

V.

THE RELATION OF THE FORT AT NEWSTEAD TO SCOTTISH HISTORY, A.D. 80-180. BY IAN A. RICHMOND, CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, OXFORD.

Since 1911, when Mr James Curle published his remarkable discoveries in the Roman fort at Newstead,¹ Roman archæology in Scotland has moved forward apace. It is true that exploration has been confined chiefly to the Wall of Pius and to Traprain Law; but forts further north have been dealt with afresh² by Dr G. Macdonald, who in 1920 discussed the results gained at Inchtuthil, Ardoch, and Camelon, and brought them tentatively into connection with certain facts in northern England. At that time, however, it was impossible to include the results gained at Newstead without complicating and involving the issues, for the new theory needed the simplest possible statement. The first part of this paper will discuss the results gained from Newstead as they appear in the light of more recent research. The second and third parts will attempt to compare further the earlier results with other evidence, and to estimate their bearing upon the history of Roman Scotland. At this point, however, I wish to acknowledge gratefully the help and encouragement given to me by Dr G. Macdonald and Mr R. G. Collingwood, and, more especially, by Mr James Curle, although I hold myself responsible for the conclusions drawn below.

1. PERIODS OF OCCUPATION AT NEWSTEAD AND THEIR INTERPRETATION.

In 1911 the excavators at Newstead felt able to distinguish five periods, divided between a late and an early occupation of the site. The discovery was made possible by tracing roads and buildings in which definite changes were recorded. But it is important to note that the only building within the fort thoroughly cleared was the *prætorium*;³ elsewhere the floors were noted merely as they occurred in trenches. For this reason it is impossible to judge from the amount of late or early pottery found at Newstead the relative intensity of occupation of the buildings. The coin list, on the other hand, is a rather safer guide, since each coin is minutely described by Dr G. Macdonald in an appendix to the book on Newstead, and therefore is a valuable indication for dating.

¹ *A Roman Frontier-Post and its People; the Fort at Newstead, near Melrose.* By James Curle. Referred to *passim* as "Newstead."

² "The Agricola Occupation of North Britain," *J.R.S.*, vol. ix.

³ *Newstead*, p. 42.

Guided partly by these results and partly by scanty historical records, the excavators came to the following conclusions. The early occupation dated from Agricola's conquests about A.D. 80 until the close of Trajan's reign, about A.D. 115-7. In it were discerned at least two periods. The first included the building and the evacuation of a fort 11·7 acres in size; the two latest coins¹ found in its ditches dated to A.D. 86 and were nearly in mint condition. The second period seemed to continue to the close of Trajan's reign, and at all events fairly fresh coins of Trajan Cos. V. appeared to show that both the fort and its bath-house were occupied then.² It included the erection of a 15-acre fort, surrounded by a huge ditch and by an earthen rampart; the four gates were protected by curved ditches (*claviculae*), and it appeared that at least the main buildings, which faced west, were built in stone.

The late occupation dated from the advance of Urbicus in A.D. 140-2 until about A.D. 180, and to it were assigned three periods, not without doubt about the first. It seemed to begin with the building of a stone wall all round the 15-acre fort, in such a position that the great ditch, although still receiving drainage at the south-west corner, could not have remained open to full size.³ Now, if not before, two more ditches were made to surround the fort; the *claviculae* of the earth-fort were filled up; all buildings of importance, including barracks, were made of stone. These events belong certainly to one period. Soon, however, the fort was reduced in size and its main buildings were made to face east instead of west. Later still—the excavators suggested A.D. 155-8—the final late period began. The fort was thrown open to full size and its buildings were refurbished. Noteworthy was the addition at this time of a long hall to the *prætorium*.⁴ The fort then was held for some time and abandoned about A.D. 180 with the rest of Scotland. Coins made quite clear this final date.

