

IV.

NAMES OF POTTERS ON SAMIAN WARE FOUND IN SCOTLAND.

BY SIR GEORGE MACDONALD, K.C.B., F.B.A., LL.D., D.LITT.,
F.S.A.SCOT.

The printing of the following paper completes an undertaking originally begun more than a quarter of a century ago. It was laid aside when the mass of new material that began to emerge from Newstead showed the desirability of waiting until the excavation of that site had been completed. Lack of leisure has prevented its resumption in the interval, but the postponement has, of course, been all to the good. Apart from the direct fruits of Mr Curle's harvesting, the publication of *A Roman Frontier Post* gave a valuable stimulus to the scientific study of Samian ware as a whole. Since it appeared, progress has been rapid. In many cases it is now possible to say, with some approach to certainty, where a particular example was manufactured, and even to fix its date within a period of twenty or thirty years. As a rule, the individual potters used their own names as trade-marks. With the advance of knowledge along the lines just indicated, these names have acquired a fresh significance. A list of the craftsmen whose goods made their way into Scotland during the two periods when Roman troops were in garrison north of the Border, between A.D. 80 and about A.D. 180, can therefore hardly fail to be of interest. Scrutinised with the necessary caution, it may help to suggest or to confirm historical inferences of a wider character.

Mr Curle's article in our *Proceedings* (li. pp. 130 ff.), with the introductory paragraphs of the Appendix contributed by Mr E. B. Birley to No. 3 of the series of *London Museum Catalogues*, enables me to dispense with any preliminary observations on chronology, on the distribution of the various manufacturing centres, and on the gradual transference of the industry from Southern Gaul to the banks of the Rhine. But the chief obligation I have to acknowledge is to Dr Felix Oswald's *Index of Potters' Stamps on Terra Sigillata*. My own list was, indeed, complete before that monumental work came into my hands. As soon as it did so, however, I recognised that, whatever modifications in matters of detail might ultimately be called for, the broad lines which it laid down were bound to serve as the basis for all future compilations of the kind. I have therefore adopted *sans phrase* the author's conclusions as to the 'floruit' of the various potters, and as to the locality or localities in which their kilns were situated. The numbers enclosed within brackets

after the names of sites indicate the shapes of the vessels concerned, the letter *x* being employed where the piece cited is no longer accessible. It is hardly necessary to add that the conventional system of numeration has been adhered to. The designation '18/31' has, however, been interpreted somewhat liberally, being applied to all the fragments of platters which it was difficult to class confidently as either 18 or 31, occasionally because so little of them was left.

The great majority of the stamps recorded are in the National Museum. Most of the others are in the Hunterian Museum, Glasgow, but two or three are in the Museum in the Dollar Park at Falkirk, and two or three are in private hands. A very few are cited from the earlier literature, and several I copied about 1907, when they were in the possession of a workman then employed in the foundry that occupies the site of Camelon. Those which I have had no opportunity of examining personally are marked with an asterisk. Incidentally, a good many of the readings given in previous volumes of the *Proceedings* and elsewhere are corrected *sub silentio*, as only here and there did it seem worth while making specific mention of emendations. I have to thank Mr Birley for help in deciphering one or two of the more difficult names. With it all, a substantial residuum of doubtful examples has been excluded. None that are not reasonably certain have been admitted.¹

A. NAMES ON UNDECORATED WARE.²

1. ADJECTUS of Lezoux. Period: Antonine.
ADIECTI[·MA]—*Inchgarvie, near Queensferry (*x*), described in *Stat. Acct. of Scotland*, i. (1791), p. 238; *Cramond (*x*), noted in Wilson, *Prehist. Ann. of Scot.*², ii. p. 76.
2. ADVOCISUS of Lezoux and Lubié. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
[AD]VOCISI·O—Newstead (33).
3. AELIANUS of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
AEL[IANI]—Mumrills (18/31). This reading cannot be regarded as quite certain.
4. AELIUS of Lezoux (?). Period: Hadrian-Antonine (?).
AELIΛ—Castlecary (27). This is the AHIM of Wilson, *Prehist. Ann. of Scot.*², ii. p. 76. I share the doubts which Dr Oswald expresses as to the home and period of the potter. To my eye the colour and texture of the fragment seem suggestive of Southern rather than of Central Gaul.
5. AESTIVUS of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
AESTIVI·M—Castlecary (33).

¹ Square brackets have generally been used where letters have had to be supplied. But the absence of these does not necessarily imply that the name is complete on all of the examples cited.

² With the exception of No. 14 all of these are stamped across the inside of the bottom.

