where the Hallstatt settlers had made little impression, and there in the middle or second half of III B.C. they began the rich series of their barrows and chariot-burials which show that this new province of La Tène B–C culture was rooted in that of the Marne. Actually, though, the resemblance between the two provinces is not in all respects very exact, and it is in the Seine valley, on the outer edge of the Marne culture-area proper, that perhaps the closest Continental analogue to a Yorkshire chariot-burial occurs. This is at Nanterre, near Paris,¹ and as the people of east Yorkshire are in Ptolemy the Parisii, and the Parisii of Paris were in Caesar’s time a small tribe just outside the borders of what by then

¹ Dechelette, Manuel, iv, p. 531; St. Catharine’s Hill, p. 159.
had become Belgic Gaul, the inference that a migration was made thence to Yorkshire at the period indicated may be drawn with something approaching confidence.

There are traces of the same culture around the Fens, and we may guess that more groups of the same immigrants arrived in East Anglia and mingled with the inhabitants of the northern fringe of the area of Hallstatt tradition, the main block of which they could not penetrate. Lincolnshire and the basin of the Trent are very little known archaeologically, and more La Tène material like the Witham shield may one day there be found to link East Anglia with Yorkshire—a connexion which would be no new feature in the history anyhow of the Fen region.

Thus on the north, as had happened already in the west, the flank of the backward peoples of south-east Britain was as it were turned. The new La Tène culture of the north-east was, broadly speaking, parallel to that of the south-west, in spite of the distinctive elements already noticed in the latter, and Celts from the south-west were now spreading inland along the former Hallstatt frontier, supervening in the Cotswolds and here and there in the Upper Thames valley upon the older people, and at the important oppidum of Hunsbury near Northampton, it may be suggested, fusing with them and raising their civilisation.

In taking this route they were following the natural path formed by the zone of Jurassic formations which runs in a big curve across the midlands north-east to the Humber, and it can hardly be doubted that this natural corridor served in the period under review to link the kindred peoples of La Tène culture in the south-west and the north-east. Beyond it, the central forests remained no doubt largely uninhabited, but the other path of expansion from the south-west up the Severn undoubtedly brought the same culture to North Wales. And the extension of the same culture over Ireland was certainly begun by landings along the northern half of its eastern coast, made by invaders from the opposite shore of the Irish Sea.

The gaps requiring to be filled in our detailed knowledge of this spread of Middle La Tène culture
northward and westward are still many, and a full review of what evidence there is would be irrelevant here; but it is essential, before returning to trace the formation of the Belgic peoples on the Continent, to get a clear idea of the situation in Britain in III and II B.C.

Geographically that situation is a paradox. The obvious inlet from the Continent across the narrow seas is blocked to any save a feeble infiltration of La Tène culture by the stolid backwardness of the south-eastern tribes. Immigrants have, however, taken that culture further up the east coast from Norfolk to Yorkshire, and in the wolds beyond the Humber have established what no doubt became a centre of its diffusion over the north, which must hitherto have been largely still in the Bronze Age. The result of this process, when we meet it in I A.D., is the great confederacy of the Brigantes.

Connexion with this northern group is being established along the midland Jurassic zone by the Celts of parallel culture from the south-west, who hold the southern end of this route stretching across the upper Thames basin and into Northamptonshire. They have also appeared on the Severn shore of South Wales, and reached, we must suppose, also up the western midlands to North Wales and the Irish crossing. They have an intimate cross-channel connexion with Brittany, which, as the tin trade is still flourishing and the shorter crossings further east are beyond their reach, is in this period the main link between Britain and the Continent. To this is due the western character of the La Tène culture they are diffusing, which is seen at its best in the south-western counties where they are most firmly rooted. Their occupation of much of the country further north can only be rather sparse, and the hinterland of South Wales at least must still be in the hands of the far older dark-skinned people whom Tacitus describes under the name of the Silures.

The principal area of trade among the south-western Celtic peoples is shown by the distribution of their iron currency-bars. This, as well as covering
the south-western counties and reaching as far as Worcestershire and Northants, overlaps eastward into the adjacent territories of the old Hallstatt tradition. Their inhabitants, indeed, now begin to show marked traces of western influence; it is no longer merely a matter of their accepting La Tène brooches—their pottery in Wessex and as far east as Park Brow and the Caburn in Sussex begins in II B.C. to bear the curvilinear incised ornament so typical of the western Celts. The Hagbourne Hill hoard, too, which comes from Berkshire near the line of contact of the two peoples on the upper Thames, and may be dated in this century, shows the overlap of cultures in its association of typical La Tène horse-furniture with an old Bronze Age form of spearhead which had evidently lingered on, as here and there did palstaves and socketed celts, as part of the south-eastern Hallstatt tradition.

But that tradition, we may finally repeat, was still in essence unbroken all over the south-east, largely because of the very similar backwardness of the Low Countries between the Ardennes and the mouths of the Rhine, in which the La Tène culture of the Celts south of the forest belt had made so remarkably little headway.

It is, however, in the Low Countries and the Rhineland beyond them that a fresh movement must now be watched, which was in fact decisive in bringing about the formation of the Belgic peoples in northern Gaul.

The foregoing narrative has been an attempt to describe the previous racial movements and fusions in western Europe, so as to set the final formation of the Belgae in a true historical perspective. It has become clear in the course of it that none of the migrations to Britain that have been observed admit so far of being called Belgic migrations, and indeed that the use of the Belgic name has not yet been justified for any group or tribe on the Continent.

The change came in the years following 150 B.C.
6. THE FORMATION OF THE BELGAE

It has long been recognised that at some time before Caesar's campaigns the old Marne culture with its rite of inhumation gave way to a new one in which cremation was the rule. Since the latter is demonstrably the latest La Tene phase in the district and immediately precedes Caesar's conquest, it is evidently that of the Belgae, who were the people Caesar found in possession. Further, as their culture belongs to Déchelette's 'La Tène III' period, corresponding roughly to the La Tène D of the scheme here followed, it has been conventionally dated as beginning about 100 B.C., as that was the initial date given by Déchelette to his 'La Tène III.'

Now a review of the latest phase of the old Marne culture, our La Tène C, Déchelette's 'La Tène II,' makes it clear that this lasted well into II B.C. Its survival for nearly or quite a century longer than the corresponding phase of culture in the area of the Treveri may be taken as certain, and we have seen that the latter ended about 250 B.C. or soon after. Therefore a date about 150 B.C. may safely be taken as the earliest possible for the break-up of the old Marne culture. On the other hand, it is reported as a well-known fact by Caesar that its successors, the Belgae, were established in their historic territories sufficiently strongly when the Cimbri and Teutones invaded Gaul to repel them.¹ And there is no doubt about the date of that invasion: the two peoples first entered Gaul after the Cimbric victory over the Romans in Noricum in 113 B.C., and their main onslaught upon the whole country occurred in 103–1 B.C.² Of their movements in the intervening years only those affecting the south of Gaul, Italy, and Spain are known to us, but it is enough for us here to be able to affirm that the Belgae were firmly settled in Belgic Gaul—or at least in most of it—by the decade 113–103 B.C. It is a reasonable conclusion that they superseded the old Marne culture roughly between 150 and 125 B.C.

Now what distinguished the Belgae from the rest of the Gauls, as we know from Caesar, was their strain of German blood. It is certain that their predecessors on the Marne had none of this: it must therefore have been brought in when the latter were swamped between 150 and 125 B.C., or thereabouts, by irruption from the east or the north-east.

We shall find evidence for some amount of influence from the east upon northern Gaul at this time: that is, from the middle Rhine country. Opposite the eastern gap in the natural frontier, indeed, were the Treveri, among whom the German invaders of the preceding century had been, or were being, absorbed. Yet the Rhenish element in the ensuing Belgic culture is in fact appreciable, and when in the next chapter the material evidence has been reviewed, we shall find ourselves led to believe that some movement from the middle Rhine did form part of the irruption.

But it is to the north-east that the origin of the larger part of the new immigrants must be sought, across the Ardennes barrier. There, in the background beyond the lower Rhine, was the ferment in inner Germany that was soon to throw up the Cimbric and Teutonic hordes. On the Low Countries themselves, open as they were to the heart of Germany on the east, there must by now have been continual German pressure. Tracts that till now have seemed a sort of no-man’s-land must have been filling up. The forest lands themselves did not repel the Germans as they usually did the Celts, and under a century from this time we shall find them peopled with many redoubtable warriors. We may expect that groups of invaders soon began not merely to penetrate the forest but to emerge beyond its southern edge, while between it and the sea the constant pushing from the east was bound sooner or later to bring about an overflow.

What evidently happened, in fact, was that after about the middle of II B.C. a part of the mixed Celto-
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1 B.G. ii, 4, 1; see further p. 183 ff.  
2 Cf. 'Les Forets et le Peuplement de la Gaule,' L'Anthropologie, xxxix, 132.
German population of all the lands from the lower Rhine to the sea was forced down upon the Marne country and the other regions south and south-west of the great forest.

Here, then, must be the main movement, following on the course of events we have sketched, that formed the Belgic tribes as they are known to us. Though their diversity was not yet at an end, henceforward we can speak of the lands north and south of the Ardennes alike as Belgic Gaul.

NOTE ON BIBLIOGRAPHY

Detailed reference to the authorities consulted for this chapter has not been feasible. The British evidence has been summarized by C. F. C. H. in *St. Catharine’s Hill (Proc. Hants Field Club, xi, 1930)*, pp. 140-161, and with special reference to hill-forts, *ibid.* pp. 72-84, and *Antiquity* v (March, 1931), p. 60 ff. Some of the more important authorities for the Continental evidence may here be appended:—

*Altertümmer unserer heidnischen Vorzeit*, bd. v (Mainz, 1911).
Various articles on Hallstatt and La Tène material from southern and western Germany.


Stampfuss, R. : *Das Germanische Hügelgräberfeld Diersfordt* (Augsburg, 1928), and arts. in *Mannus*, xvii, 4, p. 287 ff., and *ibid.*, Erganzungsband v, p. 50 ff.
II

THE BELGAE OF GAUL UP TO THE CAMPAIGNS OF CAESAR

I. BELGIC ORIGINS IN CAESAR AND STRABO

It will now be wise to reverse the method of the previous chapter, and to work back from such notices of the Belgae at and after their conquest by Rome as we have in classical writers. By comparing these with the archaeological material we shall see what evidence we can find for or against the notion reached in the first chapter concerning their origin. If we find this is confirmed, we shall have reached the same goal by two opposite paths of enquiry.

Caesar in his historic exordium divides all Gaul into three parts, the inhabitants of which, the Belgae, Aquitani, and Celtae or Gauls, differed from each other in language, institutions and laws (B.G. i, 1, 1–2). The Aquitani, south of the Garonne and up to the Pyrenees (ibid. 4 and 7), must to a large extent at least represent fusion between an older population, akin to that of Spain, and the early Celtic migrants from the lower Rhine noticed above. Thus it is not surprising that while their tribal names have generally a Celtic character, their dialect should be distinctive, nor that Strabo should in fact tell us (iv, 176) that the Aquitani were wholly different from the Cельты (or Gauls proper) and in body and speech more like the Iberians. The whole of central Gaul, between the Rhône, Garonne, Seine and Marne, and right up to the N. and W. coast, was occupied by the peoples who called themselves Celtae, and who were called in Latin Galli (Gauls proper). These are the peoples of the true La Tène culture, originally focussed on the Marne: in Caesar’s time, while it was diffused among the whole body of the Celts of Gaul, the Marne and Seine and the lands thence to the lower Rhine were held by the third great group, the Belgae, who boasted their German blood, were the bravest and least civilised folk of all Gaul, and had conquered and driven out
the previous Celtic inhabitants of their territories (B.G. i, 1; ii, 4). We learn, however, from Strabo (loc. cit.) that, unlike the Aquitani, the Belgae were ‘Gauls (i.e. true Celts) in appearance, though not all of the same speech (sc. as the true Celts), but some of them differing slightly in dialect. And they differ slightly also in their institutions and habits.’ Evidently, then, some at least of the Belgae were not so very different after all from the Celts who had no German blood. The name Belgae itself seems to be Celtic, and so do all the names of individual Belgae given by Caesar, such as Commius and Diviciacus. We may suspect, then, that their German ancestors who, as some of them told Caesar (B.G. ii, 4, 1-2), had crossed the Rhine and settled in northern Gaul because of its fertility, had fused with at least as large a proportion of its Celtic population as they had expelled or exterminated. We have found evidence for this in all the cases noticed in the first chapter where Germans invade the territories of Celts, both in the country of the Treveri and in the various regions round the lower Rhine. If this surmise is also correct for the Marne, the archaeological evidence there ought to show a persistence among the Belgae of the tradition of the old Celtic Marne culture, side by side with the intrusive elements we should expect. If we are first able to isolate to some extent these intrusive elements, we shall appreciate all the better any such persistence we may find in what will then remain.

2. THE EVIDENCE OF ARCHAEOLOGY

First and foremost we have the introduction of cremation. With the exception of a few early survivals of the Hallstatt rite, inhumation had been the rule among the Celts from the beginning of the La Tène period, whereas the Germans had always been and

1 Belgius was the name of the Celtic chieftain who in 280 B.C. invaded Macedonia and defeated Ptolemy Keraunos, Justin xxiv. 5; Pausanias (who calls him ‘Bolgios’) x, 19, 7, and the same name occurs in an inscription from the district of the Celtic Pictones in W. Gaul: Espérandieu, Épigraphie du Poitou et de la Saintonge, p. 236, no. 82, from St. Pierre-les-Églises, near Chavigny, Dept. Vienne.
always remained a cremating people. The plain urn burials found in I B.C. in Belgic Gaul clearly follow the German rite, and its wholesale adoption inevitably testifies to the effectiveness of the German invasion.

This mention of cinerary urns naturally brings us to the question of pottery in general. We have seen how north of the Ardennes the older traditions of the Hallstatt and Harpstedt styles had lingered on. Excellent examples of this survival may be quoted from the important site of La Panne on the Belgian coast near the French frontier, which has been scientifically excavated. The occupation here has been proved to last from the Hallstatt throughout the La Tène period, and the typical La Tène vessels sketched as nos. 4–6 in Fig. 2 (p. 164) will be seen to be scarcely modified from such Hallstatt forms from the Low Countries as were noticed above (p. 164: Fig. 2, nos. 1–3). Archaic forms of incised and finger-moulded decoration, too, survive here throughout the La Tène period, and rather further inland near Bavay are even reproduced in the finer wares that appear under Roman influence at the time of Caesar’s conquest. Indeed, it was only after that conquest that the old barbarous traditions began to disappear.

But south of the Ardennes it is a different story. Here in the century before Caesar coarse pottery is plentiful to a degree unknown in the old Marne culture, but it is far harder to recognise in it the same archaic forms as persisted in the northern districts. For now technique was revolutionised by the introduction of the potter’s wheel, which first appears in these districts between 150 and 100 B.C.

Therefore the question of the lower invading culture supervening upon the higher, and the point concerning the latter’s persistence-value, is present here in a very special form for us who are relying so largely upon ceramic evidence. Coarse, gritty pottery

1 Tacitus Germania 27. 'Funerum nulla ambitio... etc. cf. Dechelette, p. 520. For cremation introduced into the rest of Gaul, see p. 225 below.


3 Bavay and British Museums; Revue des Musées, 1926, pp. 196–9.
of barbaric antecedents is present in such quantity as to make it clear that a new people had entered the country from the N.E., but their ceramic was changed not merely by contact with the superior civilisation they found, but by the supervention upon both of a new craftsmanship, that of making pots on the wheel. That craftsmanship, applied to the manufacture of this coarse pottery, inevitably modified its forms in the direction of those already adapted to the wheel in the countries from which the wheel came. We have already seen how the wheel had become known to the Celts of south Germany long before it reached Gaul: by this time it was in common use in all the lands of the middle and upper Rhine basin.

Though the Germanic penetration among the Treveri had not been without its effect on the pottery of the middle Rhine, the older tradition had been effectively maintained. Pedestals are now rarer and plainer, often supporting tall, narrow urns. In La
Tène C the urns curve in to a well-marked waist above the foot, which is definitely of the hollow pedestal type, as at Braubach (Fig. 6, 1). Later, in La Tène D, the shape is normally more conical, and the base almost flat (Hirstein, Fig. 6, 2), and in this form the type survives into the Roman period.

But vessels with a plump body and a conical neck, usually with well everted rim, are in II B.C. still most typical of the middle Rhineland, and these characters had now been generally adapted to wheel technique, which gave a new lease of life to cordon and girth-groove ornament, and accentuated the existing tendency towards more curvilinear profiles.

The natural route westward across Lorraine from these regions into Gaul was bound to serve for the spread of such an invention as the potter’s wheel from the Rhine to the Marne, and in fact near where this route emerges from the border forest of the Argonne a notable burial group has been found, that of Saint-Rémy-sur-Bussy,¹ which aptly illustrates this event and dates it to the latter part of the second century B.C. (p. 195, Fig. 10, 9).

First of all, it is a cremation interment in a flat grave, and its material shows it to be the earliest of its kind known in the Marne country. The urn is wheel-made, and its plump body, everted rim, cordoned neck, and plain pedestal foot, quite unlike the La Tène C stepped pedestals of the Marne, point unmistakably to an origin in the Rhineland, where the vessel falls perfectly into place between the Hilterwald and Westhofen urns illustrated below (p. 194: Fig. 9): in other words, it belongs to the latter part of II B.C., and no later. In the following century the true pedestal became there restricted to the tall narrow urns above mentioned, which form a special local class that had no effect on the pottery of other regions until, as will be seen, it became still further specialised in the early Roman period. The Saint-Rémy urn, standing before this development, thus belongs definitely to La Tène C, but its character is already beginning to fore-

¹British Museum. E.I.A. Guide, Morel, Album, Pl. 41, fig. 9, Texte, Pl. v, 11, and pp. 70-71, 75-6: pp. 185-6.
shadow the La Tène D style. A date about 125 B.C. is confirmed by the glass bracelet and iron brooch found within it, described and figured below (p. 196, Fig. 11): both belong to well-known Swiss and Rhenish La Tène C types, and their appearance here in the Marne country corroborates the exotic character as well as the date of the containing urn. The type of the latter is met with elsewhere in what became the southern Belgic area, and with the associated objects and the novel and Germanic rite of cremation in a flat grave clearly points to movement into the Marne country from the east in the second half of II B.C., which thence spread west and north-west across Northern France. We are not, of course, justified in assuming a movement of peoples from the Rhine commensurate or coterminous with the undoubted cultural influence, especially the spread of the potter’s wheel. But it may be taken as certain that as well as the barbarous people from the north-east, others more advanced entered the Marne country at this time from the east, bringing a cultural influence more than proportionate to their actual numbers.

Thus the movement from the north-east brought new blood into northern Gaul, but no new culture, while that from the east brought along with some immigration a vital share of new cultural influence from the Rhine. But neither of these dynamic elements could have produced the Belgae and their civilisation of I B.C. without a static element of at least equal weight, and that static element was the blood and tradition of the old Marne people. Literary evidence concerning the language, habits, and physical character of the Belgae has already led us to suspect this, and archaeology makes it abundantly clear. Though the potter’s wheel was a new foreign importation, the vessels it was used to produce embody the old Marne tradition far more than any intrusive elements of style. The Saint-Rémy-sur-Bussy type is indeed significant, but among Belgic pedestal urns it is in a minority. How the bulk of them carry on the established Celtic conventions of the Marne will be made plain in the ensuing descriptions: meanwhile
FIG. 7. DISTRIBUTION-MAP OF PEDESTAL-URNs

Note.—Urns of the Saint-Remy-sur-Bussy type are here included under 'La Tène III.'
(See pp. 190, 199, 249)
the historical and ethnological import of this combination of literary and archaeological evidence can be fully appreciated, and the nature of the fusion that produced the Belgae in the country south of the Ardennes is thereby reliably explained.

Burials of the Belgic period in Champagne are not nearly so numerous as the richer burials of La Tène A–C. In all recorded cases, they are flat graves and the burials are single, not grouped in large cemeteries or urnfields, as in Normandy (see below, p. 198). The earliest cremations are those from Saint-Rémy-sur-Bussy, Somme-Suippe, and Bignicourt (Fig. 10, nos. 9, 10, 13), all late II B.C., the Rhenish analogies for which are further discussed in detail below (p. 194). The other urns cannot be closely dated, either by associated objects or by type, but clearly belong to I B.C. The fine pedestal-urn from Presles (Fig. 8, 5) was found in an elaborate vault which closely resembles, and may be regarded as the Gaulish counterpart of, the rich vaults found at Welwyn in 1906¹ and the similar burials, probably later in date, found at Mount Bures, Essex,² and Stanfordbury, Beds.³ (see pp. 259–261). In all these numerous pottery vessels, including amphorae, and imported Italian bronzes reflect not only the wealth of their owners, but the persistence of the same ritual and beliefs, which passed from Gaul to Britain, there to survive the Roman Conquest. The small urn from Armentieres (Fig. 8, 2) is apparently of early Roman date; a few more such early Roman survivals of the pedestal-urn tradition occur in Normandy (see below, p. 199). The distribution of the Champagne pedestal-urns (Fig. 7) covers the territory of the Catuvellauni, Remi and Suessiones, and the isolated urn from Chelles is just within the easterly border of the Parisii, a non-Belgic tribe.⁴

¹ Arch. Ixiii, 1–30.
² Ibid., pp. 8–9.
⁴ The following cremation burials are also given in Dechelette’s Appendix V (see also Manuel, iv, 543). Many of the graves contained pottery and Gaulish coins, but are not plotted on the map or in the list owing to lack of information about the pottery. Most of the burials were excavated by Bosteaux-Paris, whose collection was destroyed in the bombardment of Reims in 1914. Ardennes: Chateau-Ferriére, Ville-sur-Tagne; Beine, Cernay-les-Reims, Cernon, Conde-sur-Suippe, Pont-Faverger, Vitry-le-François, Vitry-les-Reims.
FIG. 8. POTTERY: 1-2, ARMENTIÈRES; 3-4, CHASSEMY; 5-6, PRESLES, DEPT. AISNE (1/4) (pp. 192-3)
DESCRIPTION OF BELGIC PEDESTAL-URNS IN CHAMPAGNE

(a) AISNE.

Armentières (Fig. 8). St. Germain Mus.

1. Pear-shaped pedestal-urn with wide mouth, short neck, high shoulder and slender foot with nearly flat base. Brown gritty ware with darker coating and polished surface. Resembles, but is probably slightly earlier than, the Marne ' pot a beurre ' type (Fig. 10, 7-8).

2. Pedestal-urn containing cremation. Everted rim, globular body and flat splayed base. Very thin hard grey ware. The featureless shape, flat base and paste suggest a late date for this type, probably under Roman influence. Compare similar urn from Notre-Dame-du-Vaudreuil (Fig. 13, 28). Probably early 1 A.D.

Chassemy (Fig. 8). St. Germain Mus.

3. Miniature pedestal-urn containing cremation. Wide mouth with everted lip, high shoulder and slender foot with splayed flat base. Hard grey ware with polished face. The shape is identical with that of the fine urn from Saint-Audebert (no. 5), and the urn is probably of the same date.

4. Slender pedestal-urn with cordon below neck, rounded shoulder, and groove above the splayed nearly flat base. Gritty grey ware with darker coating.

Presles, Saint-Audebert (Fig. 8). St. Germain Mus.

In 1890, M. F. Moreau excavated a rich burial in a rectangular tomb of rough stones, measuring 6 ft. by 4 ft. 3 ins. In the centre was a pedestal-urn containing burnt bones and two iron brooches, and elsewhere in the grave were six pottery vessels, some containing animal bones, a two-handled amphora with bronze circlet on the rim, a heavy bronze ring, five clear glass beads and a large bead of polychrome glass. The burial was obviously that of an important person, probably a chieftain, well supplied with wine from the south.

5. Graceful pear-shaped pedestal-urn with wide mouth, high rounded shoulder, slender lower part with band of fine striations, and heavy splayed foot, concave at the centre. Fine sandy brown ware, dark brown coating with polished surface. One of the brooches is preserved in the Saint-Germain Museum (p. 197, Fig. 11, 1). The bow is highly arched and decorated with a central row of small dots. Two small wings protect the spring: the chord passes behind the head. Originally it had a small chain, the brooches being worn in pairs, one on each shoulder. This custom may be traced back to the early La Tène period. The bead on the bow is a decorative survival of the collar attaching the returned foot to the bow in the La Tène C type. The foot is open and square-ended.

1 In the descriptions which follow, all pottery is wheel-turned, unless stated otherwise.
2 F. Moreau, Album Caranda, Pl. 113.
3 Dechelette, Manuel, iv, 758.
This brooch is the direct ancestor of an early Roman brooch with arched bow and long, straight foot, usually solid, common on continental sites of the first half of the first century A.D. The brooch is probably late 1 B.C.

6. Pedestal-urn with cremation. Squared out-bent rim, globular body with angular cordon at base of neck, and splayed flat base. Probably late 1 B.C. This is the only example from France of a type with flat quoit-shaped base, occurring north of the Thames at Abbots Langley, Hitchin, Newnham near Bedford (Fig. 21, 3), and Welwyn (see p. 247 below). This urn has every appearance of being late La Tène D. The profile and base agree with examples from Welwyn (Arch, ixiii, 23, fig. 22 and Pl. iii), but caution is needed in referring to the typological value of bases. Probably late 1 B.C. or early 1 A.D.

(b) ARDENNES.

Bignicourt (Fig. 10). Chalons-sur-Marne Mus.

13. Small pedestal-urn with beaded rim, tall neck, rounded body and contracted foot with heavy concave base. Decorated on upper part with burnished vertical lines between girth grooves. Fairly coarse grey ware.

This urn is of the Saint-Rémy-sur-Bussy type, but probably of slightly later date, as the form inclines to that of the pear-shaped pedestal-urn. Probably about 100 B.C. or soon after.

(c) MARNE.

Camp de Chalons (Fig. 10). St. Germain Mus.

7. Pedestal-urn with wide mouth, short neck, high shoulder and concave base. Decorated with zone of narrow girth grooves. Hard sandy brown ware, polished grey-brown surface. There are about six urns of this type from cemeteries in the Camp de Chalons in the Saint-Germain Museum, but no details of their discovery are known. The type is localised in the Marne, and has received the name of 'pot a beurre.' The prototype in the Marne culture may be seen in an urn, with stepped pedestal base characteristic of La Tène C, from Prosnes (pp. 172-3: Fig. 5, 3). Probably late 1 B.C.

Han-au-Diable (Fig. 10), St. Germain Mus.

8. Pedestal-urn of 'pot a beurre' type with flat base. Decorated from rim to base with fine shallow striations. Hard gritty pinkish-grey ware.

1 R. G. Collingwood, Archaeology of Roman Britain, 255, fig. 63, 70-71.
4 Arch. ixiii, 23, fig. 22 and Pl. iii, 1, 2, 7, 9.
5 We are indebted to M. A. Thierot, of Chalons-sur-Marne, for supplying a drawing of this urn.
6 Morel Collection, British Museum: Morel, La Champagne Souterraine, Pl. 23, 9, texte p. 107.
Saint-Rémy-sur-Bussy (Fig. 10). British Mus.

9. Pedestal-urn containing cremation of adult male and fragments of iron brooch and glass bracelet (p. 197: Fig. 11, 2-3). Biconical form with everted beaded rim, conical neck with two cordons, globular body with wide band of narrow girth grooves, and burnished vertical and scribble lines between and below the cordons. The foot is spreading and concave at the centre, quite unlike the stepped pedestals of the La Tène C Marne type (p. 172: Fig. 5, 2-3). Fine hard gritty brown ware, surface polished round neck, dull on body. While not identical with any single vessel from the middle Rhine, the character of this pot is clearly derived from that district and not native to the Marne, for it is developed directly from the type

FIG. 9. POTTERY: 1, HILTERWALD, NEAR TRIER; 2, WESTHOSEN, RHEINHESSEN (1)

of Fig. 9, 1, which comes from a grave in the Hilterwald near Trier, and is probably not more than a century older than the Saint-Rémy urn.1 The possibility that the latter should really belong to the first century B.C. (La Tène D) cannot well arise, for by the beginning of that century Rhenish urns of this type no longer had pedestals, though their neck and body shape continued strongly to resemble the Saint-Rémy type, as is shown by Fig. 9, 2, a vessel decorated with cordons and burnished lines, from a La Tène D grave at Westhofen in Rheinhessen.2 In fact, in the Rhineland the true pedestal had by then become restricted to the tall, narrow urns above mentioned.

1 Trier Mus., Hettner, Illus. Führer durch das Provinzialmuseum in Trier (1903), p. 124, abb. 11; cf. Baldes-Behrens, Birkenfeld Katalog (1914), taf. xiii, 1, 3, 4 (Hirstein, rather earlier in date).

2 Mainz Mus. Germanische Denkmäler der Frühzeit, i, p. 20, abb. 24, 2, 2a, 2b; Schumacher, P.Z. vi, 263, abb. 9, 7.
FIG. 10. POTTERY: 7, CAMP DE CHÂLONS; 8, HAN-AU-DIA BLE; 9, SAINT-REMYSUR-BUSSY; 10, SOMME-SUIPPE; 11, VERT-LA-GRAVELLE, DEPT. MARNE; 12, CHELLES (SEINE-ET-MARNE); 13, BIGNICOURT (ARDENNES) (I)
(7, 8, 13, p. 193; 9, p. 194; 10-12, p. 196)
which form a special local class that had no influence on the pottery of other regions until, still further specialized as shewn above (p. 187), it passed into the early Roman period. The Saint-Rémy urn thus belongs definitely to La Tène C, but its fine wheel technique and the burnished lines which relate it closely to the Westhofen vessel, show it to be already near the transition to the La Tène D style. Its date must accordingly fall in the latter half of II B.C.

Fig. 11, 2. Fragments of small iron brooch of La Tène C. type, with angular foot and long spring of fourteen turns. Although the collar attachment of foot to bow is broken away, the restoration may be relied upon, as springs with an excessive number of turns do not occur on La Tène D brooches. The brooch may be paralleled in Switzerland¹ at the same date, and also in the Rhineland, though indeed the type survived there into the ensuing century.² Here it is clearly exotic, as the long spring is totally unlike the contemporary brooches, whether of iron or bronze, of the Marne culture.³ Moreover, the angular foot and tendency to arching of the bow over the spring should place the brooch late in La Tène C.

Fig. 11, 3. Fragments of moulded bracelet of yellowish-white glass, flat inside, with the ribs round the outside, distorted and fused by fire. It belongs to a well-known La Tène C type (Déchelette's 'La Tène II'), often richly ornamented in relief and painted, which is characteristic of the Rhineland and Switzerland, in which country they were probably manufactured.⁴ So, like the brooch, it is definitely an exotic object, which must have reached the Marne before the end of the second century B.C.

Somme-Suippe (Fig. 10). St. Germain Mus.

10. Pedestal-urn of Saint-Rémy-sur-Bussy type, decorated on the upper part with burnished lines in a lattice pattern, and on the body with a wide band of narrow girth grooves. The lattice pattern should be compared with the similar design on the Hilterwald urn (Fig. 9, 1). Fine sandy buff ware, polished light brown surface with red and grey patches. The upper part is cracked and distorted by over-firing in the kiln. Late II B.C.

Vert-la-Gravelle (Fig. 10). St. Germain Mus.

11. Pedestal base of fine grey ware, with flat splayed foot. Probably same late date as urn from Armentières (pp. 190-2: Fig. 8, 2).

(d) SEINE-ET-MARNE.

Chelles (Fig. 10). St. Germain Mus.

12. Graceful pear-shaped pedestal-urn of Saint Audebert type (Fig. 8, 5). Body decorated with band of narrow girth grooves. Sandy brown ware with grey coating, polished dark grey surface. Late I B.C.

¹ P. Vouga, La Tène, Pl. xx, 20; D. Viollier, Sépultures du second âge du fer en Suisse (1916), Pl. 8, 317.
² Beltz, Zeitschrift für Ethnologie, xliii, 683 ff.; Germanische Denkmäler der Frühzeit, i, 51, and e.g. p. 31, abb. 35.
³ e.g. Déchelette, Manuel, iv, 759, fig. 535, 1, 3, 5.⁴ Déchelette, Manuel, iv, 830-32; Viollier, op. cit., p. 64, Pls. 33-35.
FIG. 11. BROOCHES AND GLASS BRACELET: 1, PRESLES (AISNE); 2–3, SAINT-RÉMY-SUR-BUSSY (MARNE); 4–5, ALIZAY (EURE); 6, CAUDEBEAC-LES-ELBEUF (EURE); 7–8, NOTRE-DAME-DU-VAUDREUIL (EURE); 9, FORÊT D’EU (SEINE INFERIEURE) (½) (1, p. 192; 2–3, p. 196; 4–5, p. 201; 6, p. 202; 7–8, p. 206; 9, p. 208.)
The distribution of these, the typical Belgic vessels of the period, is concentrated to a large extent in the country round the Marne and Aisne where the earlier La Tène culture had its focus. This is exactly what we should expect; in fact the distribution no less than the typology of the vessels inevitably confirms the hints to be found in our literary evidence concerning the survival there of the old Marne stock.

But the type is also thickly concentrated in a second district, namely the valley of the lower Seine, where remains of the earlier La Tène periods are, in sharp contrast to the Marne and Aisne country, rather scanty.

