

Durham E-Theses

The Brigantes: a study in the early history of the North Pennines

Robert Pedley

How to cite:

Pedley, Robert (1939) *The Brigantes: a study in the early history of the North Pennines*. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/10308/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

T H E
B R I G A N T E S

A Study in the Early History
of the Northern Pennines

- by -

ROBERT PEDLEY

A Thesis presented for the Degree of Ph.D.

July, 1939.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Preface	iii
Bibliography	vii
List of Plates	xxx
List of Figures	xxxii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. HISTORICAL: (i) General Outline	3
(ii) The Ancient Sources	41
III. THE ORIGIN OF THE BRIGANTES	100
IV. EXTENT	113
V. THE ROMAN MILITARY OCCUPATION OF BRIGANTIA:	
(i) General	
(ii) Bainbridge: (a) The Antiquarian History of the Site	194
(b) Archaeological Problems	203
(c) The Place of Bainbridge in the Roman Road-system	225
VI. ECONOMIC CONDITIONS	
(i) Introductory	246
(ii) <u>Isurium Brigantum</u>	251
(iii) Villas	258
(iv) Native Settlements and Agriculture	266
(v) Native Strongholds and Dykes	291
(vi) Industry and Trade	306
VII. ART, LANGUAGE, RELIGION	
(i) Art	317
(ii) Language	319
(iii) Religion	321
VIII. CONCLUSION	330
<u>APPENDICES</u>	
<u>A.</u> A Gazetteer of Iron Age and Roman remains in Brigantia	334
<u>B.</u> Miscellaneous Foundations and Earthworks	542
<u>C.</u> Published References to Native Settlements	619
<u>D.</u> Brigantian Inscriptions	622

PREFACE

This dissertation is in the nature of prolegomena to the subject, rather than an attempt at a complete or final survey. In many respects its purpose is to indicate lines of development for future research. Such is the range and importance of the many facets that it would be impossible to devote exhaustive attention to each in one work. For instance, Isurium, the Roman capital of Brigantia, demands separate large-scale treatment as soon as full reports on the most recent excavations are made available. The geographical extent of Brigantia, too, has necessitated a selective rather than a comprehensive study of the important aspect of economic conditions generally; and a study of the native pottery is reserved for a later specialist examination which cannot fail to be of the first importance.

It is hoped that the selection of really typical areas and sites will clarify the problems under discussion by avoiding over-congestion of material at this early stage, while ensuring that the selective principle shall not entail the omission of other matter of first importance, or the distortion of the final picture. Thus, while the description of typical native settlements deliberately draws its illustrations mainly from Swaledale and Wensleydale, reference is repeatedly made to the outstanding parallel features of other districts which have also been carefully studied. Again, while no more than

a brief summary of the general military occupation of Brigantia is necessary as a background to the main subject, a full consideration of the history, position and significance of the fort at Bainbridge is incorporated, as a particularly suitable illustration of Roman policy in the Pennines as a whole, but covering an area which has already received special consideration from the entirely different angle of the native occupation. The short sections on art, language and religion, included for the sake of completeness, are not intended to be more than brief summaries of the existing evidence.

The Gazetteer, while aiming at providing a convenient source of reference to the finds of the period, is by no means merely a collection of previous records. Wherever an opportunity for fieldwork offered, it has been gladly seized; and it is therefore possible to incorporate the results of much first-hand information. This also applies particularly to the appendix on miscellaneous earthworks - a field rich in information, where it is hoped in future to expand the investigation so far undertaken. For the benefit of future students an accurate reference for each site to the 1 inch O. S. Maps is given in these Appendices.

While these various aspects all invite further close attention, it has been necessary first of all to give detailed consideration to the purely historical evidence available for

the Brigantes. It was of fundamental importance that their true significance in the history of the Roman occupation of Britain should, as far as possible, be clearly established before any elaboration of the evidence for their social and economic life was to be attempted. It was therefore essential that a completely unbiassed reconsideration of the evidence furnished by the ancient sources should be undertaken forthwith.

In the pursuit of learning covering such a wide field, my obligations are many, and I cannot hope to mention by name all whose ready assistance has been accorded in the course of the past three years. Certain particular acknowledgments are to be found in the text; more generally, I have received the utmost consideration and courtesy from the librarians, museum curators, land owners and tenants, and numerous other people with whom I have been brought into contact. I have been fortunate in being able to make use of much unpublished material of local antiquaries and other scholars; needless to say, however, all photographs have been taken during the course of my own field-work. To three persons in particular I owe a special debt. Miss A. M. H. Kitson Clark, with typical generosity, was ever ready to lay at my disposal her extensive knowledge of Roman Yorkshire, and it is largely through her assistance that these portions of the Gazetteer, while one cannot hope that they are complete, have achieved their present compass. I am also grateful for permission to

quote one or two extracts from her private correspondence on matters archaeological. It is impossible adequately to express my appreciation of the guidance and advice which I have throughout received from Mr. Birley and Mr. Richmond. Only those who have had the privilege of working with them can fully realise the true value and constant encouragement afforded by this association. Finally, original research was rendered possible by the financial assistance of the Council of the Durham Colleges and the North Riding Education Committee, through the award of a Fellowship and a Research Exhibition respectively.

BIBLIOGRAPHYAbbreviation

- Abercromby, Hon. J. - Bronze Age Pottery (Oxford 1912)
- Abraham, R. and Clark M. K. - Circular summarising
the work at Bainbridge in 1931
- Adel: Plan of the excavations at, by YAS. RAC
n. d. In YAS library, 28 HN 8)
- Aikin, J. - A description of the Country round
Manchester (London, 1795) Manchester
- Allcroft, A.H. - Earthwork of England (London,
1908)
- Allen, J. R. - Celtic Art in Pagan and Christian
Times (London, 1904)
- Allen, T. - History of Yorkshire (6 vols.,
London, 1828-32) Yorks
- Ammianus Marcellinus (Loebe Classical Library,
ed. J. C. Rolfe 1935) Amm. Marc.
- Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology A.A.A.
- Antiquaries Journal Ant.J.
- Antiquary, The
- Antiquity
- Archaeologia Arch.
- Archaeologia Aeliana, ser. 1-4 A.A. 1-4
- Archaeologia Cambrensis Arch. Camb
- Archaeological Institute Proceedings P.A.I.
- Archaeological Journal Arch. J.
- Archaeological Review (4 vols. 1888-90) Arch. Review
- Atkinson, D. - The Roman fort at Ribchester
(3rd. ed. Manchester, 1928) Ribchester

Abbreviation

- Atkinson, D. - The Governors of Britain from Claudius to Diocletian (J.R.S., xii 60-73)
- Bainbridge: Leeds Philosophical Society, Proceedings of the Literary and Historical Section; Vol. I, Part vi, 261-84: R. G. Collingwood, Excavations at Brough-by-Bainbridge, in 1926 Report 1.
- do. Vol. II, Part ii, 77-85: J. P. Droop, Excavations at Brough-by-Bainbridge in 1928 Report 2
- do. Vol. II, Part iv, 234-45: Droop, Excavations at Brough-by-Bainbridge, Second Interim Report, 1929 Report 3
- do. Vol. III Part i, 16-38: Droop, Excavations at Brough-by-Bainbridge in 1931, and Remarks on the Bainbridge Finds, 1928, 1929, and 1931 Report 4
- Baines, E. - History of Lancashire (London 1835) Lancs, (1835)
- do. - do. (Ed. Harland and Hertford, 2 vols., 1868-70) do. (H)
- do. - do. (Ed. Croston, 1887-93) do. (C)
- Barwick-in-Elmet: Plan of Wendel Hill and Hall Tower Hill, by H. S. Chorley (n.d. In YAS library, 28 HN 20)
- Bateman Collection of Antiquities in the Sheffield Public Museum, Catalogue of the (London, 1899) Bateman Collection
- Bede, Historia Eccles: in Baedae Opera Historica (ed. C. Plummer, 1896) Hist. Ecc.
- Birley, E. B. - Excavations at Birrens, 1936-7 (PSAS, lxxii, 275-347)
- Bayeⁿische Vorgeschichtsfreund, Der.
- do. - A Note on the date of the Vallum (AA 4, xi, 146 f)