6. AETERNUS of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
[M·INP]ETEA—Newstead (33).
7. AFRICANUS of St Bonnet, Iseure. Period: Hadrian.
AFRICANM—Mumrills (33).
8. ALBINUS of Lezoux. Period: Trajan-Antonine.
A·L·B·I·N·I·M—Castlecary (33).
9. ALBINUS, G., of South Gaul. Period: Nero-Vespasian.
G·ALBINIM—Camelon (27).
10. ALBUCIANUS of Lezoux. Period: Antonine.
ALB[VCI]ANI—Traprain Law (33).
11. ALBUCIUS of Lezoux. Period: Trajan-Antonine.
ALBVC·I·—Birrens (33, two, if not three, examples).
AL[B]VCI—Balmuilty (31).
12. AMBITOTUS of East Gaul. Period: Antonine.
AMB[TOT]V—Newstead (18).
13. ANNIUS of Lezoux. Period: Trajan-Hadrian.
M·INNA—Camelon (18/31). The registered provenance of this fragment is Falkirk. But it probably came from Camelon. The two sites are often confused.
14. ATTIANUS of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
ATTIANIM—Camelon (44). As usual with vessels of this shape, the stamp is on the outside.
15. AVENTINUS of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
AVENTINI·M—Newstead (33); possibly Mumrills (18/31).
16. AUGUSTUS of Rheinabern and Westerndorf. Period: Late Antonine.
AVGV[S. . .]—Newstead (31). In the absence of the termination one cannot be quite certain as to the name, but I have chosen the alternative which seemed to suit the spacing best.
17. AVITUS of Lezoux. Period: Vespasian-Trajan.
AVITI·MA—Ardoch (33); Mumrills (18/31); Newstead (18/31).
[A]VITVSFEC—Newstead (18/31). Dr Oswald assigns this form of stamp to a later Avitus. The fragment was, however, found in an early pit (*A Roman Frontier Post*, p. 112).
18. AVITUS of Ittenweiler and Rheinabern. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
AVITVS—Camelon (18/31); Newstead (31).
AVITVSF—Bar Hill (31); Camelon (31); Newstead (31, six examples).
AVIT[VSFE]—Newstead (31). The reading is not quite certain, but it suits the spacing.
19. BANOLUCCUS of Lezoux. Period: Antonine.
BANOL[V]CCI—Newstead (31).
20. BANVILLUS of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
BANVILLIM—Balmuilty (31, probably two examples); Camelon (33).
21. BELINI(C)CUS of Lezoux. Period: Trajan-Antonine.
BELINICIM—Bar Hill (31).
M[ICINI]EB—Camelon (33, two examples); Newstead (33, two examples).

22. BELLUS of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
BELLVSF—Newstead (33).
23. BITVNUS of Blickweiler. Period: Trajan-Hadrian.
BITVN[VS]—Newstead (31).
24. BORILLUS of Lezoux. Period: Trajan-Antonine.
BORILLI·OF—Balmuidy (31 and 33); Camelon (33); Mumrills (33);
Newstead (18/31 and two examples of 33).
BORILLI·OFFIC—Balmuidy (33); Birrens (31); Camelon (18/31 and 33).
25. BRICCUS of Lezoux and Lubié. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
BRICCVS·F—Mumrills (18/31).
26. BUCCULA of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
BVCCVLA·F—Birrens (33).
27. BUTTURRUS of Lezoux. Period: Antonine.
BVTTVRR1—Camelon (33).
28. CADGATIS of Lezoux. Period: Domitian-Trajan.
CA·DGA·TIS·F—Camelon (33).
ϜITΛΓΔΛΘ—Castlecary (33).
29. CALVINUS of La Graufesenque. Period: Vespasian.
CALVINI·M—Mumrills (18/31).
30. CALVUS of La Graufesenque. Period: Nero-Domitian; mainly Vespasian.
OF CALVI—Camelon (18, two examples); Newstead (27). The Newstead example is not quite certain, but the piece is undoubtedly of early date, as it came from an early pit.
OF CAL—*Castlecary (x), noted in Wilson, *Prehist. Ann. of Scot.*², ii. p. 76; *Camelon (x), noted *ibid.*, where the stamp is read as OPCAL and the provenance given as Grahamston.
31. CARATILLUS of Lezoux. Period: Antonine.
CARATILLI—Camelon (18/31 and 33); Newstead (33).
32. CARROTALUS of Avocourt and Pont-des-Rêmes (Florent). Period: Antonine.
CARR[OTA]LVS—Newstead (31).
33. CARUSSA of Lezoux. Period: Domitian-Antonine.
CA·RVSSA—Newstead (18/31, two examples).
34. CASSIUS of Heiligenberg. Period: Domitian-Antonine.
CASSIVS·F—Mumrills (27); Newstead (18/31).
35. CASURIUS, L., of Lubié. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
CASVRIVSF—Cadder (18/31).
CASV[. . .]—Cadder (18/31).
36. CATVS of East Gaul. Period: Trajan-Hadrian.
CATVSF—Birrens (33). This reading is not quite certain.
37. CENSORINVS of Lezoux. Period: Trajan-Antonine.
CESORINI—Newstead (33).
38. CERIALIS of Lezoux. Period: Trajan-Hadrian.
[CE]RIALI·M—Newstead (27).