How do these results, briefly summarised, agree with interpretations of facts gained on other Scottish sites? At first sight satisfactorily, at least so far as the late periods are concerned. On the Wall of Pius at Rough Castle, Castlecary, Balmuildy, and now at Old Kilpatrick, three periods of occupation certainly belong to Antonine times.⁵ The opening of the second period has been assigned with good reason to about A.D. 158.⁵ The third period is characterised by hasty and slipshod repairs, and did not last for very long. Dr G. Macdonald, noting the character of the work and the fact that no third period occurs at Birrens, in

¹ Coins numbered 163 and 170, *Newstead*, pp. 405, 406.

² *E.g.* Coins 74, 77, 78, p. 394.

³ This is shown by Sections II., VII., VIII., *Newstead*, p. 30.

⁴ *Newstead*, pp. 43, 44, Pl. ix. 1.

⁵ See *Roman Wall in Scotland*, pp. 396, 397; *The Roman Fort at Balmuildy*, p. 104.

Dumfriesshire, has suggested that just before A.D. 180 the Wall was lost and regained temporarily.

These interpretations, however, have not yet been applied to the results at Newstead. But supposing the three periods assigned to the Antonine occupation to be identical with those on the Wall of Pius, I find it difficult to believe that Verus built the reduced fort. All the buildings of this fort were new; yet elsewhere, especially in Scotland,¹ it was the habit of Verus to rebuild old buildings upon old lines, since, though destroyed, they had only been deserted for a year or two. It is unexpected, moreover, to find him reducing a fort in size just after a dangerous frontier war. On the other hand, if the final work at Newstead is thought to be contemporary with that on the Wall of Pius, it differs a good deal in character: at Newstead repairs were passably executed and even involved some new building, including a large hall at the *prætorium*; on the Wall they were temporary, slipshod, and makeshift. Indeed this work at Newstead resembles much more closely the work of Verus at Birrens or at Balmuildy, although, if it is assigned to Verus, the reduced fort would have to belong to Urbicus, or to unknown changes falling between him and Verus of which there is little likelihood. Another solution could assign the final reconstruction at Newstead to A.D. 169, when literary tradition,² but no Scottish archæological evidence yet to hand, mentions that a war was pending in Britain; but here again the incongruity of the reduced fort with work done by Verus elsewhere has to be explained away.

Enough has been noted now to show that the interpretation of 1911 is beset with puzzles. But another solution remains to be mentioned. It is possible to throw back the 15-acre fort to the Flavian-Trajanic period, and, giving the last repairs to Verus, as at Birrens, to believe that the reduced fort was built by Urbicus in A.D. 140-2. The later history of Newstead after A.D. 158 then would resemble that of Birrens, which may have been built rather before A.D. 140-2,³ and was only reconstructed once. Evidence from Lyne, near Peebles, unfortunately is not so clear, but few signs of reconstruction were noted.

So much for facts external to Newstead and their suggestions. Certain evidence from within the fort seems to point in the same direction. A general consideration raises the question why the reduced fort, which belongs to the fourth period, was placed in the eastern half of the 15-acre fort. This involved not merely the construction of three new gates instead of one, but also at least the complete re-

¹ Haverfield, *Proc. Soc. Ant. Scot.*, vol. xxxviii.

² Capitolinus, *Vita M. Ant. Phil.*, 22; also *Arch. Æl.*, 3, vol. viii. p. 217.

³ G. Macdonald, *Trans. Dumfries. Ant. Soc.*, 1920-1.

building of the *prætorium*; it also included the building of new granaries. But, if the reduction was decided upon just after A.D. 155-8, it would have been much simpler and much more normal to use existing and little damaged gates and buildings and to erect an eastern cross-wall, that is, to rebuild the fort as much upon old lines as possible, as Iulius Verus did elsewhere. Also this position would have avoided the building of a new main road outside the fort. On the other hand if, as I suggest, the reduced fort was the work of Urbicus, and his troops were reoccupying the mere shell of a fort deserted for a score of years, all kinds of reasons, including dry ground, not powerful enough in the former case to outweigh the advantages mentioned, then may have dictated that it was better to build in the eastern end of Trajan's old fort. This appears to suggest that some question of this sort really faced Urbicus rather than Verus.