Abbreviation

- Blackpool Herald
- Bloch, M. - Les Caractères originaux de l'histoire rurale française (London, 1931)
- Blome, R. - Britannia; or a Geographical Description of the Kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland, etc. (London, 1673) Britannia
- do. - Yorkshire (with maps; reprinted from the Britannia) (London, 1673)
- Bogg, E. - The Wild Borderland of Richmondshire (London, Leeds, Darlington and Hawes, 1909) Richmondshire
- Bowman, W. - Reliquiae Antiquae Eboracenses (Leeds, 1855) Reliq. Ant. Ebor.
- Boyd, W. and Shuffreys, W.A. - Littondale, past and present (Leeds, 1893)
- Bulletins of the Roman Antiquities Committee, Yorkshire Archaeological Society (typescript) B.R.A.C.
- Bradford Antiquary Bradford Ant.
- Brierley, J. - Prehistoric Saddleworth (Oldham, 1910)
- British Archaeological Association Journal B.A.A.J
- British Museum, Guide to the Antiquities of the Bronze Age (Oxford, 1920) B.M.G.B.A.
- British Museum, Guide to the Antiquities of the Early Iron Age (Oxford, 1925) B.M.G.E.I.A.
- British Museum, Guide to the Antiquities of Roman Britain (Oxford, 1922) B.M.G.R.B.
- Britton, J. and Brayley, E.W. - The Beauties of England and Wales, vol. ix, Lancashire, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire (London 1807) vol. xv, Westmorland (London, 1814)
- Brooke, G. C. - The Philippus in the West and the Belgic Invasions of Britain (NC 5, xiii 88-138)

	<u>Abbreviation</u>
Brown, G. H. - <u>Victoria Cave</u> (Settle, 1925)	
Bruce, J. C. - <u>The Roman Wall</u> (3rd ed. London, 1867)	<u>Wall</u>
do. - <u>Handbook to the Roman Wall</u> (London 3rd ed. 1885)	
Bruton, F. A. - <u>Excavations at the Roman Forts at Castleshaw</u> (Manchester, 1911)	<u>Castleshaw</u>
do. - <u>The Roman fort at Manchester</u> (Manchester, 1909)	<u>Manchester</u>
do. (ed) - <u>Excavations at Melandra Castle, Glossop.</u> (Manchester, 1909)	<u>Melandra</u>
Burton, T. - <u>The History and Antiquities of Hemingbrough</u> (ed. Raine, York, 1888)	<u>Hemingbrough</u>
<u>Cambridge Ancient History</u>	<u>C.A.H.</u>
Camden, W. - <u>Britannia</u> (5th ed., London, 1600)	
do. - <u>do.</u> (6th ed. London, 1607 first folio)	
do. - <u>do.</u> (ed. Gibson, London, 1695)	<u>Gibson's Camden</u>
do. - <u>do.</u> (ed. Gough, 4 vols., London, (a) 1786, (b) 1806)	<u>Gough's Camden</u>
(1806 ed. used except where otherwise stated)	
Carr, J. - <u>Annals and Stories of Colne and Neighbourhood</u> (Manchester, 1878)	<u>Colne</u>
Cassius Dio - <u>Roman History</u> (9 vols. ed. Cary, London, 1917; Loeb Class. Lib.)	
Childe, U. G. - <u>The Danube in Prehistory</u> (Oxford, 1930)	
do. - <u>Excavations at Castlelaw, Midlothian, and the small forts of North Britain</u> (<u>Ant. J.</u> , xiii 1-12)	

- | | <u>Abbreviation</u> |
|---|---------------------|
| Clark, M.K. - <u>A Gazetteer of Roman remains in East Yorkshire</u> (Roman Malton and district Report No. 5 Leeds, 1935) | <u>E. Yorks</u> |
| do. - <u>Where were the Brigantes?</u> (<u>YAJ</u> , xxxiv, 80-7) | |
| do. - <u>Some invasions of Yorkshire</u> (<u>YAJ</u> , xxxi. 320-30) | |
| Clarke, J. - <u>The Roman Fort at Cadder</u> (Glasgow, 1933) | <u>Cadder</u> |
| Codrington, T. - <u>Roman Roads in Britain</u> (London, 1928) | |
| Cohen, H. - <u>Monnaier Frappees soris l'Empire Romain, communement appellees Medailles Imperiales</u> (2nd ed., Paris and London, 1880-92) | <u>Cohen</u> |
| Collingwood, R.G. - <u>The Archaeology of Roman Britain</u> (London, 1930) | |
| do. - <u>Roman Britain</u> (Oxford, 1932) | |
| do. - <u>Britain, in An Economic Survey of Rome III</u> (ed. Tenney Frank, Baltimore, 1937) | <u>Econ. Survey</u> |
| do. - <u>An introduction to the prehistory of Cumberland, Westmorland and Lancashire north of the Sands</u> (<u>CW</u> 2, xxxiii 163-200) | |
| do. - <u>Romans^o - Celtic Art in Northumbria</u> (<u>Arch.</u> , lxxx 37-58) | |
| do. (with Myres, J.N.L.) - <u>Roman Britain and the English Settlements</u> (Oxford History of England, vol. I 2nd ed. Oxford, 1937) | <u>O.H.E., 1</u> |
| Collingwood, W. G. - <u>Northumbrian Crosses of the Pre-Norman Age</u> (London, 1927) | |
| Collyer, R., and Turner, J.H. - <u>Ilkley: Ancient and Modern</u> (Otley and Leeds, 1885) | <u>Ilkley</u> |

Colman, F. S. - History of Barwick in Elmet
(Leeds, 1908)

Congress of Archaeological Societies and the Earth-works Committee, Annual Reports of

Corder, P. - Petriana (reprinted from
Discovery, Dec. 1937)

do. - The Roman pottery at Crambeck
Castle Howard (Roman Malton and
district, Report No.1, York, 1928) Crambeck

do. - The Defences of the Roman fort
at Malton (Roman Malton and district,
Report no.2, 1930) Malton

do. - The Roman pottery at Throlam,
Holme-on-Spalding Moor, East Yorkshire
(Roman Malton and district, Report No.3;
Hull, 1930)

do. and J. L. Kirk - A Roman Villa at Langton near
Malton East Yorkshire (Roman Malton and
district, Report No.4; Oxford, 1932) Langton

do. and T. Romans - Excavations at the Roman
Fort at Brough-on-Humber Reports 1-4,
Hull, 1934-7 Brough 1-4

do. and M. I. Birley - A pair of Fourth
Century Roman-British pottery kilns
near Crambeck (Ant. J. xvii 392-413) Crambeck
Types

Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, vol.VII ed.E.Hübner
(Berlin, 1873) C I L