39. CHRESIMUS of Montans. Period: Flavian.
 CHRESIMI—Inveresk (18/31, two examples); Traprain Law (18/31).
 CHRESIM—Newstead (27).
40. CINTUGENUS of Lubié. Period: Trajan-Hadrian.
 CINT·VGENI—Newstead (31).
41. CINTUSMUS of Lavoye, Ittenweiler, Rheinzabern, and Westerndorf.
 Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
 CINTVSMVSF—Castlecary (33).
42. CIRRIUS of Lezoux. Period: Trajan-Antonine.
 CIRRI·M—Mumrills (33).
43. COCCILUS of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
 COCCI·L·M—Newstead (33).
44. COIUS of South Gaul. Period: Flavian.
 OFCO·IVS—Newstead (18).
45. COMPRINNVS of Lezoux. Period: Second Century.
 COMPRIN[F]—Cadder (31).
46. COSIUS and RUFINUS of La Graufesenque. Period: Flavian.
 COSI·RV—Newstead (18).
 COSI·RV[F1]—Camelon (18).
47. COTTO of South Gaul. Period: Flavian.
 OF COTTO—Newstead (18).
48. CRACUNA of Lezoux, and later at Pont-des-Rêmes (Florent). Period:
 Hadrian-Late Antonine.
 CRACVNA·F—Balmuldy (33); Castlecary (33); Inveresk (33); Newstead
 (27 and 18/31).
49. CRECIRO of Banassac. Period: Vespasian-Trajan.
 CRECIRO·OF1—Mumrills (18).
50. CRICIRO of Lezoux. Period: Trajan-Hadrian.
 CRICIRONIS—Camelon (18/31).
51. CRISPUS of La Graufesenque and Montans. Period: Claudius-Domitian.
 CRISPI·M—Newstead (33).
52. CUCALUS of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
 CVCALIM[A]—Old Kilpatrick (27).
53. CUCCILLUS of Lezoux. Period: Antonine.
 CVCCILM—Balmuldy (27); Newstead (18/31).
54. CUDUS of Lezoux (?). Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
 CVDI·M—Newstead (31).
55. DAGOMARUS of Lezoux. Period: Flavian.
 DAGOMA[RVS]—Traprain Law (18/31).
 DAGO—Newstead (27).
56. DIVICATUS of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
 DIVICATVS—Bar Hill (33); Newstead (33).
57. DO(V)ECCUS of Lezoux and Lubié. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
 DOV11CCVS—Rough Castle (33).

58. DOMITIANUS of Heiligenberg and Kräherwald. Period: Trajan-Hadrian.
 DOM[ITIANVS·F]—Castleary (31). Another fragment of a similar vessel in the National Museum preserves the name in full. But nothing definite can be said about its provenance, except that it is probably Scottish.
59. DRAUCUS of Montans. Period: Domitian-Trajan.
 DRAVCI—Newstead (33).
60. DROMBUS of Heiligenberg. Period: Hadrian.
 NORC—Mumrills (33).
61. DUPPIUS of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
 DVΦIVS·F—Newstead (33).
62. ERICUS of Lezoux (?). Period: Domitian-Trajan.
 ERICI·M—Camelon (18/31).
63. FELICIO of Montans. Period: Claudius-Vespasian.
 OIC|JEF—Old Kilpatrick (18/31). This is *Old Kilp.*, Pl. xvii. 8.
64. FELIX of Montans and La Graufesenque. Period: Claudius-Vespasian.
 FE[LIX]·F—Camelon (18/31).
 ·X|JEF—Newstead (27).
65. FIRMO of La Graufesenque and Montans. Period: Claudius-Domitian.
 O·FIRMON—Newstead (18).
 OFFIRMON—Camelon (18).
66. FIRMUS of Lezoux. Period: Flavian (?).
 FIRMI·AN—Camelon (18).
67. FIRMUS of Heiligenberg, Ittenweiler, Rheinzabern, Kräherwald, and Westerndorf. Period: Trajan-Antonine.
 FIRMVS·F—Newstead (33).
68. FRONTINUS of La Graufesenque. Period: Nero-Trajan.
 ⊕FRON+NI—Newstead (18).
69. GATUS of Hedderheim (?). Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
 GATVSF—Cramond (18), apparently the CARVSF of Wilson, *Prehist. Ann. of Scot.*², ii. p. 76; *Traprain Law (*x*), without F.
70. GEMELLUS of Heiligenberg and Rheinzabern. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
 [GE]MELLI·M—Mumrills (18/31).
71. GEMINUS of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian-Late Antonine.
 GEMINIAM—Camelon (33, two examples); Newstead (33, two examples).
 GEMINI[M]—Balmuildy (33).
 INIMIIO—Inveresk (33).
72. GNATIUS of La Madeleine (?). Period: Trajan-Antonine.
 GNAT[. . .]—Camelon (*x*).
 GNA[. . .]—Newstead (31).
 GN[. . .]—Camelon (18/31).