More detailed evidence points the same way. When the first stone fort-wall was built at Newstead in Period III., the *claviculae* which had guarded the gates of the old earth-fort of Period II. were filled up and roads were laid down across them. These ditches did not contain much pottery, and although all the pieces found were of essentially first-century type, Dragendorff has noted¹ that they do not necessarily prove that the ditches were filled up at the end of the first century. Dragendorff, however, did not visualise a Trajanic occupation. Actually had these ditches been open and in use during most of Trajan's reign we should have expected them to yield rather later pottery. While Dragendorff's implication, that the ditches might have been filled up at the beginning of an Antonine occupation and still produce purely first-century pottery, would hold only if the occupation of the site ceased about A.D. 100. Coins prove that this did not happen.²

The solution of another puzzle again gives a similar result. With the *prætorium* of the reduced fort (that is, of the fourth period) are contemporary the granaries on either side of it, for their orientation and level are the same. But beneath the southern granary was found an early building of stone of which the alignment belongs to Period II., like that of the walls marked I. beneath the Antonine *prætorium*, which are discussed below. Then, since no building or floor lay between this building and the granary of Period IV., we have to suppose either that the granary goes back to Period III., which is disproved at once by level and orientation, or that the building of Period II. also was used in Period III.; otherwise there must have been in Period III. an empty space just where the buildings of a Roman fort were most substantial and most crowded. But if a

¹ Dragendorff, *J.R.S.*, vol. i. p. 135.

² See note 2 on p. 310.

long interval of more than twenty years separated Period II. from Period III., the building must have been rebuilt in order to be used in the two periods. Since it was not reconstructed, it seems only reasonable to suppose that Periods II. and III. followed one another closely. But Period II. is certainly pre-Hadrianic. Therefore the same result occurs as before. Period III. is Trajanic and Period IV. falls to Urbicus.

If these deductions are correct, then the 15-acre fort, with its buildings and wall of stone, goes back at least to the reign of Trajan. It will be necessary, however, to consider the objection that stone fort-walls did not come into general use in north-western Europe until after Hadrian's reign. This seems an admirable generalisation when there is evidence to support it in each special case considered. But there are special cases which contradict it, of which not all can be said to have been governed by a lack of wood or an abundance of stone to hand for building material. Unless the sculptors of Trajan's column allowed prophetic imagination to guide their work, they have shown that plenty of forts provided with stone walls and stone buildings existed before A.D. 106 in the wide forest-lands of Dacia.¹

Even in Britain the fort at Hardknot,² abandoned in A.D. 122-5, has walls of stone; Gellygaer,³ a Trajanic fort, is more than half-way in evolution between earthen rampart and stone wall; at Papcastle,⁴ as Mr R. G. Collingwood tells me, an early stone fort-wall is associated with Samian shape 30 and other Domitian-Trajan pottery, together with a slightly worn *denarius* of Galba. Thus Newstead quite well may be regarded as an early instance of a stone fort placed in a very important advanced position. As such it would be in advance of its time; in its position wood and stone were plentiful.

From the point of view of the earlier periods the assignment of the first stone-walled fort to before A.D. 115-7 is satisfactory. It brings Newstead into line with facts elsewhere in the north and, as will appear, in the south. In 1920, Dr G. Macdonald pointed out⁵ that there was evidence for three pre-Hadrianic periods at three Scottish forts to the north of Newstead. His proofs of the statement have been accepted widely as facts, and, taken as a whole, seem indisputable. At present it does not seem a valid objection to point to the scantiness of Flavian-Trajanic pottery in Scotland as compared with Antonine pottery. Such observations only emphasise the fact that no pre-Hadrianic fort in Scotland yet has been excavated thoroughly.

¹ *E.g.* Cichorius, vol. ii. Pls. xvii., ciii., xciii., cxvi.

² *Cumberland and Westmorland A. and A. Soc. Trans.*, N.S., vol. xxi. p. 41.

³ *Roman Fort at Gellygaer*, J. Ward.