Cowen, J. D. - Two Bronze Swords from Ewart Park,
Wooler (AA 4, x.185-98)

Crabtree, John - A concise history of the parish
and vicarage of Halifax (Halifax, 1836) Halifax

Craven Herald

Crawford, O. G. S. - Castle Dykes (British Assoc-
iation Excursion Handbook, Leeds, 1927)

- Crawford, O. G. S. - Man and his Past (Oxford 1921)
- do. - Arthur and his battles (Antiquity,
ix 277-91)
- Crowther, H. - General Guide to the Museum of the
Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society
(Leeds, 1897)
- Cumberland & Westmorland Antiquarian & Archaeological
Society Transactions, series 2 C.W.²
- Cunnington, R. H. - Military Engineering in the Early
Iron Age (B.A.A.J., n.s. xl. 206-22)
- Curle, J. - A Roman frontier-post and its people:
the Roman fort at Newstead, near Melrose
(Glasgow, 1911) Newstead
- Curwen, E.C. - Prehistoric Agriculture in Britain
(Antiquity, i. 261-89)
- do. - Ancient Cultivations at Grassington,
Yorkshire (Antiquity, ii. 168-72)
- Darlington & Stockton Times
- Davies, O. - Roman Mines in Europe (Oxford, 1935)
- Dawkins, Sir W. Boyd - Cave Hunting (London, 1874)
- Denham Tracts (ed. Hardy; London, Vol. I 1892;
Vol. II, 1895)
- Derbyshire, Victoria County History of, Vol. I V.C.H.
Derbyshire
- Dessau, H. - Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae
(3 vols; Berlin, 1892-1916) I.L.S.
- Dexter, T. F. G. - The Pagan Origin of Fairs
(New Knowledge Press, Cornwall; n.d.)
- Diodorus Siculus (ed. Fischer; Teubner, 1905)
- Dottin, G. - La Langue Gauloise (Paris, 1918)
- Drake, F. - Eboracum etc (London, 1736)

	<u>Abbreviation</u>
<u>Durham & Northumberland Antiquarian & Archaeological Society, Transactions</u>	
<u>Durham, Victoria County History of, Vols I - III</u> (London, 1905-28)	<u>V.C.H.D.</u>
<u>East Riding Antiquarian Society Transactions</u>	<u>E.R.A.S.T.</u>
Edwards, W. - <u>Early History of the North Riding</u> (London, 1924)	
Ekwall, E. - <u>English River Names</u> (Oxford, 1928)	
do. - <u>Place Names of Lancashire</u> (Manchester, 1922)	<u>P.N.L.</u>
do. (ed.) - <u>Oxford Dictionary of English Place Names</u> (Oxford, 1936)	<u>O.D.E.P.N.</u>
Elgee, F. - <u>Early Man in North East Yorkshire</u> (Gloucester, 1930)	<u>Early Man</u>
do. - <u>The Romans in Cleveland</u> (Middlesbrough, 1923)	
do. F. and H. W. - <u>The Archaeology of Yorkshire</u> (London, 1933)	<u>Arch.Yorks</u>
<u>English Historical Review</u>	<u>E.H.R.</u>
<u>Ephemera Epigraphica</u> iii, iv (ed. Hubner); vii, ix (ed. Haverfield)	<u>E.E.</u>
Evans, E. - <u>The Sword-bearers</u> (<u>Antiquity</u> , iv 157-72)	
do. - <u>The bronze spear-head in Great Britain & Ireland</u> (<u>Archaeologia</u> , lxxxiii 187-202)	
Evans, Sir John - <u>The Ancient Bronze Implements, Weapons, and Ornaments of Great Britain & Ireland</u> (London, 1881)	<u>A.B.I.</u>
do. - <u>The Coins of the Ancient Britons</u> (London, 1864)	<u>A.B.C.</u>
Fallow, T. M. (ed.) - <u>Memorials of Old Yorkshire</u> (London, 1909) (c.I. <u>Prehistoric Yorkshire</u> , by George Clinch; c.II, <u>Roman Yorkshire</u> by J.N. Dickons)	

AbbreviationFinancial News

- Fishwick, H. - History of Garstang
(2 vols., Manchester, 1878-9) Garstang
- do. - History of the Parish of Kirkham
(Manchester, 1874) Kirkham
- do. - History of Poulton-le-Fylde
(Manchester, 1880) Poulton-le-Fylde
- do. - History of Rochdale
(Rochdale and London, 1889) Rochdale
- Forrest, J. and Grainger W. - Two pamphlets,
(a) Rambles on Rombalds Moor
(b) Addingham (Counterhill) (1868)
- Fox, Sir Cyril - The Archaeology of the Cambridge Region (Cambridge, 1923)
- do. - The Personality of Britain
(Cardiff, 1932)
- Fronto, M. Cornelius - Correspondence
(ed. C.R.Haines, 2 vols., 1920,
Loebe Classical Library)
- Gale, T. and R. - Antonini Itiner Britanniarum
(London, 1709)
- do. R. and S. - Reliquiae Galeanae
(London, 1782)
- do. R. - An Essay towards the Recovery of
the Courses of the Four Great Roman Ways
(In Hearne's Leland, VI 108-40)
- Gentleman's Magazine G.M.
- Gentleman's Magazine Library of Roman Remains
(2 vols., London, 1887) G.M.L.R.R.
- Gentleman's Magazine Library: Archaeology
(2 vols., ed. G. L. Gomme, London, 1886) G.M.L.A.
- Gill, T. - Vallis Eboracensis (2 vols., 1852)

	<u>Abbreviation</u>
Gillam, J. P. - <u>A Resurvey of Roman Derbyshire</u> (MSS thesis in the Archaeological Seminar, Hatfield College, Durham)	<u>Derbyshire</u>
Gough, J. W. - <u>The Mines of Mendip</u> (Oxford, 1930)	
Gough, R. - <u>British Topography</u> (2 vols., London, 1780)	
Greenwell, W. - <u>British Barrows</u> (Oxford, 1877)	
Guest, J. - <u>Historic Notices of Rotherham</u> (folio, Worksop, 1879)	<u>Rotherham</u>
 <u>Halifax Antiquarian Society Transactions</u>	
<u>Halifax Guardian</u>	
Hardwick, C. - <u>History of Preston</u> (Preston, 1857)	<u>Preston</u>
Hargrove, E. - <u>The history of the castle, town and forest of Knaresborough</u> (Knaresborough, 1798)	<u>Knaresborough</u>
Harrison, W. - <u>An Archaeological Survey of Lancashire</u> (London, 1896)	<u>Survey</u>
Haverfield, F. - <u>MS Index of Roman sites in Yorkshire</u> , in the Haverfield Library, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford	<u>Haverfield</u> <u>MSS</u>
do. - <u>The Romanisation of Roman Britain</u> (4th ed. Macdonald, Oxford, 1923)	
do. - <u>The Corbridge inscription to Brigantia</u> (<u>AA3</u> , vii. 176-7)	
do. and Macdonald, G. - <u>The Roman Occupation of Britain</u> (Oxford, 1924)	
Hawkes, C. F. C. - <u>Hill-Forts</u> , (<u>Antiquity</u> , V. 60-97)	
Hawkes, C. F. C., Myres, J. N. L., and Stevens, C.G. - <u>St. Catharine's Hill, Winchester</u> (Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society, Vol. XI 1930)	