The explanation must evidently be displacement of part of the Marne and Aisne population by the Germanic invaders: those who survived the invasion and found themselves ousted by the aliens from their old lands retired westward to the scantily-peopled lower Seine valley, and the district between it and the sea on the north; there they settled, bringing with them the traditions of the old Marne culture as they had been modified by the events which had led to their own displacement. Their funeral rite, their types of cinerary urn, differ hardly at all from those of their contemporaries on the Marne and Aisne.

The late La Tène burials in Normandy are not only more numerous than those in Champagne, but contain a more varied range of pottery. Most of the cemeteries were carefully excavated and recorded by the Abbé Cochet (1812–1875), and recently M. Léon Coutil has collated all the material in l’Époque Gauloise en Normandie (1918). Large cemeteries of flat graves are the rule in Normandy, some containing as many as sixty urns, but only a small proportion have been preserved in most cases. Normally, each grave contained a pedestal-urn with burnt bones, often with a brooch inside it, or placed underneath. Accessory pottery vessels are often present. Next to the brooch, the sword in its scabbard is the most usual grave-furniture (Alizay, Hallais, Moulineaux, Léry, Notre-

---

1 Abbé Cochet, Sepultures gauloises, (1857); La Seine-Inferieure historique romaines, francaes et normandes et archéologique (1866).
Dame-du-Vaudreuil, etc.). The sword was often bent or otherwise mutilated before being placed in the grave.

The earliest graves in Normandy are at Bellozanne, Caudebec-lès-Elbeuf, and Sainte-Beuve-en-Rivière, which contained urns related to the Saint-Rémy-sur-Bussy type, and date from the late II or early I B.C. The majority of the burials belong to I B.C., and associated brooches help to fix the dates more accurately. In Normandy, pedestal-urns survived, though rare, almost unchanged into the Roman period, the latest being about A.D. 70 (Notre-Dame-du-Vaudreuil, Fig. 13, 27). It has been found practically impossible to assign accurate dates to the Normandy pedestal-urns on typological grounds alone. This is well illustrated by Fig. 13; a comparison of nos. 22, 23 and 26, and 27 and 28, which cover a period of some two centuries, shows that, apart from minor details, the form of the pedestal-urn remains practically unchanged throughout its history in Normandy. Where possible in the descriptions which follow, dates have been suggested for the pottery, but it should be clearly understood that these are in most cases purely tentative.

The cemeteries cluster thickly on the territory of the Caleti and Veliocasses, with isolated cemeteries in the Ambiani (Port-le-Grand), Atrebates (Billy-Montigny), and Bellovaci (Bellozanne). Outside the Belgic area, pedestal-bases occur at Fort-Harrouard, on the western border of the Carnutes (compare Figs. 7 and 20, pp. 189, 230).

DESCRIPTION OF BELGIC PEDESTAL-URNS IN NORMANDY AND PICARDY.

(a) EURE.

Alizay (Fig. 12). Rouen Mus.

This is one of the richest sites in Normandy, but the site was largely plundered before the Abbe Cochet conducted more regular excavations here in 1870. The pottery found by Cochet is now in Rouen Museum, but the major part of the finds are still in inaccessible private collections. In all, over forty pots are known, also a varied
FIG. 12. POTTERY: 14-19, ALIZAY; 20-21, LÉRY, DÉPT. EURE (4)
(14-19, p. 201; 20-21, p. 203)
number of grave-goods, including brooches, spearheads, knives and bent swords.

Among the pottery is one of the two vases with painted decoration found in Normandy (see below, p. 227). The pot is covered with a white slip, with brown bands round the neck and above the base, connected by similar bands and groups of straight and wavy lines.¹

The majority of the pedestal-urns have the characteristic pear-shape with nearly flat base usual in Normandy, but several pots are of finer ware, with polished bands in place of cordons, and betray Roman influence. The cemetery should thus cover most of La Tène D, and probably persisted into early Roman times.


The brooches (p. 197: Fig. 11, 4) are of the same type, with spring of four turns, and small bead on the bow, in the position of the collar attaching foot to bow in the La Tène C type. The more complete brooch has a flat bow and pierced foot. Typologically, the brooches belong to the earlier part of La Tène D, 100-50 B.C.

15. Pear-shaped pedestal-urn, containing cremation of adult man, burnt animal bones (not determined), and iron brooch. Same type as no. 14. Hard gritty brown ware with dull brown-grey surface. On the body are ten evenly spaced polished bands, made by a flat tool while the pot was being turned. Such bands occur on the later pedestal-urns of fine hard 'metallic' ware, and betray mass-production and the decline of the use of cordons under Romanisation.

The brooch (Fig. 11, 5) has an angular swollen head and open foot; it should not be earlier than the mid-first century B.C., and may have been made considerably earlier than the pedestal-urn in which it was placed.

The burial is probably late I B.C.

16. Conical urn with cordon at base of neck and wide raised bands bounded by grooves on the body. The base is restored after an urn of similar type from Notre-Dame-du-Vaudreuil (p. 207: Fig. 14, 30). Grey ware, brown coated with polished surface. Probably the prototype of a conical pot with everted lip, low pedestal base and two groups of cordons on the body, from Billericay, Essex.² Probably mid I B.C.

17. Butt-shaped urn, containing cremation of adult man and small indeterminate fragment of iron. Everted lip, three narrow girth grooves below neck, and slightly concave base. Hand-made, fine grey ware, brown coated with well-tooled surface. Probably early I B.C. The Marne prototype of this form usually has grooves round the upper part, and is often enriched by red-painted chevrons or fret-pattern.³

18. Small wide-mouthed bowl, with concave neck, high angular shoulder and beaded concave base. Hard gritty grey-brown ware, brown coated. Several bowls of similar form were found at Alizay, some of coarse hand-made ware.

19. Small wide-mouthed bowl, with everted lip, two wide and three narrow girth-grooves on neck above the angular shoulder. Fine black ware with tooled brown-grey surface. Resembles Swarling type 26, placed before 50 B.C.

Caudebec-lès-Elbeuf (Fig. 13). Rouen Mus.

In 1865 the Abbe Cochet excavated a large cemetery, which had been partially explored the previous year. In all, at least fifty urns were found, but unfortunately most of the pottery has been dispersed in private collections. There are, however, several pots in Rouen Museum, which are the survivors of ten urns 'franchement gaulois' found by Cochet. Coins of Augustus, Tiberius and Nero, found in the graves, prove that the cemetery continued in use into the Roman period.

22. Pear-shaped pedestal-urn, containing burnt bones of adult man and two iron brooches. Wide-mouth, short vertical neck, and nearly flat base. Decorated on the upper part with pairs of shallow girth grooves in five zones, with burnished vertical lines between the uppermost zones. Hand-made, hard gritty grey ware, tooled brown-grey surface. The brooches (p. 197 : Fig. 11, 6) are of La Tène C type, with rectangular foot held to the bow by a small collar, and spring of six turns. The angular foot appears to be a late feature of this class of brooch, probably late II B.C. The urn is thus one of the earliest from the Normandy urn-fields, and the band of vertical burnished lines relate it to the early urns from Bellozanne (Fig. 15, 40), and Saint-Rémy-sur-Bussy (p. 195 : Fig. 10, 9).

23. Pear-shaped pedestal-urn, containing a few burnt bones and a small fragment of iron. Decorated with two cordons bordered by grooves. Hard gritty grey ware, brown coated. Probably mid-I B.C.

24. Pear-shaped pedestal-urn, found in 1912. Fine hard grey ware, tooled grey surface with large buff patches. Probably mid to late I B.C. A similar urn, found by Cochet in 1865, contained a bronze bracelet with overlapping ends wound spirally round the wire. This type occurs at well-known La Tène D sites, e.g. Mont Beuvray and Stradonitz in Bohemia, but lasted into the early Roman period.


Léry (Fig. 12). Evreux and St. Germain Mus.

In 1872 M. P. Nouvel discovered a cemetery, but it was excavated without care. One grave-group is described, and is of unusual

---

1 Bull. Comm. antiq. Seine Inf. (1912), xvi, 156, fig. h.
2 Rev. Arch., 1867, i, 298.
3 Dechelette, Manuel, iv, 733, fig. 520. A U H V, II, v, taf. iii, 6.
interest, as it contained a painted pot. A large urn, 24 inches high, contained burnt bones and an ovoid vase, 8½ inches high, of buff ware covered with a red slip and painted in grey with bands of chevron and chequer pattern. By the side of the urn was a bent iron sword in its scabbard.

More burials were found in 1890, and M. L. Coutil rescued some of the iron objects. These include a La Tène C sword in its scabbard, spearheads, knife and razor, rings, and a fine horse-bit. It was not possible to ascertain whether these objects came from burnt burials or inhumations, but the horse-bit suggests a chariot-burial. The only well-recorded La Tène D chariot-burial in Gaul is from Armentieres, Aisne¹ for Britain, see p. 261 (Lexden).

In 1898 further burials were destroyed, from which Coutil rescued fragments of twenty-six urns, including eight pedestal-urns, six bronze brooches of ‘pseudo-La Tène II’ type,² six brooches of ‘Nauheim’ type, three brooches with disc on the bow,³ and three tinned-bronze mirrors of usual Roman type. It is clear that the cemetery, or group of cemeteries, lasted throughout the La Tène D period into early Roman times; the latest objects belong to early I A.D.

20. Wide-mouthed pedestal-urn, outbent squared lip, high rounded shoulder and slightly concave base. Decorated with three narrow cordons bounded by grooves. Hard sandy grey ware, brown coated with dull tooled grey surface. Probably mid I B.C.


Notre-Dame-du-Vaudreuil (Figs. 13-14). Louviers, Rouen and St. Germain Mus.

This important cemetery was first noticed in 1846, but it was not until 1858–59 that the site was properly excavated by M. P. Goujon, and shortly afterwards the Abbe Cochet discovered eight more burials. Among the associated objects found by Goujon are two La Tène C brooches, one with long spring (like that from Saint-Rémy-sur-Bussy, p. 197: Fig. 11, 2), about eight La Tène D brooches, and two provincial Roman brooches of early I A.D.⁴ Roman coins were found in eighteen graves, of which fourteen are of Augustus and four of Tiberius. An interesting grave-group consisted of a fine bent iron La Tène D sword, placed inside an iron helmet with cheek-pieces, containing burnt bones; beside the helmet lay a pottery urn. The latest grave-group contained a coin of Nero, showing the persistence of burial rites without change till after the middle of I A.D. The urn (Fig. 13, 27) scarcely differs from the

¹ Moreau, Album Caranda, II, pt. i, Pl. 24; Rev. Arch., 1902, ii, 203; Dechelette, Manuel, iv, 688. ⁴ The brooches and other objects are illustrated by Coutil, Arch. Gauloise . . . Dept. de l’Eure, ii, fig. 538.

² Dechelette, Manuel, iv, 766.


[The text continues with further detailed descriptions and references.]
La Tène D type, and the pedestal-base remained practically unchanged throughout the whole of the Normandy series (compare Figs. 13, 22 and 27). Most of the urns and iron objects are at Saint-Germain, and there are a few pots in Louviers and Rouen Museums.


27. Ovoid pedestal-urn, with vertical neck and angular foot with almost flat base. Very hard fine grey ware, dull black surface. This urn contained burnt bones, a small broken Roman handled pot of buff ware, and a coin of Nero (A.D. 54–68). A cast of the coin was submitted to Messrs. J. Allan and G. C. Brooke, Department of Coins and Medals, British Museum, who kindly report as follows: As of Nero, minted at Rome. Obv., Head to r.: legend uncertain. Rev., Victory advancing 1.: holds in r. a shield inscribed S.P.Q.R., S C across field.1 The coin is worn, but was probably not deposited in the grave more than five years or so from minting. The pedestal-urn is therefore not likely to be later than A.D. 70.

28. Pedestal-urn, with short vertical neck, globular body and concave base. Thin hard gritty grey ware, dull grey surface, with six polished bands on body. Compare Alizay no. 15 (Fig. 12). Probably late I B.C.

29. Conical urn with beaded rim and three wide cordons on body. Hard sandy grey ware, brown coated, with tooled brown-grey surface. Resembles, but is probably earlier than, the conical pot from Alizay (Fig. 12, 16). Probably early I B.C.

30. Conical urn, with beaded rim and single wide cordon on body, foot-stand with concave base. Sandy grey ware, brown coated, with tooled brown-grey surface. Resembles Swarling type 10, and is probably about the same date, mid-I B.C.

31. Biconical urn with thickened rim, bulging shoulder and small concave base. Broad cordon at base of neck and groove above shoulder, between which are two burnished wavy lines. Fine softish grey sandy ware, brown coated, with tooled brown surface, grey below shoulder. Probably early I B.C. The prototype of this form occurs in the Marne Culture.2

32. Straight-sided bowl with outbent lip and two narrow cordons above the angular shoulder. Fine hard sandy red ware, polished brown surface. A similar bowl was found at Billericay, Essex.3 Probably mid I B.C.

The following two brooches were no doubt once associated with pottery, which cannot now be traced. They are illustrated to complete the Normandy series of La Tène D brooches.

1 Cohen, 288–305; B.M. Catalogue of Roman Coins, 240 ff.; Mattingly and Sydenham, Roman Imperial Coinage, 318–331.
2 Morel, Champagne Souterraine, Pl. 4, 5, 10; Pl. 35, 3; Pl. 41, 14; Rev. Arch., 1906, ii, 263, fig. 64, 2.
Fig. 11, 7 (p. 197). Iron brooch with separate bead on top of the bow, spring of four turns, and open foot. Transitional type between La Tene C and D, in which the bow is usually plain. Probably early 1 B.C.

Fig. 11, 8. Iron La Tene D brooch with plain flat bow, spring of four turns with chord passing inside head, and solid foot. Typologically, the solid foot is later than the open foot, and the brooch may be a local copy of the Nauheim type, which belongs to the latter part of La Tene D. Probably second half of 1 B.C.

(b) EURE-ET-LOIR.

Fort-Harrouard (Fig. 14). St. Germain Mus.

This large promontory camp, overlooking the valley of the Eure, has been systematically excavated by the Abbe J. Philippe since 1906. The camp was twice occupied in the Neolithic period, apparently abandoned until the late Bronze Age, and again desolate until late La Tene. Several La Tene D pit-dwellings and hearths have been examined. The huts were of timber plastered with clay daub, and it is remarkable that many of the huts suffered a violent end and were burnt down. After this destruction, the camp seems never again to have been occupied, and it seems almost certain that Fort-Harrouard was finally overthrown by Caesar or one of his lieutenants in a campaign against the Carnutes. Thus the pottery illustrated may be dated about mid 1 B.C.

Apart from a few La Tene C brooches, all the objects belong to La Tene D. Many of the brooches are of 'Nauheim' type, which occurs but rarely in the contemporary cemeteries in Normandy. The coarse pottery is still hand-made, while the finer wares, including pedestal-bases, are turned on the wheel.


34. Pedestal-base with cordon above spreading foot-ring, and two grooves above. Concave base with pronounced omphalos. Hard grey ware, reddish-brown coating, well tooled surface. This is the only example of the omphalos in the base of a pedestal-urn which we have found in France. It is a common feature in the base of some types of bowls in the Hallstatt period, and in some instances is derived from the 'kick' in the base of bronze bowls and buckets of the same period. The omphalos occurs more frequently on La Tene pottery in Britain, at Aylesford and Swarling, Hengistbury Head, Theale, near Reading, Glaston-

1 Reports in Bull. Soc. normande d'Etudes préhistoriques, xv (1907), 101-137; xviii (1910), 36-57; xx (1912), 61-90; xxii (1913), 23-36; xxi (1922-24), 17-47; xxv bis (1927), 1-170.

2 e.g. Les Jogasses, Marne, Rev. Arch., li, 322, Pl. viii, 7.

3 Arch., li, 352, Pl. viii, 7.

4 Swarling Report, type 11.

5 Hengistbury Head Report, classes B and C.
FIG. 14. POTTERY: 29-32, NOTRE-DAME-DU-VAUDREUIL (EURE); 33-37, FORT HARROUARD (EURE-ET-LOIR); 38, BILLY-MONTIGNY (PAS-DE-CALAIS); 39, PORT-LE-GRAND (SOMME) (4) (29-32, p. 205; 33-37, p. 206; 38, p. 217; 39, p. 220.)
bury¹, Meare, and Wookey Hole, Somerset², and Woodcuts, Wilts³ (see Fig. 21, 5).

35. Small pedestal-base with 'kick' at centre. Hard grey ware with fine flint grit, dull buff surface.


37. Wide-mouthed bowl with outbent lip and two narrow cordons above the angular shoulder. Hard grey ware with fine grit, polished buff surface.

(c) SEINE INFÉRIEURE.

Ancourt, near Dieppe (Fig. 15). Dieppe Mus.

In 1867 the Abbe Cochet excavated this cemetery, and found several high-shouldered urns of coarse ware, decorated with striations, similar to the pot from Moulineaux (below, p. 276, Fig. 24, 8), containing burnt bones. There is also a pedestal-base from this site.

48. Base of pedestal-urn, with hollow foot. Hand-made, hard grey ware, tooled surface. The form suggests an early date, though hand-made pottery persisted throughout La Tene D into the Roman period. Probably late II or early I B.C.

'Basse Foret d'Eu' (Fig. 15).⁴ Dieppe Mus.

47. Pear-shaped pedestal-urn, containing burnt bones and large iron La Tene D brooch. Outbent rim, cordon at base of neck, and slightly concave base. Fine hard grey ware, tooled brown-grey surface. The brooch (p. 197: Fig. 11, 9) has a flat-sided bow and square-ended open foot with knob-like projection. The form is typically La Tene, and lasted into the Roman period on the Continent. It is rare in Britain.⁵ Probably late I B.C.

Bellozanne (Fig. 15). Rouen Mus.

In 1873 the Abbé Cochet excavated this cemetery, and found five graves and about twenty pots. Each grave contained an urn with cremation, and accessory vessels. An iron brooch, now lost, was found in one grave-group.

This small cemetery is one of the most interesting in Normandy, as it not only shows very early influence from the Marne in the pedestal-urn (No. 40), but also has an equally notable connection with Britain in the curious corrugated vessel (No. 43). The cemetery probably dates, in part at least, from the end of II B.C., and it is especially unfortunate that the associated brooch is lost, as this would perhaps have confirmed the early dating.

¹ Glastonbury Lake Village, ii, 515, fig. 168, pls. lxxx, lxxxiv.
² Arch., lxiv, 340, fig. 1, 2, 7.
⁵ R. G. Collingwood, Archaeology of Roman Britain, p. 246, fig. 60, 3.
FIG. 15. POTTERY: 40-45, BELLOZANNE; 46, CAUDECÔTE-LÈS-DIEPPE; 47, BASSE FORET D’EU; 48, ANCOURT; 49, NORMARE,
DÉPT. SEINE INFERIEURE (1/2)

(40-45, p. 210; 46, p. 212; 47-48, p. 268; 49, p. 213.)
Bi-conical pedestal-urn, with heavy splayed base. The upper part is decorated with wide cordons and grooves, the space between the lower cordons being filled with sloping burnished lines. Fine hard grey ware, well tooled brown-grey surface. Similar burnished lines occur on only one other pedestal-urn in Normandy; the late La Tène C urn from Caudebec-les-Elbeuf (Fig. 13, 22). Moreover, the cordons are broad and numerous, distinguishing this urn from the usual La Tène D Normandy pedestal-urn, which is either plain or has a few narrow cordons.

The shape, cordons, and decoration of this urn class it with the Saint-Remy-sur-Bussy type (p. 195 : Fig. 10, 9-10), of which it is a fairly close local copy. It is, moreover, the earliest pot in Normandy showing the use of the potter’s wheel, and unfamiliarity with this appliance probably accounts for its somewhat heavy rendering of the prototype. Everything points to the end of II B.C. as the date of this urn.

Ovoid bowl, with cordon at base of neck and two narrow girth-grooves on shoulder, beaded foot with concave base. Fine gritty grey ware, brown coated, with polished dark brown surface.

Ovoid bowl, with wide cordon at base of neck, flat base. Hard grey ware, brown coated, with polished brown-grey surface.

Fragment of conical vessel, with broad corrugations. Fine soft black ware, thick reddish-brown coating, with polished grey-brown surface. Copies in clay of the late Hallstatt bronze cordoned bucket have been found at Allington1, Aylesford2, and Swarling.3 This form has not been found in the Marne, and it was probably of local origin in Normandy. A bronze cordoned bucket, found in a grave at Inglemare (Seine Inferieure), which Déchelette classed as La Tène I,4 would serve as a local prototype. The Bellozanne pot is thus intermediate between the bronze model and the Kentish vessels, which are referred to I B.C.5

Clay copies of the bronze cordoned bucket occur, but rarely, south of the Alps, and more particularly in Italy, the place of manufacture of the originals.6 The only other model in clay from France seems to be the cylindrical handled bucket from the Hallstatt tumuli of the Plateau de Ger (Hautes-Pyrenees).7

Wide conical bowl, with thin inbent rim and sagging base. Hand-made, hard black ware, well tooled grey-brown surface. This is an early example of a type common over a wide area in I B.C., e.g. at Mont Beuvray8 and Stradonitz in Bohemia.9

Wide conical bowl with outbent rim and concave neck. Hand-made, hard gritty grey ware, brown coated, with well tooled brown-grey surface.

---

1 Swarling Report, p. 19.
2 Arch., iii, 332, Pl. viii, 7.
3 Swarling Report, p. 10, type 11.
4 Manuel, iv, 566.
5 Swarling Report, p. 25.
6 E. Pottier, Cat. des vases grecs du musée du Louvre, i, 332.
7 Déchelette, op. cit., iii, 265, 305, fig. 329, r.
8 J. G. Bulliot, Fouilles du Mont Beuvray, Pis. xxvi, 6, 8-9; xxviii, 13, 15.
9 Pic-Déchelette, Le Hradischt de Stradonitz en Boheme, Pl. ii, 11.
FIG. 16. POTTERY: 50-52, HALLAIS; 53-55, MOULINEAUX; 56-57
SAINTE-BEUVE-EN-RIVIERE; 58-59, VARIMPRE, DEPT. SEINE INFÉRIEURE (1)
Caudecôte-lès-Dieppe (Fig. 15). Dieppe Mus.

This large cemetery was destroyed without record until 1887, when M. Milet excavated five urns, containing cremations. These are high-shouldered pots, decorated with chevrons, saltires and curvilinear designs, discussed below p. 218, and see Fig. 18, 3-4. There is also a pedestal-base from this site.


Cite de Limes, near Dieppe.

This well-known camp on the cliff about 1 mile east of Dieppe has been sporadically excavated since 1822. In 1926, sections were cut through three low mounds, supposed to be the debris of dwellings. In one mound were found fragments of two pedestal-bases, two La Tène D brooches, and a Gaulish coin of new type. The pedestal-bases are similar to that from Caudecôte-lès-Dieppe (Fig. 15, 46), and with those from Fort Harrouard (Fig. 14, 33-36) are the only known domestic pedestal-pots in Normandy. They show no features distinguishing them from the pedestal-urns made for funerary use. Indeed, the latter were probably domestic pots in the first place, and simply used later to contain the ashes of the dead. In any case, if made solely for this special purpose, they were modelled on the forms in daily use.

Hallais, near Bouelles (Fig. 16). Dieppe and Neufchâtel Mus.

Between 1842 and 1854 a large cemetery was destroyed without proper record. Groups of pots, sometimes four or five together, were noticed about 6 feet apart, buried in pits filled with burnt earth. The pots comprised pedestal-urns and bowls, some with covers. In 1854 the Abbé J. E. Decorde carefully excavated a grave-group. It consisted of a fine urn with cover (Fig. 16, 50), containing burnt bones and rings and beads of bone and flint. The urn had been placed inside a wooden bucket with mouth larger than the base, bound by bronze bands, 16-18 inches in diameter and 1 inch wide. Outside the bucket was a fine iron La Tène D sword in its scabbard, slightly bent before burial, and a pair of iron shears. The sword, at least 32 inches long and 2 inches wide, has a scabbard decorated near the mouth with semicircular bands, and lower down with cross-bars, very similar to an example from La Tène. The typology of La Tène D swords is not yet fully worked out; the Hallais example is probably early or mid-I b.c.

50. Wide-mouthed bowl with cover, both with a cordon round the neck. Hard sandy grey ware, tooled brown-grey surface. In the Marne, wide-mouthed urns were sometimes provided with

---

4 Cochet, *Sépultures gauloises*, p. 397.
6 Similar but smaller buckets were found at Armentières and Saint Audebert (Aisne), F. Moreau, *Album Caranda*, N.S., Pls. 43, 116.
7 Dechelette, Manuel, iv, 620, fig. 460, 4.
covers, but the type is better represented in Britain at Braintree, Colchester, and Lexden, Essex. These are globular bowls with a series of cordons from rim to base, dating from late I B.C. to early I A.D.

51. Wide-mouthed bowl, with two girth grooves round neck. Hard sandy grey ware, brown coated, tooled brown-grey surface.

52. Pedestal-base, with heavy splayed foot and base sagging downwards. Hard grey ware, grey-brown coated, with polished surface. Probably late I B.C.

Lucy.

Cemetery partially explored by M. Courtin, who found two pedestal-urns, similar to Fig. 12, 14 (p. 200), and two bowls, resembling Fig. 15, 45 (p. 209).

Moulineaux (Fig. 16). Rouen Mus.

In 1855, a workman discovered and partially destroyed about thirty urns. Each grave contained several pots, and was surrounded by a ring of stones. The Abbe Cochet rescued about a dozen pots, and fragments of two iron swords. Later, M. Sanson saved a complete grave-group (see below, p. 220). Most of the pots are hand-made wide bowls and seem to be early, but hard to date without associated objects.

53. Wide-mouthed conical urn, containing burnt bones and fragments of an iron sword. Decorated with five cordons. Hand-made, coarse heavy grey ware with fine grit, tooled light red surface. Resembles the cordoned pot from Alizay (p. 200 : Fig. 12, 16). The low, wide cordons and crude potting suggest a date near that of the early pedestal-urn from Caudebec-les-Elbeuf (p. 204 : Fig. 13, 22). Probably late II or early I B.C.

54. Ovoid urn with beaded rim and short vertical neck. Decorated with three cordons below neck, and two girth-grooves round shoulder. Hard grey ware, buff surface. The fine paste suggests Roman influence. Similar to pots from Swarling (type 12) and Welwyn. Probably early I A.D.

55. High-shouldered urn, with expanded rim and concave neck. Girth-groove at base of neck, and two narrow cordons on shoulder. Hard grey ware with sparing grit, brown coated, tooled grey-brown surface. This pot is probably a wheel-made cordoned version of the high-shouldered urn of earlier La Tene type discussed below (p. 218 ff. and Fig. 18). Probably early I B.C.

Normare (Fig. 15, p. 209). Rouen Mus.

49. Ovoid pedestal-urn, containing burnt bones and formerly 'remains of weapons.' Hand-made, soft heavy black ware, brown coated, uneven surface tooled vertically. Probably late II B.C. or early I B.C.

2 Colchester Museum Reports, 1905, p. 15, Pl. ; 1906, p. 14, Pl. ; 1909,
3 Arch., lxiii, 26, Pl. iii, 8.
Sainte-Beuve-en-Rivière (Fig. 16). Rouen Mus.

In 1862, workmen destroyed several urns. The following year the Abbe Cochet excavated two intact graves—(1) four vessels in a group, of which one (Fig. 16, 56) was complete; (2) single pedestal-urn (Fig. 16, 57).

56. Globular bowl, with outbent rim, foot-stand and concave base. Decorated with broad, heavy cordon and three girth-grooves on the body. Hard black ware, thick red coated, polished red-brown surface. Probably derived from a globular Marne bowl. 1 Similar bowls, with cordons and hollow foot-stand, have been found at Braintree, Colchester, and Lexden, Essex (see above, p. 213). Probably early I B.C.

57. Small bi-conical pedestal-urn, with splayed rim, squared shoulder, and heavy foot. Decorated with cordons and offsets. 2 Miniature of the Bellozanne type (p. 209: Fig. 15, 40). Probably late II or early I B.C.

Saint-Wandrille-Rançon.

In 1861, a large cemetery was destroyed. Between fifty and sixty urns were found, including pedestal-urns and bowls, also three bent iron swords in their scabbards and two or three iron spearheads.

Varimpré (Figs. 16-17). Rouen Mus.

In 1865, the Abbe Cochet partially excavated a low oval tumulus, surrounded by a ditch and slight bank, in the Forest of Eu. The mound measured about 32 by 23 feet, and about 5 feet below the summit was a deposit of burnt bones, apparently contained in a wooden box, of which the iron binding nails remained, with traces of wood. Around the box were grouped ten pottery vessels, several iron objects, and the remains of a wooden bucket, about 8 inches in diameter and height. All that remained of the bucket was a hoop of iron, 2 ½ inches wide, with two movable ring handles, diameter 3 ½ inches, and a sheet of thin bronze, thought to be the bottom of the vessel. 3 Most of the pottery from this burial seems to have disappeared. There are two pots in the Rouen Museum, and the rest have been drawn from Cochet's figures. 4

Fig. 16, 58. Wide-mouthed bowl with spreading pedestal-foot and high concave base, sagging downwards at the centre. Upper part decorated with three cordons and grooves, and one cordon above the foot. Fine hard grey ware, brown coated, polished surface. The prototype of this form may be found in the Marne culture, e.g. the fine pedestal-bowl with characteristic ‘stepped’ base found with a La Tène C sword in a warrior’s grave at Montfercaut, Marson 5 (pp. 172-3: Fig. 5, 4). This bowl has a painted red band

1 B.M. Early Iron Age Guide, p. 70, Pl. v, 10.
2 Drawn after the Abbe Cochet, Seine Inferieure, p. 333.
3 Compare the iron band and ring handle of a second bucket at Aylesford, Arch., lli, 319, fig. 2.
5 Morel, La Champagne souterraine, texte p. 9, Pl. 1, 7; B.M. Early Iron Age Guide, p. 74, Pl. vi, 8.
FIG. 17. POTTERY AND IRON OBJECTS FROM TUMULUS AT VARIMPRE (SEINE INFÉRIEURE)
(60, 1/2; 62, 1/6; 61, 63-5, 1/6; 1, 3/6; 2-4, 1/6)
(p. 216.)
round the broad cordon, and burnished ‘scribble’ design above the shoulder.

A still earlier form was found with La Tène B brooches in a woman’s grave at Courisols, Marne. On the other hand, the Varinpre bowl is the prototype of the cordoned bowl with pedestal-foot, or tazza, such as is frequently found with pedestal-urns in Britain, e.g. at Welwyn, Herts, Creeksea, Essex, Oare, and Woodcuts, Wilts (p. 248 : Fig. 21, 5). The British examples usually have a sharply carinated shoulder and high hollow pedestal-base, with finer profile than the Varinpre bowl. The type lasted into the Roman period, as in London; the biconical form is not emphasised, but the pedestal tends once more to merge into the body of the vessel.

59. Wide-mouthed bowl with vertical lip, high rounded shoulder, and foot ring. Fine hard black ware, brown coated, tooled dark brown surface.

Fig. 17, 60. Hand-made, high-shouldered pot with tall neck. The prototype occurs in the Marne: Morel, *La Champagne souterraine* Pl. v, 7. Similar to Swarling type 14 (Report, p. 26, early I A.D.).

61. Wide-mouthed bowl with cordon round neck and angular shoulder.

62. Lower part of pedestal-urn with conical base and spreading foot. Body decorated with burnished lines and cordon at junction of body and base. The ovoid pedestal-urn with tall conical foot seems to be largely a local development in Britain in early I A.D., and survives into the Roman period in Essex, and London.

63. Wide-mouthed bowl with cordon at base of neck. Similar to Swarling type 16 (Report, p. 26 ; late I B.C, or early I A.D.).

64–65. Wide-mouthed bowls with two cordons at base of neck. Similar to urn from Aylesford, *Arch. lii*, 331, Pl. ix, 8.

Iron Objects (Fig. 17, 1–4).

1. La Tène D brooch with open foot.
2. Knife with socketed handle. A similar knife was found in a Gaulish settlement at Orgeville (Eure). Cf. Vouga, *La Tène*, 109, Pl. xii, 1–2.
4. Pair of shears. Shears have not infrequently been found in La Tène C–D graves in Champagne and the Rhineland. In five instances at La Tène, shears and a razor were found together.

---

1 Morel, *op. cit.*, texte p. 125, Pl. xxi, 12.
2 *Arch., liii*, 25, Pl. iii, 3, 5.
5 Wilts Arch. Mag., xxxvi, 130, Pl. iv, E.
9 Swarling Report, p. 21, Pl. x, 7; Colchester Museum Report, 1929, Pl. viii, 294–5.
10 Royal Commission’s *Roman London*, p. 22, fig. 2, 1, 5, 9.
wrapped in cloth, forming a toilet set: Vouga, *La Tène*, 70, Pl. xxii, 4-6.