⁴ *C. and W.A.S., Trans.*, N.S. vol. xiii. p. 139.

⁵ See note 2 on p. 309.

Nor is the suggestion, first made by Dragendorff,¹ convincing that such sites should produce East Gaulish Samian ware. Further south thoroughly explored forts like Slack, Castleshaw inner fort, and Hardknot have produced only two decorated pieces of this pottery between them.² All these sites were occupied until A.D. 122-5, when Scotland had been abandoned almost for a decade, and northern Britain clearly was not yet receiving abundant supplies of pottery from Gallia Belgica, or from the Germanies.³

But, if the first stone fort at Newstead belonged to Trajan, when was the earth-fort abandoned? Evidence shows only that this did not happen before about A.D. 97, and for more definite information, which suggests a date soon after A.D. 100, it is necessary to look elsewhere than Newstead. At Newstead, however, a *denarius*⁴ of Domitian, dated to A.D. 92-3, and not quite in mint condition, was found on the surface of the road contemporary with the *clavicula* outside the early south gate, and covered by the road which crossed the *clavicula*, and was abandoned when the reduced fort was built. This proves that the road of the third period was not constructed until after about A.D. 97, when I suggest the coin was dropped.

Outside the fort the bath-house raises problems of its own. Here foundations had been robbed so thoroughly that it was impossible even at the time of excavation to make much of periods of alteration.⁵ But it seems that the "nucleus" building was constructed in precisely the same way as the walls beneath the Antonine *praetorium* marked I,⁶ which orientation and level show to belong to the earth-fort II.; the materials used were exactly similar. This seems good foundation for the belief that the buildings were erected at the same time, and it gives a starting-point. In this early bath-house the floors of room B and of the *caldarium* (E) were renewed once.⁷ There followed changes which the plan shows to have involved at least two reconstructions of the building; thus there were no less than four periods in the bath-house. Their date is not quite so certain, and it seems advisable to remember that at Gellygaer the bath-house was reconstructed at least twice, although no alterations took place within the fort.

But if the inference drawn from building materials is right, the "nucleus" bath-house at Newstead, the earliest building on the site

¹ *J.R.S.*, vol. i. p. 135.

² *Yorks. Arch. Soc.*, vol. xxvi. p. 46; *Castleshaw*, 2nd *Interim Report*, pp. 51, 52; *C.W.A.S. Trans.*, N.S., vol. xxi. pp. 31-2.

³ See S. N. Miller, *Scott. Hist. Rev.*, xviii.; but I arrived at the conclusion independently.

⁴ Coin numbered 61, *Newstead*, p. 392.

⁵ *E.g.* Flavian-Trajan remains were found beneath the rampart round the building; a fresh coin of A.D. 89 (No. 59, p. 392) was found above its foundation.

⁶ *Newstead*, p. 52.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 94, Pl. xiii. 1, p. 96.

where it stood, was not built until A.D. 86-90, and was contemporary with the 15-acre earth-fort. This seems probable. The late Mr G. L. Cheesman noted¹ that Agricola's fort at Newstead, 11·7 acres in size, was not permanent, but belonged to a type used in Germany for winter-quarters. In that event a bath-house well may not have existed until A.D. 86-90, when a more permanent fort, held year in, year out, was erected at Newstead; just as at Balmuildy² the bath-house outside the fort does not seem to have existed in the earliest days of occupation. The alterations in the floors of this building at Newstead then might be assigned, with caution, to the third early period.

The next alterations, even if their number is uncertain, belong to a new building at a higher level, of which the plan was new and embodied fewer apses. In the north-east corner may be discerned walls which hardly can have stood together.³ Also room J had two floors. Those walls which jut very far out, however, seem later, or earlier, than the inner walls. They encroach upon the rampart which was made to surround the bath-house but which later was demolished. A mystery surrounds the exact period of this unique fence. Pit LVII. was dug beneath its foundations and is of Flavian-Trajanic date, as its contents show.⁴ Mr Curle tells me also that Antonine pottery was found beneath it. But evidently the whole site was much disturbed, for a coin of Domitian, dated to A.D. 89 and in good condition, was found above the cobble foundation.⁵ Clearly, therefore, no more definite conclusion is warranted about the date of the rampart than that it was later than Trajan's reign; to assign it to a definite period in the Antonine occupation seems rash. At some time within the Antonine period, however, the baths were included by an annexe ditch.⁶