Abbreviation

- Henderson, W. - Folk Lore of the Northern Counties
(London, 1879)
- Herodian, Ab excessu divi Marci (ed. Mendelssohn, 1883)
- Heslington, J. - Roman camps in the neighbourhood
of Ripon (Ripon, 1867)
- Hill, G. F. - Cartimandua (NC³, xvii 293-301)
- Hodgson, J. - History of Northumberland
(6 vols., Newcastle, 1858-85) Northumberland
- Holder, A. - Alt-Celtischer Sprachochatz
(Leipzig, Vol. I 1896; Vol. II 1904)
- Horne, G. - Roman York (London, 1924)
- Horsley, J. - Britannia Romana (London, 1732) BR
with MS notes by T. D. Whitaker
- Hulbert, C. A. - Annals of Almondbury (London, 1882)
- Hunter, J. - Hallamshire: The history and topo-
graphy of the parish of Sheffield, etc.
(London, 1819) Hallamshire
- do. - South Yorkshire: The history and
topography of the deanery of Doncaster
(London; Vol. I 1828; Vol. II, 1831) S. Yorks
- Huntingford, G. W. B. - Ancient Agriculture
(Antiquity, vi, 327-37)
- Hurst, A. - Catalogue of the Boynton Collection
of Yorkshire pottery (York, 1922)
- Hutchinson, W. - View of Northumberland
(Newcastle, 1778)
- I'Anson, W. M. - Castles of the North Riding
(YAJ, xxii. 303-99)
- Ingledeu, C. J. D. - The History and Antiquities
of North Allerton (London, 1858)
- Itinerarium Antonini (ed. Otto Cuntz, Leipzig 1929) Ant. Itin.

Invenalis, D. Junii - Saturae XIV
(ed. J. D. Duff, Cambridge, 1929)

Jackson, J. W. - Contributions to the Archaeology
of the Manchester region (North West
Naturalist, June, 1936)

do. - Preliminary report on the explor-
ation of "Dog Holes" Cave, Warton Crag
near Carnforth, Lancashire (LCAS, xxvii
1-32)

do. - Further report on the explorations
at Dog Holes, Warton Crag, Lancs.,
with remarks on the contents of two
adjacent caves (LCAS, xxviii 59-81)

do. - Third report on the explorations
at Dog Holes, Warton Crag, Lancs.
(LCAS, xxx 99-130)

James, John - The history and topography of
Bradford (London and Bradford, 1841)

Bradford

Johnston, H. M. - Roman Lancashire (MSS un-
published thesis in the Archaeological
Seminar, Hatfield College, Durham)

Jones, H. S. - Companion to Roman history
(Oxford, 1912)

Journal of Hellenic Studies

Journal of Roman Studies

JRS

Kendrick, T. D. - The Druids (London, 1927)

do. and Hawkes, C. F. C. - Archaeology in
England and Wales, 1914-31 (London 1932)

Kent B.W.J. and Clark M.K. - A Roman settlement
at Wetherby (YAJ xxxi, 170-84)

King, E. - Munimenta Antiqua (4 vols. London
1799-1806)

	<u>Abbreviation</u>
<u>Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society Transactions</u>	<u>LCAS</u>
<u>Lancashire and Cheshire Historical Society Transactions</u>	<u>LCHS</u>
<u>Lancashire and Cheshire Historical and Genealogical Notes</u>	
<u>Lancashire, Victoria County History of</u> (London, Vol. I, 1906; Vol. II, 1908)	<u>VCH Lancs.</u>
Leeds, E. T. - <u>Celtic Ornament in the British Isles down to A.D. 700</u> (Oxford, 1933)	<u>Celtic Ornament</u>
<u>Leeds Mercury</u>	
<u>Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society, Proceedings</u>	
do. - <u>Proceedings of the Literary and Historical Section</u>	
Leigh, C. - <u>Natural History of Lancashire, etc.</u> (Oxford, 1700)	<u>Lancs</u>
Leland, J. - <u>Antiquarii de rebus Britannicis Collectanea</u> (6 vols. ed. T. Hearne; Oxford, 1715)	
do. - <u>Itinerary</u> (2nd ed. (Hearne) 9 vols. Oxford, 1744; 5th ed. (L. T. Smith) 5 vols. London, 1906-10)	<u>Hearne's Leland Smith's Leland</u>
Lewis, S. - <u>Topographical Dictionary of England</u> (5th ed. 4 vols. 1845)	<u>Topog.Dict.</u>
Lofthouse Hall Camp, near Wakefield: Sketch plan and notes, by A. Raistrick 1931 (In <u>YAS</u> library, 28 HN 50)	
<u>London, Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of</u>	<u>PSA</u>
do. - <u>Society of Antiquaries Minute Book</u>	
do. - <u>Society of Antiquaries, Catalogue of Antiquities in the possession of</u> (London, 1847)	

Abbreviation

- Longstaffe, W. H. - Richmondshire (London and Richmond, 1852)
- Lonsdale Magazine (ed. Briggs)
- Lucas, J. - Studies in Nidderdale (London, 1882) Nidderdale
- Macdonald, Sir George - The Roman Wall in Scotland (2nd ed. Oxford, 1934) RWS
- do. - Agricola in Britain (London, 1932)
- do. - Roman Britain 1914-28 (British Academy Supplemental Papers, no. VI London, 1931)
- do. - Rome in the Middle East (Antiquity, viii 373-80)
- Maclauchlan, H. - Memoir written during a survey of the Watling Street from the Tees to the Scottish Border (London, 1852) Memoir
- do. - The Roman roads, camps, and other earthworks, between the Tees and the Swale, etc. (Arch. J.,)
- Magna Britannia Antiqua et Nova (6 vols. London, 1720-31) MBAN
- Manchester Guardian
- Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society Transactions
- Mattingley, H., and Sydenham, E. A. - The Roman Imperial Coinage (vols. i - v; Spink, 1923-38) M & S
- Mawer, A. - The Place Names of Northumberland and Durham (Cambridge, 1920)
- May, T. - The Roman forts at Elslack (in YAJ xxi, 113-67) Elslack
- do. - The Roman forts of Templebrough near Rotherham (Rotherham, 1922) Templebrough

Abbreviation

- May, T. - Warrington's Roman remains
(Warrington, 1904)
- Mayhall, J. - The Annals of York, Leeds, Bradford,
etc. (Leeds, 1860)
- Miller, E. - The History and Antiquities of Doncaster Doncaster
and its Vicinity (Doncaster, n.d.; accompany-
ing map dated 1804)
- Miller, S. N. - Note on an inscription from Birrens
(Dumfriesshire) (JRS, xxvii 208-9)
- do. - The Roman fort at Balmuildy Balmuildy
(Glasgow, 1922)
- Monumenta Historica Britannica (ed. Petrie and
Sharpe, 1848)
- Morehouse, H. J. - History and Topography of Kirkburton
Kirkburton (Huddersfield, 1861)
- Morkill, J. W. - The parish of Kirkby Malhamdale Kirkby
in the West Riding of Yorkshire Malhamdale
(Gloucester, 1933)
- Mortimer, J. R. - Forty years' researches in the Forty years
burial mounds of East Yorkshire
(London, 1905)
- Naturalist, The
- Nennius - Historia Brittonum (ed. Mommsen:
Mon. Hist. Germ., chronica minora,
vol. iii, 1896)
- Newbigging, T. - History of Rossendale Rossendale
(Bacup, 1868)
- Newcomen Society Transactions
- Newton, Charles - Map of British and Roman
Yorkshire (1846) Newton's Map
- North Western Naturalist, The
- Notes and Queries