As regards the date of the Varimpré tumulus, it is clearly La Tène D. Closer dating may be inferred from two well-dated tumuli in Britain, namely, at Hurstbourne Tarrant, Hants¹ (described in detail below, pp. 304-9) and at Lexden, Essex²; the latter contained a medallion of Augustus (27 B.C.-A.D. 14). Both the British tumuli belong to the early part of I A.D., and obviously cover the remains of persons of high rank—the Lexden tumulus may even be the grave of Cunobelin himself who died about A.D. 40. So the Varimpré tumulus is probably a chieftain's grave also, and at the very earliest belongs to late I B.C., and more probably to early I A.D. Further, it is unique in Belgic Gaul,³ and the only other La Tène D tumulus in France at all comparable with it is that called Tumulus du Bois-Vert, near Lavilleneuve (Cote-d'Or), opened in 1913,⁴ which contained a central burial pit surrounded by a circular stone wall with a timber framework, strikingly similar to the well-known *murus gallicus* construction described by Caesar (B.G. vii, 23). But the Lavilleneuve tumulus is simply an isolated survival into La Tène D of the Hallstatt-La Tène tumulus culture of Franche-Comté,⁵ and does not help in seeking the origin of contemporary barrow-building in Belgic Gaul. The flat grave is a distinctive Celtic method of burial, and in Champagne flat graves are the usual rule from late Hallstatt throughout La Tène times, so that it seems quite certain that the practice of barrow-building in La Tène D cannot be derived from the Marne culture.

Now in Armorica, which was scarcely affected by Celtic influence, the tumulus-culture persisted from the Bronze Age⁶ and Hallstatt period⁷ into La Tène times,⁸ though how late has not yet been determined. Suffice it, however, that a long-established and conservative tumulus-culture lasted along the N.W. French coast well into the La Tène period, and if we derive the practice of occasionally building barrows in La Tène D in Normandy from the neighbouring culture to the west, we are very probably correct, and as near the truth as present knowledge allows. As we shall see below (pp. 218-20) this explanation is to some extent confirmed by certain archaic pottery-forms lasting into La Tène D in Normandy, which are also related to the earlier Armorican culture.

(d) PAS-DE-CALAIS.

**Billy-Montigny** (Fig. 14: p. 207).

38. Pear-shaped pedestal-urn of fine black ware, with bands of striations on the body: splayed foot. This urn is stated to have

¹ *Proc. Hants Field Club*, x, 122.
² *Arch.*, lxxvi, 241-254.
³ Other tumuli containing iron objects and pottery have been opened at Neuville-les-Dieppe and Auppe-gard, near Dieppe, but the evidence of dating is very meagre. Coutil, *Époque Gauloise en Normandie*, iii, 115-124.
⁷ *ibid*, iii, 169.
been found in a cemetery, but cannot now be traced. The drawing is modified after an engraving by H. du Cleuzion: *La Poterie Gauloise* (1872), p. 67, fig. 45. Probably late 1 B.C.

(c) SOMME.

**Port-le-Grand, near Saint Valéry-sur-Somme (Figs. 18–19).**

In 1834 M. Hecquet d’Orval methodically excavated this cemetery, and published a fully illustrated account.¹ Seventeen graves were opened, containing forty-eight urns. The graves were irregularly spaced, 18 inches to 3 feet in depth, and each contained from one to six urns. Burnt bones were found in the majority of the graves; usually the bones were inside the urns, but in a few instances the urn had been placed on top of the bones, or the bones deposited between the pots. Five burials contained grave-goods; namely, a short iron rod, the blade of a knife or spearhead, fragments of copper oxide (probably disintegrated bronze), and two pieces of iron described as ‘boucles,’ one of which is certainly the bow of a La Tène C brooch.

In addition, most of the graves contained bones of animals—ox, boar, sheep and goat, and, what is more remarkable, in at least two burials the unburnt bones of small wild animals—mole, shrew, mouse, water rat, and frog—were found inside the urns.

Most of the pots are turned on the wheel, and clearly belong to the Normandy pedestal-urn culture; they also have analogies at Aylesford, noted below. But three of the seventeen urns illustrated by Hecquet d’Orval equally clearly represent another tradition (Fig. 18, 1–3). The same type occurs in Normandy at Moulineaux near Rouen, the Cité de Limes near Dieppe, and at Caudecôte-les-Dieppe (Fig. 18, 3–4). These pots are all hand-made, of fairly uniform conical shape, with concave neck and high, rounded shoulder. The decoration is limited by girth-grooves, and may consist of a simple chevron or saltire pattern of lines (Fig. 18, 3), a line of dots round the shoulder (Fig. 18, 1) or in a wide band round the body, or grouped in triangles combined with the chevron pattern (Fig. 18, 2). More noteworthy are the curvilinear designs, either a continuous scroll (Fig. 18, 3) or the ‘swag’ or festoon (Fig. 18, 4). All these devices are pre-Belgic in origin; indeed, the tool-marks on the shoulder or grouped in triangles recall Hallstatt parallels in Britain, e.g. All

Cannings Cross, but the bluntly-pencilled lines and neat dots of the Normandy pots point to La Tène C, or at earliest La Tène B in Gaul. The closest French parallels, indeed the only pots really comparable, occur in the well-known high-shouldered La Tène B urns of Brittany, some of which are elaborately decorated with incised scrolls and curvilinear designs. In particular, the urn from Caudecôte-lès-Dieppe

FIG. 18. POTTERY: 1–2, PORT-LE-GRAND (SOMME); 3–4, CAUDECÖTE-LÈS-DIEPPE (SEINE INFÉRIEURE) (1/4) (1–2, p. 220; 3–4, p. 222)

1 M. E. Cunnington, All Cannings Cross, Pls. 31, 5; 32, 3; 49, 2.
(Fig. 18, 3) is strikingly similar to the urn from Saint-Pol-de-Leon (Finistère),\(^1\) both in general form, shape of base, and the scroll pattern round the shoulder, though lacking the intricate S-decoration on the body and base. Now, although the parallels cited in Britain and France belong to La Tène B or C, the Normandy pots are clearly a stage later. The practice of cremation does not help in dating, for the Brittany urns contain burnt bones, but in two instances the pots may be dated by association.

The Port-le-Grand urn (Fig. 18, 1) was found in the same grave-group as the Belgic pots (Fig. 19, 6–7), and therefore belongs to La Tène D.\(^2\) And at Moulineaux the urn, containing burnt bones, was found with a socketed spear head and a bent iron La Tène D sword.\(^3\)

So our Normandy pots represent the scanty indigenous cremators subdued and dispersed by the Belgae, living along the fringe of Belgic territory, and continuing in I B.C. to make pottery in the tradition of the older Hallstatt-La-Tène stock of the N. and N.W. French coasts, which, in turn, was no doubt in part descended from the Bronze Age population in this region.

A few pots from Port-le-Grand are in the Musée de Céramique, Sévres (pp. 207, 219: Figs. 14, 39, and 18, 1–2); the others (Fig. 19) are redrawn from Hecquet d’Orval’s illustrations.

Fig. 14, 39. Pear-shaped pedestal-urn, with wide mouth and concave base. Fine hard grey ware, brown coated with tooled surface. Probably early I B.C.

Fig. 18, 1. High-shouldered urn with outbent thickened rim, and vertical neck with wide girth-groove separating neck and body. Decorated above the shoulder with small oval tool-marks. Hand-made, black ware with tooled dark grey surface.

2. High-shouldered urn with expanded flat rim, and vertical neck with wide girth-groove. Body decorated with a band of chevrons of three shallow grooves, between similar girth-grooves. The triangles on each side of the chevrons are filled with rows of

\(^1\) Dechelette, Manuel, iv, 974, 3 Cochet, Sépultures Gauloises, fig. 663, 1.  
\(^2\) Hecquet d’Orval, op. cit., p. 291, 2\(^{me}\) fouille.
neatly made shallow dots. Hand-made, grey ware, brown coated with tooled surface.

Fig. 19, 1. Pear-shaped pedestal-urn, with narrow mouth and splayed base.

2. Ovoid urn with narrow mouth and bevelled rim.

3. Globular urn with narrow mouth and two cordons on upper part of body. Similar to cordoned urn from Aylesford, Arch. lii, 331, Pl. viii, 4.

4. Shallow bowl with wide mouth and concave neck.

5. Small globular urn with wide mouth, concave neck and cordon on upper part of body.
6. Globular urn with vertical neck and two cordons at junction of neck and body. A very similar urn was found inside the iron loop of a large wooden bucket at Aylesford, Arch. lli, 331, Pl. ix. 7.

7. Conical bowl with wide mouth and concave neck. Compare bowl from Bellozanne, above, p. 209, Fig. 15, 45.

Caudecôté-lès-Dieppe (fig. 18). Dieppe Mus.

3. High-shouldered urn containing burnt bones. Rounded rim, short neck, and heavy widely splayed base. The decoration is in two zones of unequal width, between three shallow girth-grooves. In the upper zone is a continuous scroll traced by a blunt-ended tool, and in the lower zone four saltires of double lines. Hand-made, soft brown ware with fine grit, reddish-brown tooled surface. The similarity of this pot to the urn from Saint-Pol-de-Léon (Finistère) is discussed above, p. 220.

4. High-shouldered urn containing burnt bones of a woman. Rounded rim and short neck. Decorated with a series of double festoons of shallow grooves, between shallow girth-grooves. Hand-made, soft gritty grey ware, brown coated with tooled surface. British parallels for the festoon decoration are noted above, p. 219. Similar decoration in dotted lines occurs on a sherd found in the underground chambers at Saint Guen (Cotes-du-Nord).¹

In spite of these interesting survivals of the pre-Belgic culture in Normandy, which is thus seen to have produced a style of pottery-decoration analogous to the contemporary fashions of Southern Britain, as well as showing relationship to Breton conventions, the bulk of the late La Tène pottery in this province strongly resembles that of Champagne, even to the inclusion of the early Saint-Rémy-sur-Bussy type of pedestal-urn as well as the more normal and longer-lived pear-shaped forms.

Plainly the movements of late II B.C., as indicated above, were such as to form a unitary area of Belgic culture stretching from the Argonne on the east to the mouth of the Seine on the west. Its southern boundaries were roughly, as Caesar found them to be, the Marne and the Seine, except that immediately around their confluence the non-Belgic Parisii still clung to their small territory, and that below the neighbourhood of Les Andelys the south as well as the north side of the Seine valley was Belgic.

The northern boundaries of the culture are harder to define. For here we encounter the natural conse-

quence of the movements we have been describing. Of the peoples bearing the Belgic name the northern and north-eastern boundary is the Rhine. But when they pushed through and past the Ardennes into the lands of the old Marne culture, there was no backwash of that culture northwards into the country from which they came and in which many of their kinsmen were still established. The movement which produced a new Belgic culture based on the old Marne tradition, stretching the whole way across northern Gaul south of the Ardennes, had little or no cultural reaction north of them. The latest pots from La Panne, which must belong to this period, are an improvement on their predecessors, and those from the fortified site of Hastedon close to Namur are something more than degenerate Hallstatt survivals; La Tène D brooches, too, may appear north of the Ardennes during the first half of 1 B.C. But all this amounts to very little. Though now the Belgic name was shared by the people on either side of the Ardennes, that great line of forested upland continued to be a cultural frontier hardly less effective than before, which divided Belgic Gaul into two contrasted halves. North of it, indeed, the proportion of Teutonic stock was inevitably still higher than before. It was German pressure from the east, as we saw in the last chapter, that drove the men of the Low Countries down upon the Aisne and Marne, and it is not surprising to find that in and after Caesar’s time a number of the tribes between the Straits of Dover and the lower Rhine are, though they rank as Belgae, unequivocally stated to be Germans. Indeed, after the movement that caused the formation of the Belgae as we know them, the storm of Teutonic invasion began to burst upon Western Europe as never before.

3. THE CIMBRIC-TEUTONIC INVASION AND AFTER.

We have already noticed the invasion of Gaul by the Cimbri and the Teutones between 113 and 101 B.C. as an important fixed point in the chronology of the Belgae (p. 180), which gives us a definite lower limit of date for their settlement in Gaul. While the Celtic
Gauls all over the country were pent up by the invaders in their fortified towns (many of them, it would seem, newly strengthened to meet the emergency), and forced to support life against starvation upon the bodies of the aged and infirm, the Belgae alone succeeded in defending their territories, or most of them, from being ravaged and depopulated.

It is not surprising that this successful defence against the Teutonic barbarians greatly enhanced the military pride and prestige of the Belgae. All the rest of Gaul was laid waste, and the memory of the disaster was still vividly fresh half a century later. But the concentration in fortified towns it had enforced gave a great impulse to town life in Gaul, and the further development of the temporary war-time refuge into the permanent peace-time centre of tribal life, commerce, and industry was intensified through the civilising influence on the Celtic Gauls effected by the Roman annexation of Gallia Narbonensis, which had been carried out in 120–118 B.C. by M. Domitius Ahenobarbus.

Once the whole of the Mediterranean littoral, with its hinterland up to the Cevennes and up the Rhône valley past the Isère, had become a Roman province,

---

1 Dechelette, Manuel, iv, p. 453.
2 Caesar, B.G. vii, 77, 12.
3 ibid. ii, 4, 2.
4 In 193 B.C., after their abortive attack upon Spain which followed their victory at Arausio over the Romans, the Cimbri returned to Gaul, and joined the Teutones, who had apparently never left it (see Atkinson in Stewarling Report, Appendix II B, p. 48). The MS. of Livy, Epit. 67, which is our authority for this, ' reversaeque in Galliam bellicosae se Teutonis coniunxerunt,' and ' bellicosae ' has generally been considered corrupt. Accordingly Mommsen emended it to ' in Velio-cassaeis,' the Veliocassi or Veliocasses being the tribe which, at least in Caesar's time, inhabited the lower Seine valley (see p. 232). But Caesar states that the Veliocasses were Belgae (B.G. ii, 4, 9), and we have seen that their district is rich in the typical pedestal pottery of the Belgic Gauls (p. 199). There are three possible solutions: either (a) Mommsen's emendation, though accepted in the Teubner text of 1914, is wrong, or (b) it is right, and this part of Belgic Gaul was invaded by the Cimbri and Teutones, in spite of B.G. vii, 4, 2, or (c) it is right, and the Veliocasses at the time of the invasion were not yet included among the Belgae, as they were in Caesar's time. Certainly most of the pedestal pottery of their district seems to be subsequent to the invasion (pp. 198–9). But this view implies the persistence after 'Belgicization' of a pre-Belgic tribal name—a matter on which opinion may be divided.
5 B.G. ii, 4, 3.
6 B.G. i, 33, 4; ii, 4, 2; vii, 77, 4.
7 Dechelette, Manuel iv, p. 453:
8 Wheeler, Roman and Native in Wales, Hon. Soc. Cymrurodigion, Transactions, 1920–21, pp. 73–4; St. Catharine's Hill, pp. 72, 81.
and no longer merely the sphere of influence indirectly of Rome and directly of Massilia, where tranquillity depended on the behaviour of the Celtic and Ligurian tribes, the civilisation of the south was furnished with a base from which to permeate Celtic Gaul even more effectively than during the four previous centuries.

The southern custom of cremation spread everywhere in regions where no German influence could effect the same result. ¹ Not only did trade carry far and wide the imports of the Mediterranean world, but native industry received an enormous stimulus. Metal-working, both in bronze and iron, made great advances. The potter’s wheel was generally adopted, and its best products show abundant evidence of the influence exerted on the Gaulish potter’s craft by the imported fabrics of Italy. True, the native tradition, which had been founded four centuries before by the old Celts of the Marne, was by no means unseated, but the combined effect of Italian imports and the adoption of the wheel that produced them made of at least the better class of Gaulish ware a very different thing in this period from anything that had been current before.

A few pear-shaped vessels, like one from the famous Arvernian tumulus of Celles, ² and a bare few from Mont Beuvray ³, show the dying flicker of the pedestal-urn tradition, but, in general, outside the Belgic area, where events had not taken the same turn, the true La Tène pedestal-urn was dead. In future, any pedestalled vessels produced south of that area are either derived from something wholly different, namely the pedestalled Graeco-Italian crater, or belong to a distinct class of vessels of Romanized character, in which the form of the pedestal stands outside the typological sequence here under review, as we shall

¹ Thus German and Roman influence between them spread cremation over the whole of Gaul : Caesar describes it as general (B.G. vi, 19, 4-5), though some persistence of inhumation seems to be noticed by Mela (III, ii, 19: ‘cremant ac defodiunt ‘): Dechelette, Manuel, iv, p. 520. M. Maurice Henault has found La Tène inhumations in the neighbourhood of Bavay, i.e. in the territory of the Nervii (see below, p. 235).
² L.L. Dechelette, Manuel, iv, p. 588, fig. 677, 3. For pottery of this period (La Tène III) in general, see the whole section, pp. 987-994.
³ E.g. Fig. 5, 5, p. 172 : p. 254.
see when examples of the early Roman period in Britain come to be considered (pp. 249-254).

It would indeed be wrong to exaggerate the differences in pottery between Belgic Gaul and the rest of the Celtic west in this period: plain jars, cooking-pots, and bowls are found everywhere to be very much alike, and everywhere coarse hand-made ware continued to be made. But when the Belgic potter was working up to his highest standard, the Marne tradition was uppermost in his mind, and his modifications of it were inspired from the Rhine as much as from the south: the Celtic Gaul kept his underlying native tradition, but inevitably he was directly influenced by southern models.

An excellent instance is provided by the fine type of barrel or butt-shaped urn that appears in the Celtic world at this time, with a normally plain foot, gently convex body decorated with cordons and bands of wheel-turned incisions, and short somewhat everted rim. The Graeco-Roman inspiration of this form has been pointed out by Holwerda: the Celtic potter inevitably modified his prototypes, he made a special point of cordon decoration, of which his new wheel made him fonder than ever, he invented all manner of varieties of incised ornament, and thus produced a form that quickly became characteristic of the Celtic lands on the eve of their conquest by Rome, and after that conquest developed into a leading type which lasted with various vicissitudes throughout the history of Roman provincial ceramic in the west. In particular, he found that this type lent itself peculiarly well to an art which had altogether died out of the native Celtic tradition, but was now re-introduced under the wholly different inspiration of the south, namely the painting of pottery. The fine painted vessels of Celtic Gaul are typical of this period and of the influences there at work in it. They have nothing in

1 Nederlands Vroegste Beschaving, pp. 101-2 of German summary, quoting Italian prototypes of the later Republican period as e.g. Atti dei Lincei 1903, p. 320 ff., esp. figs. 5, 6b; 1905, ii, 2, p. 34 ff. (from Lovana, Viterbo, and other cemeteries): cf. Leiden Mus. Vasekatalog, xxvili, 104 ff.

2 Dechelette, Manuel iv, pp. 994–1000.
common with the much earlier painted pottery of the Marne culture, with its spiral patterns in the best La Tène manner. Spiral patterns—what Celt could resist them?—indeed appear upon the new vessels, but the direct effect of contemporary classical design is almost everywhere apparent, and this new painted-pottery industry may be taken as a typical product of the Celtic lands in their intimate contact with the classical world of the first century B.C.

The distribution of this painted ware is almost exclusively complementary to that of the Belgic pedestal-urns, and the two examples known in Normandy show that it did not penetrate far into the Belgic area. One of its chief centres of manufacture seems to have been that part of the central massif of Gaul, between the Cevennes and the plateau of Langres, occupied by the Arverni, the Segusiavi, and by the Aedui, whose principal city, Bibracte (Mont Beuvray), has become through the excavations of Bulliot and Dechelette the best known oppidum of the time in Gaul. Not only is it found all over Central France, but its distribution follows the natural trade-route from the Lyonnais up the Saône and Doubs valleys and through the Belfort gap into Switzerland and the basin of the upper Rhine. This route lay through the territory of the Sequani, who possessed the important mart of Cabillonum (Chalon-sur-Saône) on the Aeduan border, and thence extended north-eastward to the Vosges and into southern Alsace.

Thus the culture of the Helvetii and their neighbours, and of the Vindelician lands eastward along the upper Danube, became to a large extent uniform with that of Central Gaul, while the Alpine passes did not fail to afford a further contact with Italy. The corridor between the upper Danubian lands and the Saône valley is marked by a chain of sites where painted pottery has been found. Its most vital stretch was that held by the Sequani, and their neighbours to south and north as well as east were affected by the cultural movement. On the south painted pottery and its regular concomitants occur in Savoie, and on

1 On this see especially Schumacher in P.Z. vi, pp. 250–254.
the north the Lingones, Leuci, and Mediomatrici, all true Celtic peoples, spread the same unitary culture from the Aeduan boundary to Lorraine. Further, from the marches of the Sequani and Raurici by the bend of the Rhine at Bale, a direct route lay down the river to the shifting frontier of Celt and German around its second bend at Mainz, and here too the painted pottery begins to appear. We thus reach the country of the Treveri, where, however, it is uncommon, and what there is seems to be subsequent to Caesar's conquest: we have, in fact, come to the edge of Belgic Gaul, and among the Belgae the cultural influence of the south was never more than relatively weak. Though the Leuci and Mediomatrici, and further west the Tricasses and Senones and their western neighbours as far as Normandy, bordering directly on the Belgic lands along the Marne and the Seine, could hardly fail to pass it on to them in some degree, the Belgae continued to preserve a sufficient measure of their individuality. They would scarcely ever buy and never imitated painted pottery, nor were they very interested, as the men of the old Marne culture had been, in the products of Mediterranean craftsmanship. The cordoned butt-shaped urns, indeed, they did adopt, and the late La Tène brooches that were coming into fashion further south, with their triangular catch-plates—a form which perhaps owes as much to a new touch from the tradition of the old Italian Certosa type as to vestigial treatment of the returned and attached foot of the Middle La Tène brooch, which indeed continued to be made throughout this century all over the Celtic and much of the German world. But they were clearly prouder of their German blood and their reputation as fighters than of picking up second-hand culture from the south; besides, they had their own traditions, which made their southern tribes, for instance, go on producing pedestal-urns, and kept echoes of old Hallstatt and Harpstedt conventions alive among their ruder cousins beyond the great forests. Caesar at any rate was quick to grasp their character and its results. While the rest

of Gaul was full of Roman and Romanised traders, the mercatores and negotiatores who so constantly occur in his pages, he says of the Belgae\(^1\) that of all the Gauls they are the bravest, because they are furthest removed from the civilisation of the province [sc. of Gallia Narbonensis], and are least frequently visited by merchants bringing imports that make for the enervation of their spirit: also they live nearest to the Germans dwelling across the Rhine, with whom they wage incessant warfare.'

4. THE BELGIC TRIBES AND THEIR CONQUEST.

The truth of this generalisation of Caesar's must obviously be measured differently for the various Belgic tribes with reference to the different ingredients in their ancestry and their distance from the trade routes leading up from the south. The exact boundaries of all the important Gaulish tribes can be traced with a far greater accuracy than those of the tribes of Britain, because they were not only authoritatively fixed by the Roman government when the tribes were incorporated as cantons or units of local self-government in the three Gallic provinces of the Empire, but owing to the essential continuity in the ecclesiastical history of Gaul throughout the period of the barbarian invasions and the collapse of the Western Empire these same cantons emerged from the Dark Ages intact in the form of Christian bishoprics, which indeed with various modifications still exist to-day.

It is thus possible to trace the boundaries of the bulk of the Belgic as of the other tribes of Gaul as they were at the Roman conquest with a reasonably close approach to exact accuracy. This has been done once and for all for English readers in the monumental 'Geographical Index' to Dr. Rice Holmes' Caesar's Conquest of Gaul,\(^2\) and a brief résumé is all that is required here, illustrated by the map, Fig. 20.

The most important district of the whole of Belgic

\(^1\) B.G. i, 1, 3.
\(^2\) 2nd edition (1911), pp. 351-503 (alphabetically arranged). The reader is referred to this work for all points of detail.
FIG. 20. TRIBAL MAP OF BELGIC GAUL AT THE TIME OF CAESAR'S CONQUEST
Based on that in Rice Holmes' Caesar's Conquest of Gaul, ed. 2, 1911.

The names of Belgic tribes are in block capitals, that of the Treveri in italic capitals, those of non-Belgic tribes in small letters. The boundary of Belgic Gaul is marked by long shading, broken where this is doubtful; that of the Treveri similarly by short shading. The dotted lines marking inter-tribal boundaries are widely spaced in cases of uncertainty.
Gaul was what had been the core of the old culture-area of the Marne: it was held by the Remi, whose capital under the empire was Durocortorum (Reims), and whose territory comprised the dioceses of Reims and Laon. Though the Bellovaci and Nervii each claimed to be the most formidable in war, the Remi, among whom the civilisation and no doubt the blood of the old Marne people inevitably persisted most strongly, were culturally and diplomatically the leading tribe. A 'commune Belgarum concilium' was held, apparently in their territory, in 57 B.C.\(^1\)—it is open to doubt whether this was an emergency measure occasioned by Caesar's appearance or a regular institution, but its existence anyhow implies a degree of conscious unity on the part of the Belgic peoples. Thereafter ambassadors of the Remi appeared before Caesar, and while boasting of their German origin and their warlike prowess, urged that their tribe, unlike all the other Belgae, was on the Roman side; indeed they stood by him against their kinsmen that year and afterwards,\(^2\) and owing to their high standing among the Gaulish peoples their friendship was clearly of the greatest value to Caesar.

Adjoining the diocese of Reims on the south-west is that of Chalons, which is known to have consisted of the territory of the Catuvellauni or Catalauni, a tribe not mentioned by Caesar or by any writer before Ammianus Marcellinus.\(^3\) It is reasonable to explain Caesar's silence on the view that the Catuvellauni were a client tribe of the Remi, or that they were one of the peoples that enrolled themselves as such in 53 B.C.\(^4\) It will appear likely below that their relative unimportance at this time was due to the departure of a large number of them for Britain not long before (see pp. 243-5-6): anyhow the supposition that they shared the civilised and pacific character of the Remi is supported by the identity between the archaeological material of both districts as strongly representing the old Marne culture tradition.

To the south-west of the Remi were the Suessiones,

\(^{1}\) B.G. ii, 4, 4.  
\(^{2}\) E.g. B.G. vii, 63, 7.  
\(^{3}\) Bk. xv, 11, 10.  
\(^{4}\) B.G. vi, 12, 7.
their 'allies and brothers,'\(^1\) whom Hirtius\(^2\) states to be 'attributi' to them. It is clear archaeologically that they embodied the same cultural tradition, and though they began by repudiating the pacifism of the Remi in 53 B.C., their willing surrender immediately afterwards\(^3\) testifies to their underlying community of sentiment. Their lands are now the diocese of Soissons, that is, most of the department of the Aisne. Their king Diviciacus, who not long before Caesar's coming ruled in Britain as well as in Gaul, will be noticed below (p. 243).

North of them were the Viromandui of the Vermandois district round Noyon: they were on the edge of the old Marne culture-area, and after their defeat in 53 B.C. gave no further trouble to Caesar.

All the rest of the Belgic tribes were more determined enemies of Rome. The Veliocasses have been already noticed as occupying the lower Seine valley round and below Rouen. Not only in the great revolt of 52 B.C. but also the following year\(^4\) they were still bent on resistance to the Roman arms, as were also the Caleti or Caletes their neighbours on the north in the 'pays de Caux.' Just east of these two, in the modern diocese of Beauvais, were the Bellovaci, who either included or had as their dependents the Silvanectes of the diocese of Senlis, who are not mentioned by Caesar. They were among the most determined of Caesar's opponents, and revolted even after his victorious withdrawal from Gaul (see p. 264).

While pedestal-urns of the Marne type are plentiful in the country of the Caleti and Veliocasses, and are even represented south of the Seine at the Fort Harrouard, a northern stronghold of the Carnutes, who were not Belgae at all, nothing of the sort is attributable to the Bellovaci save perhaps one (p. 209: Fig. 15, 40) at Bellozanne, close to their western border: this is of the Saint-Rémy-sur-Bussy type. It is anyhow clear from Caesar\(^5\) that war rather than civilisation was their ruling interest. As a matter

\(^1\) So the ambassadors of the Remi in B.G. ii, 4, 3.
\(^2\) B.G. ii, 12, 5.
\(^3\) B.G. vii, 75, 3.
\(^4\) B.G. viii, 6, 2.
\(^5\) B.G. viii, 7, 4 ff.
...and the Atrebates (of that of Arras); plainly outside the old Marne culture-area itself participation in its tradition did not carry with it any great conformity with the sentiments of the Remi, for both these tribes were, like the Bellovaci, still taking the field as late as 51 B.C. against the Romans, and the notorious exploits of the Atrebatic chieftain Commius, of whom we shall have more to say, are a vivid example of Gallic treachery and intransigence.¹

In fact, while the peoples of the Marne and Aisne were the most civilised, it was these three warrior tribes between the Oise and the sea who, along with the ruder fighting men of the north, made up the chief military strength of the whole Belgic group. It has been argued that the lands of these three went together to form a district known as 'Belgium' in a special sense, and were thus in very truth the core of the Belgic 'nomen'; this contention will be discussed in a more relevant context (pp. 241-243) below; meanwhile we must observe that they were not the only irreconcilables.

North of them, right along the coast from the mouth of the Canche to that of the Scheldt, stretched the lands of the Morini, and beyond them again the Menapii reached to the Maas and the lower Rhine itself. There are no traces of the Marne culture here; La Panne is the typical site, and the culture of the people is almost pure Hallstatt-Harpstedt survival. The elusive warfare they waged among their woods and marshes was different from anything else Caesar had to encounter in Gaul,² and they were still giving trouble as late as 29 B.C. (see p. 265). Also they were sailors, and were expected to send help to the maritime tribes of the north-west of Gaul, headed by the Veneti, in the naval struggle with Caesar in 56 B.C.,³ though they were not included in the actual grouping of these maritime peoples known as the 'Aremoricae civitates.'⁴

The only Belgic tribe so included was the Caleti:

¹ B.G. ii, 4, 5.
² B.G. iii, 28, 1-2.
³ B.G. iii, 9, 9.
⁴ B.G. vii, 75, 4.
otherwise the 'Aremoricae civitates' represent the non-Belrig peoples on the north-western coast whose tradition of Atlantic and cross-Channel seamanship have been noticed in the previous chapter (pp. 169-71).

The archaeology of their districts makes it clear that the proportion of German blood among the Morini and the Menapii must have been high: further inland it was higher. The Nervii, with their client tribes the Cetrones, Geidumni, Grudii, Levaci, and Pleumoxii, lay all along the east of the Scheldt, from the boundary of the Viromandui to that of the Menapii: on the east they bordered on the Ardennes. Though almost annihilated by Caesar in 57 B.C. they yet sent 5,000 men to the relief of Vercingetorix at Alesia in 52—no wonder that they were considered the fiercest warriors among the Belgae: they allowed no merchants from the south into their territories, nor would they tolerate such enervating luxuries as wine, and any suggestion of overtures to Rome aroused their contemptuous wrath. Considering what we know archaeologically of the history of their district, we might expect them to be almost wholly of German blood, and Strabo in fact definitely calls them a German people. Caesar, however, does not, though had he considered them to be, he would certainly have said so, for of their neighbours in the forest country stretching eastward to the Rhine he explains that the Atuatuci were descended from the rearguard of the Cimbri and Teutones—i.e. were Germanic, while the Condruusi, Eburones, Caerosi, and Paemani he definitely groups together in a single appellation as Germans. That the Nervii were in fact of mixed Celtic and German stock, and that Strabo is exaggerating, is made clear by a passage in Tacitus' *Germania*. 'The Treveri and the Nervii,' he says, 'deliberately lay claim to German origin as a point of honour, as though to be marked off by this boast of lineage from resemblance to the sluggish Gauls.' And then: 'The

---

1 *B.G.* v, 39, 1, 4.  
2 *B.G.* ii, 28, 1.  
3 *B.G.* vii, 75, 3.  
4 *B.G.* ii, 4, 8.  
5 *B.G.* ii, 15, 3-5.  
6 iv, 194.  
7 *B.G.* ii, 29, 4-5.  
8 *B.G.* ii, 4, 10.  
9 Ch. xxviii.
actual banks of the Rhine are inhabited by peoples who are undoubtedly German, the Vangiones, Triboci, and Nemetes.'

The point of the contrast is unmistakable: evidently at the end of the first century A.D. the Nervii would have liked to be thought pure Germans like the Vangiones and the rest along the Rhine, but in fact were not. Archaeology, too, gives some little assistance: it has been noticed above that M. Maurice Hénault attests the presence of late La Tène inhumations in the neighbourhood of Bavay (the Roman capital of the Nervii)\(^1\); in this period, when cremation, as we have seen, had become general in Gaul, these can only be survivals of the earlier Celtic rite, and they therefore attest the presence of a Celtic element in the Nervii of the first century B.C., for the Germans were, of course, always a cremating people. We may thus conclude that the Nervii were a mixture of the two stocks. The tribes lying between them and the Rhine, whose precise boundaries are for the most part uncertain, are described by Caesar as Germans, but they must be supposed to have contained a Celtic element in degrees varying according to its chances of survival among the German invaders. We cannot estimate these closely, but we need not forget Strabo's statement (p. 184, above) that the Belgic dialects differed in part only, and nowhere more than slightly, from those of Celtic Gaul, and that all the racial, individual, and geographical names we know of at this period in this, as in all the other districts of Belgic Gaul, are Celtic and Celtic only.\(^2\)

It has indeed been argued that in the first century B.C. the word German was not used by the informants of Caesar and Strabo in the contexts we have been considering as meaning Germans as generally understood. Among various theories embodying this idea, \(^3\) Tourneur has propounded one\(^4\) to the effect that

---

\(^1\) P. 225, n. 1: in connexion with Mela's observation of the burial rites of the Gauls: 'cremant ac defodiunt' (III. ii. 19). The burials are unpublished, and were described verbally to one of us by M. Henault.