At the *praetorium* evidence is more definite. In the final period of the late occupation this building received a new colonnade and new floors within its western range of rooms. In the *sucellum* was placed an underground strong-room, first typical under Marcus. At the front of the building was erected a great hall whose purpose is not quite clear. In Germany the same thing is called habitually an *Exercier-Halle*; at Newstead it was set up during the enlargement of the fort for cavalry; perhaps one may guess that something like it is referred to⁷ as *basilica* on a Lancaster inscription, and as *basilica equestris exercitatoria* on

¹ *Auxilia of the Roman Imperial Army*, p. 106; *Newstead*, p. 25.

² Miller, *Balmuildy*, pp. 53, 104.

³ *Newstead*, p. 95.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 129; Oswald and Pryce, *Terra Sigillata*, p. 58.

⁵ See note 5 on p. 314.

⁶ The ditch produced Samian ware of Cinnamus and Divixtus, a *denarius* of Hadrian and a second brass of Faustina I., the last found in filling near the surface; this suggests the Urbican period.

⁷ *C.I.L.*, vol. vii. Nos. 287, 965.

another stone, from Netherby. Apart from this addition, however, the Antonine building was a large *prætorium* of fairly simple type, with two courtyards.

Earlier *prætoria* are less sharply defined. But beneath the Antonine courtyard were observed two levels,¹ the first containing a small square room, whose north, south, and east sides rested upon cobbles, and the west upon hard gravel; the second is thus represented by the cobbles and the gravel. Beneath the wall which separated the Antonine courtyards two levels also were noted,² first a clay floor, and then a *stratum* of gravel one foot thick. This accounts for two buildings of early date. But the suggestion that the lower level of gravel represented Agricola's streets or an Agricola building will not suit the position of the gates of the Agricola fort. Rather, then, this level represents a courtyard contemporary with the walls marked I., which are aligned to the rampart of the earth-fort II., and to the building which lies beneath the Antonine south granary. The foundations of pillars found two feet below the Antonine inner courtyard, and the building on site XVII. found five feet below the surface, may belong to the Agricola age. But if the pillars are so early in date they represent a building of stone. Thus certain traces of Agricola's *prætorium* still are to seek.

It seems probable, therefore, that at least three *prætoria* lie below that contemporary with the reduced fort. The most prominent is that belonging to the 15-acre earth-fort of Period II., represented by the walls marked I. This may have been used also in the 15-acre stone fort of Period III., but the small square room "2" is at a slightly higher level, and so is the clay floor, and they seem to belong to that period. The building contemporary with the walls marked I., as its orientation shows, seems also to have been used in the third period without doubt. Later, the Antonine south granary was built above it.

The conclusions which the discussion has reached now may be collected and set forth in summarised form, telling briefly the history and evolution of the fort as it appears to me.

(1) *Period I.*, A.D. 80-86—A.D. 90.

In A.D. 80, Agricola advanced northwards and soon founded a large fort on the south bank of the Tweed. It was 11.7 acres in size and belonged to a common Flavian type, indicated by the late Mr G. L. Cheesman.³ Perhaps it was not intended that the fort should last very long, since the frontier in the north still was unfixed. But the position was strong and the fort was defended by an earthen rampart, double

¹ *Newstead*, p. 47.

² *Ibid.*, p. 51.

³ See note 1 on p. 315.

ditches, and *claviculae*. Nothing is known for certain about its internal buildings. Whether a bath-house was built now is unknown.

(2) *Period II.*, A.D. 86-90—about A.D. 100.