73. GONDIUS¹ of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
GONCI·M—Camelon (33); Old Kilpatrick (33).
74. JANUARIS of Lezoux. Period: Domitian-Hadrian.
IANVARIS—Newstead (31).
75. IASSUS of Rheinzabern and Westerndorf. Period: Antonine.
IASSVS·F—Newstead (31).
76. ILLIOMARUS of Lezoux. Period: Claudius-Vespasian.
ILLIOM[. . .]—Old Kilpatrick (*cf.* Ritt. 8).
77. ILLIXO of Lezoux. Period: Trajan-Antonine.
ILLIXO—Old Kilpatrick (18/31).
ILLIXO—Old Kilpatrick (18/31); Newstead (31). The latter is the
OXMII of Wilson, *Prehist. Ann. of Scot.*², ii. p. 76.
78. JVCUNDUS of La Graufesenque. Period: Claudius-Flavian.
OF·IVCVN—Camelon (27); *Cramond (*x*), noted in Wilson, *l.c.*; New-
stead (27, two examples).
79. JULICCUS of Lezoux. Period: Domitian-Antonine.
IVLICCI·M—Balmuilty (33).
80. JULLINUS of Lezoux. Period: Flavian-Antonine.
IVLLINI—Newstead (18).
81. JULLUS of Montans. Period: Nero-Trajan.
IVLLI—Newstead (27, three examples).
82. LIBERTUS of Lezoux. Period: Vespasian-Trajan.
LIBERTI·M—Castle Cary (33).
83. LOGIRNUS of La Graufesenque and Montans. Period: Flavian.
LOG[. . .]—Camelon (18, two examples).
84. MACER of La Graufesenque. Period: Nero-Vespasian.
MACRIM—Newstead (33).
MAC[. . .]—Camelon (18/31). The name is obviously not quite certain.
85. MALLEDO of Lezoux. Period: Trajan-Antonine.
MALLEDOF—Newstead (33).
86. MALLIACUS of Lezoux. Period: Trajan-Antonine.
MALLIACI—Balmuilty (33).
87. MALLURO of Lezoux. Period: Vespasian-Hadrian.
MALLVROF—Bar Hill (31).
88. MAMMIUS of Lezoux. Period: Trajan-Antonine.
MAMMI—Camelon (33); Newstead (33).
89. MARCELLUS of Lezoux and Mandeuire(?). Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
MARCELL[IMA]—Newstead (18/31).
MARCELLIM—Newstead (31).
MARCILIM—Newstead (31).
[MARCEL]LIM—Mumrills (31). This is obviously not quite certain.
90. MARCUS of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
MARCI—Newstead (31).

¹ This form of the name seems preferable to CONDIUS or CONGIUS.

91. MARITUMUS of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
 MARITVMI—*Castlecary (*x*), noted in Wilson, *Prehist. Ann. of Scot.*²,
 ii. p. 76, where the stamp appears as MAR·IV·M.
92. MASCULUS of La Graufesenque. Period: Claudius-Early Vespasian.
 OFMASCVLI—Newstead (18).
93. MATTIUS—of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
 MATTI·M—Camelon (33); Mumrills (33); Newstead (33).
94. MAXIMUS of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
 MAXIMI—Birrens (33).
95. MEMOR of La Graufesenque. Period: Claudius-Vespasian.
 MEMO[RISM]—Newstead (18).
 MEM[. . .]—Camelon (*x*).
96. METTIUS of Lezoux. Period: Trajan-Antonine.
 METTI·M—Newstead (33 and large bowl).
97. MICCIO of Lubié. Period: Trajan-Antonine.
 MI[CC]IO·F—Newstead (18/31, two examples).
98. MINERTUS.
 MINERTI OFF—Camelon (*x*). This stamp does not appear in Dr
 Oswald's *Index*, the only analogy to it being MINERTIA from
 Aldborough (*C.I.L.*, vii. 1336, 711). The material was evidently
 too scanty to justify any endeavour to identify the potter. Nor
 does the Camelon example help much, except as to the name. I
 give it as it was copied into my notebook about 1907. The form
 is perhaps suggestive of a late rather than an early date.
99. MOX(S)IUS of Lezoux and Lubié. Period: Vespasian-Hadrian.
 [MO]XSI·M—Camelon (*x*).
100. MUXTULLUS of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
 MVXTVLLIM—Camelon (18/31), three examples).
101. PATER of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
 PATER·F—Newstead (33).
102. PATERATUS of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
 PATIRATI·OF—*Castlecary (*x*), noted in Wilson, *Prehist. Ann. of*
*Scot.*², ii. p. 76, where PATIRATI·OF is read.
103. PATERNUS of Lezoux. Period: Trajan-Antonine.
 IIRĒTAP—Balmuildy (33).
104. PATRICIUS of La Graufesenque. Period: Nero-Domitian.
 OF PAT[RICI]—Camelon (18).
105. PATRICIUS of Lezoux. Period: Trajan-Antonine.
 PATRICIVSF—Newstead (31 and possibly 33).
106. PECULIARIS of Lezoux. Period: Domitian-Antonine.
 PĒCVIAR·F—Newstead (31 and 33).
 PĒCVLIARISF—Bar Hill (31); Camelon (18/31); Newstead (31); Rough
 Castle (31).
107. PEREGRINUS of South Gaul. Period: Domitian.
 PEREGRIN—Camelon (18 and *x*).