\(^2\) Rice Holmes, Gaul\(^5\), p. 338.

\(^3\) Ibd. pp. 232-340.

\(^4\) 'L'Origine des Tongrois,' in La Gazette numismatique xii (Brussels 1907), pp. 33-46.
Germani was a group-name peculiar to the Condrusi, Eburones, Caerosi, and Paemani, and that both they and it were plain Celtic. Now the word 'Germanus' may or may not be Celtic, but there is no reason to suppose that Caesar or Strabo used it of these or any Belgic peoples in a different sense from its general one, nor have we any right to squeeze arguments out of isolated passages for its actual use in their day in a restricted sense. The plain solution of the matter is that while all the Belgae had German blood in some degree, these tribes, lying nearest to the Rhine and being evidently the latest immigrants, had more of it than any of the others, and therefore not only called themselves Germans, as the Condrusi and their neighbours the Segni, who are to be included in the same group, did to Caesar in 53 B.C., but were so called by every one else, whether or no the name was then also borne by their kinsmen further east. In the first century A.D. and afterwards, the inhabitants of this region are called the Tungri, and Tacitus explains the word 'Germani' as being a name originally borne by the Tungri, who were the first tribe to cross the Rhine and expel the Gauls, which was afterwards applied to all the Teutonic tribes indiscriminately. But however it came about that these people came to be called Tungri, there is nothing in any ancient or modern literature to upset our conclusion concerning their race, which agrees entirely with the archaeological evidence for the whole history, as we have recorded it, of the lower Rhineland and the Low Countries generally in the Early Iron Age. Rice Holmes tolerates what is essentially the same conclusion, though, as working without archaeological evidence, he seems perhaps to overestimate the weight of the Celtic element among them. We have seen how little evidence we have from archaeology for a numerous Celtic population in this whole region during the Early Iron Age.

1 B.G. vi, 32, 1: ‘Segni Condrusiqua, ex gente et numero Germanorum, qui sunt inter Eburones Treverosquae, legatos ad Caesarem miserunt oratum ne se in hostium numero duceret neve omnium Germanorum qui essent cita Rhenum unam esse causam iudicaret.’

2 Germania, ii.

3 See Tourneur, op. cit., pp. 44-46.

It was the pride of the Germans to surround their own territories with as wide a belt as possible of waste and deserted country,¹ and if this practice attended the stages of their advance into Celtic lands, as we have already (pp. 160, 175) seen reason to suspect, an additional explanation may thus be afforded for the poverty of much of present-day Belgium in Celtic remains of these centuries. There was at any rate room for the Atuatuci, after they had been posted in the country by the Cimbri and Teutones, to establish a permanent settlement—in which we may suppose such Celtic women as there may have been played the inevitable part.

All the known tribes of Belgic Gaul have now been enumerated, and in our estimate of their character, our analysis of their culture, and our reconstruction of their origins, an accord has been seen to be feasible between archaeological and literary evidence along the lines we have indicated. By way of a postscript, we may observe how the literary notices we have of the Treveri fit in with the archaeological evidence reviewed above for their formation from the crossing of Celtic with German stock, similarly to the true Belgae but at an earlier date (pp. 175–6). Actually, some passages do and others do not include them among the Belgae, which is exactly what one would expect if the state of the case was as we have urged. The matter is weighed by Rice Holmes,² to whom ‘it seems reasonable to conclude, from the fact that the Treveri do not appear in the list of Belgic tribes [in B.G. ii, 4], and from the fact that they actually assisted Caesar in his first campaign against the Belgae [B.G. ii, 24, 4], that, according to his informants, they were reckoned among the Celtae. Still, there were striking differences, which Hirtius noticed, between the Celtae and the Treveri.’ Hirtius actually states in the passage cited³ that owing to their adjoining the Germans the Treveri were engaged in daily warfare with them, that their civilisation, like their ferocity, was very like that of the Germans, and that

¹ B.G. vi, 23, 1.
³ B.G. viii, 25, 2.
it always required a Roman army to make them do what they were told. In fact, their constant border fighting with the Germans must have strengthened the self-assertion of their Celtic tradition, though indeed they were boasting in Tacitus’ day, like the Nervii, of their German blood (p. 234). But at the same time they were only too glad to receive with acclamation the famous speech of Petilius Cerialis in their capital city in A.D. 70, justifying the rule of Rome over the Gauls in general, and most evidently over them in particular, as constituting their only safeguard against German aggression.¹ The truth was that the earlier date of the influx of German stock among them had given the native Celtic element more time to assert itself, and it was perhaps throughout stronger than in the composition of some of the true Belgic peoples. For instance, their cavalry was among the best in Gaul, and did fine service to Caesar as well as later on as Roman auxiliaries throughout Imperial history. Now horsemanship was always a strong point of the Celtic peoples, whereas Tacitus makes it clear that the Germans with their little ponies were certainly not a race of horse-soldiers.² Thus an excellent contrast presents itself to the Belgae, for their most warlike tribe, the Nervii, had no cavalry and no interest in cavalry fighting³—this is plainly a German trait. However, as we learn from the same passage that the neighbours of the Nervii did have cavalry, we have another hint of the greater strength of Celtic tradition among the more southerly of the Belgic tribes—those, in fact, in the Aisne and Marne region.

In spite of this, and in spite of their indisputably close connexion with the tribes of Belgic Gaul,⁴ the individuality of the Treveri, which is emphasised by literary and archaeological evidence alike, requires its own recognition, in view particularly of its historical importance. Notwithstanding their early influx of German blood and whatever part they may have played in the east-to-west movement which we have seen

¹ Tacitus, Histories, iv, 73-4.
² Germania, vi.
³ B.G. ii, 17, 4.
⁴ For instance, the Eburones and Condrusi were 'clients' of the Treveri: B.G. iv, 8, 4.
contributed to the formation of the Belgae in the decades following 150 B.C., they were for long the main bulwark of Gaul against the German tide. Stretching as they did from the Ardennes to the Hardt mountains, they protected the purely Celtic tribes to the south of them, the Mediomatrici, Leuci, and Sequani, and the two main passes into Gaul from the east, the Col de Saverne and the Belfort gap. In fact, the Treveri first, and afterwards the whole of the Belgae as well, defended Gaul against the Germans with a vigour they could only have acquired from inoculation with the blood of their enemies.

But nevertheless they were fighting a losing battle. As the first century B.C. wore on, it became clear that the Cimbric-Teutonic invasion had only been a prelude. On the right bank of the Rhine the Germans were pushing steadily south,\(^1\) threatening, as it were, to turn the flank of the fighting tribes of northern Gaul. And then, thanks to the ruinous factions of the Celtic Gauls, the Sequani and Arverni called in the common enemy as mercenaries against their rivals the Aedui. The Aedui were beaten, but the German king Ariovistus, with his swarms of followers, remained in Gaul. By the time of Caesar’s first campaign in 58 B.C., he had been there twelve or thirteen years\(^2\): the Germans were overflowing the middle and upper Rhineland, the lands of the Sequani were being swallowed up. It would be the Cimbri and Teutones over again: what the Belgae had defended, it seemed that the Celtae had abandoned to a menace which threatened the whole of Western Europe.

How that menace was encountered, the story of the Helvetic migration, the appearance of Caesar as proconsul, the defeat of Ariovistus, and the succeeding years of brilliant campaigning which turned Celtic and Belgic Gaul alike into the raw material of a Roman province, need not be recounted here.

At the moment of their conquest we must interrupt

---

\(^1\) For archaeological material, see e.g. \(A U H V, v, pp. 80-81\) (German cremation-burials in the Ladenburg area).

\(^2\) Rice Holmes, \(Gaul\), pp. 553-4.
the history of the Belgae of Gaul, to examine that of their kinsmen in Britain. It is easy to understand that in the first century B.C., after the influx from the north-east and east, Belgic Gaul was found to be overcrowded, and after the final retreat of the Cimbri and Teutones the renewed threat of German aggression which culminated under the leadership of Ariovistus might well cause some of the Belgae, like the Helvetii soon afterwards, to think of emigration. We have already seen that Celtic movements into Britain seem to reflect each of the earlier stages of the southward and westward advance of the Germans. It is true that what we know of the Belgae has led us to think of them as the mainstay of the Gallic resistance, but we cannot reconstruct the actions and reactions of inter-tribal history, and it may be that land-hunger was not the only motive to prompt a migration from Belgic Gaul over the Channel, though in any case it was probably the chief one.

III

THE FIRST BELGIC INVADERS OF BRITAIN AND THEIR PEDESTAL POTTERY

I. THE EVIDENCE OF CAESAR

Our review in the first chapter of the history of south-eastern Britain from Late Hallstatt to the end of Middle La Tene times, shewed it to have remained throughout in the undisturbed occupation of the Celtic or mainly Celtic people who had passed over from the Continent before the La Tene period began in V B.C. It remained, that is to say, in a state closely resembling that of the Low Countries north of the Ardennes, but for the gradual reception by the latter of the Germanic stock from the east.

But when our island comes in Caesar's pages for the first time into verbally reliable history, we learn that while the people of the interior believed themselves to be aboriginal, the 'maritime part' was inhabited by men who had crossed over for warfare and plunder 'from Belgium' (ex Belgio), and settled down per-
manently to till the land, still bearing, for the most part, their ancestral tribal names. No tribal name, however, is mentioned by Caesar as thus occurring on both sides of the Channel, and it must therefore be our first business to find out what Caesar meant by ‘ex Belgio.’

The word Belgium occurs twice, with certainty, in Caesar, and three times in Hirtius’ eighth book of the De Bello Gallico. The last of these occurrences, taken with the sentence following, clearly implies that Belgium and the country of the Belgae were one and the same thing, and the two preceding may be taken in the same sense. Of Caesar’s own mentions, one is this passage about the emigrants to Britain, and the other has given rise to much controversy, in view of a corrupt passage in the chapter preceding it.

Caesar is there describing the quarters assigned to his legions for the winter of 54–3 B.C., and we first learn that three of them were quartered among the Morini, the Nervii, and the Remi, all of whom, of course, were Belgae. The best MSS. (the α group) then go on to say ‘tris (sc. legiones) in Belgis collocavit,’ and so specify three more legions. This obviously makes a false antithesis that cannot be right unless Caesar has made a surprising slip: we instantly suspect corruption in the word ‘Belgis,’ and, indeed, find that the inferior β group of MSS. read ‘Belgio’ instead. This reading is accepted by the great majority of scholars. If it is right, we have a sixth occurrence of the word ‘Belgium’ in the De Bello Gallico, and one which, taken together with the instance we have noticed in the following chapter, which refers to one of the same three legions in Belgio, forces us to conclude that Belgium to Caesar was not the same thing as the whole country of the Belgae, but (though he fails to explain this) a special part of it. And the context shows that if so, this

1 B.G. v, 12, 1–2.  
3 B.G. viii, 46, 4; 49, 1.  
4 B.G. v, 25, 4.  
5 B.G. v, 24, 2.  
6 Ibid, 3.
special part must be the territories of the Bellovaci, Ambiani, and Atrebates.¹

If this is right, and while Hirtius loosely uses ‘Belgium’ for the whole Belgic country, Caesar does not, it follows that he is informing us in V, 12, 2, that the emigrants to Britain came from among these three tribes only. Now, of the three, the name of the Atrebates is known, though not from Caesar, to occur in Britain: a tribe so called inhabited Berkshire and north Hampshire after, and evidently at, the Roman conquest. But this district could not be described by Caesar as maritime, and the adjoining people, which stretched from Somerset to the Hampshire coast and was thus in a sense maritime, is called Belgae. Archaeology, as we shall see, shews that these two people formed a single cultural group and must have come over to Britain together, and, therefore, if Caesar is referring to them in this passage, he must after all have used ‘Belgae’ and ‘Belgium’ as co-extensive terms, as Hirtius did. In fact, we shall find reason to believe that Caesar was not referring to these British Atrebates and Belgae in this passage; without anticipating the conclusions of a later chapter, it is enough to point out that the ‘maritima pars’ here can, from the whole context, hardly refer to any maritime region which Caesar did not himself visit—in other words, it must refer to Kent and the country adjoining the mouth of the Thames.

Then, did the emigrants into this district come exclusively from among the Gaulish Bellovaci, Ambiani, and Atrebates? The archaeological evidence is wholly against this conclusion. The pottery of the period in question has far more and better parallels in other parts of Belgic Gaul, particularly in the Lower Seine valley and on the Aisne and Marne. And there are two points in the literary evidence which are also against it.

First, the British chief who led the resistance to Caesar in 54 B.C. was named Cassivellaunus. His stronghold was not far beyond the Thames in the

¹See Rice Holmes, Gaul², pp. 395-7, where the controversy over this passage is reviewed.
district known to have been inhabited, from the Roman Conquest onwards, by the tribe of the Catuvellauni, which was certainly an offshoot from the Catuvellauni of Belgic Gaul. After Caesar’s withdrawal numismatic evidence tells us that he was succeeded by Tasciovanus, a prince whose grandsons at the time of the Roman conquest are likewise described as Catuvellauni.\(^1\) The Catuvellauni, therefore, provided the ruling dynasty of the ‘maritime part’ of Britain, which Caesar tells us was peopled from ‘Belgium.’ Therefore, he cannot have limited ‘Belgium’ to the territory of the Bellovaci, Ambiani, and the Atrebates, from whom the Gaulish Catuvellauni, living on the Marne, were altogether distinct.

Secondly, the ambassadors of the Remi told Caesar in 57 B.C., that their neighbours, the Suessiones, had had within their own memory a King Diviciacus, the most powerful prince in the land, who not only ruled over a great part of Belgic Gaul, but also bore sway in Britain.\(^2\) It seems, therefore, that there were Suessiones also among the emigrants thither from ‘Belgium.’

We may thus affirm that Caesar, in so describing those emigrants, is merely telling us that they came from Belgic Gaul generally, and the vexed passage in V, 24, 3, where on any existing interpretation Caesar must have made a slip, must be left to look after itself.

Beyond the various observations made by Caesar in the course of his two expeditions, some of which will be noticed presently, we can learn little more from the Commentaries about the Belgic settlers in Britain, except their determined hostility to Rome. It was the fact that help had been sent from Britain to the Gauls in almost all their campaigns against him that made Caesar first resolve to invade the island,\(^3\) and while Britain was the refuge of the anti-Roman conspirators among the Bellovaci,\(^4\) the Atrebatic prince, Commius, though he was considered very influential across the Channel, was flung into chains

\(^1\) Dion Cassius, ix, 20: see pp. 256-7, 262, 311, 314 below.  
\(^2\) B.G. ii, 4, 7.  
\(^3\) B.G. iv, 20, 1.  
\(^4\) B.G. ii, 14, 3.
on his arrival as an envoy from Caesar, and only released after the first Roman defeat of the Britons.\(^1\) In fact, it was only before they realized Caesar was really coming across, and when they were cowed by his successes in the field, that any of them thought of offering submission. Of their internal warfare, the chief fact that emerges is that while the Belgic tribes put aside bickerings among themselves in order to combine against Caesar, they never abated their hostility towards the Trinobantes, the tribe that inhabited Essex. We shall shortly have more to say on this matter; meanwhile, we must turn to archaeological evidence for a closer insight into the origin and date of their immigration, and the progress and nature of their settlement.

2. THE EVIDENCE OF ARCHAEOLOGY

As far as the literary evidence goes, the Belgic migrants to Britain may have come from anywhere between the Seine and Marne valleys and the Lower Rhine. All we are bound to is the inclusion of the Suessiones and the Catuvellauni of the Aisne and Marne. But archaeology helps us further. The material culture of the new arrivals in Britain is exclusively that of the southern half of Belgic Gaul, that is the country south of the Ardennes barrier, where the tradition of the old Marne culture was rooted. Its appearance marks the beginning of the La Tène D—or, in Déchelette's nomenclature, La Tène III\(^2\)—phase of the Iron Age in Britain. Its funeral rite is cremation. Except for a very few barrow and vault-burials, evidently of great nobles (p. 259 ff.), the cinery urns are buried in flat graves, usually single, sometimes grouped in a ‘family circle.’ The sepulchral pottery—the so-called Aylesford-Swarling series—hangs well together, and its leading

\(^{1}\) B.G. iv, 21, 7-8; 27, 2-4. \(^{2}\) In this and the following chapters this term, from its greater familiarity to English readers, will normally be used, though we have not thought it desirable to call the period after A.D. 1 'La Tène IV,' which, since the opening of the Christian era is marked by no essential change in culture, is an unnecessary and misleading term. See note on Chronological Terms above, p. 156.
feature is the wheel-made pedestal urn. The domestic pottery, which is now beginning to be better known, corresponds with the sepulchral, but shews a wider range of unpedestalled types. These are the first wheel-made wares to appear in Britain, and coarser hand-made vessels continued in domestic use alongside them, as in Gaul. La Tène III brooches appear with them, of which the earliest only are likely to have been imported. Iron weapons and tools are of regular La Tène III types, and the bronzework shews a developed phase of La Tène art, now and then rising to the production of real masterpieces.

Imported Graeco-Roman metalwork and amphorae also make their appearance, and after the Roman conquest of Gaul the Romanized wares of the new provinces began to be imported, along with the Arretine pottery of Italy. Setting these imports aside, and considering only the material culture of the first Belgic invaders themselves, we can, by its comparison with that of Belgic Gaul, define their country of origin as lying between the Ardennes, the Argonne, and the Marne and Seine valleys. That is, the known tribes from whom they may have been drawn are the Remi, Catuvellauni, Suessiones, Silvanectes, Viromandui, Atrebates, Ambiani, Bellovaci, Caleti, and Veliocasses.

With the rude culture of the northern Belgic tribes they have, materially speaking, nothing in common. There are some early coins found in Britain which very closely resemble some of the Morini, but these may all be Gaulish, brought over, as were the coins of other tribes, in the course of trade; no pedestal pottery has yet come to light in the territory of the Morini, where the type-site is La Panne, and no trace of the characteristic Hallstatt traditions of the La Panne wares occurs among the Belgic material of Britain. In fact, unless new discoveries, which we see no reason to expect, are made on one side or the other of the Channel, the derivation of the British Belgae from the southern half of Belgic Gaul must hold good.

The next matter is the date of their migration. Caesar’s evidence leads one to suspect that it was not

1 Swarling, pp. 36–7 (based on the work of Dr. G. C. Brooke).
so very long before the Gallic wars. The archaeological evidence has been carefully reviewed by Mr. Bushe-Fox in his Swarling Report. He sums up as follows:

'With the available evidence it would therefore appear safe to place the earliest examples of the Aylesford-Swarling pottery not earlier than between 100 and 50 B.C., and probably rather after 75 B.C. than before it.'

There is no need for us to go again over the ground covered by the Swarling Report in regard to dating evidence. Nothing has come to light since it was written to upset this main conclusion. Nor need we describe the typical cemeteries of Aylesford and Swarling, which are well known from Sir Arthur Evans' and Mr. Bushe-Fox's own work, as mentioned in our Introduction, and from the concise accounts in the British Museum Iron Age Guide.

What follows is accordingly a study of the Aylesford-Swarling class of pedestal-urn, as the typical product of these British Belgae in sequence and distribution. This will lead us to such historical conclusions as are possible concerning the expansion and achievements of the invaders. It will be seen that in this last regard we have but little to add to what has been put forward by Mr. Bushe-Fox.

The earliest pedestal-urn pottery in Britain is found in Kent, and is now well known from the work of Sir Arthur Evans and Mr. Bushe-Fox. The pear-shaped pedestal-urn is the predominant type, and the Saint Rémy-sur-Bussy type, or indeed any sign of its influence on the pottery, is entirely absent. The recognition of this type as belonging in Belgic Gaul to the half-century or so centred on 100 B.C., in fact, enables us to add a further support to the dating of the invasion of Britain advocated in the Swarling Report: the absence of any hint of it from this country forms an argument as strong as any negative argument can be for a date at least 20 or 25 years after 100 B.C.

Cordons are more numerous on British pottery than on that from France. The fine striations characteristic of pedestal-urns in Champagne occur on only

---

1 p. 27.
4 Report, p. 27.
one British urn, from Aylesford. There is no need to illustrate here a series of British pedestal-urns, as most of them have already been published. One urn is selected from Aylesford to show the type with concave base of I B.C. found in the territory of the Cantii (Fig. 21, 1). Late in I B.C. or the beginning of the following century, the base tends to become flatter and more quoit-shaped, and this late form is more typical of the pedestal-urns of Essex, most of which belong to early I A.D. In Kent, the pedestal-urn culture lasted well into I A.D., as shown not only by pedestal-urns in which the base tends once again to become hollow, as at Aylesford (Fig. 21, 2), but also by a curious urn found in a Roman cemetery at Strood, near Rochester (Fig. 21, 4). Here the base has become almost as high as in some early La Tène urns from Champagne (p. 172: Fig. 5, 1-3). This apparent recrudescence is a direct result of Roman influence, and will be again considered in dealing with finds from London (below, p. 251 ff). The same phenomenon appears on pedestal-urns in Gaul after the conquest, e.g. at Mont Beuvray (see pp. 225-6, 253-4, and Fig. 5, 6).

North of the Thames, and apart from Essex, the pedestal-urns lose their fine proportions and become more globular, and the base is now almost flat and heavily splayed (Fig. 21, 3). This type is especially characteristic of the Catuvellauni, and belongs to early I A.D.; it has been found at Arlesey and Newnham, near Bedford, Chesterton, near Cambridge, Abbots Langley, Hitchin, and Welwyn, Herts.

Outside these three tribal areas, pedestal-urns are associated with an early Roman brooch, Colchester Mus. Report, 1922, p. 19, Pl. iii, and Colchester, in a Flavian grave-group, May, Colchester Pottery, p. 266, Pl. lxxxii, 46. Fox, Archaeology of the Cambridge Region, p. 90, Pl. xii, 3.

1 Arch. iii, 329, pl. vii, 7.
2 Arch., iii, 328 ff; J. P. Bushe-Fox, Swealing Report; C. Fox, Archaeology of the Cambridge Region, chap. iii; Colchester Museum Reports, passim.
3 Arch., iii, 330, pl. vii, 6.
4 Swarling Report, p. 25, pl. vii, 8; cf. urn from Deal, ibid. pl. iv, 1.
5 Swarling Report, pp. 21-3, Pls. x, 6; xi, 1.
7 Fox, Archaeology of the Cambridge Region, p. 90, Pl. xii, 3.
8 Antiq. Journ., vi, 177, Pl. xxx, 2.
10 Arch., lxiii, 23-4, fig. 22, Pl. iii, 1, 2, 7, 9.
FIG. 21. POTTERY: 1–2, AYLESFORD, KENT; 3, NEWNHAM, NEAR BEDFORD;
4, STROOD, NEAR ROCHESTER; 5, WOODCUTS, WILTS (4)
(1–4, p. 247; 5, pp. 208, 216)
scarce, and all of late date: they belong to the second group of Belgic invaders, whose arrival in Wessex has yet to be considered. We need only here observe that among them the pedestal-urn tradition had practically come to an end: the urn from Hurstbourne Tarrant (p. 306: Fig. 32, 1) has a pedestal-base added to a body of wholly incongruous character, and the few other pedestal-bases from Wessex—Theale, near Reading, Kingsdown Camp, near Mells, Hanging Langford Camp, Hengistbury Head, and Oare, Wilts,—fall well into A.D.

On the distribution-map (p. 189: Fig. 7) are plotted all pedestal-urns of known provenance in Britain. The areas of greatest pre-Roman concentration ('La Tène III') are N. Kent, Essex, Hertfordshire, S. Cambridgeshire and S. Bedfordshire. The most northerly find-spots are Duston and Weekley in Northamptonshire. The Catuvellan territory extends as far as the S. border of the Fens. Pedestal-urns are not found further to the N.E. in Suffolk and Norfolk, which were Icenian, but very little is known of the culture in this region during the period under consideration.

Pedestal-urns are conspicuously absent from Sussex, and the Weald forms the tribal frontier between the Cantii and the Regni. Indeed, Belgic influence scarcely penetrated at all among the Regni, whose culture persisted unchanged throughout the La Tène period into Roman times.

We must now consider a special class of pedestal-base found in London, which has recently been reviewed as possible evidence of a pre-Roman settlement on the site of London. Those illustrated (Fig. 22, 1–6) are selected from about forty examples found in excavations in different parts of the city.
FIG. 22. POTTERY: 1–6, LONDON; 7, DÉPT. MARNE; 8, BRIONNE (EURE) ($\frac{1}{4}$)
(1–6, p. 251–2; 7–8, p. 253)
1. From the site of Fenchurch Buildings, Fenchurch Street. Pedestal-urn of fine hard grey ware with graphite-coated surface. Between broad cordon on the upper part are groups of vertical combed lines, deeply incised, and lower down, panels of applied dots above a prominent applied cordon. The base is restored from an almost identical fragment at the Bank of England (no. 2). Combed lines occur on Augustan beakers at Haltern (type 87), but the type is very rarely found in this country, e.g. at Colchester. The decoration is more characteristic of a large group of 'Romano-Belgic' wares of the latter part of I A.D. frequently found in London, and widely distributed over southern Britain. The applied dots are found on Claudian beakers at Hofheim (type 106) and Margidunum, but are more general on pottery of late I A.D. and lasted well into II A.D. All the evidence, therefore, points to a late I A.D. date for this urn.

2. From the site of the Bank of England. Hollow pedestal-base of fine hard sandy red ware with black-coated polished surface. Broad applied cordon above the base, and rows of applied dots. Resembles a pedestal-base found in Colchester, and in pure Roman technique . . . hardly earlier than the Claudian invasion of A.D. 43 (Swarling Report, p. 21, Pl. x, 5) and other pedestal-bases from Colchester (Colchester Museum Report, 1929, p. 25, Pl. viii, 294-5).

3. From the Minories, possibly a burial (Guildhall Mus. Cat. p. 17, no. 272). Complete pedestal-urn with narrow neck and hollow base, fine hard grey sandy ware. Three cordon on upper part, and single cordon above the base, with incised wavy lines on each side. The high base with external moulding resembles pedestal-bases found at Margidunum, and 'kicks' upwards into the body of the pot 'a Roman rather than a "Celtic" characteristic' (Roman London, p. 22). Similar pedestal-urns, probably 'wasters,' are found in Cambridge, and the type is possibly a local copy of certain Augustan pedestal-urns of Belgic red ware. It is also possible that these 'Belgic' pedestal-urns were influenced to some extent by certain forms of Italian and S. Gaulish sigillata, e.g. the crater, which also has a moulded hollow pedestal-base. The wholesale

2 Walters, Cat. Roman Pottery, li and p. 418, fig. 274; B. M. Guide to Roman Britain, p. 114, fig. 128; Wheeler, London in Roman Times, p. 149, fig. 56, 10; May, Silchester Pottery, 171, Pl. lxxi, 163-4; Pitt-Rivers, Excavations, iii, 175, Pl. cliii, 16; Wheeler, Roman Fort near Brecon, 224, fig. 100, c. 62; Fox, Archaeology of the Cambridge Region, 208, Pl. xxii, 1; Colchester Mus. Report, 1929, p. 25, Pl. viii.
3 Journ. Roman Studies, xiii, 125, Pl. xi, 19.
4 Walters, op. cit., p. 415, fig. 272; Richborough Report, i, 198, Pl. xxv, 54; May, Silchester Pottery, 170, Pl. lx, 160; Colchester Pottery, 165, Pl. lx, 298; Fox, op. cit., p. 208, Pl. xxiv, 2; Arch., lxxi, 176, fig. 13, 92.
6 Journ. Roman Studies, xiii, 115, fig. 9.
7 Fox, op. cit., p. 211, Pl. xxiv, 3.
8 May, Colchester Pottery, p. 11, Pl. i, 4.
9 Oswald and Pryce, Terra Sigillata, Pl. ii, 1-4.
copying of imported Italian wares by the early potters of Roman Belgica will be noticed below (pp. 269-71).


5. From the site of nos. 55–61 Moorgate. Pedestal-base of light red ware with grey slip. Low base, grooved near the edge, with two external mouldings.

6. From the same site. Pedestal-base of fine grey ware with smooth black-coated surface. Low, hollow base with prominent angular moulding and narrow girth-grooves ‘quite foreign to the pedestal-pottery of the Aylesford-Swatling series’ (Roman London, p. 22, and fig. 2, 6). This base is very similar to that of a large ‘Belgic’ jug found at Silchester, of late 1 A.D. date.¹

There is no need to reiterate the general evidence set forth in detail in Roman London, pp. 23–4.² Suffice it that in no instance is a pre-Claudian date certain for the London pedestal-bases, whilst the majority show features both in paste, type, and decoration, which clearly point to a purely Roman

origin. On the other hand, pedestal-bases of this class occur in far greater numbers in London than at any other site, and this fact alone indicates the mass-production of coarse pottery with Romanized native features which followed the introduction of improved technique into the native crafts after the Claudian conquest. Their distribution is far too wide for a pre-Roman settlement; indeed, pedestal-bases are found scattered over nearly the whole of the area enclosed by the Roman town-wall (Fig. 23). Any pre-Roman settlement would have been concentrated on the two low gravel-capped hills bordering the Wallbrook. Elsewhere⁵ it has been shown, from a study of the Arretine and early S. Gaulish sigillata found in London, that London started as a small trading-settlement a decade or so before A.D. 43. It must be frankly admitted that the evidence under review does not substantially affect the problem of a pre-Roman native settlement on the site of London.

The comparative abundance of these pedestal-bases there is readily explained by London's outstanding importance from the first in Roman Britain. Bases of similar type are found at Colchester, Margidunum, and Silchester ("Roman" on fig. 7, p. 189), at the latter site on a jug evidently copied from a classical metal prototype. A few similar pedestal-bases have been found in France, and are here illustrated to show the corresponding range of French types (cf. pp. 225-6 and 272).

P. 250, Fig. 22, 7. Exact site unknown, Dept. Marne. Pedestal-base of fine sandy red ware black-coated surface. Hollow base with external moulding and girth-groove, similar to nos. 3 and 6 above.

Similar bases are a feature of the small decorated jugs of green-glazed ware made at Saint-Remy-en-Rollat, in the Allier valley, during the first half of I A.D. A few of these jugs were exported to Britain, perhaps before the Claudian Conquest. The type is of purely classical inspiration.⁶

8. Brionne (Eure).³ Greater part of ovoid pedestal-urn of fine hard gritty brown ware, with black-coated polished surface.

⁵ Arch., lxxviii, 73 ff.
⁶ Dechelette, Vases céramiques ornés de la Gaule romaine, i, 41 ff.; Walters, Cat. Roman Pottery, xi, p. 10, fig. 5; May, Silchester Pottery, p. 100, Pl. xi; R. E. M. Wheeler, London in Roman Times, p. 144, fig. 54, 6; Antig. Journ. x, 161.
³ Illustrated by Coutil, Archeologie de l'Eure, iii, Arrondissement de Bernay (1917), p. 181, Pl. facing p. 182, no. 5.
Splayed quoit-shaped base with hollow centre. The base bears some resemblance to those of pedestal-urns from Champagne (pp. 172, 195 ; Figs. 5, 1, and 10, 12), but the shape of the body is entirely different from any of the pedestal-urns of the Roman period in Normandy (cp. Fig. 12, 15, and Fig. 13, 27–8, pp. 200, 204), and like the jug from Silchester, this pot is probably mainly inspired by a metal prototype of purely classical origin.

P. 172, Fig. 5, 5. From Mont-Beuvray (Saone-et-Loire). Pedestal-base of grey ware, with splayed foot and body sagging downwards into the base, a pre-Roman vestige in contrast to the rest : see p. 225.

Fig. 5, 6. From the same site. Pear-shaped pedestal-urn of grey ware, with tall hollow base. In general form this pot is not unlike the Roman pedestal-urn from Strood (Fig. 21, 4), and the base resembles the 'Romano-Belgic' urns from London (Fig. 22, 1–2).

After the pacification of Gaul, the Romanized pedestal type was diffused beyond Belgic Gaul, and the present example probably dates to the latter part of 1 B.C.

These Romanized pedestal-urns must be dissociated from the normal pre-Roman types. They are, indeed, interesting as shewing the persistence in the early decades of Roman rule in Gaul and Britain of native tradition in a Romanized form. But it is with that tradition in the days of its independence that we are here mainly concerned, and the evidence of the native pedestal-urns on both sides of the Channel is of the greatest historical value, not least in the fixing of the first Belgic invasion of Britain about the second quarter of 1 B.C. We may now proceed to a more general review of the culture in Britain, to which the pedestal-urns form the main archaeological guide.

3. HISTORICAL CONCLUSIONS

It is in Kent that the earliest types of the Aylesford-Swarling pottery have been found, and there the series so begun runs right on until the years immediately following the Roman conquest. Its makers are described by Caesar as the most civilized people of Britain, and he found that their manner of life differed little from the Gaulish.1 Kent in 54 B.C. contained four tribes or tribal groups, each under a king, and these kings, at least while Caesar was in the country, acknowledged the supremacy of Cassivellaunus,2 though

1 B.G. v, 14, 1.  
2 B.G. v, 10, 8–9; 22, 1.
before the invasion he had been fighting all the other kings, and Caesar found one of the chief Kentish strongholds, evidently Bigbury Camp, near Canterbury, specially fortified with tree-trunks with a view to one of these tribal wars. The names of the Kentish tribes are unknown to us; after Caesar’s withdrawal they seem to have been united under a prince named Dubnovellaunus, and when they came under Roman rule they formed a single unit, known as the Cantii, after the old name of their country and its foreland, which Pytheas had discovered as ‘Cantion’ nearly four centuries before.