In A.D. 86-90 Agricola's site was occupied by a larger *castellum*, fifteen acres in size, and surrounded by a huge earthen rampart, built with upcast from a deep ditch. At the gates were *claviculae*. Internal main buildings were of stone; one of them may be recognised beneath the Antonine south granary; part of the *prætorium* may be identified with the walls marked I. on the plan of the Antonine HQ. building. Similar in construction was the "nucleus" bath-house.

(3) *Period III.*, about A.D. 100—A.D. 115-7.

Evidence at Newstead seems to show that this period opened after about A.D. 97; analogies given below strongly suggest a date soon after A.D. 100. The place of the earthen rampart was taken by a stone wall, set at a slightly different angle. The *claviculae* of Period II. now were filled up, and their place was taken either in this or in the next period by two outer ditches. If these ditches were dug now, their upcast may have helped to fill up the great ditch until it reached smaller dimensions; that it still remained open is proved by the fact that a drain from beneath the stone wall discharged into it at the south-western corner of the fort; that it was partly closed has been noted above. Inside the fort either parts of a new *prætorium* or additions to the old one may be recognised in the little room and clay floor below the Antonine courtyard. Orientation suggests that the stone barracks on site II. belong to this time rather than to an earlier period. New roads were laid out and new gateways built. Alterations seem to have taken place in the *caldarium* of the bath-house (E), and in room B.

(4) *Period IV.*, A.D. 140-2—A.D. 155.

When the troops of Lollius Urbicus marched northwards about A.D. 142 they found the shell of a Trajanic stone fort still standing, doubtless in comparatively fair preservation. From it they cut off a suitable space and built at its eastern end a 10-acre fort. The main buildings, erected afresh, now faced eastwards instead of westwards, and where had been the earlier *retentura* stood the *prætentura*. A new cross-wall, but no ditches, fronted the west side of the fort, built less wide than the Trajanic wall. The bath-house, now quite isolated, was reconstructed, and perhaps was enclosed by an earthen rampart.

(5) *Period V.*, A.D. 158—about A.D. 180.

In A.D. 155-8 the fort seems to have been evacuated with the rest of Scotland for the duration of the Brigantian War. Under Iulius Verus it was reconstructed in order to hold cavalry, just as most Scottish forts received new garrisons¹; the whole fifteen acres was occupied once more. The cross-wall of Urbicus was demolished; the *prætorium* received new floors and an underground strong-room; a large hall and stables were newly erected, and the old western fort-wall of Period III. was refurbished. At the bath-house the rampart perhaps was razed now and the building may have been repaired and enlarged. About A.D. 180 the whole site was abandoned by Rome for ever.

2. SITES SOUTH OF NEWSTEAD, A.D. 80-117.

Northern England has not been very fortunate in the excavation of sites occupied under the Flavian Emperors and Trajan; several have been attacked with the spade, but most are covered with later Roman buildings, and these have received more attention. Yet there are some notable exceptions. In the West Riding of Yorkshire should be mentioned the forts at Slack and at Castleshaw, abandoned in A.D. 122-5. Further north are Ambleside, Hardknot, and Papcastle, in Cumberland, all excavated sites. Last of all may be mentioned Corbridge, where magnificent remains of the Antonine period have tended to eclipse important earlier discoveries.

Instead of unbroken and uneventful occupation, all these sites reveal traces of change. The early forts at Ambleside and at Castleshaw were not held for long, and it is suggested² that both were founded by Agricola and abandoned at least soon after his recall. Roughly, therefore, their history corresponds³ with that of Agricola's fort at Newstead and legionary *hiberna* at Inchtuthil. All were abandoned by the years A.D. 86-90. Elsewhere, however, there is evidence of later changes. At Hardknot⁴ there were three floors in the commandant's house and in the east corner-tower; in the tower the two lower floors at least were covered by a tell-tale layer of burnt matter. At Slack, pottery suggests that the granaries of stone were not built until about A.D. 100; and with their erection are associated alterations in the bath-house and the building of the second small fort at Castleshaw, as stamped tiles show.⁵ At

¹ Macdonald, *Roman Wall in Scotland*, p. 354.