108. POTTACUS of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
POT.[TACVS]—Birrens (18/31).
109. PRIMIGENIUS of Lezoux. Period: Antonine.
PRIMIGENIM—Newstead (31).
110. PRIMULUS of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
PRIMVLT—Old Kilpatrick (33).
111. PRIMUS of Montans and La Graufesenque. Period: Claudius-Vespasian.
P·~~RM~~·M—Newstead (27).
PRM·M—Camelon (33).
112. PRISCUS of Blickweiler and Eschweilerhof. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
PRISCVSF—Castlecary (33).
113. PROBUS of Ittenweiler and Rheinzabern. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
PROBVS·F—Newstead (33).
114. PUGNUS of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
PVGNUM—Camelon (18/31).
115. Q. V. C. of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
Q·V·C—Newstead (27).
116. QUINTILIANUS of Lezoux, Vichy, and Lubié. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
[QV]INTILIANIM—Inveresk (31).
117. QUINTUS of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
QVINTI—Newstead (27); Camelon (27). One or both of those stamps may belong to a potter of the same name who worked at Montans and La Graufesenque during the period: Claudius-Vespasian.
*QVINTI·M—Newstead (27).
118. REBURRUS of Lezoux. Period: Trajan-Antonine.
[REB]VRRIOF—Birrens (33).
119. REDITUS of Lezoux. Period: Trajan-Antonine.
REDITI·M—Camelon (33).
120. REGALIS of Lezoux. Period: Domitian-Antonine.
REGALISF—Newstead (31).
121. REGINUS of Lezoux, Lubié, and (?) Mandeure. Period: Domitian-Antonine.
REGINI·M—Newstead (33, two examples).
RIIGNI—Newstead (33).
122. RITOGENUS of Lezoux. Period: Antonine.
RIIOGENIM—Ardoch (31); Balmuildy (31); Birrens (18/31); Camelon (18/31 and 33); Mumrills (31); Old Kilpatrick (31).
123. RUFFUS of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
RVFFI·MA—Cappuck (33); Newstead (27 and 33).
RVFFI·M—Newstead (31).
124. RUFUS of La Graufesenque and Montans. Period: Nero-Vespasian.
OF RVF—Newstead (27).

125. SABINUS of La Graufesenque and Montans. Period: Nero-Domitian.
 SABINVS · F—Newstead (Curle 2).
 OF SAB—Newstead (Curle 2).
126. SACER of Lezoux. Period: Trajan-Antonine.
 SACER · OF—*Birrens (x), noted in Wilson, *Prehist. Ann. of Scot.*²,
 ii. p. 76, where the stamp is read SAC · EROR.
127. SAC(I)RAPUS of Lezoux. Period: Antonine.
 SACIRAPO—*Castlecary (x), noted in Wilson, *l.c.*
128. SACIRO of Lezoux and Blickweiler. Period: Trajan-Antonine.
 [S]ACIRO · F—Newstead (31).
129. SAMILLUS of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
 SAMILLI · M—Newstead (33).
130. SCIPIUS of Montans. Period: Nero-Vespasian (?).
 SCIPIV—Camelon (27).
131. SECUNDINUS of Lezoux. Period: Domitian-Trajan.
 SECVNDINVS—Newstead (18/31).
 [SECVN]DINI · M—Rough Castle (18/31).
132. SECUNDUS of La Graufesenque. Period: Claudius-Vespasian.
 SECVDI OF—Newstead (27).
 O SECVN—Camelon (27).
 NVCE[290]—Newstead (18).
133. SECUNDUS of Lezoux. Period: Flavian.
 [SEC]VNDVS—Camelon (18). The lack of the first three letters leaves
 the name a little doubtful. But the shape of the dish and its
 colour and texture all favour an early date.
134. SENILA of Lezoux. Period: Antonine.
 SENILA · M—Newstead (33).
135. SEVERUS of La Graufesenque. Period: Nero-Vespasian.
 O SEVER—Newstead (18).
136. SEVERUS of Lezoux. Period: Trajan-Antonine.
 SEVERV · S—Camelon (33); Newstead (33).
 SEVERV · S · F—Balmuildy (33).
137. SILVANUS of La Graufesenque. Period: Claudius-Vespasian.
 SILVANI—Newstead (18, two examples).
138. SINTURUS of Lezoux. Period: Trajan-Antonine.
 SINTVR[V · F]—Camelon (18/31, two examples).
139. SUOBNILLUS of Lezoux. Period: Trajan-Antonine.
 SVOBN[ILLI]—Mumrills (18/31); Newstead (27).
 SV[OBNIL]LI · M—Camelon (18/31).
140. SUOBNUS of Lezoux. Period: Trajan-Antonine.
 SVOB · N1 · M—Ardoch (18/31); Camelon (18/31, three examples); New-
 stead (31).
141. SURIUS of Montans. Period: Nero-Vespasian.
 OF 2VR11—Camelon (27, three examples).
142. TASGILLUS of Lezoux. Period: Domitian-Hadrian.
 TASGILLIM—Camelon (33); Rough Castle (33).