Caesar was impressed by the dense population of Kent, and the ease with which he was able, when unmolested, to reap enough native-grown corn to supply his army in both his expeditions, shows that the country was intensively cultivated. The distribution of their pottery makes it plain that the Belgic immigrants had not encroached upon the Weald, where, indeed, all habitation seems to have been of the sparsest. But they evidently spread all over the rest of the county, and from the evidence of several excavated dwelling-sites, it is clear that the previously established Celtic population was by no means either exterminated or expelled. Pottery of native character appears along with the Belgic fabrics at Broadstairs, Margate, Walmer, and other places, and plainly by Caesar’s time the two peoples had settled down together and were mingling. The stronghold of Bigbury tells the same tale, and the quantity of ironwork found there, notably kitchen, horse, and farming gear, testifies to the inhabitants’ manner of life—though the earthworks have not been dated, the settlement seems certainly to belong to La Tène III.

North of the Thames some early pedestal-urns from

1 B.G. v, 9, 4 : cf. St. Catharine’s Hill, p. 49; Rice Holmes, Britain, pp. 337, 685.
2 Evans, Coins, pp. 206-2: Supplement, p. 527; Rice Holmes, Britain, p. 353.
3 Strabo, i, 63.
4 B.G. iv, 31, 2; v, 17, 2.
5 Arch. Journ. lix, p. 211 ff.
6 Arch. lx, p. 427 ff.; Jessup, Kent, pp. 131, 135, 147-8.
7 Jessup, op. cit., pp. 132, 134 (British Museum).
the south-east coast of Essex suggest Belgic landings there at the same time as the movement into Kent: but further inland this pottery is not earlier in type than the first century A.D., and we cannot claim that in Caesar's time Essex had been much penetrated by the invaders. Instead, we find them in the Hertfordshire district next after Kent, and it is here that the woodland stronghold of Cassivellaunus is to be looked for, since Caesar states it was north of the Thames, some 80 miles from the sea (sc. the East Kent coast), and this was the centre of the known territory of the Catuvellauni in Roman times. The importance of the Catuvelaunian ruling dynasty has been touched upon above, and whatever the precise site of Cassivellaunus' oppidum in 54 B.C., most of the known coins of his successor, Tasciovanus were certainly struck at Verulamium by St. Albans, which later became a Roman municipium. The excavations now in progress at Verulamium have already begun to reveal pottery of La Tene III character, and the history of this important centre may soon be very much better known to us.

Anyhow, this was the region from which Cassivellaunus waged his wars against the Trinobantes, who must be considered a native stock descended from the Hallstatt immigrants of some four centuries before, for up to now we know of no intrusion that can have disturbed their tenure of Essex. In, or shortly before, 54 B.C., Cassivellaunus had killed their king, and his son, Mandubracius sought the protection of Caesar, who, after he had reduced Cassivellaunus with the Regni. This pottery will shortly be published. G.C.D.

---

1 Pp. 242-3. 2 See pp. 170-1, 176-9 above. In support of this we may mention certain La Tene III pots found at Langenhoe (Proc. Soc. Antiq. xxii, 191, fig. 8) and Canewdon (Southend Mus.), Essex, decorated with incised scroll patterns. Pots of similar type have been found at Fetter Lane, London (Guildhall Mus.), and at Brighton (Antiquary, viii (1912), p. 223, fig. 1). The decoration in all these cases is clearly in the native pre-Belgic tradition, and in this regard helps to link the Trinobantes with the Regni. This pottery will shortly be published. G.C.D.
to serious straits in the field, restored the youth to his inheritance, in return for hostages and supplies, and when he left for Gaul, strictly forbade his defeated enemy to interfere again with the Trinobantes.

This alliance between a non-Belgic tribe and the Roman power for protection against Belgic aggression is a notable fact, and points to an orientation of British tribal politics which will be found a suggestive clue to their history for more than a century afterwards.

However, the next phase of that history was a painful one for the Trinobantes. Whether or no Cassivellaunus ever paid the tribute imposed upon him, Caesar's retention of his hostages probably deterred him from further attacks upon his neighbours, but with the next king, Tasciovanus, it was otherwise. He reigned from the 'thirties of I B.C. until about the beginning of the Christian era, and the coins of this long reign and their distribution show a wide extension of his original dominions, not only northwards into Northamptonshire, but also over the country of the Trinobantes, whom he evidently at last conquered and subdued. Possibly their subjugation was only finished by his son, Cunobelinus, but at any rate, in his reign Belgic dominion was established all over this part of the country, and the capital of the Catuvellaunian dynasty was transferred to Camulodunum, outside the site of Colchester, where he had his famous mint. Whether this may have been the original Trinobantian capital has not yet been revealed by the excavations now proceeding, but, if so, it was greatly extended under Cunobelinus into a regular city of the first importance. From the last decades of I B.C. until just after the Roman conquest it flourished, and the Aylesford-Swarling pottery of Essex in general falls within the same period. The series from Kent and Hertfordshire runs on concurrently, and over Bedfordshire and the southern parts of Northamptonshire and Cambridge-shire the distribution is carried as far as the Nene valley and the edge of the Fens, which mark its limits.

1 B.G. v, 22, 5.
on the north. While Duston and Weekley (Northants) and Abbots Langley (Herts) are the most westerly sites where the pedestal-urn culture has been found, coin distributions and other evidence suggest that the western boundary of the Catuvellauni was the valley of the Cherwell, which marked them off from the purely Celtic Dobuni, the region of whose scroll-ornamented pottery begins at Yarnton, just across it. The Thames valley appears to mark their southern limit, and south of the river there are few sites west of the Medway valley. The whole of the Weald lies well outside the Belgic area thus delimited. On the north-east, between the Fens and the sea, the finds of pottery cease beyond the Deben valley, while across the line of the Icknield Way, between the forest and the fenland, the frontier is plainly marked by the almost exclusive distribution on either side of a narrow belt across Newmarket Heath of the coins attributable on the one hand to Belgic dominions and on the other to the Iceni of Norfolk and Suffolk. The pedestal-urn region is bounded by the same belt, and here, too, are grouped nearly all the hill-forts which have yielded evidence of occupation under Belgic rule. Some of these, like Caesar's Camp, Sandy (Beds), and Danesborough (Bucks), seem to have been constructed by the Belgae; while others, like Wandlebury and War Ditches, near Cambridge, they took over from the earlier inhabitants: but the concentration of so many of them in this frontier district is significant, and compares well with the hill-fort distribution of the Belgic period in Wessex to be noticed below: both are illustrated on the map (Fig. 29, p. 301). The combination of these facts with topography makes it clear that this was not only a cultural but a hostile political frontier, as the line of the Icknield Way would, unless thus interrupted, inevitably serve as a trade-channel for the mingling of the two coin-distributions. The Iceni, then, resisted Belgic

1 Arch. lxxi, pp. 229, 262.
3 One of us has recently discussed in place here when the Wessex evidence is reviewed (pp. 299-301).
encroachment and preserved their racial and cultural continuity with earlier La Tène times.

The area of pedestal-urn distribution thus represents the full extent of the Belgic immigration with which we have been concerned. The amalgamation of the immigrants with the earlier populations is, as in Kent, attested in the counties north of the Thames by the appearance on habitation sites of Aylesford-Swarling ware and pottery of pre-Belgic tradition side by side. This is a marked characteristic of the material being obtained at Camulodunum, and occurs also at various sites in the Cambridge region noticed by Dr. Fox: an unpublished group shewing the same combination has been obtained by Mr. Perceval Westell from the hill-fort site of Willbury Hill, near Letchworth.¹ Evidently a fusion was taking place in these years analogous to that which on the continent had produced the Belgae themselves.

Rule over this mixed population was borne by Belgic chiefs, among whom the Catuvellaunian dynasty, as explained, was paramount. The degree of wealth, civilization and luxury attained by these great nobles is strikingly revealed in the richly furnished burials under barrows and in underground chambers or vaults.

Two vaults were destroyed at Welwyn in 1906,² and contained a remarkable quantity of amphorae and imported objects of bronze and silver, as well as pedestal-urns. In addition, there were two separate burials containing pedestal-urns and other La Tène III pottery. The pedestal-urns are all of globular shape, with heavy flat bases like Fig. 21, 3 (p. 248). This type is characteristic of the Catuvellauni, whose capital, Verulamium, is only eight miles SW. of Welwyn. The amphorae found in both vaults are of Mediterranean origin, and may have contained wine or oil at the time of burial. The most notable objects of native manufacture are three pairs of iron fire-dogs, measuring 42 inches between the uprights, which terminate in animal heads with knobbed horns, and an iron frame,

¹ Letchworth Garden City Museum. ² Arch. lxxiii, 1 ff.; B. M. Early Iron Age Guide, p. 131 ff.
42 inches high, which may have been a sacrificial table or altar. Iron fire-dogs are widely distributed over the Celtic area, from Bohemia to Gaul, and the custom of placing them in graves goes back to the late Hallstatt period in the Palatinate. ¹

The iron frame is unique in Britain, but may be paralleled abroad in a frame, 18 inches high, surmounted by bulls' heads, found in a large burial vault near Arras (Pas-de-Calais) in 1879. ² A similar frame was found in the Marne. ³ These frames are clearly Celtic imitations of the sacrificial table in use in the classical world, as represented, for instance, on a marble bas-relief from the amphitheatre at Capua. This shows a table with two sacrificial knives on the top, and other sacrificial utensils. ⁴ The imported bronzes at Welwyn include a bowl with pedestal-foot, patella and jugs, all of Italian origin, as are also a fine pair of silver cups and the silver handles of a kylix. Three heavy bronze masks with the hair and moustache in straight lines, and the bronze handle of a wooden tankard are of purely Celtic origin, and the latter has been found in burials elsewhere. ⁵ Some of the imported vessels may have been made considerably earlier than the date of deposit in the graves, which probably belong to the second half of I B.C. ⁶

A single vault of triangular shape was discovered at Mount Bures, Essex, in 1849, and recorded by Roach Smith. ⁷ In it were six amphorae arranged in two groups, lying on the cross-bars of two iron fire-dogs, 3½ feet high, with ox-head terminals, ⁸ a wooden box with bronze mounts, and a large number of pottery plates of black Belgic ware. The burial is clearly later than the Welwyn vaults, and should probably be dated shortly before the Claudian Conquest.

At Stanfordbury, near Shefford, Beds, two large vaults, measuring 12 by 15 feet, both paved with

¹ References in Arch., lxiii, 5-8; cf. Dechelette, Manuel, iv, 913-8. ⁴ Aylesford, Kent and Elvedon, Suffolk, Arch., iii, 368.
² Figured in Arch., lxiii, 15, fig. 9. ⁵ Summary in Arch., lxiii, 8.
³ Dechelette, Manuel, iv, 918, fig. 631, r. ⁶ Cf. fire-dogs from Lord's Bridge, Barton, Cambs., Antiq. Journ., vi, 316.
⁴ Figured in Arch., lxiii, 15, fig. 10.
Roman tiles, were discovered in 1845, and described by Sir Henry Dryden.¹ Both contained amphorae standing against the wall, and a collection of Roman pottery, bronzes and glass. In addition, in one vault were two iron fire-dogs, four spits, and a tripod with six hooks, and in the other vault were two iron bars, 2 feet 5 inches long, which may have originally belonged to a square frame like that from Welwyn. These pits date from mid 1 A.D. and reflect the same persistence of ritual and belief with regard to the dead under Roman rule as in pre-conquest days in this country and in Gaul, as shown by the strikingly similar burials at Arras and Saint-Audebert (Aisne): see above, p. 190.

Perhaps the most remarkable of all burials on Trinobantian soil is the Lexden tumulus, about two miles W. of Colchester, excavated in 1924.² The mound is about 100 feet in diameter and 9 feet high, surrounded by an irregular ditch. Near the centre was a large oval grave, 30 by 18 feet, and 7 feet deep below the original land-surface. The burial had been partially disturbed before, but enough remained to show there had probably been a chariot-burial.³ The pottery included fragments of a La Tène III cordoned bowl and butt-shaped beaker, also a large number of pieces of amphorae. Fragments of iron bands, embossed bronze plates and studs with red enamel are probably the remains of a richly ornamented wooden bucket, which may have contained burnt bones (cf. the bucket from Hurstbourne Tarrant, described below, p. 304). Bronzes of Italian manufacture, or showing strong classical feeling, were numerous: a table on four feet, small hollow pedestal, statuette of Cupid, and figures of animals (head of a griffin, bull with knobbed horns, boar), also a silver medallion of Augustus mounted in a frame. These are the belongings of a Belgic noble with strongly Romanized tastes, buried with much bric-à-brac from the Roman world. The burial probably dates from early 1 A.D.,

¹ Summary in Arch., liii, 9; cf. Fox, Archaeology of the Cambridge Region, p. 99, Pl. xvii.
² Arch., lxxvi, 241 ff.
³ Cf. p. 203.
and may even be that of Cunobelin himself (died A.D. 40).¹

The Romanization in taste and material culture which is attested by such costly imports from Gaul and the Mediterranean as have been found with these burials, and no less by the mass of Italian and Gaulish pottery which it now appears was in common use by all classes in the city of Camulodunum, is significant of the trend of the times. Cunobelinus himself, who calls himself Rex on some of his coins, must have played the leading part in encouraging this policy in commerce and material civilization. But he must have done so secure in the knowledge, at least in the old age of Augustus and the whole lifetime of Tiberius, that Britain had no immediate menace of aggression to fear from Rome. The traditional hatred, indeed, will be seen in the sequel to be still deeply engrained in the Belgic spirit. But it is still too soon to bring Roman Imperial policy and the reactions it stimulated into the story of Britain. The Catuvellaunian dynasty did indeed come to exercise, in the person of Cunobelinus, a supremacy stretching over the whole southeast of the island. But the stages in its growth cannot be understood until the exploits of another Belgic dynasty have been estimated, namely that found by Caesar’s old ally Commius. To do so, we must consider the evidence for what we shall call the Second Belgic Invasion of Britain. As with the first, which we have studied mainly through a review of the Aylesford-Swarling pottery and especially of the pedestal-urns, we shall be guided in the ensuing chapters by the consideration of certain leading ceramic types, and the evidence of these and other groups of archaeological material will be collated with such relevant historical notices as we possess. For this purpose a fresh beginning must be made by fixing attention once more upon Gaul.

¹ The practice of building barrows was continued by the Belgic aristocracy in I and II A.D. Roman barrows are found scattered over S. Britain, and are particularly numerous in East Anglia. See Fox, Archaeology of the Cambridge Region, pp. 191 ff.; Antiquity, i, 346; Crawford and Keiller, Wessex from the Air, p. 16.
When Vercingetorix surrendered Alesia in 52 B.C. the supreme effort for Gaulish liberty had been made and crushed. The last stand against Caesar next year at Uxellodunum was desperate from the first, and when the fortress fell Caesar treated the survivors with a terrible cruelty that effectively succeeded in its avowed aim of teaching the Gauls a lesson they would not forget. After another twelve months of consolidation the Civil War with Pompey had become imminent, and Caesar’s dispositions for the winter of 50–49 B.C. explain how matters stood in Gaul when he left it.

It was impossible to instal a ready-made machinery of civil government: the tribes must be left to accustom themselves to the Roman peace under the eye of an army of occupation. Four legions were accordingly posted among the Aedui, Caesar’s old and powerful allies, who had turned against him in 52, tried to imperil his army before Gergovia, and sent with their client tribes 35,000 men to the relief of Vercingetorix. They had always claimed a paramount position among the Gaulish peoples, and now that their old rivals the Arverni were humbled, while they were still above competition from the Sequani or the Remi, their prestige as the leading state of Gaul obviously required careful watching, for their great city of Bibracte on the Mont Beuvray was potentially the political as it was in fact the commercial focus of the whole country.

Four more legions were stationed among the Belgae, where Caesar himself had spent the previous winter, for they were the most warlike of the tribes, and to hold them and the Aedui equally in check was the best guarantee of security. Their neighbours, the Treveri, were not above soliciting the aid against Rome of
their natural enemies the Germans, and in Belgic Gaul itself the spirit of resistance lingered.

The Eburones, indeed, whom Caesar had sworn to annihilate after their massacre of the cohorts of Sabinus and Cotta in 54, had had their whole land laid ruthlessly waste in 53 and again in 51. The wretched people sought safety in the forests, and the whole of the Ardennes became full of bands of Belgic refugees. But even here the dry summer weather enabled the Romans to hunt them out, and before long the whole of the difficult forest country as far as the Rhine was reduced to subjection, and the network of strategic roads which was to hold it down was begun.

But south of the great woodlands there were also formidable tribes. The Bellovaci roused all their neighbours to try conclusions with Rome in 51, and their heavy defeat did not prevent them renewing the challenge in 46 after Caesar’s departure, when an army under Brutus was required to overpower them. After this we hear of no more trouble in Belgic Gaul for 14 years. Irreconcileables like Commius the Atrebate disappear from the scene: we know that after Caesar’s final triumph many men left their towns and their holdings and scattered as refugees rather than accept the Roman yoke, and it looks as if by the end of five years or so from Uxellodunum those intransigents had either surrendered, been killed, or had fled the country. Commius himself, after a series of adventures, escaped to Britain, and he can hardly have escaped alone. Thither we cannot yet follow him; it is enough here to note that the unrest in Belgic Gaul with which we should connect such migrations to Britain belongs chiefly to the years 52–45 B.C. The Aquitani, on the other hand, went on giving trouble, and expeditions to quell their revolts are recorded in 39–38 and 29–28 B.C.

But the whole of Celtic Gaul remained compara-

---

1 For the successive stages of this achievement see B.G. vi, 34, 8; iv, 194. 2 For B.G. viii, 24, 1.
3 See pp. 292 ff. below. 4 B.G. viii, 6–2 ff. 5 Appian, Bell. Civ., iv, 38; v, 75, 92; Dio, xlviii, 49, 2, etc.: see Atkinson in Swarling, pp. 46–7.
tively quiet. The Aedui took the hint furnished by the four legions in their territory, and from Narbonensis to Armorica we hear of nothing but peace.\(^1\) The Raeti beyond the Belfort gap required fighting in 44–43, and Agrippa in 39–38 carried the Roman arms across the Rhine,\(^2\) but Gaul in general was settling down. Roman provincial civilization was making rapid strides. Trade was penetrating everywhere, and Bibracte was becoming still more of a cultural capital. The truth was that Caesar’s wise policy of leaving the tribes to manage their own internal affairs was bearing fruit. Cicero had been rash enough to complain as early as 56\(^3\) that Caesar was shewing no inclination to legislate for the setting up of direct provincial government. But Caesar knew what he was about, and once his victories had been won, it was on conciliation that he saw he must rely, and this conciliation\(^4\) took the form of flattery and munificence to the Gallic nobles and the free leaving to them and their people of their local liberties, institutions, laws, and property, to keep in their own hands. And as he foresaw, prosperity and comparative peace followed.

Setting aside the Aquitani, it was only among the Belgae and Treveri that hostility was still nursed. After the seemingly peaceful interval noted above, the Treveri raised a rebellion in 30–29 B.C., which had to be put down by Nonius Gallus, and in the same years Carrinas had to take the field to defeat the Morini and certain other tribes who had revolted with them.\(^5\)

Plainly, if the Belgae and Aquitani were to be made to follow the example of the Celtae, a more permanent settlement than Caesar’s was wanted. Accordingly, in 27 B.C., Augustus took the matter in hand; he appeared in Gaul, and the Assembly of Narbonne, the holding of a recensio, and the fixing of the number and boundaries of the Gallic provinces followed. The extent of Caesar’s old Gallia Celtica was narrowed so that the new Aquitania on the one hand, and the
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\(^1\) Cf. for example Cicero Ad Atticum xiv, 9, 3 (44–2 B.C.) omnia plena pacis, quoted ibid.
\(^2\) Atkinson ibid. (records in the Fasti Triumphales).
\(^3\) De Provinciis Consularibus, 8, 19.
\(^4\) B.G. viii, 49, 2–3.
\(^5\) Dio, li, 20, 5; 21, 6.
new Belgica on the other, should take in a number of the more peaceful Celtic tribes adjacent to the actual Aquitani and Belgae. Thus Aquitania now stretched north to the basin of the Loire, and Belgica south-east to the Alps. This division, the establishment of the concilium Galliarum, and the numerous other dispositions made by Augustus in 27 and the two following years, proved as successful as could have been hoped. The secret of his success was his retention throughout of Caesar’s generous principle of local autonomy on which to erect the framework of his provincial system.

But a notable fact confronts us in the record we have of this visit of Augustus to Gaul. Its original object, it appears, was nothing less than an expedition against Britain. On arriving across the Alps he found it impossible to proceed with this owing to the need of a general Gallic re-organization, and at the same time envoys arrived from the Britons with whom, though the threat of invasion had to be made again next year, some agreement was then evidently concluded. This certainly suggests a possible connexion between Britain and the recent rebellions in Belgic Gaul. For, in fact, in 34 B.C., Augustus had started out on this same enterprise against Britain, but had had to abandon it owing to a revolt in Dalmatia; but after the years 27 and 26, in which both the Gallic and British questions were after all peacefully settled, there is no more talk of invasion: inspired poets cease to expect it, and the settlement was accepted and justified as a perfectly satisfactory example of the policy cohibendi intra terminos imperii.

Up to 27–26 B.C., then, the steady Romanization of Gaul was liable to be interrupted by revolts in the south and north: in Belgica there were two bouts of these, between 52 and 45 and in 30–29, and a connexion with Britain may reasonably be suspected. At any rate, Augustus was glad to settle both questions together when he did, because the business he really
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1 Dio, liii, 22, 5.
2 Dio, liii, 25, 2.
3 Dio, xlix, 38, 2.
4 Such passages as Horace Odes i, 35, 29; iii, 5, 2–4, which belong to these years, require no fresh quotation here.
5 See p. 311 below.
aimed at undertaking in the west was the conquest of Germany, for which the organization of the Gallic provinces would give him a firm base and abundant resources.

In Germany, as everywhere, the path of the legions was opened up by traders. As early as Caesar's time, mercatores were going to buy plunder from the Suebi, while the more peaceable Ubii further down the Rhine, who did not share their objection to purchasing imports, did a trade regular and comprehensive enough to be an effective agent of Gallic civilization. By now the middle and much of the upper Rhineland was settled by German tribes who had encroached with Arivistus on the Gaulish frontiers—Vangiones, Nemetes, Triboci—and among them the commerce of the south was now passing in ever greater volume along the river. Thus, after the conquest of Gaul the painted pottery of the Arverni appears among the Vangiones, along with all the Romanizing fashions in other wheel-made wares that accompanied it. The supplying of the frontier legions and the building of roads gave enormous stimulus to trade, and the Rhineland, though it always maintained characteristics of its own, was rapidly drawn into the orbit of western provincial culture.

Beyond it the traders also ventured, though it was not always safe, and the effect on native German culture by Celtic and Romano-Celtic influence is shewn by archaeology to have been enormous. It was, in fact, more permanent, beyond all comparison, than the attempted military conquest, which, beginning three years after the disaster of Lollius in 16 B.C., succeeded under Drusus and Tiberius in reducing Germany almost to the form of a regular Roman province as far as the Elbe.

If the ruin of this whole enterprise in the annihilation of Varus' legions along with the Pannonian revolt in A.D. 9 did not prevent the cultural penetration of
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1 B.G. iv, 2, 1.  
2 B.G. iv, 3, 3-4.  
3 Germanische Denkmäler der Frühzeit, i, pp. 53-4.  
4 e.g. M. Vinicius had to avenge murdered negotiatores by a punitive expedition in 25 B.C.  
5 Velleius, ii, 97.
Germany, that of Belgic Gaul, which every consideration favoured, was out of all proportion wider and deeper.¹

In the central region that became Gallia Lugdunensis, the pre-conquest process we have described became greatly intensified: in the north, such influences as Belgic exclusiveness had previously kept out flowed strongly in and did much to assimilate the country to the general character of the provincial west, though, as in the Rhineland, a certain individuality remained. But it was not merely a question of imports and influences from the south. Painted pottery, moulded pottery, all manner of other wheel-made wares, new techniques in metalwork, and the rest, did indeed come rapidly in. But their effect was not merely to create markets: they led to the setting up in Belgic Gaul of new and individual industries. The badly civilized northern Belgae had suffered enormous losses in their resistance to Caesar: at the close of the Civil Wars there were multitudes of men all over the empire looking round for places in which to settle down and make a fresh start. The rapid transformation of Belgica from a fiercely barbarian land to a civilized province, in spite of the stubborn spirit of the old fighting men who remembered the days before Caesar, suggests some considerable influx of such new blood, chiefly, no doubt, into the newly-founded provincial towns. But in its new industries, as in its former barbarism, the true Belgic stock kept a character of its own. Its ironwork was obviously the improvement of a native craft: its bronze-founding preserved a certain undercurrent of Celtic feeling in decorative style: while in enamelling, which came to be a very flourishing industry in the neighbourhood of Namur, it kept alive in a provincialized sort of manner an art which, if it was not actually rooted in that particular district, had yet always been a distinctively Celtic creation. Glass-

¹See in general F. Cumont: Comment la Belgique fut romanisée; Annales de la Société royale d'archéologie de Bruxelles, tom. xxviii (1914-19), pp. 77-181; Schumacher, Siedelungs- und Kulturgeschichte der Rheinlande, bd. ii.; Grenier, Manuel v (Arch. Gallo-Romain), ch. i, 3.
work, which became established in the same region was a more purely southern introduction, but pottery, of which we can distinguish four main groups among the material of Belgic Gaul, represents the whole range of the effects and character of the Romanization.

First of all we have the definitely imported wares from the south: the red-glazed Arretine of Italy, and rather later the new sigillata of Southern Gaul which supplanted it. Next, we have new industries starting to produce in local fabric, mostly white, fine red, and fine black ware, a series of types modelled closely on the imported classical models that were now to hand. These, represented mainly by the well-known ‘Belgic Terra Nigra’ and ‘Terra Rubra,’ supplied all the markets of the Roman north-west and beyond it till at last the Gaulish sigillata captured the whole demand for fine table-ware (though the production of jugs, etc., in white ware was never thus interrupted).

Thirdly, native forms of such vessels as jars and cooking-pots were modified under classical influence, so that the resulting types are real hybrids. This tendency resulted in an almost uniform series of forms thus derived from La Tène D prototypes (themselves, as in the case of the butt-shaped urns noticed above, to some extent classically inspired), all over the western provinces, though Belgic individuality may in some cases be traced here, too. Lastly, the old coarse wares of the poorer native classes continued to be made, often still by hand, as before.

The varying degrees in which native and Roman influences combine in moulding the character of the industries of Belgic Gaul form an instructive commentary on the gradual settling of the political balance between resistance and submission. The opening up of the country to trade, and the early abandonment of its military occupation, effected a very rapid transition. Its new character was not long in forming. We need not follow the fortunes of the province into the Flavian period. Its last flicker of rebellious spirit showed in the upheaval of A.D. 69. After that its acquiescence in the logic of Cerialis’ famous speech

\[1\text{p. 226.}\]
to the Treveri keeps any such conflict of loyalties effectively at a distance until the third century and the curiously dissimilar separatism of the Imperium Galliarum.

2. THE POTTERY OF THE TRANSITION AND ITS ANCESTRY

Though the last rebellion in Belgic Gaul took place as late as A.D. 69, we need not so far prolong our study of the nature, as reflected in its pottery, of its transition to provincial character. For one thing, that rebellion would never have been undertaken even by the Treveri and Lingones but for events in the Rhineland, to go no further afield, and the Rhineland, with its military occupation and its German populace, presents us inevitably with a different story from Belgic Gaul, where normally the only soldier to be seen was the recruiting-sergeant. For another thing, the Treveri and Lingones were not true Belgae, and such rebel tribes as were required a pitched battle with the revolting leader Civilis and his Germans before they would join him: there was little enough of the old Belgic spirit for him to harness to his cause. And even so, the Remi were foremost in counsels of peace. In fact, Belgic provincial culture had acquired its settled character very much earlier, so that our transitional period need not be made to extend later than the opening of the Christian era.

We have then to consider the pottery of our region in the second half of the first century B.C. The first of its four component classes, the imported fabric of the south, need not detain us long. The moulded craters, conical and hemispherical cups, and plates and dishes with stepped rims of the Arretine workshops are familiar Augustan forms, and their red and yellowish-red glaze is only less well known than that of the Gaulish ware that succeeded them.

Their imitations in Terra Nigra, Terra Rubra, and other fine Belgic wares betray no share in a native as opposed to a classical inspiration. The only question is the degree of fidelity to model. The fine white
pipe-clay jug, the wall-sided mortarium, and other pale clay fabrics all have their prototypes beyond the Alps. Both these classes of ware, in fact, interesting as they are, shew us only the Roman side of the picture. On the other hand, the fourth class of coarse, normally hand-made jars and cooking-pots merely constitutes the other extreme. These vessels are the work of the native poor, whether town-dwellers or peasants, whom Romanization in such a domestic affair as pot-making had yet to reach. This survival of primitive workmanship is commonest, as we might expect, in the northern districts of Belgica, where before the Roman conquest it had been the only known technique. In the purely German districts of the Rhine frontier, analogous survival is, of course, even more strongly marked.

A greater interest for us lies in the mean between these two extremes, our third class of pottery, in which the Roman and native traditions are mingled. To a large extent, these wares, normally in hard grey, brown, or pale clay, made, of course, on the wheel, belong to types which are the common heritage from La Tene D culture over most of the Roman west. The butt-shaped urns we have already noticed: they persist, and their technique merely improves. For the rest, we have a wide range of plain or more usually cordoned jars, normally with a roll rim and always with a wide swelling shoulder, and various types of bowl of analogous parentage.

Roman influence is clear in their hard, ringing, quality, their mechanical technique, pointing to mass production, and the various unimaginative ornamental devices that are made to take the place of classical moulded designs. On the other hand, the cordon had long been a feature of La Tene potting, the forms of the vessels themselves are mainly in the full pre-conquest tradition, and the methods of incising decoration are often purely native in character.

As this large class of wares is found far beyond the
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1 For examples see Holwerda, *Nederlands Vroegste Bescheiding*, pp. 97–8 (German summary).  
2 Ibid., pp. 105–6.
limits of our province as well as in it, we shall do well to concentrate upon such Belgic specialities as we can find. We have already anticipated one of these in our notice\(^1\) of the gradually weakening survival of the pedestal-urn tradition in the southern half of our region. The hard, pear-shaped urns of this model, in which the footstand is hardly even a vestige of the pedestal from which it has degenerated, continue as late as III A.D. in the original district of their type. They become a regular feature of Gallo-Roman pottery.\(^2\) The latest example of anything like a true pedestal is that from Notre Dame-du-Vaudreuil (p. 204 : Fig. 13, 27) dated about A.D. 70, and by then the type had been getting rarer and rarer for a century, while the Romanized type (see pp. 253-4) had vanished. Thenceforward, the truncated pear-shape alone persists, and outside the home of its prototype only appears in so far as it became, after all memory of its origin was lost, part of the normal stock-in-trade of the provincial potter.

However, we must recall the stronger persistence, in something like isolation, of the special class of pedestal-urn we have above observed on the Rhine, which in its latest form (Fig. 6, 2 : pp. 186-7) is there found on Roman sites as late as the middle of I A.D. The old individuality of the Rhineland was now emphasized by the Roman military occupation that marked it off from the civilian provinces of Gaul, and here only on the whole Continent did the pedestal-urn tradition survive well into I A.D. In Belgic Gaul it was virtually dead.

The other type to which we must now attend is the bead-rim jar or bowl. The production of a true bead-rim is the stylizing, in or under the influence of wheel technique, of the irregular lip formed in a handmade pot by slightly pressing down the mouth in the course of making it smooth and even. In a necked pot, of whatever variety, the neck cannot help being the principal character, though the mouth above may be finished in this same manner; but where there is no
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\(^1\) Pp. 199, 226, above.

\(^2\) Moreau, *Album Caranda*, i, 37, Pl. xiii, 2.
neck, the bead-rim or its prototype is the sole distinguishing feature of the mouth of the pot, and is thus, in the absence of any controlling peculiarity in the foot, the characteristic feature of the whole type.

Considering how common the primitive bag- or barrel-shaped pot is, from which such a bead-rim bowl or jar must ultimately be derived, one would expect that by the time we are considering, such bead-rim vessels would be the common property of the whole of Western Europe. In fact, this is not so: their development is localized in Northern Gaul and the Rhineland. The later Hallstatt period saw the beginning of the imitation in clay, north of the Alps, of the shouldered bronze situla of the time.¹ There duly appear in the earliest La Tène culture of the Marne a class of vessels with a high carinated shoulder, obviously the same in origin. These vessels have a rim usually pressed by hand into a rudimentary beading, and most of the pots are decorated below the shoulder with roughly combed or scored lines, punctured dots, rows of finger-nail marks or other survivals of Hallstatt methods of decoration² (fig. 24).

1. Exact site unknown. Dépt. Marne. Carinated bead-rim bowl. Hand-made, fine, hard, gritty grey ware, tooled brown-grey surface. Just below the shoulder the surface is combed horizontally, and vertically from shoulder to base.