	<u>Abbreviation</u>
<u>Notitia Dignitatum</u> (ed. Otto Seeck; Berlin, 1876)	<u>Not. Dig.</u>
<u>Numismatic Chronicle</u> - series 1-5	<u>NC 1-5</u>
<u>Numismatic Journal</u>	
<u>Obergerm - Ratische Limes</u>	<u>ORL</u>
Ordnance Survey Map of Roman Britain (2nd ed., 1928)	<u>OSRB</u>
O'Neil, B. H. St.J. - <u>Excavations at Breiddin Hill Camp, Montgomeryshire, 1933-5</u> (<u>Arch. Camb.</u> (1937) 88-98)	
do. <u>Excavations at Titterstone Clee Camp, Shropshire</u> (<u>Ant. J.</u> , xiv. 13-39)	
Orwin, C. S. and C. S. - <u>The Open Fields</u> (Oxford, 1938)	
<u>Palatine Note Book</u> (Manchester, 1881-4)	
Parkinson, Rev. T. - <u>Yorkshire Legends and Traditions</u> (London, 1888)	
Parsons, E. - <u>History of Leeds</u> (2 vols., Leeds, 1834)	<u>Leeds</u>
Pauly - Wissowa - <u>Realencyclopädie</u> (Stuttgart, 1893-)	<u>PW</u>
Pausanias - <u>Description of Greece</u> (ed. Jones & Omerod, London, 1926) (Loebe Class.Lib)	
Peake, H. J. - <u>The Bronze Age and the Celtic World</u> (London, 1922)	
Pearson, F. R. - <u>Roman Yorkshire</u> (London, 1936)	
Pedley, R. - <u>The Roman Fort at Brough-by-Bainbridge, in Wensleydale</u> (MS thesis in Archaeological Seminar, Hatfield College, Durham)	<u>Bainbridge MSS</u>
Pelham, Sir H. - <u>Essays in Roman History</u> (Oxford, 1911)	
Petch, J. A. - <u>Early Man in the Huddersfield district</u> (Huddersfield, 1924)	<u>Early Man</u>

	<u>Abbreviation</u>
Phillips, J. - <u>The Rivers, Mountains and Sea-coast of Yorkshire</u> (London, 1855)	<u>Yorks.</u>
<u>Philosophical Society, Transactions of the Royal</u> (old and new editions)	1-2
Pliny the elder: - <u>Natural history</u> (6 vols., ed. Bostock & Riley; Bohn, 1855-7)	<u>Nat. Hist.</u>
Pontefract, Ella - <u>Swaledale</u> (London, 1934)	
do. - <u>Wensleydale</u> (London, 1936)	
do. and Marie Hartley - <u>Wharfedale</u> (London, 1938)	
<u>Prosopographia Imperii Romani</u> (2nd ed) (Berlin, 1897)	
Pryce, T. Davies, and Birley, Eric - <u>The Fate of Agricola's Northern Conquests</u> (<u>JRS</u> , xxviii 141-52)	
Pryme: <u>Diary of Abraham de la Pryme, the Yorkshire Antiquary</u> (Surtees Society Publications, LIV)	<u>Pryme's Diary</u>
Ptolemy, <u>Geographia</u> (ed. Müller, Vol I Paris, 1883)	<u>Geog.</u>
Raine, Rev. J. - <u>History of Auckland Castle</u> (Durham, 1852)	
Raistrick, A. - <u>The Bronze Age settlement of the north of England</u> (<u>AA4</u> , viii 149-65)	
do. - <u>Prehistoric Cultivations at Grassington, West Yorkshire</u> (<u>YAJ</u> xxxiii 166-74)	
do. - <u>The Bronze Age in West Yorkshire</u> (<u>YAJ</u> , xxix 354-65)	
do. - <u>Roman remains and roads in West Yorkshire</u> (<u>YAJ</u> , xxxi 214-23)	
do. - <u>Notes on lead mining and smelting in West Yorkshire</u> (<u>Newcomen Soc. Trans.</u> vii 81-96)	
do. - <u>Iron-Age settlements in West Yorkshire</u> (<u>YAJ</u> , xxxiv 115-50)	

- Raistrick, A. and Chapman, S. E. - The Lynchet Groups of Upper Wharfedale, Yorkshire (Antiquity, iii 165-81)
- Rauthmell, R. - Antiquitates Bremetonacenses (1st ed. 1746; 2nd ed. 1824) Antiq. Brem
- Ravennas Cosmographia (ed. Pinder & Parthey Berlin, 1860) Ravennas
- Reliquary and Illustrated Archaeologist, The
- Richmond, I. A., - Huddersfield in Roman Times (Huddersfield, 1925) Huddersfield
- do. - Roman Lead Sealings from Brough-under-Stainmore (CW², xxxvi 104-25)
- do. - A fourth-century disturbance in the Pennines (YAJ, xxvii 211-8)
- Riley, W. - The Settle District 1923)
- Ripon Manual (Yorks. Arch. and Topog. Assoc. pub.; Ripon, 1874)
- Ross, F. - Legendary Yorkshire (Hull and London, 1892)
- Rostovtzeff, M. - Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire (Oxford, 1926) Social and Econ. Hist.
- Roth, B. - A large hoard of gold and silver Ancient British coins of the Brigantes, found at South Feniby, Lincolnshire, in 1906 (NC⁴, viii 17-55)
- do. - A unique Ancient British gold stater of the Brigantes (? A pattern) (NC⁴, ix 7-9)
- Roth, H. L. - The Yorkshire Coiners, and Old and Prehistoric Halifax (Halifax, 1906)
- Roy, W. - Military Antiquities of the Romans in Britain (London, 1793)
- Rylands, T. G. - The Geography of Ptolemy Elucidated (Dublin, 1893)

- Scarth, H. M. - Roman Britain (n.d.)
- Scotland, Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of PSAS
- Scriptores Historiae Augustae (ed. David Magie,
Loebe Classical Library, 1930)
- Seneca, Lucius Annaeus - Apocolocyntosis (ed. Rouse,
Loebe Class. Lib. 1913)
- Sheffield and Rotherham Independent
- ShIPLEY Times
- Silius Italicus - Punica (ed. J. D. Duff, Loeb Class.
Lib. 1934)
- Simpson, H. T. - Archaeologia Adulensis (London, 1879)
- Smith, A. H. - Place Names of the North Riding of
Yorkshire (Cambridge, 1928) PNNRY
- Smith C. R. - Collectanea Antiqua (7 vols. 1848-80)
- Smith H. E. - Archaeology in the Mersey district,
1867 (Liverpool, 1868; reprinted from LCHS)
- Smith, W. - The History and Antiquities of Morley
(London, 1876) Morley
- Speight, H. - One hundred and eighty pleasant walks
round Bradford, etc. (Bradford, 1890) Bradford
- do. - Nidderdale and the garden of the Nidd,
etc. (London, 1894) Nidderdale
- do. - Romantic Richmondshire (London, 1897) Richmondshire
- do. - Two thousand years of Tadcaster
history, etc. (London, 1902) Tadcaster
- do. - Upper Nidderdale, from Nun Monkton
to Whernside (London, 1906) Upper
Nidderdale
- do. - Upper Wharfedale (London, 1900) Upper
Wharfedale
- Steer, K. A. - The Archaeology of Roman Durham
(Ph.D. thesis in Durham University Library) RD