143. L. TERENTIUS SECUNDUS of Montans (?). Period: Flavian-Trajan.
LÆRSECW—Castlecary (27). This is the IRSECA of Wilson, *Prehist.*
*Ann. of Scot.*², ii: p. 76.
144. TERTULLUS of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian (?).
TERTVLLI—Camelon (x).
145. TITTIUS of Lezoux. Period: Domitian-Antonine.
TITTIVS·F—Newstead (18/31).
146. TITUS of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
TITI·M—Mumrills (18/31).
TIOFFIC—Newstead (33).
147. TULLUS of Pont-des-Rêmes (Florent). Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
TVLLVS·F—Newstead (33, two examples).
148. UXOPILLUS of Lezoux. Period: Antonine.
[VX]OPILLI·M—Newstead (18/31, two examples).
149. VALERIUS of Montans. Period: Tiberius-Nero.
OFVAL—*Cramond (x), noted in Wilson, *l.c.*
150. VAREDO of East Gaul. Period: Antonine.
VAREDVFATIP—Birrens (18/31).
151. VEGETUS of Lezoux. Period: Antonine.
VEGETI·M—Newstead (31).
152. VERUS of Rheinzabern and Westerndorf. Period: Antonine and Late
Antonine.
[V]ERSVF—Camelon (31). This name cannot be regarded as quite certain.
153. VESPONIUS of Lezoux. Period: Hadrian-Antonine.
VESPONI—Newstead (33).
154. VINIUS of South Gaul. Period: Flavian.
VINII—Camelon (27).
155. VIRONIUS—
VIRO[NIMA]—Camelon (27).
VIÆ[ONIM]—Camelon (27).
156. VITALIS of La Graufesenque. Period: Claudius-Domitian.
VITAL—Newstead (27).
OF VITAL—Newstead (18, two examples).
OF VITA—Newstead (18, 18/31, and Curle 2).
OF V[. . .] Newstead (18 and 27).

B. NAMES ON DECORATED WARE.

(a) *Inside, across the bottom.*

157. CHRRESIMUS. *Cf.* No. 39, *supra*.
CRRESIMI—Camelon (37).
158. COSIUS and RUFINUS. *Cf.* No. 46, *supra*.
COSIRV—Camelon (29).
159. FELIX. *Cf.* No. 64, *supra*.
FELICISO—Camelon (37).

160. FRONTINUS. *Cf.* No. 68, *supra*.
 ⓄFRONINI—Camelon (29). This is on the same vessel as No. 173.
161. HABILIS, Q. IULIUS, of South Gaul. Period: Flavian.
 Q·IV[L·HABI]—Newstead (29).
162. RUFINUS of La Graufesenque and Banassac. Period: Nero-Domitian.
 OF·RVFINI—Camelon (29); Newstead (29).
163. VERECUNDUS of La Graufesenque. Period: Claudius-Vespasian.
 VERCVFE—Camelon (29). Dr Oswald does not record this form of stamp as having been used by Verecundus of La Graufesenque, but it can hardly belong to either of the other two potters of the same name. They are later, while (29) is a characteristically first-century shape.
164. VERIUS, S., of South Gaul. Period: Vespasian.
 S·VIIRIVS—Camelon (37).

(b) *Outside, on zone beneath decoration.*

165. ATTIANUS. *Cf.* No. 14, *supra*.
 O·IAITTA—*Newstead (30).
166. AVENTINUS. *Cf.* No. 15, *supra*.
 AVENTINI·M—Newstead (37).
167. CRICIRO. *Cf.* No. 50, *supra*.
 ΟΡΙΟΙΡΟ in cursive script (*cf.* *J.R.S.*, xvii. Pl. vii. Nos. 30-32)—
 Mumrills (37).
 ΡΟ—Mumrills (37).
168. DIVIXTUS of Lezoux. Period: Trajan-Antonine.
 DIVIX·F—Balmuildy (37, two examples); Birrens (37); Camelon (37);
 Newstead (37, two examples).
169. SILVIUS of Lezoux. Period: Flavian.
 SILVIO in cursive script (*J.R.S.*, xvii. Pl. ix. No. 70A)—Camelon (37).

(c) *Outside, among the decoration.*

170. ALBUCIUS. *Cf.* No. 11, *supra*.
 [AL]BVCI—Mumrills (37).
171. CINNAMUS of Lezoux and Lubié. Period: Trajan-Antonine.
 CИИИAMI—Bar Hill (37, two examples); Mumrills (30 and 37).
 CИИИAMI on large label—Rough Castle (37).
 ИМАИИΙΟ—Balmuildy (30 and two examples of 37); Bar Hill (37);
 Cadder (37); Camelon (37); Mumrills (37, three examples); Newstead
 (37, four examples); Traprain Law (37).
 ИМАИИΙΟ on small label—Newstead (37).
 ΜΙΜΑИИΙΟ on small label—Bar Hill (37).
172. CRUCURO of La Graufesenque. Period: Vespasian-Trajan.
 CRVC[CVRO]—Newstead (37).