Later in the Marne culture, the carination tends to disappear and the outline becomes a simple bulge. At the same time, the rim is better moulded and more emphasized.


Along with the last form, another class of bowl in the Marne may be noted, in which the rim is not pressed out into a regular beading, but has an internal swelling.

¹ Dechelette, Manuel, iii, 248, figs. 291–2.  
² Moreau, Album Caranda, i, Pl. xxxix, i, n.s. Pl. 85, 6; Morel, La Champagne souterraine, Pls. 5, 20, 22, 24, 41; Rev. Arch., 1906, ii, 337 ff.; Early Iron Age Guide, p. 70, Pl. v, 5, 8; see also a series found at Breuvery (Marne), Soc. Arch. Champagne, 1926, Pl. iii.  
³ Morel, La Champagne souterraine, Pl. 6, 12.
fig. 24. Pottery: 1, Dépt. Marne; 2, Marson (Marne); 3, Dépt. Marne; 4, Bignicourt (Ardenne); 5, Thuizy (Marne); 6, Alizay (Eure); 7, Notre Dame-du-Vaudreuil (Eure); 8, Moulineaux (Seine Inférieure); 9-10, Port-le-Grand (Somme); 11, Saint-Martin-en-Campagne (Seine Inférieure) (4)
(1-2, p. 273; 3-7, p. 275; 8-11, p. 276.)
This type may be tall or short, and also lasts into La Tène D in Normandy (see Fig. 24, 10).


In the Marne, the unornamented bead-rim bowl, now turned on the wheel, passed unchanged into La Tène D, and also survived into the Roman period. In neither period, however, is the type well represented.


5. Thuizy (Marne). Bead-rim bowl with wide mouth. Wheel-turned, hard grey ware with polished surface. Probably La Tène D.

The Marne carinated pot (Fig. 24, 1) survives with singularly little change into La Tène D in Normandy (Fig. 24, 8), and is found in all the large cemeteries, at Alizay, Léry, Moulineaux, and Notre-Dame-du-Vaudreuil. All the known examples are hand-made, usually of coarse, gritty ware, and the majority are combed vertically below the shoulder. The bead-rim bowl proper, in which the carinated shoulder softens into a bulging profile, is developed from this type in Normandy. The Normandy bead-rim bowls illustrated (Fig. 24, 6–10) vary in detail, but one or other exhibit features constant in British bead-rims, namely, the internal thickening of the rim and its tendency to rise above the contour of the pot, and the groove outside the lip. The careful combing of the immediate Normandy prototype is usually present as more simple tooling, though the zonal effect is still maintained. The type with internal swelling of the rim (Fig. 24, 10) is also represented in Normandy, and passed with the more common form of bowl to Britain. There is also a single bead-rim bowl of the Roman period (Fig. 24, 11).

6. Alizay (Eure). Bead-rim bowl containing burnt bones of a woman. Hand-made, coarse heavy grey ware, thick brown coating with uneven surface. Groove below the rim, and the slightly angular shoulder is emphasised by rough tooling round the upper part and vertical tooling to the base.

7. Notre-Dame-du-Vaudreuil (Eure). Globular bead-rim bowl, hand-made, coarse gritty grey ware, tooled grey surface with brown
patches. The rim is thickened on the inside, and there is a slight step above the rounded shoulder. From shoulder to base the body is combed horizontally.


9. Port-le-Grand (Somme). Wide-mouthed bowl with rim thickened on the inside. Hand-made, coarse thick sandy grey ware, thick brown coating with uneven surface, dark grey with brown patches. Two deep girth-grooves below the rim, and irregularly tooled on the body, sloping round the shoulder and vertically to the base.

10. From the same site. Ovoid pot with rim internally thickened. Wheel-turned, hard gritty grey ware, dark brown coating with well-tooled surface.

11. Saint-Martin-en-Campagne, near Dieppe. Small bowl with large bead-rim and well-marked rounded shoulder. Wheel-turned, thin hard grey ware with buff patches. This large cemetery dates from I and II a.d.¹; the bead-rim pot is probably I a.d.

The majority of the Normandy bead-rim bowls are hand-made, and the effects of the potter’s wheel are first noticed in Normandy early in I B.C.; these pots are therefore unlikely to be late in the century. In fact, as the bead-rim bowl is scarce in Normandy, the type seems to have been in use but a short time before Caesar’s conquest and the years of unrest following it, in which we may see reason to expect migration to Britain.²

Thus, we see that in the southern half of Belgica the bead-rim pottery of the transition we are studying embodies the tradition of the old Marne culture, as does the pedestal-urn series that was dying out at just the same time. But while the steady degeneration of the Marne carinated jar certainly thus led to the bulging jar on which the true bead-rim originated, this process was really nothing more than assimilation of the copy of a metal vessel, the situla, to the simple old bag- or barrel-shaped pot which had gone on being made alongside it. Fidelity to copy is sacrificed to easy working. Hence, it is not surprising that in the lands beyond the old Marne area bead-rim jars should appear along with wheel technique, which are direct render-

¹ Abbe Cochet, Sepultures gauloises,
² See pp. 264, 279, and ch. v.

pp. 58–68.
nings on the wheel of the simple old bag-shaped pot, which was still being made by hand, and in fact, constitutes much of our fourth or purely native class of Belgic pottery.\(^1\) This rendering certainly took place in the Rhineland, and in the north of Belgica, and it need not be denied that in the south of the province the same desire was felt, to produce a direct wheel-made version of the coarse vessels there current as in La Tène D after the northern inroads. But the bead-rim which appears on the resulting jars of the transition all over Belgic Gaul and the Rhineland was the perfecting by means of the wheel (or at least in hand-work copying a wheel-made model) of the method of finishing the mouth of a neckless pot which had been growing up during the earlier La Tène period on the Marne, in the degenerating series that began with the carinated copy of the situla. It was the coincidence that this degeneration ended by production of a bulging bowl of just the shape required for rendering the old hand-made barrel- or bag-shape on the wheel, that produced the beginnings of the true bead-rim jar in 1 B.C.

The most frequent form of decoration on these jars, and on a large variety of other types of the same sort of quality, is the primitive one of furrowing, combing, or striating, with some kind of comb or a bunch of twigs. This barbarous convention is unknown on the earliest La Tène pottery. It is first found in the Middle La Tène period in South Germany and Bohemia,\(^2\) when the Celtic migrations had spread far across Europe and earlier decorative traditions were in many respects being modified. It will be remembered that this was the time (early La Tène C) when the Celtic culture of Central Europe had most in common with that of the Marne; it is not surprising, therefore, to find this furrowing there also, though it is comparatively uncommon there, and the technique tends to be improved so as to form bands of fine combing instead of indiscriminate coarse furrowing.

\(^1\) See on this Holwerda, *Nederlands Vroegste Beschaving*, pp. 101, 104-5 (German). The same thing happened with the round-shouldered urns of the north Belgic Hallstatt tradition.

\(^2\) E.g. at the La Tène C cemetery on the Steinsbichel near Manching, Bavaria: *A.U.H.V.* v, p. 292 ("geriefte Ware") and taf. 51, nos. 937, 942.
In fact, this furrowing never became any integral part of the Marne ceramic tradition.

But by the beginning of 1 B.C. it was spread all over Central Europe and the Rhineland: it appears among the northern Belgae at La Panne,¹ and with the invasion of the Marne district and the establishment of southern Belgic culture there it was introduced on the coarse pottery of the newcomers we have noticed above: for instance, it is much in evidence on the coarse ware from the Oppidum de Pommiers (Aisne) in the St. Germain Museum. But among the civilizing influences which, after the Roman conquest, got so rapidly to work among the southern Belgae, such a crude convention began at once to die out. It was different on the Rhine, where the tradition was more firmly rooted, where the barbarian frontier was close at hand, and where the military occupation tended to keep the country with a character of its own.

As the Belgic migration to south-eastern Britain had taken place in the first half of 1 B.C., during the short period when furrowed as well as plain bead-rim jars were current south of the Ardennes, we may expect that the decoration as well as the form was carried over along with the pedestal-urn to form part of the Aylesford-Swarling series. For a type of plain bead-rim jar occurs at Swarling itself,² and furrowing is certainly found on necked vessels in the same series³: further, furrowed bead-rim jars are plentiful at Richborough from the very first moment after the Roman conquest.⁴ Therefore, as Mr. Bushe-Fox has suggested in discussing the latter, it is only reasonable to class the furrowed bead-rim jar with the plain bead-rim jar and the furrowed jar without a bead-rim as part of the Aylesford-Swarling series in south-eastern Britain. This point may be made without prejudice to the recognition of the influence of the Rhineland, along with northern Belgica, in maintaining and enhancing the popularity of the type here after the conquest.

¹ La Panne, p. 28, fig. 11, J, M, and fig. 2.
² Swarling Report, Pl. ix, 29: cf.
³ E.g. Swarling Report, Pl. ix, 31.
The connexion between Britain and those provinces was of the closest, and in both the furrowed bead-rim jar continues until the Claudian period and often later to take a leading place among ceramic types: furrowing also continues to appear on coarse pottery of other types, chiefly varieties of necked jar. One of us has attempted to identify some at least of the tools with which it was executed. But both decoration and form are in origin non-Roman and pre-Roman, and both were certainly current in the first half of B.C., when the vogue of the pedestal-urn was at its height, and the Belgic migration to south-eastern Britain occurred.

If now there is to be any question of another offshoot of Belgic culture being formed outside the new limits of the Empire in the transitional period after that conquest, it is clear that this matter of furrowed and bead-rim pottery will furnish important evidence for its date and place of origin. The contrast is especially important between the long-lived wheel-made group of these wares of the Romanized character typical of the Rhineland area, and the short-lived largely hand-made group in Normandy. On the other hand, the Marne pedestal tradition, being on the way to extinction, would not be likely to have much effect on the culture of any Belgic colony made at this period.

These considerations concerning the archaeological material, especially the pottery, of Belgic Gaul, must have the greatest weight, along with the political estimate of affairs made in the former section, in deciding on the interpretation of contemporary evidence from Britain. For it is to Britain at this time that there seems to have been precisely such a migration at this juncture from Belgic Gaul as would carry such an offshoot of its culture as we have posited. The Gaulish evidence now in our possession, in conjunction with the British, ought to enable us to fix with some approach to accuracy the position of this movement in the history of both countries.

I. THE EVIDENCE OF ARCHAEOLOGY

Apart from the pedestal-urn culture of Kent and Essex, there is only one other widespread and well-defined type of pottery in Southern Britain during La Tène III. This is the bead-rim bowl, first found by Gen. Pitt-Rivers in excavating the downland villages at Woodcuts and Rotherley, and later by Mr. and Mrs. Cunnington at a number of Wiltshire sites, such as Casterley Camp and Knap Hill. As the evidence of a second Belgic migration from Gaul to Britain is based to some extent on this type of pottery, we must now collate all the available material, define its type, dating and distribution, and endeavour to find out the points at which this culture entered Britain.

Bead-rim pots are of ovoid shape, with wide mouth and high rounded shoulder, and may be divided into two groups according to the rim-form. In the less developed type, the rim, more or less inbent, continues the curve of the upper part of the pot and is thickened on the inside, with a groove round the outside (p. 285: Fig. 26, 1–2). This type seems to be characteristic of S.Wilts, Dorset and the Isle of Wight. In the other class, the rim is thicker and fuller, and tends to rise above the curve of the pot, and the groove may or may not be present (Fig. 26, 3–8). This form is found in N. Wilts and Hants. There is not enough evidence to show any difference in date of the two groups, and both may be hand-made or turned on the wheel. The surface may have a coating of bitumen on the upper part, applied after firing the pot and carefully burnished, which appears as a highly polished band, the lower part of the pot remaining dull or more lightly tooled. Often the upper part of the pot is simply more carefully tooled than the lower part. However, there is usually some attempt to produce a zoning effect, whether by the
application of a coating of bitumen or merely by tooling
the surface, which reproduces the rough scoring of the
earlier bead-rim bowls in Normandy (p. 274: Fig. 24,
6–9). Occasionally the latter technique persists in a
more recognisable form, as on pots from Cadbury Camp,
Somerset, and Rotherley, Wilts (Fig. 26, 4). Sometimes
the zonal effect is emphasized by burnished lines
forming a lattice pattern round the middle part of
the pot (Fig. 26, 5). 1 Bead-rim bowls have been
found in kilns at Silchester 2 and Broomsgrove, Wilts. 3

The pottery described above bears the closest family
likeness to the bead-rim pottery in Normandy, as a
comparison of Figs. 24 and 26 will shew, and cannot
suggest any influence from the Rhine. The outstanding
feature of the British material is its sudden appear-
ance in this country at the very moment when migration
from Gaul is likely to have occurred, along with the
introduction into Wessex of the potter’s wheel, the
earliest local coinage, La Tène III brooches, and
the rite of cremation, which betoken the arrival of
invaders. It has been suggested, indeed, that the
British bead-rim may be simply a strong development
of certain hand-made incipient bead-rim bowls found on
earlier sites in Wessex: Fifield Bavant, 4 Wilts, and St.
Catharine’s Hill 5 and Worthy Down, 6 near Winchester.
The type is characteristic of La Tène II, and is a
natural development from the plain rounded or
swollen rim prevalent in La Tène I in this country 7 and
abroad (p. 274: Fig. 24, 3). It also sparingly survived
into La Tène III (= D) in Normandy (Fig. 24, 10)
and in Wessex at Casterley Camp and Horton, Dorset.
In Britain the incipient bead-rim is clearly the latest
form of a long series in hand-made rim development,
but to link it with the true bead-rim of La Tène III,
normally wheel-made, is misleading, as it is not
associated with other features of bead-rim ware,

1 And at Rotherley, Pitt-Rivers,
Excavations, ii, 143, Pl. cviii, 4.
2 Arch., lxiii, 328.
3 Wilts Arch. Mag., xxvii, 294;
Devises Mus. Catalogue, ii, 86,
Pl. xvii, 11.
4 Wilts Arch. Mag., xlii, 476,
Pl. vii, 39-45.
5 Report, p. 112, figs. 12–14.
6 Proc. Hants Field Club, x, 183,
figs. 32–3, 38–41.
109 ff., fig. 12. Numerous references
to other British sites are given in the
text.
namely, the tooling and zoning noted above, which are features as characteristic as its rim-form.

We have seen above (p. 276) that the Normandy bead-rim pots may be dated to the first half of I B.C. Now in Britain, as will appear below, the dated examples of this class of pottery may be referred at the earliest to the latter years of the same century. At first sight, this appears to leave an awkward gap between the Normandy and British bead-rims, but it should be borne in mind that in Wilts and Dorset excavation has been almost entirely limited to the Romano-British villages and camps, none of which is much earlier than the Claudian period, whilst the larger prehistoric earthworks, such as Maiden Castle, near Dorchester, which may be expected to yield evidence of occupation in La Tène III, still remain unexplored. Moreover, though it is more than probable that many of the hand-made bead-rim bowls of Wessex, as from Hengistbury Head and Yeovil, belong to the second half of I B.C., hand-made pottery continued up to mid I A.D. We therefore regard this gap between the two series as due to restricted excavation and lack of well-dated material, and not as any serious objection to the argument here to be set forth. The necked pots generally associated with the bead-rim, as with the pedestal-urn series, are all of regular La Tène III types, and may normally belong to any part of this period.

In fact, few bead-rim bowls have been found associated with more closely dateable objects. The best dated group was found in a midden-heap at Oare, N. Wilts, with pieces of Arretine pottery, including two stamps, AT[eius] and PLEV. The latter potter is unknown, but ATEIVS worked during the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius up to about A.D. 40. Now, although the published bead-rim bowls from Silchester do not seem to be earlier than I A.D., the site is generally considered to have been first occupied towards the end of I B.C., as coins of Eppillus, son of Commius, are inscribed CALLE(va). At Winchester, bead-rims

1 An Iron Age settlement has recently been excavated at West Parley, Proc. Dorset Field Club, 1929, p. 232. 7 ; lxxviii, 7, 8.
3 May, Silchester Pottery, PIs. lxxv, lxxvi, 125 ff. 4 Evans, Ancient British Coins, 523-4 : cf. p. 294 below.
FIG. 25. DISTRIBUTION-MAP OF BEAD-RIM BOWLS (pp. 275-279, 284-286)
have been found below the Roman deposits and attest some occupation of the site early in I a.d. if not before: and at a neighbouring site, Worthy Down, 3 miles NW. of Winchester, is a settlement of the same period. Again, at Hengistbury Head, large numbers of bead-rim bowls were found, and the deposits are assigned to late I. b.c. and early I a.d. For the rest, the bead-rim bowls found at Casterley Camp, Rotherley, and Woodcuts, associated with La Tène III brooches, do not materially help with the dating, as the exact period of these brooches is still uncertain, but like other La Tène III brooches from Wilts none are certainly earlier than about 50 b.c.

Now, the fact that the earliest dateable bead-rims occur in N. Wilts and at Silchester implies that their makers were also occupying the more coastal parts at least as early as the latter part of I b.c., and it can thus be said with some confidence, that the earliest bead-rims in this area date to the latter part of I b.c. There is a considerable quantity of bead-rim and associated pottery from Jordan’s Hill, Weymouth, and other S. Dorset sites, but so far as is known, only one bowl is accurately dated, namely, the Cogdean burial (Fig. 26, 5), which is mid I a.d. The evidence of coins from Dorset suggests that this area came under Belgic influence at a relatively late date, probably not before early I a.d. The few bead-rim bowls from Somerset, none accurately dated, also seem to show that this area was penetrated by the Belgae during the first forty years of I a.d. (see also below, pp. 296–7).

The distribution-map of bead-rim bowls (Fig. 25) shows the main concentration to be on the chalk uplands of the Wilts-Dorset border and in N. Wilts. Occupation is also dense in the regions of Winchester and Silchester, but further east finds become scarce. Find-spots again thin out towards the west, in Dorset and Somerset. The map suggests that the main body of the invaders landed along the coast between Christ-

1 St. Catharine’s Hill, pp. 182 ff.
3 Hengistbury Head Report, pp. 45–8, Pis. xxii–xxiv.
FIG. 26. POTTERY: 1, 4, ROTHERLEY, WILTS; 2, JORDAN'S HILL, WEYMOUTH; 3, CASTERLEY CAMP, WILTS; 5, COGDEAN, DORSET; 6, GLASTONBURY, SOMERSET; 7, ST. LAWRENCE, ISLE OF WIGHT; 8, WINCHESTER (4) (p. 286)
church and Poole Harbour, and spread inland up the Avon valley. Another section landed in the Isle of Wight, and also passed up Southampton Water to Winchester, N. Hants and Berks. The map makes clear the relative density of bead-rim bowls in Britain compared with Normandy, and supports the idea that this type of pottery only reached its maximum development after passing from Normandy to Britain. In Wessex, in fact, the series persists into Roman times.

_Description of Bead-rim Bowls (Fig. 26)._  
5. Cogdean, Dorset. Bead-rim bowl containing burnt bones, fragments of two glass phials distorted by fire, and a coin of Claudius. Hand-made, hard gritty brown ware, grey surface with buff patches. Well tooled round rim and base, the central zone is matt, with a large lattice-pattern of lightly burnished lines. The coin is a 2 s of Claudius, A.D. 41-2; there is no _Pater Patriae_ in the _obv._ legend, with ordinary _rev._ of Minerva Promachus to _r._, SC. Condition, rather worn; deposited probably not later than Claudius, say about A.D. 45-55.  
7. St. Lawrence, Isle of Wight. Wheel-made, hard sandy brown ware, grey coated, tooled surface.  

The undercliff of the Isle of Wight, from Niton to Ventnor, a distance of about 5 miles, was thickly occupied in La Tene III. Bead-rim bowls are found in midden-heaps with broken animal bones, shells, etc.  
8. Winchester. Bead-rim bowl containing burnt bones. Wheel-turned, thin hard sandy grey ware, dull grey surface. The rim
is well developed and prominent, and the shoulder is marked by a shallow girth-groove.

The lid, of hard sandy-grey ware with black surface, is a common Roman type of dish, not closely dated, but here probably mid or late 1 A.D.

We may now conveniently deal with the bead-rim material from the more eastern part of Britain, which belongs almost, if not entirely, to the Roman period. The bowls are found in large numbers in London, and their occurrence here is especially im-

![FIG. 27. DISTRIBUTION-MAP OF BEAD-RIM BOWLS IN LONDON](image)

portant for dating. We have seen above (p. 253) that the rise of London as a commercial city followed immediately upon the Roman conquest. The bead-rim bowls support this idea; none are certainly pre-Claudian, some are Claudian, but the majority may be dated A.D. 50–80, from their association with Roman pottery. The distribution (Fig. 27) extends over nearly the whole area enclosed by the Roman town-wall. The great incidence of bead-rim bowls in London is to be explained by the vigour of native arts and crafts under the Roman rule, and it is
further probable that the artisan population of London was to some extent drawn from the native upland villages of Wessex.

Description of Bead-rim Bowls from London (Fig. 28).

1. From the site of the old General Post Office, St. Martin’s-le-Grand. Bowl of gritty grey ware with dark grey surface. The shoulder is marked by a shallow girth-groove, a Claudian feature on burial-urns from the same site (Roman London, p. 154, fig. 63, 2, 6). Cf. also a small bead-rim pot found in Farringdon Street with a Samian dish of form 22 (Guildhall Mus. Catalogue, p. 90, no. 291, Pl. xli, 8).

2. From Paternoster Row. Bowl of fine grey ware, matt surface. Large beaded rim with groove round outside, and girth-grooves round body. Similar bowls were found with Samian pottery of A.D. 50–80 in rubbish-pits on the site of the old General Post Office (Arch., lxvi, 258–60, fig. 14, 12–3).

3. From London Wall. Bowl of hard gritty grey ware, grey surface tooled above shoulder, matt below. The shoulder is slightly carinated.

4. From King William Street. Bowl of fine sandy grey ware, turned light brown coating with grey surface. Tooled round rim and base, roughish on body with pairs of vertical burnished lines. Cordon and groove above shoulder. A very similar bowl was found with Samian pottery of A.D. 65–80 in a rubbish-pit on Cornhill.

Bead-rim bowls are found in some numbers in NW. Surrey on early Romano-British sites, such as Ashtead,¹ and in burials at Charterhouse and Haslemere.² In every dated instance the bowls are associated with Romano-British pottery of I A.D., and their presence is due to the spread of population in early Roman times over country difficult of tillage, which had previously been much more sparsely inhabited. In type, the Surrey bead-rims closely resemble the bowls found in London (Fig. 28, 1–2).

Further east, in Kent and Essex, there are a few bead-rim bowls which may have a somewhat different origin. The pots are more globular than usual, and simply tooled or striated round the upper part. They are probably derived from the local bead-rim bowl of the Aylesford-Swarling series³ noticed above (p. 278).

Fig. 28, 5. Rochester, Kent. Bowl with small bead-rim and slight shoulder. Fine hard grey ware, grey surface with buff patches.

FIG. 28. POTTERY: 1-4, LONDON; 5, ROCHESTER, KENT;
6, MARGATE, KENT (4)
(1-4, p. 288; 5, p. 288; 6, p. 290)
Tooled above shoulder, dull and roughish below. Similar pots have been found at Thornton Heath, near Croydon, Ospringe, Kent, Braintree and Great Wakering, Essex.

In concluding this section, we may recall that while furrowed bead-rim bowls occur in the southeastern counties on late prehistoric sites, e.g. Broadstairs and Walmer, yet the type mainly belongs to the early Roman period, as at Richborough and probably Margate.

Fig. 28, 6. Margate, Kent. Wheel-turned bowl of hard sandy-grey ware, light brown surface with grey patches. The surface is regularly furrowed round the rim, and vertically below the shoulder.

The rough scoring on earlier bead-rim pots in Normandy (p. 274: Fig. 24, 6-9), which also occasionally appears in Wessex (p. 285: Fig. 26, 4), is here formalized into regular decoration, due to the use of the potter's wheel. The distribution of furrowed bead-rims in Britain (Fig. 25: p. 283) and their frequent occurrence on early Roman sites link them more closely with the same type of Roman pottery found in the Low Countries and on military sites in the Rhineland, and plainly distinguish them from the Normandy and Wessex groups. In fact, the Roman furrowed bead-rim bowls are simply another manifestation of the cultural unity of south-eastern Britain and the lower Rhine—defined by the importation of Romanized 'Belgic' pottery into this country and the exportation of 'Celtic' enamelled brooches and mirrors, later of pottery made at Castor—which is a direct result of the military and commercial links between the two areas in Roman times.

But a century behind this effect of their common

---

1 Arch. Cant., xxxviii, 149, Pl. xxv, 225.
3 Colchester Museum Report, 1922, p. 10, Pl. iii.
4 Pp. 278-9 above.
5 Arch. lix, part 2, p. 434, fig. 5.
7 Namur, Haltern Report, p. 296; Nijmegen, Holwerda, Nederland's Vroegste Beschaving, p. 81, Pl. xii, 6.
8 Cologne, PZ, xviii, 255, figs. 1-3; Haltern, Haltern Report, p. 294, type 91; Mainz, PZ, xviii, 257, fig. 4; Neuss, Bonner Jahrb., 111-2, p. 313, Pl. xx; Regensburg, Haltern Report, p. 296; Xanten, Bonner Jahrb., 119, p. 279, type e, ibid, 122, p. 380, Pl. iv, 4-5.
10 Royal Commission on Historical Monuments, Huntingdonshire (1926), pp. xxxii-iv.
Romanization is the introduction of the bead-rim type into Wessex, which we now see to betoken an historical event of great importance, namely, a second immigration from Belgic Gaul. The character of the new ware clearly shews direct derivation from the Normandy type, and it is now plain that the furrowed bead-rim vessels of Romanized character, whether from the Rhineland or SE. Britain, are to be classed separately and do not affect the main issue.

2. HISTORY AND CHARACTER OF THE INVASION

The fact of a second Belgic invasion of Britain, wholly distinct from that which brought in the Aylesford-Swarling culture, has been conclusively proved in the foregoing sections, and much has begun to be clear concerning its date, origin, and limits.

In the absence of pottery of Rhineland types and of other material, notably brooches, belonging to the frontier regions of Gaul and Germany, we need not look for its origin beyond the Ardennes. The material we have reviewed shows that the invaders came out of the districts of Belgic Gaul lying between that forest and the mouth of the Seine, more especially from Normandy, and as the pedestal-urn was there practically extinct, and the furrowing of bead-rim bowls and other pottery in process of dying out at the time of their crossing, its date must fall in the years immediately following the campaigns of Caesar. The typology of the associated brooches agrees entirely with this conclusion. The distribution of the characteristic bead-rim pottery in Britain indicates that the newcomers landed mainly at the Hampshire harbours, and suggests that they sailed from the mouth of the Seine and perhaps from various points along the coast immediately north-east of it.¹

Of the two tribal names of Gallic origin associated with the area of the new culture in Britain, one is the collective name of the Belgae themselves, the other is that of the Atrebates. If now we turn to the sketch

previously attempted (pp. 263, 270) of the political state of Belgic Gaul after the Roman conquest, we find that the date required for the pottery unquestionably covers the years of unrest and rebellion there from 51 to 45 B.C. Further, associated with this pottery we have the first inscribed coinage of Britain, and that was struck by Commius the Atrebate. The connexion of the invasion with his name, already suggested, thus becomes as near a certainty as may be, for his escape to Britain, as recorded by Frontinus, can hardly have been made much, if at all, later than 50 B.C.¹

Commius' services to Caesar in the earlier part of the Gallic War had been liberally rewarded, but in the winter of 53–52 B.C. he was among the foremost agents in forming the great coalition of revolt which Vercingetorix was to lead. Caesar was then absent in Cisalpine Gaul, but his lieutenant, Labienus, found out what Commius was at, and commissioned the tribune Volusenus to assassinate him. He escaped, though with a severe wound, and in the crisis of 52 was one of the four generals in command of the great relief force which went to Alesia.² From its defeat he again escaped, and next year headed the Atrebates in the fresh revolt, made in conjunction with the Bellovaci and other neighbouring tribes, which we have already recorded (p. 264). This revolt cost Caesar a serious effort to suppress. Commius, who knew what was the fate of friends of Caesar who turned against him, fled to the German auxiliaries he had succeeded in bringing in: he dared not and would not make his submission. His life was safe in no man's hands, and he took to guerilla warfare.³ His depredations on the Roman supply-convoys during the winter of 51–50 began seriously to endanger Caesar's commissariat, and Mark Antony sent Volusenus a second time to try to kill him and suppress his force of brigand cavalry. Again and again ambushes were laid for him, and in the

¹ It is arguable that if it had been made during 50 B.C., Hirtius would have mentioned it in B.G. viii, 48–55, but Frontinus clearly thought it took place while Caesar was still in Gaul. See next page.

² B.G. vii, 76, 1–2; viii, 23, 3–6.
³ B.G. viii, 6, 2–23, 2.
final hand-to-hand fight he dealt Volusenus a crippling wound, but had to escape defeated, while his men were killed or scattered. Then, at last, he sent in hostages for his submission to Antony, on the express condition that he should never again be brought face to face with a Roman.\footnote{B.G. viii, 47-48.}  

For his life on these terms there was thenceforward little hope in Gaul, and it was natural that he should turn his eyes to Britain. His Belgic kinsmen in the south-east had shewn five years before\footnote{B.G. iv, 27, 3: cf. p. 243, above.} that they had little love for him, and though he was Caesar’s friend no longer, Cassivellaunus had learnt his lesson, and was not likely to take the risk of harbouring him. Besides, he was clearly a man who loved power, and cannot have wanted harbourage as a refugee so much as a new kingdom for himself. West of the existing Belgic dominions in Britain were other lands, peopled only by the backward descendants of the Hallstatt immigrants, which it was not too late to win.  

His escape to Britain was sensational. The Romans had evidently discovered his design, and pursued him to the shore, where ships were waiting for him and for the followers he must have had. He was able to get on board, but it was low tide, and the ships were aground, so he bluffed the Romans by setting full sail, which, as the wind was blowing off-shore, made them think he was under weight and out of their reach. They according gave up the chase, and he was left to wait for high water unmolested.\footnote{Frontinus, Strategemata, ii, 13, 11: ‘Commius Atrabas cum victus a divo Iulio ex Gallia in Brittanniam fugeret et forte ad Oceanum vento quidem secundo sed aestu recedente venisset, quamvis naves in siccis littoribus haererent pandi nihilominus vela iussit: quae cum persequens eum Caesar ex longinquo tumentia et flatu plena vidisset, ratus prospero sibi cripi cursu, recessit.’ That Caesar himself, even if still in Gaul at the time, headed the pursuit seems unlikely: but Frontinus evidently believed the escape followed immediately on Commius’ final defeat.}  

The next we know of him is that he began to strike coins inscribed with his name in the district of our British bead-rim pottery. We have seen that the earliest examples of the latter have been found at the
seaport of Hengistbury Head and in the northern portion of this district. This northern portion is, in fact, the area later recorded as occupied by Commius’ tribe the Atrebates, which includes northern Hampshire and most of Berkshire, stretching a certain way eastwards into Wilts, and, it seems, westwards into Surrey. Thus the combination of documentary, numismatic, and ceramic evidence indicates that Commius himself, with the Atrebates who escaped out of Gaul and gathered to follow him, passed straight inland from the Hampshire harbours and established himself in the northern part of the area we find characterised by bead-rim pottery. Before long there was founded at Silchester the capital city of Calleva. The mint-mark CALLE on the coins of his son, Eppillus, and the pre-Roman pottery, associated with imported Arretine ware, already recorded from the site attest unmistakeably its foundation at least before the end of I B.C. Exactly how far the polygonal lay-out of the site and the presence of earthworks outside the later Roman walls may be accepted as pre-Roman relics is not, and perhaps cannot be, established, though a pleasing theory in this regard has been put forward by Lieut.-Col. Karslake.1 Anyhow, with Silchester as a centre the Atrebatic territory stretched from Surrey to the Vale of Trowbridge, bounded on the north by the middle Thames valley and the Vale of White Horse, and on the south by an uncertain line across the Hampshire and Wiltshire chalk.