² Tolson Memorial Museum, Huddersfield, *Handbook IV.*; *C.W.A.S. Trans.*, N.S., vol. xxi. p. 6.

³ See note 2 on p. 310; *J.R.S.*, vol. ix. p. 115.

⁴ *C.W.A.S. Trans.*, O.S., vol. xii., "tower," pp. 421-2; "house," p. 423.

⁵ Tolson Memorial Museum, Huddersfield, *Handbook IV.*

Papcastle¹ a stone fort-wall—hardly to be considered Agricolan—was found amid Domitian-Trajanic associations, as mentioned above in connection with stone walls.

Still more definite is the evidence at Corbridge, which needs explanation in more detail. On site VIII., sealed by the Stanegate of A.D. 120-40, were found three levels, all quite certainly pre-Hadrianic in origin.² The uppermost contained well-built walls of ashlar masonry; the middle consisted of mixed earth, 20 inches thick; the lowest contained wooden post-holes, driven into virgin soil, found in association with Samian shapes 29, 30, 27, and 18, and therefore of Agricolan date. Here, therefore, as the late Professor Haverfield noted,³ is an important indication of pre-Hadrianic periods. Further towards the north-east, if the two long ditches, running roughly from north to south,⁴ and the curved ditches⁵ with a gateway and *clavicula*, which face north, belong to the same system of defence, rules of castrametation are violated wholesale. But both sets of ditches belong to the first century, as the objects found in them show. At present they cannot be explained certainly, since they are too isolated; but the suggestion⁵ seems probable that the eastern set belong to the north-eastern corner of a fort. Within the area of the supposed fort was found an important coin-hoard, amid abundant traces of fire. The latest coin,⁶ in mint condition, dated to A.D. 98, and Dr H. H. Craster dated the deposit to A.D. 99-100. The hoard may be taken as certainly indicative of serious trouble at that date, but what buildings were involved will not be wholly clear until work begins once more at Corbridge, an event long overdue.

Thus, such facts as excavation has brought to light in northern England agree well with what has been provisionally deduced in Scotland. It is very gratifying also to find the most precise evidence upon Dere Street, which connected the two countries, and it seems fair to assume now that the course of events was much the same both beyond and behind the Cheviots. In England, however, the evidence for dating is rather more clear. It seems plain that before A.D. 115-7 there were two changes in Agricola's fort-system, the first in A.D. 86-90, and the second, heralded by disaster at Hardknot and at Corbridge, after A.D. 100. After A.D. 100 also, as an inscription and excavations show,⁷ there was activity in Wales at Gellygaer and at Castell Collen. While two more inscriptions,⁸ at York of A.D. 108-9, and at Lancaster

¹ See note 4 on p. 313.

² *Ibid.*, vi. p. 207.

³ *Ibid.*, xii. pp. 232-4.

⁴ *Eph. Epigr.*, vol. ix. Nos. 1031, 1032; *Cymmrodorion Soc.*, 1908-9, pp. 95-7; *Arch. Camb.* 6, vol. xiv. pp. 15, 41; coin numbered 6.

⁵ *C.I.L.*, vol. vii. No. 241; *Eph. Epigr.*, vol. vii. No. 943.

⁶ *Arch. Æl.* 3, vol. vi. pp. 76-7 and 214-5.

⁷ *Ibid.*, vii. p. 167.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 250.

of Trajan's reign, point in the same direction. It would be wrong to insist upon precise parallelism of events, but there seems to be a strong case for a wholesale consolidation of Agricola's frontier early in Trajan's reign, preceded by trouble in the north, and continuing at least until A.D. 108.