Abbreviation

- Stevens, C. E. - Gildas and the Civitates of Britain (EHR, lli. 193-203)
- do. - A Roman inscription from Beltingham (AA4, xi 138-45)
- Strabo - Geography (8 vols. ed. Jones, London 1917) (Loebe Class. Lib)
- Stukeley, W. - Diaries and Letters i,ii,iii (Surtees Society Publications, vols. 73 (1880) Stukeley Corr.
- do. - Itinerarium Curiosum (2nd ed. London, 1776)
- Sumner, H. - Excavations in New Forest Roman Pottery Sites (Chiswick Press, 1927)
- Sutherland, C. H. V. - Coinage and Currency in Roman Britain (Oxford, 1937) CCRB
- Sykes, J. - Huddersfield and its vicinity (Huddersfield, 1898) Huddersfield
- Tacitaeum, Lexicon (ed. A. Gerber and A. Greef; Leipzig, 1903)
- Tacitus, P. Cornelius - De Vita Agricolae (ed. Furneaux and Anderson, Oxford, 1922) Agric.
- do. - Historiarum Libri (Oxford text) Hists.
- do. - Annalium Libri (Oxford text) Annals.
- Thoresby, R. - Biographia Britannica (2nd ed. 1778) Biog. Brit.
- do. - Diary (ed. Hunter, 2 vols., London, 1830)
- do. - Ducatus Leodiensis (2nd ed. Whitaker, Leeds and Wakefield, 1816) Ducatus
- Thoresby Society Publications
- Turner, J. H. - Ancient Bingley (Bingley, 1897) Bingley
- do. - History of Brighouse and Rastrick (Bingley, 1893) Brighouse

Abbreviation

- Varley, W. J. - Further excavations at Maiden Castle, Bickerton, 1935 (AAA, xxiii 101-12)
- Villy, F. - A Roman road North-west from Overborough (CW², xxxvii, 49-51)
- do. - The Roman road from Chester to York, beyond Slack, and the entrenchment near Cleckheaton (reprinted from Bradford Ant., n.s., Pt. 26, Vol.vi, 1933)
- do. - The Roman passage of Airedale (reprinted from Bradford Ant., n.s., Pt.27, Vol. vi, 1935)
- do. - The Bainbridge-Ilkley Roman road, and the intermediate fortification at Conistone (reprinted from Bradford Ant., n.s., Pt.28 Vol. vi, 1936)
- do. - The Craven Way: The Roman road from York to Carlisle via Settle (reprinted from Bradford Ant., n.s. Pt.29, Vol.vi, 1938)
- Wagner, Friedrich - Prehistoric fortifications in Bavaria (Antiquity, ii 43-55)
- Walker, J. W. - Wakefield: its History and People (Wakefield, 1934) Wakefield
- Wardell, J. - Historical notices of Ilkley, Rombolds Moor, etc., (Leeds, 1881) Ilkley
- do. - Antiquities of Leeds (Leeds, 1853) Leeds
- Watkin, W. T. - Roman Lancashire (Liverpool, 1883) Lancs.
- Watson, John - History and Antiquities of Halifax (London, 1775) Halifax
- do. - do. (2nd ed. Leyland, London and Halifax, n.d.)
- Watson, W. J. - The History of the Celtic Place Names of Scotland (Edinburgh and London, 1926)

- Wellbeloved, C. - A descriptive account of the Antiquities in the grounds and in the Museum of the Yorkshire Philosophical Society (4th ed., York, 1861)
- do. - Eburacum, etc. (York and London 1842)
- Westmorland: Royal Commission's Inventory of Historical Monuments in (1936) RCHM
Westmorland
- Wheeler, R. E. M. - Prehistoric and Roman Wales (Oxford, 1925)
- do. and T. V. - Verulam: A Belgic and two Roman cities (Oxford, 1936)
- Whellan, T. - History and Topography of the City of York and the North Riding (Beverley; Vol.I, 1857; Vol.II, 1859) NR
- Whitaker, J. - History of Manchester (London 1st ed. 1771-5
2nd ed. 2 vols. 1773) Manchester
(A)
(B)
- Whitaker, T. D. - History of Craven (London; 2nd ed. 1812; 3rd ed. 1878) Craven
- do. - Loidis and Elmete (Leeds and Wakefield, 1816) Loidis
- do. - Musaeum Thoresbyanum (in Ducatus) Mus.Thor.
- do. - History of Richmondshire (2 vols. London, 1823) Richmondshire
- do. - History of Whalley. (Blackburn, 1801 4th ed. 1872-6) Whalley
- Whiting, C. E. - Excavations on Sutton Common, 1933, 1934 and 1935 (YAJ, xxxiii 57-80)
- Whittick, G. C. - Roman Mining in Britain (Newcomen Soc. Trans., xii 57-84)
- Woodhead, T. W. - Climate, Vegetation and Man in the Huddersfield district (Huddersfield, 1931)
- do. - History of the Vegetation of the Southern Pennines (Cambridge, 1929)

	<u>Abbreviation</u>
Woodward, A. M. - <u>The Roman fort at Ilkley</u> (<u>YAJ</u> , xxviii 137-326)	<u>Ilkley</u>
Wright, T. - <u>The Celt, the Roman, and the Saxon</u> (London, 1852; 2nd ed. 1861; 5th ed. 1892)	<u>CRS</u>
Wrigley, A. - <u>Saddleworth: its Prehistoric Remains</u> (Oldham, 1911)	<u>Saddleworth</u>
 <u>Yorkshire Archaeological Journal</u>	 <u>YAJ</u>
<u>Yorkshire Geological Society (formerly West Riding of Yorkshire Geological and Polytechnical Society) Proceedings</u>	<u>PYGS</u>
<u>Yorkshire Philosophical Society, Annual Reports</u>	<u>YPSAR</u>
do. - <u>Proceedings</u>	<u>PYPS</u>
do. - <u>Handbook to the Antiquities in the Gardens and Grounds of</u> (York, 8th ed. 1891)	<u>YM</u> <u>Handbook</u>
 <u>Yorkshire Post</u>	
<u>Yorkshire Weekly Post</u>	
<u>Yorkshire Record Series</u>	

LIST OF PLATES

- I. Distribution of Iron Age and Roman remains in Brigantia
- II. Distribution of Bronze leaf-shaped weapons
- III. Distribution of Moated Folds in the Yorkshire Pennines
- IV. Ingleborough: (a) Wall structure
(b) Plan of summit, with hut-circles,
after Phillips
- V. Grinton Earthworks
- VI. The relation between Stanwick and Scots Dyke
- VII. Scarth Nick hutment site
- VIII. The Promontory Enclosure at Nab End, Carperby
- IX. The Fortified Enclosure at Whitcliffe Scar
- X. The Meg Dyke: (a) The West Angle
(b) Entrance on the south-east
- XI. Victoria Cave: Vertical Section at entrance
- XII. Grinton: Medieval Walling