The southern part of the bead-rim area was divided under Roman rule between two tribal areas, that of the Belgae north and north-west of the Hampshire harbours, and that of the Durotriges in Dorset. Now, it has been pointed out already that Belgae is not a tribal but a generic name, and we can hardly resist the conclusion that the Romans found the former district inhabited by a number of small groups representing the migrated bands from each of the Belgic tribes of Gaul other than the Atrebates, and unified it into a single canton under the generic name common

to them all.¹ They were clearly from the first under Atrebatic suzerainty, for they accepted the coinage of the Commian dynasty, and of the two towns they possessed under the Empire one, Bath, cannot be proved to be a pre-Roman foundation and is anyhow remote from the centre of the bead-rim pottery area, while the other, Winchester, though its site has yielded traces of Belgic occupation, cannot be shown to have been more than a village before the Roman conquest, and its lay-out is purely Roman.²

While we have admitted above that the bulk of the dated bead-rim pottery of Britain belongs to the first half of I A.D., yet of the material not dated by association, much may, while identical in type with the later examples, belong to the preceding half-century. And throughout the territory of the Atrebatic and Belgic cantons, we have the coins of Commius and his dynasty to strengthen the link between the British pottery and his appearance in the country about 50 B.C., which the comparative evidence from Gaul has already furnished. But with the Durotriges the case is different. While none of the Dorset bead-rims need precede the Christian era, the Durotriges struck no coins at all.³ They were, at this time, evidently still using the old iron bar-currency. The Iron Age material of their district prior to the appearance of the bead-rims points to its settlement, following on, and perhaps overlapping, a big late Bronze Age immigration, by the bearers of late Hallstatt culture, after which some degree of infiltration by the south-western Celtic people is possible: anyhow, La Tène influence on the Hallstatt tradition was apparently strong,⁴ and the prevalent bar-currency is emphatically a south-western character.⁵ They were at any rate a Celtic people, and their name, which is unknown in Belgic Gaul, was probably current before the appearance among them of the Belgae, attested by the bead-rim pottery of early I A.D. They would

¹ This suggestion has been advanced by Rice Holmes, Britain, pp. 232–3, Bush-Fox, Swarling, p. 31, and C.F.C.H., St. Catharine’s Hill, pp. 187–8.
² St. Catharine’s Hill, pp. 177–188.
³ Evans, Coins, p. 131.
⁴ E.g. the Spettisbury Camp material in the British Museum.
⁵ See pp. 178–9, above.
thus appear to be a Celtic tribe Belgicized, and if so, 
their case is exactly paralleled by the Trinobantes, 
who similarly retained their pre-Belgic tribal name. 
Too little is known about Dorset in the last centuries 
b.c. to enable us to speak with more certainty. The 
great hill-forts of the county no doubt hold enough 
evidence to satisfy us: Hambledon Hill, at least, 
has a structural sequence, 1 and at Hod Hill, near by, 
there were clearly two phases of pre-Roman occupation, 
the second being of the bead-rim period. The earlier 
is characterized by contracted inhumations and by 
currency-bars, both typical of the south-western Celtic 
area; but there can be little left there to explore. 2 
The curious feature of vertical raised ribs flanked by 
knobs on some of the bead-rim bowls from Jordan 
Hill 3 and Cranborne Chase 4 deserve notice, and is 
very possibly the incorporation of a piece of native 
technique in the Belgic convention: as far as it goes, 
this idea supports the view here put forward of a late 
(i.e. early I A.D.) Belgicization of the Celts of Dorset. 
This would thus seem to be the last district to be 
settled by the bead-rim people, about half a century 
after their arrival in Britain.

But the Belgae under the Empire also inhabited 
Somerset, which we have so far seen mainly as a 
stronghold of the south-western Celtic culture. The 
theory that has been put forward to explain this 
anomaly is that shortly before the Roman conquest 
the Belgae invaded Somerset, destroyed the Glaston-
bury lake-village and such hill-forts as Worlebury, 
and forced their surviving inhabitants to take refuge 
in the Mendip caves, thereafter ruling the country as 
overlords. 5 But true bead-rim pottery in Somerset 
is extremely scarce, and though one of the pots from 
Wookey Hole recalls a Swarling type, 6 there is no 

1 Wessex from the Air, pp. 44-55: 
St. Catharine’s Hill, p. 76. 
2 Arch. Journ. lvii (1900), p. 52 ff.; 
Wessex from the Air, pp. 30-41. 
3 B. M. Guide to Roman Britain, 
p. 115, Pl. xii, 2. 
4 Pitt-Rivers, Excavations ii, 161, 17—20: 
Pl. cxiv, 7. This feature occurs on 
native (Glastonbury type) pottery 
from Hambury Fort, Devon, now in 

5 Wessex from the Air, pp. 44-55. 
6 Balch, Wookey Hole, Pl. xiv, 8, with corrugated shoulder.
pre-Roman pottery in the county which can really be used to attest any regular Belgic settlement.

On the other hand, some few bead-rim vessels are in fact known there (e.g. Fig. 26, 6), and it is hard to understand why Somerset, as far west, anyhow, as the Parrett, should have been included by the Romans in their Belgic canton if the Belgae had no claim to it based on possession before the Roman conquest, for the Roman cantonal system was deliberately founded on a tribal basis.

Our provisional conclusion can only be that the Belgae had already made their way into Somerset before the conquest and had probably harried the inhabitants, but regular settlement had not by then advanced to a sufficient extent for any remains of it to have come down to us. This involves supposing that they did not take over and occupy native sites, and though the Glastonbury bowl (p. 285: fig. 26, 6) might suggest this and more conclusive instances of it may yet be discovered, we may recall the two stages in the original Belgic conquest of Kent as narrated by Caesar: first mere destructive raiding, organized settlement and land-holding only afterwards.1 If the course of events was the same in Somerset, the Roman conquest found the first stage accomplished, but the second scarcely began. Thus the western frontier of the Belgic area is not to be fixed with precision.

The other anomalous region which we must now notice is Sussex. The Weald effectively cut it off from the Aylesford-Swarling culture, and while colonies of iron-miners certainly lived there, it was along the South Downs that the bulk of the Celtic population was concentrated. Here the continuity right through the Iron Age from Hallstatt times is plainly marked: the normal La Tène III pottery is simply developed from the earlier native forms, influenced but not superseded by the new forms prevalent in the adjoining Belgic districts. The potter’s wheel was taken over, but no wholesale intrusion of Belgic forms took place.2

---

1 B.C. v, 12, 2: see p. 240 ff, above.  
2 The best recognised series is that from Park Brow: Arch. lxxvi, p. 1 ff.
But we have coin-evidence to indicate that the Regni of Sussex were ruled in this period by Tincommius the son of Commius, which implies Belgic ascendancy, established towards the end of I B.C. at the latest. And after about 50 B.C. various seemingly significant changes took place at a number of well-known sites. The great hill-fort of the Trundle ceases abruptly to be inhabited, and it has been inferred that Belgic invaders appeared here, too, and superseded it by a new city on the plain, namely Noviomagus, or Chichester. Chichester was certainly the capital after the Roman conquest of a Romanized native king, Cogidubnus, and it may well be presumed to have been the previously established seat of government. At Cissbury, also, the abandonment of the regular occupation seems to have come with the La Tène III period, in which it seems to have been turned over to plough; so here, too, the work of the Belgae is suggested. At the same time a shifting of habitation-area occurred at two known village-sites, Findon Park and Kingston Buci, and it certainly looks as if West Sussex, anyhow, received a certain number of Belgic migrants at this time, who seem to have established a political domination, under which native hill-forts were suppressed, without being numerous enough to have much effect on the racial strain of the existing Celtic inhabitants. We may further suspect that their power did not reach beyond the Adur: in East Sussex the only known hill-fort, the Caburn, was not superseded but was actually re-fortified, and the only known La Tène III burial is an extended inhumation in the old Celtic manner, though accompanied by a pot based on a Belgic prototype. Perhaps West Sussex was included in the territories given to King Cogidubnus by the Romans as the reward of his submission at the conquest.
Anyhow, the principal feature of Sussex at this time is the persistence, without much disturbance, of the natives descended from the Hallstatt immigrants: what was apparently the Belgic political ascendancy in the west can hardly have much affected their racial character. We shall, in fact, find presently that the Regni do not fall into line historically with the really Belgic or Belgicized districts of Britain.

In general, the superseding of hill-forts and settlements seems to some extent to have been a characteristic act of the Belgae. Their predecessors all over southern Britain were evidently grouped in tribal states, each with a hill-fort as the capital point of its block of normally upland territory. Not many of these older Celtic hill-forts are found to have been taken over by the Belgae, nor did they build many of their own. In the south-east we have already noticed the concentration of those that there are on the northern frontier where they marched with the Iceni, and the exceptions either like Bulstrode in the Chil terns and Wallbury in Essex suggest temporary frontiers before the attainment of the maximum Belgic extension, or else like Bigbury in Kent must have arisen before the absorption of smaller in larger kingdoms that characterized the period. The large kingdom only wanted hill-forts on its frontiers: for the rest, Caesar observed that the typical Belgic oppidum, such as Cassivellaunus' capital, occupied a woodland site, and regular cities such as this and Camulodunum echo the town life of Gaul rather than the 'acropolis' tradition of the earlier Iron Age.

In Wessex the corresponding city is, of course, Silchester, and by contrast we find all the many hill-forts of the lands the Belgae conquered deserted under their rule, except along a narrow alignment running across the chalk country from the Berkshire to the Dorset downs, which is evidently a Belgic western frontier, and an even better example than those of the other group of the tendency we have noticed.

1 The whole question is reviewed in St. Catharine's Hill, pp. 171-188, and the hill-fort evidence given in detail in Antiquity, v, 60 ff.

2 B.G. v, 21-3.
The map (Fig. 29) shews this clearly, and also the fact that the invaders had not succeeded in pushing very far beyond this fortified march when the Roman conquest put an end to their activities; that is, the distribution of hill-forts accords entirely with the other evidence we have reviewed from Dorset and Somerset (throughout, of course, only those hill-forts where excavated evidence is to hand are considered).

From Alfred’s Castle on the Berkshire Downs, which perhaps superseded the old fort of Uffington Castle near by, the line runs by Oldbury and Oliver’s Camps near Devizes, to the great fortified enclosure of Casterley: at all these it seems there was nothing before the Belgic period but scanty unfortified habitations. Battlesbury and Hanging Langford Camps on either side of the Wylye were certainly occupied now, though the date or dates of their actual construction is not yet known: further south, Winklesbury on Cranborne Chase, a site thickly inhabited in the pre-Belgic period, appears only to have received its fortifications after the invasion.¹ This brings us to the great Dorset forts of Hod and Hambledon Hills, Spettisbury, Dudsbury, and Belbury, from which, as pointed out above, our evidence indicates Belgic occupation, but without close precision. But at least the distribution, as so far established, is striking, and forms a strong contrast with that of the earlier Iron Age; for except for the seaport settlement behind the great ramparts of Hengistbury Head, the whole extent of Belgic territory within the frontier-line was a land of open villages. Not many of these show any continuity with the preceding centuries, though Worthy Down² and Corhampton Down³ are no doubt far from being the only examples: but a large number of earlier villages were certainly deserted, and new ones appear instead on other sites. Of these, some few, like Woodcuts and Rotherley on Cranborne Chase, are on the chalk uplands, but there are signs that the Belgae

---

¹ Pitt-Rivers, *Excavations*, ii, p. 233; *St. Catharine’s Hill*, pp. 75, 166; *Antiquity*, v, 92.
³ St. Catharine’s Hill, pp. 5, 164.
A black circle indicates dating-evidence from the actual defences of a fort, a white one evidence from within only. The stippled area represents the maximum extension of Belgic culture, as assumed from known material (compare Figs. 7 and 25, pp. 189, 263).

Block from *Antiquity*, v, 91 (fig. 14), by permission.
began also to settle on woodland and valley sites, and as this preference is a regular Teutonic character, it is allowable to see here the influence of tradition in their German blood. Certainly Winchester¹ and Chilbolton² are cases in point, and the Sussex evidence above noticed may be taken to agree.

Varying local conditions, of course, must be taken into account in considering the choice of village sites, the chief being that of agricultural land. The general effect of the Belgic immigration on the countryside of southern Britain was certainly to leave the existing system of upland agriculture intact and probably increasing towards the maximum extension which it attained under Roman rule, but the idea that the Belgae undertook some little clearance of heavier and more thickly timbered lowland soils, which the older Celts had avoided, accords with what we know of their continental traditions and the distribution of their settlements, and also seems helpful to the explanation of the continued thriving of the native and Belgic stocks side by side and in combination, which must certainly have gone on.

The overlap of cultural traditions which is here implied may be traced in the mixture of burial rites. As we have seen, the regular Belgic rite was cremation and burial normally in a bead-rim urn, but two instances may be given of inhumation in the earlier La Tene manner in a cist accompanied by an urn of this same type: the sites are Sheepwash in the Isle of Wight³ and Battery Hill outside Winchester⁴ and they compare well with the Eastbourne burial above noticed (p. 298), though there, for reasons already given concerning Sussex, the urn is not a true Belgic bead-rim.

For the rest, cremation is normal in flat graves. Isolated burials in bead-rim bowls have been found at Cogdean (p. 286, Fig. 26, 5), Jordan’s Hill Weymouth,⁵ Bitterne⁶ and Winchester.⁷ A more elaborate burial was found at Ham Hill, south Somerset, in 1923.

¹ St. Catharine’s Hill, loc. cit.
² Williams-Freeman, Field Archaeology, Hants, pp. 237, 423.
⁴ St. Catharine’s Hill, p. 176.
⁵ Dorchester Mus.
⁶ Winchester Mus.
⁷ St. Catharine’s Hill Report, p. 183.
A small pit filled with black earth mixed with burnt bones contained, besides minor objects, a fine iron dagger with bronze hilt in a tinned-bronze sheath, and 'numerous fragments of plain and decorated late Celtic pottery.' Unfortunately, the pottery is not otherwise described or illustrated, and cannot now be traced. Typologically, the dagger belongs to La Tène II, as the pommel lacks the moulded head of a bearded man, characteristic of the 'anthropoid' dagger in La Tène III. On the other hand, it is

1 Taunton Mus., *Antiq. Journ.*, iii, 149.
very difficult to estimate the length of time such a weapon may have been in use and afterwards preserved as a valuable possession, and the date of deposit in the grave may be separated by a considerable period from the date of manufacture of the dagger. Anyhow, cremation is characteristic of La Tene III in Belgic Britain as in Gaul, so that the burial must certainly belong to the period here under review.

Burials of greater luxury are found in wooden buckets bound by iron bands and ornamented with bronze plates. Two bucket burials are known from Wessex, namely, the famous Marlborough bucket, found in 1807, and that found in the Hurstbourne Tarrant barrow, described next. In 1905, Mr. H. S. L. Dewar excavated a small barrow, built of clay-with-flints, in Blagdon Coppice, Hurstbourne Tarrant, about 6 miles N. of Andover. It was only 27 feet in diameter and 3½ feet high (Fig. 30). At the centre was a large interment, consisting of a wooden bucket with burnt bones, surrounded by a dozen pottery vessels, bronze brooch and bracelet, and fragments of a vessel of thin brown glass.

The Bucket (Pl. I).

The original wooden staves of the bucket had decayed away, but the iron bands, plates of iron and bronze, and bronze studs, indicate that it was similar in construction to the other British buckets. There are no traces of handles. From the iron bands, the diameter of the bucket is estimated at 14½ inches, and it was probably about the same in height.

A. Fragments of iron bands of two widths, 1.1 and 0.5 inches, showing on the inner surface vestiges of the wooden staves, preserved by rust. One fragment has a tang at one end, similar to iron strips, probably part of a bucket, found in the Lexden tumulus.

1 Wilts. Arch. Mag., xxiii, 222; Devizes Mus. Catalogue, i 87-8, no. 387. Mr. Stuart Piggott has recently published the best illustrations of the Marlborough bucket in Antiquity, v, p. 42, pl. II.

2 The remains of a similar bucket found in 1928 at Silkestone, near Winchester (Winchester Mus.), are probably also from such a burial. Outside Wessex, bucket burials have been found at Aylesford, Arch., i, ii, 319, 360 ff.; Great Chesterford, Cambs., Fox, Archaeology of the Cambridge Region, p. 105; Harpenden, Herts. Antiq. Journ., viii, 520; and Lexden, Essex, Arch., lxxvi, 246. For general accounts of the buckets, see Dechelette, Manuel, iv, 963, and B. M. Early Iron Age Guide, pp. 27, 125.

3 Short summary in Proc. Hants Field Club, x, 122. I am deeply indebted to Mr. Dewar for permitting me to draw and publish this important discovery. G. C. D.

4 Arch., lxxvi, 246, Pl. lli, 3.
A. FRAGMENTS OF IRON BANDS OF BUCKET: HURSTBOURNE TARRANT, HANTS
B. FRAGMENTS OF IRON AND BRONZE PLATES, AND BRONZE STUDS, HURSTBOURNE TARRANT, HANTS
Another band has a thin iron plate attached to one border, with an embossed bronze plate on the inner side; this may be a projection for fastening a bar-handle, as on the Marlborough bucket.

B. Fragments of thin iron plates, lozenge-shaped, about 3½ inches long and 1½ inches wide. Three bronze studs are attached to the outside of each plate, and the inside backed with wood. Round the edge on the inside are thin, pointed bronze plates, covered with indented dots and concentric circles enclosed in curved lines. There are some twenty detached studs, for about ten plates in all, which were probably attached to the bucket in the spaces between the iron bands. Precisely similar ornaments were found in the Lexden tumulus.1

---

**FIG. 31. BRONZE OBJECTS: HURSTBOURNE TARRANT, HANTS**

(1, 1; 2, ½)

*Bronze Objects* (Fig. 31).

1. Brooch of “thistle” type, with pierced foot and encased spring. The disc is cast in one piece with the brooch, and decorated with concentric raised circles. The type is essentially Continental and rarely found in Britain. It was evolved in Gaul from the La Tène III brooch in the second half of I B.C., and seems to have gone out of fashion about A.D. 50.


2. Fragments of plain bracelet, broken and twisted by fire. Similar to a bracelet found at Rotherley, Pitt-Rivers, *Excavations*, ii, 130, Pl. ciii, 1.

1 *ibid*, 246, Pl. liii. 1; 249, Pl. lix.
Pottery (Fig. 32).

1. Pedestal-urn, sandy grey ware, darker grey coating with tooled surface. Everted rim, tall conical neck with two narrow cordons, with offset at junction of neck and bulging body. The body curves inwards to a cylindrical foot with splayed base, concave at the centre.

A similar urn found at Jordan's Hill, Weymouth, is in the Dorchester Museum, and Mr. R. S. Newall, F.S.A., has found fragments of a somewhat similar urn with hollow pedestal-base in Hanging Langford Camp. The neck and body of the Hurstbourne Tarrant urn are identical with a pot with small base, found at Silchester, and the incongruous addition of a pedestal-base to this shape well illustrates the lapsing of the pedestal-urn tradition in Wessex in early I A.D. (see p. 249 above).

2. Ovoid beaker, with thin rim and short neck, and narrow girth-groove on upper part of body. Sandy brown ware, grey coating, surface tooled on upper part, roughish below groove. Silchester type 143.

3. Butt-shaped beaker, hard gritty black ware, thick light red coating with tooled brown surface. Everted rim, bevelled inside, with angle-cordon on outside at junction of rim and body. Decorated with two wide zones of deeply incised lines in a herring-bone pattern, between three broad cordons bordered by grooves. A similar beaker was found with a 'thistle' brooch at Hauxton, Cambs. The angle-cordon below the rim occurs at Silchester, and is characteristic of beakers of fine ware found at Colchester of early I A.D.

4. Upper part of butt-shaped beaker, thin light red ware, surface tooled on neck, matt below the girth groove. The pattern was made by a notched wheel. Fragments of similar ware associated with bead-rim bowls have been found at Oare and Casterley Camp, Wilts., and Hengistbury Head. Nos. 4–6 are imported wares, probably from Gaul, and the same type has been found at Mont Beuvray (abandoned 12 or 5 B.C.), Haltern (11 B.C.–A.D. 9) and Hofheim (A.D. 40–51).

5. Lower part of beaker with girth groove above the base, ware similar to No. 4.

6. Upper part of beaker with everted thickened rim, ware similar to No. 4.

The next three pieces are plates of the 'Belgic' ware ('Terra Nigra' and 'Terra Rubra') characteristic of Romanization on the Continent (p. 269) and imported into Britain (cf. pp. 262, 311).

7. 'Belgic' plate, fine soft whitish ware, thick grey coating with polished surface. Upright rim offset from base by an internal quarter-round moulding, foot-ring with internal bevel.

---

1 May, Silchester Pottery, 164, Pl. lviii, 141.
2 May, op. cit., 164, Pl. lxviii.
3 Fox, Archaeology of the Cambridge Region, p. 91, Pl. xiii, 1 A.
4 May, op. cit., 167, Pl. lx, 150.
6 Hengistbury Head Report, Pl. xiii, 8, references on p. 58.
FIG. 32. POTTERY: HURSTBOURNE TARRANT, HANTS (1)
(pp. 306, 308.)
Copy of Arretine plate, Haltern type 1a; by about A.D. 50 the foot-ring is normally no longer functional, and lies above the plane of the base.1

The degenerate rim-form approaches the Hofheim type 97, variant 3 (Rutterling, Hofheim, p. 334, abb. 86).

8. ‘Belgic’ plate, fine hard whitish ware, thin grey coating with polished surface. Thin everted rim with internal offset at angle with base, bevelled foot-ring. This type has been found imported at Silchester,2 Hengistbury Head3 and Colchester;4 and abroad at Mont Beuvray5 and Haltern (type 73), but not at Hofheim. Copy of Arretine plate, Haltern type 5a (Augustan).

9. ‘Belgic’ plate, fine hard sandy brown ware, polished surface. Everted rim, deep groove at external angle with base, high bevelled foot-stand, base concave at the centre. The plate has ‘sagged over’ in firing.

This type had died out before the occupation of Hofheim.

10. Plate of soft grey ware with flint grit, tooled soapy grey-brown surface. Curved side with one groove internally and two grooves externally at angle with base. Probably a local copy of No. 9.

11. Bowl of hard sandy grey ware, thin grey coating with tooled grey-brown surface. Everted rim, globular body and hollow pedestal-base. Similar bowls have been found at Rotherley6 and Jordan’s Hill Weymouth.7

12. Lid with hollow pedestal-like handle. Fine hard grey ware with black specks, tooled grey-brown surface. Similar lids have been found associated with bead-rim pottery at Oare8 and Silchester.9

13. Lid, similar to No. 12, with beaded edge to handle. Fine soft grey ware, tooled soapy grey surface.

As regards the date of the Hurstbourne Tarrant tumulus, clearly it belongs to early I A.D., and the pottery indicates a pre-Claudian date, about A.D. 30–40, with which the brooch agrees. The burial shows a remarkable convergence of influences from Gaul and Britain. The bucket and numerous pottery vessels provide the closest parallel to the burial in the Varimpré tumulus (see above, p. 214 ff.). On the other hand, the curious pedestal-urn links the burial with the earlier pedestal-urn culture of south-eastern Britain. The

2 May, Silchester Pottery, 177, Pl. lxiv, 189.
3 Hengistbury Head Report, p. 56, Pl. xxvii, 28.
5 Dechelette, Fouilles du Mont Beuvray, Pl. xxii, 3 c.
7 Wilts. Arch. Mag., xxxvi, 130, Pl. vii, e.
8 May, Silchester Pottery, 183, Pl. lxxv, 11.
Hurstbourne Tarrant and Lexden tumuli are the only La Tène III burials of this class known in this country, and the material wealth attested by both indicates the burial of the ruling stock.

This review is perhaps the most that may so far be safely hazarded about the second Belgic invasion and its immediate effects. It may, we submit, now be accepted as a well attested historical fact, now that it is clear that we need no longer try to identify the Belgae of Ptolemy’s Geography with the migrants ‘ex Belgio’ recorded by Caesar. The latter are the Aylesford-Swarling people, the former the people of the bead-rim pottery who gathered round the compelling figure of Commius when he retired from Gaul: both are Belgae, and equally inheritors, though at different stages corresponding to their difference in date of arrival, of the cultural traditions of Gaul and Germany which we have endeavoured to trace.

It only remains briefly to survey the part they played in the history of their new land, and to estimate in particular the importance of their relations, both in peace and war, with the advancing power of Rome.

VI

THE PEOPLES OF BRITAIN AND THE ROMAN CONQUEST

About the beginning of the Christian era there were, as has now been shown, two Belgic areas in Britain, ruled respectively by the dynasties of Cassivellaunus and Commius. It is plain that their mutual policies were inevitably the dominating factors in the tribal wars which must have gone on and which furnished a constant supply of prisoner slaves for the Roman market.¹ The fortunes of the various British princes known to us who must have been involved in these wars may to some extent be traced from the distribution of their coins.² Thus while the three

¹ Strabo, iv, 5, 2.
² See Rice Holmes, Britain, ch. viii (based chiefly on Evans, Coins of the Ancient Britain, and Supplement).
sons of Commius, besides combining in the joint rule over their father's dominions which we have noticed, had each at one time or another his own territory within them, the coin-evidence involves us in complications extending outside. Tincommius apparently ruled at least in West Sussex and south-east Hampshire: Verica ruled over the Atrebates themselves, evidently from Calleva: but while Eppillus had also a period of minting there, his coins also appear in the other Belgic area, namely, in Kent. Here he seems to have dispossessed a prince named Dubnovellaunus, whose coins also, and perhaps earlier, appear in Essex, where they are soon superseded by those of the great Cunobelinus.

Whatever may have been the exact course of events, Dubnovellaunus seems to have been twice expelled from his dominions, once from Essex, where his people must have been the Trinobantes, by Cunobelinus or his father, and then again from Kent by Eppillus. Again, while Eppillus and his brother Verica each at one time ruled over the Atrebates, they also ruled jointly together. This fact, taken with the presumably previous triple sovereignty of all three brothers, including Tincommius, points to the elimination, by death or expulsion, of the latter.

Hence, it is not surprising that when Augustus records on the Monumentum Ancyranum that two British princes came to seek his aid, the name of one should be 'DVMNOBELLAV(mus)' and the other, which is mutilated on the stone, should be 'TIM...' or 'TIN(commius).'

Their arrival at Rome was after, probably some time after, Augustus had given up all thought of invading Britain, and he made no move, as far as we know, for their re-instatement. The point that emerges from our confused evidence for British history at this time is the gradual concentration in fewer and fewer hands of the rule over the Belgic districts.

The triple dominion of the sons of Commius was reduced to a double, perhaps to a single, authority; similarly, though after the death of Tasciovanus, the
ruler of the other Belgic area, we have coins of his son, Epaticcus, in West Surrey and also within the Commian sphere in Wiltshire, they soon disappear, as do those of Dubnovellaunus in Essex and Kent, and another Essex ruler, Addedomarus, while thereafter those of Tasciovanus' other known son, Cunobelinus, spread from their mint at Camulodunum over the whole south-east of the country.

In Cunobelinus, in fact, the Catuvellaunian dynasty seems to have superseded that of Commius and all other known rulers in, and even partly outside, the maximum area of Belgic extension. We may say that in early I A.D. he unified, in effect, all south-eastern Britain. Suetonius goes so far as to call him without qualification 'Britannorum rex.'\(^1\) Under him the capital at Camulodunum became a great city and commercial centre, filled with the imported products of Italy and Roman Gaul and Germany, which are indeed found sporadically all over the Belgic districts and notably in the Commian capital at Calleva, but nowhere in such quantity as in the fields outside Colchester where his city stood.

It was by means of the volume of trade which these imports attest that the Roman government recouped itself for the tribute imposed by Caesar upon Cassivellaunus, which is most unlikely, by this time at least, to have been directly paid. Customs dues imposed at the Gallic harbours on all British exports were held to be more productive than any tribute, and invasion would certainly be costly enough to absorb such revenue as could be got from Britain as a province; besides, Britain was now no real menace to Rome. This statement, given by Strabo,\(^2\) is clearly the official justification of the abandonment by Augustus of the policy of invasion. Perhaps the remission of the claim to tribute and the substitution of the customs duties formed part of the terms made by him with the Britons in 26 B.C.\(^3\)

The exports from Britain, according to Strabo, were coin, cattle, gold, silver, and iron. The imports

---

1. Caligula, 44.
2. ii, 5, 8; iv, 5, 3.
3. See p. 266, above.
he names are all luxury articles, but the Colchester excavations show that pottery, at least, formed an article of import which was in use by all classes of the population. In fact, the long reign of Cunobelinus was the first stage of the intensive Romanization of Britain. Nor was the Romanization confined to material things. Latin was the language at least of the mint, as the legends **REX** and **F(ilius)** testify, and figures of classical mythology appear not only on Cunobelinus’ coins but on his father’s.¹ Embassies were sent and services performed to gain the friendship of Augustus by various British chieftains, not merely refugees like Dubnovellaunus, no doubt most notably by Cunobelinus himself: votive offerings were placed by them in the Capitol, and almost the whole island became familiar to the Romans.²

If we compare the position of Cunobelinus to those of other native rulers on the fringes of the Empire, and appreciate the invariable policy of Augustus in treating such princes as he did, it becomes clear that he was content to hold his hand from the invasion of Britain not only for present advantages and economy, but because he knew that events so shaped would make conquest easy, and even, perhaps, inevitable later on. This was the true complement, in such cases, of the maxim ‘cohibendi intra terminos imperii.’ While his armies were busy on the Rhine and the Danube, Britain was quietly being conquered for him by peaceful penetration.

This process was made possible and effective by the power and character of the Belgic domination, and its intimate relation to the progress in civilization and commerce of the Belgic province of Gaul, which was no less close now than the relation in hostility and rebellion had probably been in the years immediately following the latter’s conquest.

But yet there was, as the sequel showed, no general taming of the spirit of independence among the

¹ Evans, *Coins*, pp. 223 ff., 289 ff. He observes that this proves ‘how completely Roman mythology had taken root... unless we are to suppose that the types were... left to the mere fancies of the (sc. Roman or Roman-trained) engravers,’ an alternative that Rice Holmes at least (p. 369) does not appear to support.

² Strabo, iv, 5, 3.
Belgic Britons. It is a commonplace of history that the absorption by a semi-civilized power of elements of material culture from a civilized one does not necessarily carry with it any readiness for docile submission when war breaks out, but rather it very often raises both the moral and material quality of resistance. In such cases it is only after overpowering defeat in the field that the undermining effect of such absorption makes itself apparent. Out of the intensive Romanization of Celtic Gaul in the half-century before Caesar's conquest came Vercingetorix, and nearly a hundred years later the same conditions in Britain produced Caratacus. Each of them had to be broken before the cultural Romanizing of their countries could show through. But when in Britain that had been done, the rest was easy, and Rome was left face to face with the un-Romanized north.

Cunobelinus was reigning when Augustus died, and he outlived the whole principate of Tiberius. In his last years there were domestic quarrels, and early in A.D. 40, Adminius, one of the king's sons, was driven into exile and sought the protection of Caligula, who was in Gaul at the time. The crazy Emperor's response was the famous shell-gathering fiasco, but it must have been clear that when at last Cunobelinus should die, his madness alone would stand between Britain and the long-deferred serious invasion.

In point of fact, Cunobelinus and Caligula died at about the same time. The Roman principate passed to Claudius and its direction to the astute freedmen who surrounded him: the British hegemony was divided. It was the right moment for the enterprise of conquest.

The German frontier was quiet: military success was required to give prestige to the new régime, the same forward policy was contemplated in Mauretania and Thrace. The economic exploitation of Britain, for all that Augustus had said in his day, would undoubtedly be profitable. But above all, the decisive factor was the political situation in Britain itself in A.D. 42. The elements in that situation can be understood only in the light of the past history of the island.

1 Suetonius, Caligula, 44.
as revealed mainly by archaeology, in which the two Belgic invasions are the most important points.

The south-eastern Belgae, as being conquering invaders, were obviously hated and feared by their older established Celtic neighbours. With the Regni the Weald prevented effective contact, and the sparsely populated Midlands could contain no very powerful enemies, while they had already conquered and Belgicized their old enemies, the Trinobantes, and set up their capital in their territory. It was the Iceni of Norfolk and Suffolk who presented a hostile frontier, for which the coin-distributions and hill-forts furnish evidence that we have already noticed.¹

In the south-west, the probability has been seen to be that the Belgae were at the time of the conquest engaged in ousting the Celtic inhabitants of Somerset, who were no doubt the Dumnonii, while they had already Belgicized the Durotriges of Dorset. The Dobuni of the Cotswolds, who were of the same origin and culture with the Somerset Celts, are as unlikely as the Iceni to have been on friendly terms with the Belgic invaders.

In Sussex, the Regni cannot have contained more that a small Belgic element, and in their isolated position may be presumed to have valued independence from the Catuvellaunian supremacy, as is at least suggested by the sequel.

The death of Cunobelinus was the signal for a widespread splitting-apart of his power. His dominion descended to two of his sons, Caratacus and Togodumnus. Dio records the independence of a multitude of princes in 43,² and most of these must have been revolted vassals of the old king: his two sons plainly had to fight for their full inheritance. One of the results of this warfare was the seeking of Roman aid by a refugee prince named Bericus,³ and of others with him, whose surrender their enemies, evidently the sons of Cunobelinus, demanded. Their demand, which perhaps included the return of their fugitive brother,

¹ P. 258.
² Dio, ix, 20, 1: ἄλλοι ἄλλοις κατά στάσιν.
³ Dio ix, 19, 1: ἐκπεσὼν ἐκ τῆς φήσου βασιλείας προσταταμένοι.
Adminius, was refused: this was exactly the casus belli which the Roman government wanted. The whole island was divided against itself: it was the moment for the conquest to begin.

So Aulus Plautius and his army landed and fought their way to the Thames and finally to Camulodunum. And from such accounts as we have of the first four campaigning years, it seems that the Belgae, first in the south-east and then in the south-west, alone opposed them.

The ruler of the Regni, Cogidubnus, was rewarded evidently for his submission with increased territory and the anomalous titles of rex (apparently) and legatus avgvsti in Britannia. Clearly he took the winning side by ignoring whatever Belgic strain there was in him or among his people. The Iceni had a stronger motive for deciding spontaneously to join the Romans, and the position enjoyed by their king, Prasutagus, who died eighteen years later, was much the same as that of Cogidubnus, namely, that of a dependent ruler.