3. HISTORICAL CONCLUSIONS.

The suggestion that the Scottish forts were repaired or rebuilt at this time, therefore, fits the archæological evidence well. From a historical or strategical point of view it is still more convincing. It has been a constant and reasonable complaint that Britain figures little in history from Domitian to Hadrian. But by using such facts as we possess I venture to think it possible to begin construction of an outline. If Tacitus wrote truly and Agricola left behind him in A.D. 85-6 a province free from revolt and attack, then the reconstruction of A.D. 86-90 which appears at Newstead and elsewhere in Scotland, surely at Inchtuthil, Ardoch, and Camelton, is to be connected not with Agricola's recall, but with the withdrawal of *Legio II. Adiutrix* in A.D. 86-8.¹ If the evidence from Ambleside and Castleshaw has been read correctly,² the policy then adopted was to throw all the troops available into Caledonia and, having consolidated existing northern forts, to stand firm until the borrowed legion returned. It was hoped, I imagine, that the northward advance then would be completed. Meanwhile, Agricola had cowed the natives further south sufficiently to prevent revolt from breaking asunder a rather slightly fortified chain of roads.

The *pronunciamento* of the German armies in A.D. 88-9 changed the situation profoundly. After this, even if events had allowed it, Domitian was mistrustful and unwilling to increase any provincial governor's army. The execution of the governor of Britain, Sallustius Lucullus,³ for over-attention to military affairs points the moral. When Domitian passed away, in A.D. 96, affairs in Central Europe had become much too serious to allow any return of troops to Britain. It seems allowable, therefore, to guess that some four years later it was clear that in the north the British army held the Caledonian wolf by the ears. And the burnt layers at Corbridge and at Hardknot suggest that in or before A.D. 100 the army lost control.

Just about this time, in A.D. 102-3, Trajan sent out to Britain one of his first legates, the capable and distinguished L. Neratius Marcellus,⁴

¹ Furneaux and Anderson, *Agricola*, p. lxxv., note 1.

² *C.W.A.S. Trans.*, N.S., vol. xxi. Tolson Memorial Museum, Huddersfield, *Handbook IV*.

³ Suetonius, *Vita Domitiani*, cap. x.

⁴ *Prosopographia Imp. Romani*, vol. ii. No. 43; *C.I.L.*, vol. vii. No. 1193; the same name also fits the gap in *C.I.L.*, vol. vii. No. 1194.

whom even Domitian had trusted and advanced in the civil service. To him would fall the work of consolidating Agricola's frontier, now that the idea of advancing northwards had been abandoned. Not much yet is known about the extent of the consolidation, and it well may be the successor to Marcellus whose work can be traced at York in A.D. 108-9. But there is enough evidence to prove that reconstructions took place early in Trajan's reign at Castleshaw, Slack, Corbridge, and Hardknot; pottery, but not excavation, suggests that now the forts¹ at Manchester and Nether Denton awoke also to a new life. This brings Trajan's work to light once more in northern England; and it seems reasonable to assign to the same time a consolidation in permanent guise of forts in Scotland, in view of the close connection between Newstead and Corbridge.

Not much light is thrown on events between this time and A.D. 115-7, when the Romans were driven out of Scotland amid serious troubles. But before A.D. 114 it was found possible to extend the *census*² in the Peak District, since the *censitor*, Titus Haterius Nepos, was transferred thence to Armenia Maior, a province which existed only in A.D. 114-7. This seems to indicate that there was peace in the south.

Hadrian, beset with troubles during the first few years of his reign, endorsed Trajan's policy not to advance further north in Britain, and marked his decision by building in A.D. 122-5 his great Wall between Solway and Tyne. But the new frontier did not remove the danger of massed raids from the north, and it was still worth while to experiment in methods of barring out the Highlanders. The Antonine frontier was a new method, and Professor Haverfield's description of it as a breakwater shows the difference between it and the lines of penetration which Agricola laid down. For a few years, indeed, between A.D. 140 and A.D. 180, it looked as if the *limes imperii* might find a resting-place facing the Campsie Fells. But under the Emperor Commodus the decision was made which only the great Emperor Septimius Severus seriously attempted to revoke. After about A.D. 180 there was no permanent Roman advance beyond Redesdale and the Solway. The British army had been unable to face unremoved a crisis in the north since Domitian had reduced it to three legions.

¹ *R. Manchester*, pp. 95-6; *Archæologia*, vol. lxiv, p. 303.

² *C.I.L.*, vol. xi. No. 5213.