173. FRONTINUS. Cf. No. 68, *supra*.
 FRONTINI on label—Camelon (29); Newstead (37). The Camelon stamp
 is on the same vessel as No. 160.
 FRONTINI on label—Camelon (37).
174. GERMANUS of Westerndorf. Period: Late Antonine.
 [F·2VNA]MRAO on label—Newstead (37).
175. NOCTURNUS of Westerndorf. Period: Late Antonine.
 NOCTVRN·F—*Falkirk (37). See Nimmo's *Hist. of Stirlingshire* (ed. 1880),
 i. 38. Although the stamp is there given as NOCTVRNA, the des-
 cription of the bowl is too circumstantial to admit of doubt as to
 the identification, particularly as No. 174 shows that Westerndorf
 pottery had begun to reach Scotland before the evacuation.

It will be seen that, after allowance has been made for a certain amount of repetition as between undecorated and decorated ware, the foregoing list includes the names of 166 individual potters. Many of these, however, are represented by more than one example of their handiwork. The total number of individual vessels concerned is, in fact, 337, so that there is a fairly wide basis for deductions as to the sources of supply. The main reservoir was obviously Central Gaul, notably Lezoux. That is precisely what might have been expected. Nor is it surprising to find that, before the Romans finally withdrew beyond Cheviot, there had been some infiltration of goods manufactured in places further east, where the industry was of later growth, such as Rheinzabern and Westerndorf. What will seem more remarkable is the extent of the contribution made by Southern Gaul. As it is known that the potteries there were in decay before the second century was very old, this may have chronological implications which bear very directly upon one of the most important questions in the story of Roman Scotland.

That story falls into two parts, the first beginning with the invasion of Agricola in A.D. 80, the second with the building of the Antonine Wall about A.D. 142. It is hardly doubtful that the Antonine occupation lasted for forty or fifty years. As regards the length of the one which preceded it, there is much more room for difference of opinion. Did it end with the recall of Agricola in A.D. 84? Or did it continue after he quitted the island? And, if so, until when? In 1906 it looked as if the evidence from the Bar Hill was to be conclusive in favour of the theory of precipitate abandonment. In 1911, however, a scrutiny of the coins from Newstead seemed to put another complexion on the matter,¹ and in 1918 their testimony was confirmed by a wider survey of the numismatic *data* from the whole of Scotland.² Finally, in 1921 a re-examination of

¹ *A Roman Frontier Post*, pp. 401 and 415.

² *Proceedings*, vol. lii. pp. 256 f.

the structural evidence from Camelon, Ardoch, and Inchtuthil revealed the fact that the Agricolan forts on these sites, so far from being garrisoned for only a year or two like the early fort on the Bar Hill, had been more or less continuously in Roman hands for long enough to admit of two rebuildings. On that occasion I ventured to sum up the position thus: "The probability is that the Romans did not retire behind the Cheviots until the great upheaval whose suppression has left an abiding memorial in the Tyne and Solway Wall."¹ I would add now that in saying this I did not mean to discount the possibility of the trouble having broken out before the end of the reign of Trajan, perhaps in A.D. 115 or even earlier. In any event, the short life of the Bar Hill fort is easily accounted for. Agricola's occupation of the Forth and Clyde isthmus was merely an episode in his advance. It was never meant to be permanent.

Although it was not referred to specifically in formulating the conclusions that have just been summarised, it must not be supposed that the pottery evidence was overlooked. So far as it went, it appeared to be confirmatory: figured Samian of the first or early second century was almost, though not quite, unknown at the forts on the Antonine Wall, whereas at Camelon and Newstead it was relatively abundant. This, however, was a general impression only, and as such it was too like "what the soldier said," to be allowed a place in the argument. The list now printed provides a much more definite picture, and its analysis may be expected to yield results of some moment.

For the purpose of such an analysis the only practicable course is to accept Dr Oswald's dating, provisional as it may occasionally be. I have therefore divided the potters whose wares have been found in Scotland into three groups, according to the period at which the *Index* makes their activity terminate, irrespective of the period at which it may have begun:—

- A. Potters whose activity did not extend beyond the reign of Trajan
—that is, beyond A.D. 117.
- B. Potters whose activity did not extend beyond the reign of Hadrian
—that is, beyond A.D. 138.
- C. Potters whose activity continued after the accession of Antoninus Pius—that is, after A.D. 138.

Potters whose names fall into Group A may, I think, fairly be associated with the Agricolan occupation, and potters whose names fall into Groups B and C with the Antonine advance and the occupation which

¹ *Journ. Roman Studies*, vol. ix. p. 133.

followed it. For the sake of brevity, the first of these classes will be referred to as 'early' and the second as 'late.'