The Celts of the south-west, who must, if the prevailing theory be right, have been only too glad to see the Romans take their Belgic enemies in the rear, evidently gave no trouble: the hard fighting that the left wing of the Roman army had to do under Vespasian was certainly done against those Belgic enemies themselves, the people of the bead-rim pottery, and while it included the taking of the Isle of Wight, it does not seem to have required any use of force beyond Seaton.

Thus, by A.D. 47, while the Romans had had to exert themselves for the mastery of both the Belgic areas, such of the non-Belgic, or like the Regni hardly Belgic, tribes as they had come in contact with seem to have voluntarily submitted.

This is surely what might be expected at the appearance of the Roman power in an island full of internecine quarrelling consequent on the death of a great Belgic suzerain. The hatred of most of the other tribes

---

1 Suetonius, Claudius, 17.
2 Tacitus, Annals, xii, 31, 3.
3 Tacitus, Agricola, 14, 2.
4 Suetonius, Vespasian 4, 1; Eph. Ep. ix, 1268a.

---
against the Belgae was strong enough to throw them into the arms of the invader. No doubt the Roman government had good reason, at least in the reports of Adminius and Bericus, to anticipate this turn of events.

Some degree of uncertainty admittedly surrounds the behaviour of the Dobuni of the Cotswold country; they had about this time a King Antedrigus who had previously ruled over the Iceni, and whom, it has been suggested, they had driven out for his anti-Roman sentiments, which must on this theory have been popular in his new domain.¹

But we can only guess at the nature of the tribal factions in which Antedrigus may have been involved; it is more pertinent to remember that the kinship in blood and culture between the Dobuni and their fellow-Celts in Somerset, whom the Belgae were apparently harrying, inevitably suggests that they were as anti-Belgic as the Iceni; and while we have no proof that this led them to share the latter's voluntary submission to Rome, their resistance, if any, cannot have been prolonged.

By 47 the focus of the opposition which had begun in Kent had shifted away beyond the Cotswolds into Wales, and the disturbances that led the new governor of that year, Ostorius Scapula, to establish a rigid frontier and advance north-westwards beyond it included forays by hostile bands into the territories of 'allies' of Rome² who were, it would seem, not down in the south-west, and were certainly not the Iceni or the Regni. Perhaps the Dobuni were among them.

Ostorius' new frontier was beyond any reasonable doubt the line of the Foss Way from Lincoln to Devonshire. It cut off the Iceni from their kinsmen in the eastern Midlands. For the first time they must have realized that the Roman invasion was not merely a stick for the beating of their enemies, the Belgae. They called their neighbours—no doubt the Coritani—to arms, and fought and lost a pitched battle with Ostorius. It was perhaps the first hostile move by a non-Belgic tribe; it is at least significant


with ref.
The Belgic districts, known and assumed, are marked with heavy and light shading respectively. The tribal names of the active opponents of Rome are underlined, whereas an asterisk marks those whose rulers became allies or vassals of the Imperial power. The black lines and arrows mark Roman roads and lines of advance. It will be seen how closely Belgic distributions correspond to the main areas of resistance to Rome, while the non-Belgic tribes appear for the most part pro-Roman or neutral.
that it was provoked by the first definite sign that Rome meant to deal faithfully with non-Belgic and Belgic tribes alike. But they were allowed to keep their king and they subsided, and the rest who had been watching the issue did likewise.¹

Having thus secured his rear, Ostorius drove north-west right across the Midlands. He was enabled to do this because the Brigantes on his right flank had undertaken to keep quiet. They were, indeed, a big confederacy, and there were some among them who disliked the pro-Roman policy which hatred of the Belgae had here, too, brought into play. But the rebels were few and quickly suppressed, and the submissive attitude now typical of non-Belgic tribes prevailed while Ostorius turned against his one really determined enemy.²

This was Caratacus. With the Belgae whom he ruled, he had fought the Romans across Kent, he had held the passage of the Thames, he had defended and and lost his capital. Their kinsmen in the south had contested more than twenty hill-forts and cost Vespasian at least as many battles. Now the Belgic lands were lost, and the jealous Celtic tribes around them had made their peace with the enemy. To find a new theatre of war, he had to go west beyond the limits of the old tribal faction that had made Rome’s opportunity in Britain as in Gaul, and set up his standard in the Welsh mountains. We there find him now confronting Ostorius at the head of the Silures.

The Silures occupied South Wales at least as far west as Cardiganshire. The only remains of pre-Roman Iron Age culture betokening Celtic immigration in their district come from the coast of the Severn Sea and the low hills bordering the strip of plain that runs along it. This plain has naturally more affinities with Somerset than with the mountains inland, and here, and here only, are found traces of the south-western La Tène culture prevalent across the water. Its bearers had, as we have guessed, passed up the Severn, and had certainly made some impression on the

¹ ibid., 31, 2–32, 1. ² ibid., 32, 2–4.
culture, and no doubt also on the blood, of the Ordovices of North Wales (unless indeed, which seems less likely, that impression had reached them from Yorkshire and the eastern Midlands). But the Severn turns the flank of South Wales, and the main block of the mountains there was still the fastness of a dark, curly-haired people, mainly, we can hardly doubt, of pre-Celtic ancestry, though the incoming in the Late Bronze Age of some related precursors of the main Celtic migrations is a possibility that need not be overlooked. At any rate, all traces of La Tène culture are absent there until the time of the wars here recorded. Of these warlike barbarians Caratacus managed to put himself at the head. Belgic refugees must have accompanied him, and it may be hoped that archaeology will before long find material evidence that here the remnants of the Belgae, side by side with the native mountaineers, made their last stand against Rome. For they held out for thirty years.

It is probable that patriots and landless men from all over Britain fled from the Romans or from their Romanizing countrymen, to join him: such La Tène material of this date as there is in South Wales is miscellaneous in character (e.g. the Neath hoard), and the Ogmore inhumation-burials at least are those of Celtic and not Belgic chieftains. Caratacus, anyhow, rallied the Ordovices to him, and Ostorius was faced with the stubborn resistance, under Belgic leadership, of the whole of Wales.

The Second Legion was brought up to quarters near the front, and after much campaigning, a pitched battle was at last won by the Romans in A.D. 51. Caratacus' family was taken prisoner, and he himself had to take to flight. Now, at last he was reduced to doing what he had scorned to do before, seeking refuge with his Celtic enemies. He fled to the Brigantes, knowing that there, at least, some voices had been raised against submission to the invader. But it was useless. The jealousy of the ruling house against the Catuvellaunian domination in the south had perhaps always been bitter, and now the queen,
Cartimandua, received him only to deliver him in chains to Ostorius.\textsuperscript{1}

Yet his career had made all the difference to the course of the Roman conquest. The bulk of his own people in the south had, it is true, abandoned the struggle. Once thoroughly defeated in the field, they began, like their kinsmen in Gaul, to settle down under the \textit{pax Romana}, for which the deep-laid beginnings of theirs Romanization under Cunobelinus had prepared the way. The only interruption of the peace of the south was Boudicca’s rebellion, which was provoked among the Iceni by the corruption of the civil government and the special injustices consequent on the death of Prasutagus and the annexation of his kingdom; the Iceni felt they had been cheated of the fruits of their submission, and the personality of Boudicca effected the rest. The carnage of Camulodunum, Verulamium and London was the work of men who had found out how much deeper hatred of Rome could bite than the old tribal jealousies. But after all that was over, Romanization resumed and extended its course; it was especially fostered by Agricola, and the civilization of the Belgic districts of Britain imitated and rivalled that of Belgic Gaul, perpetuating under the Roman peace the old correspondence in culture of the two lands.

Yet Caratacus had seen to it that the stubborn side of the Belgic spirit should not perish. It was he that had carried it to the west, whence it passed to the north. The Silures and Ordovices were stimulated to still fiercer efforts by his fall: Ostorius died worn out the next year, and against the unenterprising Neronian governors their resistance kept the effective frontier to the foot of the Welsh hills, where it remained till after the middle of Vespasian’s reign.\textsuperscript{2}

Among the Brigantes, following on Cartimandua’s act of treachery, a patriotic faction sprang up, this time for good, headed by her consort, Venutius, who, with Caratacus’ splendid example before him, now once and for all rejected his former pro-Roman policy. He had a strong following with him against the queen,

\textsuperscript{1} \textit{ibid.}, 35, 7-36, 1. \textsuperscript{2} \textit{ibid.}, 38, 1-40, 2.
and a civil war ensued in which the Romans intervened on her behalf without much success, leaving Venutius still triumphantly under arms until after A.D. 69 the Flavian governors set about the serious conquest of the north.  

The situation they then had to face, which developed so as to determine the frontier policy of Hadrian and react upon the whole subsequent history of Britain, was the direct result of the events we have chronicled. That they took shape as they did was mainly due to the Belgae, the character of their invasions, and the policies of their princes.

In little more than a century and a half of independent life, first in Gaul and then in Britain, the Belgae certainly left a deep and lasting mark upon the history of Europe.

VII

SUMMARY

The results of our enquiry may be briefly summarized as follows:—
1. The earliest movements of peoples to be connected with the name of the Celts belong to the later Bronze Age, but the main Celtic migrations began perhaps in VII, certainly in VI B.C., as a result of the pressure of the Germans advancing from the northeast upon the inhabitants of the Lower Rhine. These migrations eventually spread the Celts over a large extent of Europe, and before the middle of V B.C. had covered southern and eastern Britain. Meanwhile the Lower Rhine area became settled by the Germans, and the Low Countries thence as far as the Ardennes, though in parts scantily populated, witnessed a gradual fusion of Germanic with backward Celtic stocks, with an undercurrent of still older blood. This region remained a cultural backwater, while south of the Ardennes the Celts developed the La Tène culture. Here, under the influence of Mediterranean imports, was evolved the pedestal-urn, which at once became the typical vessel of the Marne area. While further

1 ibid., 40, 2–8 ; xiv, 29, 1 ; Histories, iii, 45.
migrations carried the La Tène culture over Europe, decline set in on the Marne in Middle La Tène times, and a new advance of the Germans to the middle Rhine occurred in III B.C. and formed the mixed Celto-German tribe of the Treveri.

Up to this point we cannot point to any culture or group of peoples as Belgic, but in the second half of II B.C. the old Marne culture was brought to an end by incursions from the north-east of the backward peoples noticed above, and of other Germanic peoples from the east, the result of whose fusion with the existing inhabitants was the historical Belgae (chap. i, pp. 157-182).

2. The lands between the Rhine and the Seine and Marne thus became Belgic Gaul, but the Ardennes massif continued as before to divide them into two distinct cultural districts: to the north the old backward traditions of the Low Countries lived on, while to the south, over the whole region from the mountains to the Lower Seine, the civilization of the Belgae inherited a wide measure of the old Marne traditions, the typical pedestal-urn in particular, now made on the wheel, being as before the leading ceramic type (ch. ii, pp. 183-240).

3. The Belgae successfully withstood the Cimbric-Teutonic invasions of 113–101 B.C., and about twenty-five years later found need for expansion. Round about 75 B.C. south-eastern Britain was invaded by tribes from the southern half of their country, who introduced their culture with its pedestal-urns into Kent, and had by the time of Caesar's expeditions in 55–54 B.C. carried it beyond the Thames. The leading tribe was the Catuvellauni, and by the end of I B.C. these had conquered the Trinobantes, whom they found inhabiting Essex, and reached the maximum of Belgic expansion in south-eastern Britain. Subsequently their civilization, as shown especially by the burials of their rich nobles, became under the rule of Cunobelin, who had his capital at Camulodunum, more and more susceptible to Romanization (ch. iii, pp. 240–262).

4. Meanwhile Caesar's conquest of Gaul had profoundly changed the character of civilization in the
original home of the Belgae. The lands north of the Ardennes, formerly so backward, developed a flourishing provincial culture akin to that of the Rhineland, which exercised a strong influence on south-eastern Britain. South of those mountains, Belgic Gaul became merged in the common civilization of the western provinces. The pedestal-urn tradition faded. A distinctive class of bead-rim vessels, also descended from old Marne prototypes, had been current in Normandy shortly before the Roman conquest, but it had no very long life after it. This cultural Romanization went side by side with Augustus' pacification of Gaul consummated especially in 27-25 B.C. (ch. iv, pp. 263-279).

5. But before this consummation there had been much unrest and rebellion among the Belgic Gauls, and their leading chieftain Commius the Atrebate escaped to Britain about 50 B.C. He cannot have escaped alone, and the appearance at about this time in Wessex of the typical Normandy bead-rim pottery, along with all the other elements of contemporary Belgic culture, clearly indicates a second Belgic immigration, which, as is further suggested by his inscribed coinage, was probably under Commius' leadership. The invaders, landing mainly at the Hampshire harbours, spread all over the Wessex chalk plateau, but were late in reaching Dorset and perhaps still later in penetrating Somerset. In West Sussex their presence seems to have carried with it no very great influence on the existing population. Bead-rim pottery was developed into the leading ceramic type all over Wessex, and the virtual absence of pedestal-urns distinguishes the invaders here from the earlier immigrants in the south-east (ch. v, pp. 280-390).

6. The general effect of the Belgic invasions of Britain was to substitute larger and more powerful kingdoms for the old small tribal groups, as is shown by the desertion of so many of the hill-forts typical of the latter, and finally in the first half of I A.D. the Catuvellaunian King Cunobelin became paramount over all the Belgae and the whole of south-eastern Britain.
At his death in about A.D. 40 his dominions fell apart, and the occasion was seized by the Roman government of Claudius for undertaking the conquest of the island. In spite of the material Romanization which had gone forward under his rule among the Belgic tribes, it was they who opposed the main resistance to the Roman invasion, while the older Celtic tribes, the natural enemies of the Belgae, took for the most part the Roman side. However, Cunobelin's son Caratacus succeeded after the defeat of his people in carrying the spirit of resistance to Wales, whence after his capture it passed to the north, thus leading to the campaigns which shaped the whole history of Roman frontier policy in Britain (chs. v and vi, pp. 299–321).
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### APPENDIX I

**LIST OF PEDESTAL-URNS IN BRITAIN**

(R) after provenance denotes Roman pedestal-urns as plotted on the distribution-map, Fig. 7 (p. 189).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>PROVENANCE</th>
<th>REFERENCES</th>
<th>MUSEUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beds</td>
<td>Arlesey</td>
<td><em>Swarling Report</em>, p. 29</td>
<td>British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biddenham</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td>Bedford Modern School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kempston</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;  &quot;  &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newnham, near Bedford</td>
<td>&quot; Present paper, fig. 21,3</td>
<td>British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shillington</td>
<td><em>Swarling Report</em>, p. 29</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stotford</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;  &quot;  &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks</td>
<td>Theale</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barrington</td>
<td><em>ibid</em>, Pl. xii, 3</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chesterton, Cambridge</td>
<td><em>ibid</em>, pp. 91-3</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haslingfield</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hauxton</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whittlesford</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>Jordan's Hill, Weymouth</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td>Dorchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Berchurch</td>
<td><em>Colchester Mus. Report</em>, 1929, p. 8</td>
<td>Colchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canewdon</td>
<td><em>Southend Mus. Report</em>, 1924–25</td>
<td>Southend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great Chesterford</td>
<td><em>Arch. Journ.</em>, xiv, 85</td>
<td>Audley End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>H. M. Early Iron Age Guide</em>, 1905, pp. 101, 141</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>PROVENANCE</td>
<td>REFERENCES</td>
<td>MUSEUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Colchester (La Tene III and R)</td>
<td><em>Colchester Mus. Reports</em>, 1905, p. 16, Pl. iii; 1928, Pls. vi, xx; 1929, Pl. viii \n<em>May, Colchester Pottery</em>, p. 11, Pls. i, 3; p. 266, Pl. lxxxi, 46 \n<em>Proc. Soc. Antiq.</em>, xx, 213, Pl. \n<em>Swarling Report</em>, pp. 21-3, Pls. x, 5, 7; xi, 1</td>
<td>Colchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creeksea</td>
<td>Colchester Mus. Report, 1926, p. 9, Pls. ii–iii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Hallingbury</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Trans. Essex Arch. Soc.</em>, ix, n.s, 348 \n<em>Colchester Mus. Report</em>, 1909, Pl. x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamborough Hill, near Rayleigh</td>
<td><em>Colchester Mus. Report</em>, 1913, p. 12, Pl. iii \n<em>Essex Naturalist</em>, xvi, 253, figs. 3-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heybridge</td>
<td><em>Colchester Mus. Reports</em>, 1913, p. 10, Pl. ii; 1922, p. 9, Pl. ii \n<em>Arch.</em>, lxiii, 25</td>
<td>British</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelvedon</td>
<td><em>Swarling Report</em>, p. 22, Pl. xi, 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langenoe</td>
<td><em>Proc. Soc. Antiq.</em>, xxii, 191, fig. 8, 3</td>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexden</td>
<td><em>Colchester Mus. Reports</em>, 1909, p. 11, Pl. vi; 1913, p. 12, Pls. v–vi; 1923, p. 9, Pl. iv \n<em>Swarling Report</em>, p. 21, Pls. iii, 2; xi, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purleigh</td>
<td><em>Trans. Essex Arch. Soc.</em>, ix, n.s, 349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoebury</td>
<td><em>Proc. Soc. Antiq.</em>, xvi, 258, fig. 4 \n<em>Swarling Report</em>, p. 22, Pl. x, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>PROVENANCE</td>
<td>REFERENCES</td>
<td>MUSEUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Shoebury</td>
<td>May, <em>Colchester Pottery</em>, p. 10, Pl. i, 1-2</td>
<td>Colchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southend</td>
<td><em>Swarling Report</em>, p. 28</td>
<td>Southend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southminster</td>
<td><em>Swarling Report</em>, p. 28</td>
<td>Colchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tilbury (R)</td>
<td><em>Swarling Report</em>, p. 28</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great Wakering</td>
<td><em>Colchester Mus. Report</em>, 1922, p. 9, Pls. ii-iii</td>
<td>Colchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wendens Ambo</td>
<td><em>Swarling Report</em>, p. 21</td>
<td>Saffron Walden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wickham Bishops</td>
<td><em>Colchester Mus. Reports</em>, 1916-18, p. 7; 1920, Pl. i</td>
<td>Colchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hants</td>
<td><em>Hengistbury Head Report</em>, p. 46, Pl. xiii, 20</td>
<td>H. S. L. Dewar collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hurstbourne Tarrant</td>
<td><em>Proc. Hants Field Club</em>, x, 121; present paper, Fig. 32, 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abbots Langley</td>
<td><em>Antiq. Journ.</em>, ii, 259</td>
<td>St. Albans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ashwell</td>
<td><em>Swarling Report</em>, p. 28</td>
<td>British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broxbourne</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td>S. H. Warren Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clothall, near Baldock</td>
<td></td>
<td>Welwyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Letchworth</td>
<td><em>Proc. Soc. Antiq.</em>, xxvi, 238, fig. 1</td>
<td>Welwyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pegsdon</td>
<td><em>Swarling Report</em>, p. 28</td>
<td>British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welwyn</td>
<td><em>Arch.</em>, lxiii, 23-4, fig. 22, Pl. iii, 1, 2, 7, 9; <em>Swarling Report</em>, p. 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alconbury</td>
<td><em>Fox, Archaeology of the Cambridge Region</em>, p. 193</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allington (R)</td>
<td><em>Swarling Report</em>, p. 19, Pl. xi, 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## The Belgae of Gaul and Britain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>PROVENANCE</th>
<th>REFERENCES</th>
<th>MUSEUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Aylesford</td>
<td><em>Arch.</em>, lii, 315 ff., Pls. vii–ix.</td>
<td>Ashmolean and British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Swarling Report</em>, pp. 17–8; Present paper, fig. 21, 1–2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Arch.</em>, li, 427</td>
<td>Broadstairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Swarling Report</em>, p. 18, Pl. iv</td>
<td>Deal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ibid.,</em> p. 20, Pls. v, xi, 4–6</td>
<td>Folkestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ibid.,</em> p. 28</td>
<td>British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Present paper, fig. 21, 4</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Antiq. Journ.</em>, viii, 93</td>
<td>British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Swarling Report</em>, passim</td>
<td>(one Canterbury)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Journ. Brit. Arch. Assoc.</em>, xxii, N.s., 177, fig. 21, 8</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Roman London</em>, p. 22, fig. 2, 6–8; Present paper, fig. 22, 2, 4</td>
<td>Bank of England Collection, Guildhall and London Museums Guildhall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ibid.,</em> p. 21, fig. 2, 1–3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Roman London</em>, p. 23, fig. 2, 12; Present paper, fig. 22, 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Roman London</em>, p. 22, fig. 2, 4–5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ibid.,</em> p. 21, fig. 2, 1–3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Roman London</em>, p. 22, fig. 2, 9–11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London (All R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Swarling Report</em>, pp. 17–8; Present paper, fig. 21, 1–2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Arch.</em>, lii, 315 ff., Pls. vii–ix.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Swarling Report</em>, p. 18, Pl. iv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ibid.,</em> p. 20, Pls. v, xi, 4–6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ibid.,</em> p. 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Present paper, fig. 21, 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Antiq. Journ.</em>, viii, 93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Swarling Report</em>, passim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Journ. Brit. Arch. Assoc.</em>, xxii, N.s., 177, fig. 21, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Roman London</em>, p. 22, fig. 2, 6–8; Present paper, fig. 22, 2, 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ibid.,</em> p. 21, fig. 2, 1–3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Roman London</em>, p. 22, fig. 2, 9–11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Swarling Report</em>, pp. 17–8; Present paper, fig. 21, 1–2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Arch.</em>, lii, 315 ff., Pls. vii–ix.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Swarling Report</em>, p. 18, Pl. iv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ibid.,</em> p. 20, Pls. v, xi, 4–6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ibid.,</em> p. 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Present paper, fig. 21, 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Antiq. Journ.</em>, viii, 93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Swarling Report</em>, passim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Journ. Brit. Arch. Assoc.</em>, xxii, N.s., 177, fig. 21, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Roman London</em>, p. 22, fig. 2, 6–8; Present paper, fig. 22, 2, 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ibid.,</em> p. 21, fig. 2, 1–3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Roman London</em>, p. 22, fig. 2, 9–11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>PROVENANCE</td>
<td>REFERENCES</td>
<td>MUSEUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Minories, E.1</td>
<td><em>Guildhall Mus. Catalogue</em>, p. 17, no. 272; Present paper, fig. 22, 3</td>
<td>Guildhall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55–61 Moorgate, E.C.2</td>
<td>Present paper, fig. 22, 5–6</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>129–30 Upper Thames St., E.C.3</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td>Guildhall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wallbrook, near the Mansion House, E.C.4</td>
<td><em>ibid</em>, p. 144, fig. 54, 3</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northants</td>
<td>Duston</td>
<td><em>Swarling Report</em>, p. 24</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekley</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Kettering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notts</td>
<td>Margidunum (R)</td>
<td><em>Journ. Roman Studies</em>, xiii, 115, fig. 9</td>
<td>F. Oswald Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>Glastonbury</td>
<td><em>Glastonbury Lake Village</em>, ii, 515, fig. 168, Pls. lxxiii, 124; lxxx, 190; lxxxiv, 246</td>
<td>Glastonbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kingsdown Camp, near Mells</td>
<td><em>Arch.</em>, lxxx, 80, fig. 4</td>
<td>Taunton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>Boxford</td>
<td><em>Antiq. Journ.</em>, vi, 309</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long Melford</td>
<td><em>Fox, Archaeology of the Cambridge Region</em>, p. 103</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sudbury</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great Waldingfield</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>Carshalton</td>
<td><em>Journ. Royal Anthrop. Inst.</em>, xxxv, 393, figs. 4–5</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cobham</td>
<td><em>Surrey Arch. Coll.</em>, xxii, 153, fig. 23</td>
<td>R. S. Newall Collec-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilts</td>
<td>Hanging Langford Camp</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td>tion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oare</td>
<td><em>Wilts. Arch. Mag.</em>, xxxvi, 132, Pl. v, f</td>
<td>Devizes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX II

**LIST OF BEAD-RIM BOWLS IN BRITAIN**

(R) denotes Roman bead-rim pots, and (F) Furrowed bead-rim pots, as plotted on the distribution-map, Fig. 25 (p. 283).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>PROVENANCE</th>
<th>REFERENCES</th>
<th>MUSEUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berks</td>
<td>Alfred's Castle, Ashbury</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td>Information from Mr. Stuart Pigott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ham, near Newbury Lowbury Hill</td>
<td>Antiq. Journ., ii, 218, fig. 11</td>
<td>Newbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucks</td>
<td>Hambledon (R and F)</td>
<td>D. Atkinson, Lowbury Hill, p. 65, fig. 18, 70 Arch., lxxi, 183, fig. 16, 172-5</td>
<td>British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Braintree Colchester (F) Shoebury (F) Great Wakering</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td>Colchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>PROVENANCE</td>
<td>REFERENCES</td>
<td>MUSEUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hants</td>
<td>Rockbourne Down</td>
<td>H. Sumner, <em>Excavations on Rockbourne Down</em>, p. 38, Pls. ix, 4; x, 8</td>
<td>Salisbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silchester</td>
<td>May, <em>Silchester Pottery</em>, pp. 182, 191, Pls. lxv, 7; lxviii, 7-8</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Westwood, Fareley Mount</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td>Winchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winchester (La Tène III and R)</td>
<td><em>St. Catharine's Hill Report</em>, pp. 183-4; Present paper, fig. 26, 8</td>
<td>Winchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worthy Down</td>
<td><em>Proc. Hants Field Club</em>, x, 186, fig. 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herts</td>
<td>St. Albans (R)</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td>Information from Dr. R. E. M. Wheeler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youngsbury, near Ware (F)</td>
<td><em>Arch.</em>, lli, 290, pl. vi.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Wight</td>
<td>Barnes, near Brightstone</td>
<td></td>
<td>G. C. Dunning Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carisbrooke</td>
<td></td>
<td>Carisbrooke Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chale Down</td>
<td></td>
<td>F. Mew Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morton, near Brading</td>
<td></td>
<td>Morton Roman Villa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Catherine's Point</td>
<td></td>
<td>G. C. Dunning Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Lawrence</td>
<td>Present paper, fig. 26, 7</td>
<td>Carisbrooke Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheepwash, near Freshwater</td>
<td><em>Proc. Soc. Antiq.</em> xxv, 189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shide, near Newport</td>
<td><em>Antiq. Journ.</em>, ix, pp. 358, 371, figs. 1, 26-27; 6, 7 B</td>
<td>Shide Roman Villa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totland</td>
<td>R. Walker, <em>Phoenicia in Freshwater</em> (1892), p. 16, Pl. 7</td>
<td>Ventnor Museum and G. C. Dunning Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Broadstairs (F)</td>
<td><em>Arch.</em>, lxi, pt. 2, p. 434 fig. 5</td>
<td>Bedford Modern School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dover (R)</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>PROVENANCE</td>
<td>REFERENCES</td>
<td>MUSEUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Margate (F)</td>
<td>Present paper, fig. 28, 6, pp. 289-90, <em>Arch. Cant.</em>, xxxviii, 149, Pl. xxv, 225</td>
<td>British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ospringe (R)</td>
<td><em>Richborough Report</em>, II, 98, pl. xxx, 135-6</td>
<td>Ospringe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richborough (F)</td>
<td>Present paper, fig. 28, 5</td>
<td>Richborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td><em>Swarling Report</em>, pp. 13, 26, Pl. ix, 29</td>
<td>British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swarling</td>
<td>Unpublished: cf. present paper, p. 290</td>
<td>British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walmer (F)</td>
<td><em>Journ. Brit. Arch. Assoc.</em>, xxii, N.s., 178, fig. 22</td>
<td>British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Charlton</td>
<td><em>Roman London</em>, p. 155, fig. 63, 13</td>
<td>All Hallows Bark-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(all R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td>ing Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Guildhall Mus. Catalogue</em>, p. 90, no. 291, Pl. xli, 8</td>
<td>Bank of England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td>Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Arch.</em>, lxvi, 258, 260, fig. 14, 12-3; <em>Roman London</em>, p. 154, fig. 63, 2, 4, 6; Present paper, fig. 28, 1</td>
<td>Guildhall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Hallows Bark-</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ing Church</td>
<td><em>Journ. Brit. Arch. Assoc.</em>, xxxvi, N.s., 62, fig. 4</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bank of England,</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bank Station,</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blossoms Inn Yard,</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70-3 Cheapside,</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52 Cornhill, E.C.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parringdon St.,</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.C.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>112 Fenchurch St.,</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.C.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-5 Fish St. Hill,</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.C.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Post Office,</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Martin's-le-Grand,</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9-12 George Yard,</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.C.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54 Gracechurch St.,</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.C.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haydon Sq., Minories,</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.I</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>PROVENANCE</td>
<td>REFERENCES</td>
<td>MUSEUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London (all R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>3-6 King St., E.C.2</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td>Guildhall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King William St., E.C.4</td>
<td>Present paper, fig. 28, 4</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>107 Leadenhall St., E.C.3</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td>Guildhall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>143 Leadenhall St., E.C.3</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Alie St., E.i</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roman London, p. 159, fig. 64, 27;</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Lothbury, E.C.2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midland Bank, Princes St., E.C.2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moorfields Chapel, E.C.2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newgate St. Station, E.C.1</td>
<td><em>Guildhall Mus. Catalogue</em>, p. 20, no. 316</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-8 Old Change, E.C.4</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Old Jewry, E.C.2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paternoster Row, E.C.4</td>
<td>Present paper, fig. 28, 2</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queen Victoria St., E.C.4</td>
<td><em>Guildhall Mus. Catalogue</em>, p. 19, no. 298</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Benet's Place, Gracechurch St., E.C.3</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72-4 St. Paul's Churchyard, E.C.4</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sherborne Lane, E.C.4</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wood St., E.C.2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>Cadbury Camp, South Cadbury (La Tène III and F)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Taunton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glastonbury</td>
<td>Present paper, fig. 26, 6</td>
<td>Glastonbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>PROVENANCE</td>
<td>REFERENCES</td>
<td>MUSEUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>Ham Hill, Stoke-under-Ham</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td>Taunton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kingsdown Camp, near Mells</td>
<td>Arch., lxxx, 79, fig. 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Westland, Yeovil</td>
<td>Proc. Somerset Arch. Soc., lxxiv, 135, Pl. 6, 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>Ashtead</td>
<td>Surrey Arch. Coll., xxxviii, 17, fig. 17; 201, fig. 4, 6-10</td>
<td>A. W. G. Lowther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(all R)</td>
<td>Charterhouse</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cobham</td>
<td>Surrey Arch. Coll., xxii, 153, figs. 24, 32</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ewell</td>
<td>Arch., xxxii, 451</td>
<td>British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farley Heath, Albury Haslemere</td>
<td>Surrey Arch. Coll., xxxvii, 191</td>
<td>Haslemere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hurtmore, near Godalming Puttenham</td>
<td>Proc. Soc. Antiq., xxi, 217, fig. 3</td>
<td>Charterhouse School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thornton Heath, Croydon</td>
<td>Surrey Arch. Coll., xxii, 200 and pl.</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>Alfoldean (R)</td>
<td>Sussex Arch. Coll., lxxv, 141, Pl. v, 21</td>
<td>Lewes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saxonbury Camp, Eridge Park (R)</td>
<td>ibid., lxxi, 233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilts</td>
<td>Aldbourne</td>
<td>Wilts Arch. Mag., xliii, 344, Pl. ii, 12</td>
<td>Devizes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avebury</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td>R. S. Newall Coll.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bilbury Rings</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Newbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Botley Hill, Grafton</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Devizes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broomsgrove, Pewsey Casterley Camp</td>
<td>Wilts Arch. Mag., xxvii, 294</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ibid., xxxviii, 100, Pls. iv, 3-6, 10-1; viii, 16-27; Present paper, fig. 26, 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>PROVENANCE</td>
<td>REFERENCES</td>
<td>MUSEUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilts</td>
<td>Cold Kitchen Hill, Brixton Deverill</td>
<td><em>ibid.</em>, xxvii, 289</td>
<td>Devizes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Figsbury</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td>R. S. Newall Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hanging Langford Camp</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Salisbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highfield, near Salisbury</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honey Street, Woodborough Knap Hill</td>
<td><em>Devizes Mus. Catalogue</em>, ii, 31</td>
<td>Devizes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oare</td>
<td><em>Wilts Arch. Mag.</em>, xxxvii, 62</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rotherlev (La Tene III and F)</td>
<td><em>ibid</em>, xxxvi, 128, Pls. iv, A, C; v, C, E; vii, F, H</td>
<td>Farnham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russley</td>
<td><em>Pitt-Rivers, Excavations</em>, ii, 140, Pls. 107, 2; 108, 2-3; Present paper, fig. 26, 1, 4</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Savernake Forest Stockton Earthworks</td>
<td><em>Wilts Arch. Mag.</em>, xliii, 344, Pl. ii, 11</td>
<td>Devizes and Salisbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stonehenge</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swindon</td>
<td><em>Antiq. Journ.</em>, v, 29, 47; <em>Antiquity</em>, iii, 81</td>
<td>Farnham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wansdyke,</td>
<td><em>Wilts Arch. Mag.</em>, xliii, 343, Pl. ii, 10</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodcuts</td>
<td><em>Pitt-Rivers, Excavations</em>, iii, 273, Pls. ccxxii, 15-6; ccxxiii, 23</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodminton, Bowerchalke</td>
<td><em>ibid</em>, i, 101, Pl. 33, 4-5</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Wilts Arch. Mag.</em>, xliii, 315</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>