LIST OF FIGURES

1. Bronze Ploughman from Piercebridge
2. Distribution of Hill-forts with In-turned and Out-turned Entrances in Britain
3. Distribution of Brigantian Coinage
4. North Stainley: Castle Dykes
5. Ingleborough
6. do. : The Summit, with circular hut-foundations in foreground
7. do. : Bird's-eye view of native settlement on the northern lower slopes
8. Almondbury: Ditch dividing the Norman wards
9. do. : North-east entrance
10. do. : Inner and outer ramparts on south
11. Stanwick: West rampart and outer ditch
12. do.: On top of the rampart
13. Scots Dyke in Whitfield Pasture, Richmond. Only the large west rampart now exists
14. Warton Crag: Terracing on south side
15. Wincobank: Out-turned entrance on the north-east (interior on right)
16. do. : Rampart, ditch and outer bank on south
- 7-19. Park Rash, Kettlewell: Rampart and outer ditch
20. do. : Ditch following a projecting spur
21. do. : Broad natural causeway forming entrance on south; the ends of the ditch are just visible on the west and east
22. Grinton: Harkerside intrenchment, looking north across Swaledale
23. do. : Maiden Castle - stone avenue on the east, with tumulus in background
24. do : do. - circular wall foundation in the bracken, within the rampart at junction with east entrance

25. Grinton: Fremington intrenchment, looking south
26. do. : Rectangular Celtic field-walls beneath the turf at Fremington; intrenchment (Fig.25) in background
27. do. : Celtic walling at Fremington, preserved by modern field-wall
28. do. : Ancient road in the Fremington settlement
29. Kisdon (Swaledale): Hooker Mill Scar - a typical limestone settlement site
30. do. : Celtic field-walls on west shoulder
31. do. : Revetting wall on low side of levelled terrace
32. Kirkby Malzeard, Cast Hills: Celtic wall line followed by modern wall
33. do. : do. showing massive boulders used in wall structure
34. Malham, Gordale Scar: Rectangular Celtic fields, with hut-circle in one corner
35. do. : The rough wall structure
36. do. : A modern parallel from the fells above Angram (Swaledale)
37. do. : Revetted south-west wall of a hut-circle
38. do. : A square turf-covered enclosure
39. Whitcliffe Scar (Swaledale): Fortified enclosure - the levelled interior, with hut circle in the far corner
40. do. : Fortified enclosure - outer face of west wall
41. Victoria Cave, Settle
42. Blackrod: South rampart and entrance, from the east
43. Grinton, Oxhill: Outline of moated enclosure on top of east hill, from the west. (Pond in middle distance, at foot of hill)
44. do. : Inner face of medieval wall on west hill
45. do. : Outer face and core of same
46. do. Whitaside: Fairly strong north bank (on right), outer ditch, and counterscarp, looking east.

47. Grinton, Whitaside: Slight south bank and outer ditch (on right), looking east.
48. Kirklington: Intrenchment; main rampart on right, with broad, shallow ditch
49. Flasby: Field dykes.
50. (Exhibit only) Well: Tesselated pavement.

I. INTRODUCTION

ANY consideration of the early history of the Northern Pennines must necessarily start with an estimate of the Brigantes, who form the subject of this dissertation. It is this people which supplies the link between the obscurity of prehistory and the dawn of the historical era in the north of Britain as introduced by the Roman occupation. Though an important factor in the early history of Britain, it has received but casual and scanty attention from the modern historian. Generalisations of widely varying degrees of accuracy on the subject of the character, power and extent of the Brigantes occur frequently enough, from Horsley¹ to the present day, both in obscure local periodicals and in histories of some standing. All too often, misconceptions hallowed by mere repetition have been allowed to exercise a serious perverse influence upon the interpretation of fundamental problems associated with the early history of this island.

At a time when the progress of scientific archaeology is swifter, its basic principles more coherent and more generally understood and applied than ever before, there is some danger lest, in the enthusiasm for this form of scientific deduction, the value of the more specific testimony of

¹ BR. 365.

literature and historical documents be disregarded. Archaeology is an invaluable instrument for the task of confirming, enlarging and illustrating the story outlined by history. Where historical sources are entirely absent, it must perforce enter the field alone; but, lacking a framework upon which to build, any historical conclusions it furnishes are general and tentative in the extreme. Where documentary material is available, however brief and bare of detail, it must be adopted as the foundation upon which other forms of evidence may be built. Only thus can the final edifice be assured of stability and freedom from the possible necessity of drastic reconstruction.

The ancient sources for the history of the Brigantes are admittedly sparse. Frequently they consist of casual references by a writer chiefly concerned with an entirely different topic. Nevertheless, together they indicate that this people played an important role in the history of the Roman occupation of Britain. With the present tendency towards the presentation of this period in a historical rather than (as was until recent years the case) an archaeological setting, it is high time that these ancient sources were independently examined. The results of such an examination may provide an original basis of evidence as to the true nature and importance of the Brigantes.

II. HISTORICAL

(1) GENERAL OUTLINE.

THE fleeting visits of Julius Caesar in 55 and 54 B.C. appear, as Tacitus remarked,¹ merely to have drawn the attention of his successors to Britain rather than to have bequeathed it to them. Moreover, while the subsequent development of the Roman policy of economic penetration prepared the way in the south for a more active form of invasion, its effects upon the more inaccessible regions of the north must have been inconsiderable, though copies of Gaulish coinage eventually reached the southern regions of Brigantia via the eastern counties. With the Claudian invasion of A.D. 43 an accomplished fact, however, a situation was created which no inhabitant of the island, however remote, could afford to ignore.

The immediate excuse for intervention was typical of the policy Rome was to adopt throughout the period of conquest. The quarrel over the succession to the throne of the Catuvellauni, and the resultant appeal to Claudius, followed by Roman military intervention, initiated a policy aiming at the fostering of disintegration, not only of alliances of independent tribes, but of the unity of each powerful state.²

¹ Agric. xiii, § 2.

² ibid. xii, § 1-2.

The subsequent exploitation of Cartimandua's personal and political weaknesses thus has a familiar touch.

For the present, however, the Romans were entirely preoccupied with the conquest and settlement of the populous region of the south and east. A sharp repulse was inflicted upon the Catuvellauni who had disputed the crossing of the Medway. Following the emperor's triumphant return to Rome, Aulus Plautius continued the work of subjugation; and before his recall, four years later, those who had been induced to accept Roman suzerainty included the two main Belgic areas once dominated by the respective Houses of Cassivellaunus and Commius, the powerful Iceni of East Anglia, and the Regni of Sussex.

Belgic Britain had been brought swiftly and effectively under Roman sway; but the occupied area was not large enough to provide more than a precarious foothold for the invaders. In order to accelerate the process of complete conquest, the army was divided into three columns. Plautius himself, with the XIV Gemina Martia and XX Valeria Vixtrix, penetrated to the north-west; Vespasian, commanding the II Augusta, opened up the south-west country, while the IX Hispana was given the easiest line of all, that leading northwards along the flat east coast region to Lincoln. Assuming the validity of the generally accepted emendation to the text of the Annals,¹ the

¹ Annales c. xii: 'cunstaque cis Trisantonam et Sabrinam fluvios cohibere parat.'

limit of Roman occupation by A.D. 47 must have been approximately the region between the Severn and the Trent. In this area, at any rate, the next governor, Ostorius Scapula, had to take measures to prevent risings amongst conquered tribes.

The radial movement in three columns by which Aulus Plautius began the systematic conquest of the lowland zone appears to have been responsible for the first direct contact between Brigantia and Rome.¹ Cartimandua is known to have favoured a policy of appeasement towards the invading power, and so long as she remained in control of affairs, the Brigantes are to be regarded just as essentially a client kingdom as the Regni or the Iceni, whose rulers had bought a nominal freedom and retained their thrones.