In making this classification I do not forget that "the baggage-train of the army which Lollius Urbicus led across the Scottish frontier, in the beginning of the reign of Pius, must have contained a fair percentage of table ware and kitchen utensils which experts might to-day assign to the period of Hadrian, or even of Trajan."¹ As a matter of fact, the possibility of such 'survivals' has been amply allowed for by reckoning the whole of Group B as late. One or two stray dishes here included in Group A may, indeed, have lived through the vicissitudes of frontier warfare for the twenty-five years that separated the death of Trajan from the invasion of Scotland, *circa* A.D. 142. But against that it must be remembered that not a few of the potters in Groups B and C were already active in Flavian times, so that a certain number of the sherds which I have classed as late may quite conceivably be early. That is undoubtedly the case with No. 80. Its maker, Jullinus of Lezoux, is placed in Group C, because the limits of his activity are 'Flavian-Antonine'; but the platter itself must be early, for reference to *A Roman Frontier Post* will show that it was found sealed in an early pit.

Of the 337 sherds, there are 9 which are of no use for our present purpose, either because the potter cannot yet be approximately dated (Nos. 98 and 155), or because they were found on sites (Traprain Law and Inchgarvie), which are not to be regarded as definitely Roman. The 13 from Birrens may also be left out of account. All of them are late, nor has this fort as yet yielded anything suggestive of a first-century occupation. Ardoch, Cappuck, Cramond, and Inveresk must be set aside for a different reason; all told, their quota is just over a dozen, 5 early and 8 late—obviously too narrow a basis on which to build. The 302 which remain, comprise 85 from the forts on the Antonine Wall, 139 from Newstead, and 78 from Camelon.

Only 10 of the 85 from the Wall forts are early. The other 75 are late, 5 of them belonging to Group B and 70 to Group C. The significance of these figures is decisive. The first occupation of the isthmus was far less prolonged than the second. Some details regarding the individual forts may be added. Four of them—Balmuildy with 19 sherds, Bar Hill with 9, Cadder with 3, and Falkirk with 1—have nothing whatever to show that is early, nothing that falls even into Group B. On the other hand, Castlecary with 14 sherds, supplies 4 early names, (Cadgatis, Calvus of La Graufesenque,² Libertus and L. Terentius

¹ *Proceedings*, vol. lxiii. p. 503.

² In this and the lists that follow, the locality is specified when it is necessary to distinguish between potters of the same name who worked in different centres.

Secundus), Mumrills with 27 supplies 3 (Avitus of Lezoux, Calvinus and Creciro), Old Kilpatrick with 8 supplies 2 (Felicio and Illiomarus), and Rough Castle with 5 supplies 1 (Secundinus of Lezoux). It is worth noting that Mumrills was, so far as we know, much the largest of the forts on the Wall, and that the exceptionally high proportion of early names at Castlecary is in exact accord with the trend of the other pottery evidence from this site.¹

The statistics from the Wall present a marked contrast to those from Newstead. There, the total of 139 is made up of 96 pieces which are late² and 43 which are early. It may be well to give a list of the potters from whose kilns the early vessels came, adding numbers in those cases where a potter is represented by more than one fragment. The names are—Avitus of Lezoux (2), Calvus of La Graufesenque, Chresimus, Coius, Cosius and Rufinus, Cotto, Crispus, Crucuro, Dagomarus, Draucus, Felix, Firmo, Frontinus (2), Q. Jul. Habilis, Jucundus (2), Jullus (3), Macer, Masculus, Memor, Primus of Montans, Rufinus (2), Rufus, Sabinus (2), Secundinus of Lezoux, Secundus of La Graufesenque (2), Severus of La Graufesenque, Silvanus (2), and Vitalis (8). This is surely a formidable list. Moreover, in estimating the weight of its testimony, we have to remember that at Newstead the second-century fort was planted exactly on the spot where its predecessor had stood—an arrangement that was anything but conducive to the preservation of first-century objects. As a matter of fact, the careful record in *A Roman Frontier Post* shows that the great majority of the 43 were recovered from sealed pits or from the early ditch, and that very few of them were surface-finds. If the Antonine occupation lasted for forty or fifty years, as we know that it did, we can hardly allow less than thirty for that which began with Agricola.

Lastly, there is Camelon. Here, the conditions for a fair comparison were more favourable than at Newstead, since the later fort was not actually superimposed upon the earlier, but was immediately adjacent. There was thus less risk of first-century fragments being trampled out of existence. The fruits of this happy chance are apparent in the outcome of the analysis. Of the 78 sherds from the site, not more than 43 are late, 5 belonging to Group B and 38 to Group C. On the other hand, no fewer than 35 are early, the potters concerned being G. Albinus, Cadgatis, Calvus of La Graufesenque (3), Chresimus, Cosius and Rufinus (2), Ericus, Felix (2), Firmo, Firmus of Lezoux, Frontinus (2), Jucundus, Logirinus (2), Macer, Memor, Patricius of La Graufesenque

¹ I hope to deal more fully with this peculiar feature of Castlecary in the second edition of my *Roman Wall in Scotland*.

² Only 4 of these are in Group B, as against 92 in Group C.

Peregrinus (2), Primus of Montans, Rufinus, Scipius, Secundus of La Graufesenque, Secundus of Lezoux, Silvius of Lezoux, Surlus (3), Verecundus of La Graufesenque, S. Verius, and Vinius. These figures are very striking. They speak for themselves so effectively that no comment is required, unless it be to say that they came upon myself as a genuine surprise. I had not looked for anything quite so convincing.