There is no evidence for the assumption² that the Fosse Way was constructed by Ostorius as a frontier defence against raids by the Brigantes on the neighbouring Coritani, though there is no doubt that, while he was pursuing the conquest of the Degeangli in North Wales, dissension arose amongst the Brigantes themselves which necessitated Roman intervention. By a mixture of judicious punishment and clemency, Ostorius succeeded in establishing a temporary peace.³

¹ p. 42 ff.

² OHE i, 91.

³ p. 42-3.

The advance against the Degeangli must have been responsible for the establishment of the XIV and XX legions at Wroxeter.¹ With the Brigantian problem once more shelved for the time being, Ostorius determined to renew the initiative in Wales - this time against the Silures of the south, who had been inspired to defiance by the spirited personality of Caractacus. The latter, driven to retreat into central and north-west Wales, organised the Ordovices, in A.D. 52, in a final but ill-fated resistance; and was compelled to appeal for support to the last great native military power accessible - that of Brigantia.

The appeal found no response. Cartimandua had already incurred considerable antagonism from certain factions of her own people in the pursuit of the unpopular pro-Roman policy. She had no intention of reversing this policy at the behest of a discredited exile, three times routed by the very power which she had long decided to support. Not content, however, with rejecting such a risky and unprofitable volte-face, she determined to demonstrate beyond question her loyalty to Rome; she accordingly lured the royal fugitive into placing himself in her power, then handed him over to the conquerors.

Ostorius, reassured by this proof of fidelity, was now able to devote the whole of his energies to the final pacification of Wales - a task which proved infinitely harder than he

¹ Macdonald, Roman Britain, 1914-28, 90.

could have anticipated. A concerted Silurian revolt inflicted a severe reverse on the Roman troops, and this blow was followed up by the prosecution of a fierce guerilla warfare so devastating and persistent that Ostorius died, a prematurely worn-out man.

His successor, Aulus Didius Gallus, faced a political state of affairs in which the forces of reaction were uppermost, and a policy of retrenchment vitally necessary. No sooner had the Roman defensive positions been restored in the west,¹ than further dissension broke out amongst the Brigantes.² Cartimandua, flattered by the temporary success of her policy, and too confident of the supporting strength of her unpopular ally, had become over proud. Her rejection of Venutius was a fatal mistake, for it provided all the discontented elements in the state with a focal point, and, above all, a leader. When Venutius, determined on revenge, called in armed assistance from outside the state, the Romans were on this occasion unable to intervene with decisive effect. Collingwood has taken the accounts of Tacitus in the Histories and Annals to describe two separate revolts; but this interpretation does not seem reasonably tenable. In brief, the state of affairs indicated by Tacitus is that, following Cartimandua's repudiation of Venutius and his retaliation with the aid of

¹ Agric., xiv, § 3.

² The following interpretation of the course of events is based solely upon the ancient sources, and differs considerably from the generally accepted view (ONE, 1, 97-8, 107)

friendly but foreign 'auxilia,' the Romans were compelled to intervene, but could meet with no more success than the rescue of Cartimandua from the vengeance of her hostile subjects. Venutius was too strong, Rome too preoccupied at the time to encourage Didius to challenge directly the revolted client state, and for the next decade relations between the two were hostile, though no major conflict took place.

Q. Veranius, who succeeded Didius Gallus in A.D. 58, died within a year and was in turn succeeded, in 59, by a governor of outstanding military talent in C. Suetonius Paulinus. Yet even Suetonius was unwilling to challenge the power of the Brigantes until all possibility of distraction elsewhere was removed. He determined first of all to deal with one of the factors which presumably inspired the Claudian invasion in the first place - Druidism. He accordingly marched north-west, penetrating Wales and establishing auxiliary forts for the maintenance of his communications 'en route,' until in 61 he was able to enter the retreat of that priesthood in the island of Anglesey.

No sooner was that occupation begun, however, than news of the revolt of the Iceni compelled him to undertake a brilliant march back to the scene of the outbreak. At no stage since the invasion was the Roman position in Britain so precarious; but at this critical juncture, Rome's tactical

policy towards the Brigantes bore fruit. The correctness of the attitude of armed preparedness exhibited in this direction by both Didius and Paulinus was completely vindicated. The Brigantes must have been on the verge of open attack, for there is evidence that, rather than throw all the available weight of his nearest troops against the revolted tribes, Cerialis preferred to retain the greater part of the ninth legion at Lincoln, to guard the Brigantian frontier, and suffer the ravaging and destruction of the incensed Iceni and Trinovantes during the delay until Paulinus' own troops could reach the scene from the north-west.¹

By courageous generalship, the rebellion was crushed; but it had served to warn future governors that military conquest must be consolidated, not through the harsh medium of the recruiting sergeant, the usurer and the tax-collector, but by a policy of considerate administration and economic improvement. The Boudiccan rising delayed further the territorial advance by Rome for a full decade, while rehabilitation took place under the governorship first of Petronius Turpillianus (A.D. 61-3), and later of Trebellius Maximus.

The outbreak of civil war on the continent in A.D. 69, the year of the four Emperors, was accompanied by parallel

¹ p. 49-50.

disturbances in Britain. For some unknown reason the provincial troops withdrew their support from the governor; the disaffection was so serious that Trebellius Maximus had to retire from Britain, and was replaced in A.D. 69 by Vettius Bolanus.¹ Meanwhile, Vitellius had secured the transfer of some 8,000 men from the II, IX and XX legions in Britain, for they accompanied him on his march into Italy after Bedriacum.² The Fourteenth, which had been recalled from Britain by Nero in 67, had declared for Otho, and was sent back to Britain by Vitellius under the command of the new governor. Almost immediately, however, Vitellius' position was in turn threatened by the ambitious governor of Judaea, Vespasian, and the emperor turned to Bolanus for further detachments of troops.

Bolanus, however, was in no position to loan troops without seriously weakening his own security in Britain; for at this moment the Brigantes decided to take advantage of Rome's internal dissensions to create active trouble on their frontier. Mr. Collingwood, believing that Tacitus' Histories and Annals give accounts of two separate affairs, assumes³ that not until this time did the divorce of Venutius, resulting in rebellion against the queen and her rescue by the Romans, take place.

¹ Tacitus, Hist., i, 60.

² OHE, i, 108.

³ ibid, i, 107.

The correct interpretation seems rather to be that, with these events long past, Venutius had been waiting his opportunity for bolder action, which came with the imperial civil war of 69/70, and the weakening of the garrison of Britain which it entailed.¹

Unfortunately for Venutius, the period of continental disturbance was short-lived. Having suppressed the revolt on the Rhine, Vespasian was free to take purposeful action in the north. The Brigantian offensive gave him an excellent pretext for the annexation of all the lands under the domination of Venutius. Immediately upon his appointment as governor of Britain in 71, Petilius Cerialis launched his campaign against the Brigantes - the first attack upon the recognised government of this state which had yet been attempted by Rome. The estimates of its degree of success which have been made vary to a very great extent. Based upon Tacitus' brief mention in the Agricola,² to the effect that Cerialis subdued 'a large part' of the Brigantes, these estimates have been influenced, first of all, by the vaguest impression as to the true extent of this people, and secondly, by the offhand way in which Tacitus dismisses his exploits, magnificent though even he is compelled to admit them to have been. Moreover, the current interpretation of the events of this period is a striking

¹ p. 51-2.

² c. xvii.

illustration of the way in which archaeology has in some quarters begun to dominate historical reconstruction, at the expense of the literary evidence. Thus the only places at which evidence of Cerialian occupation is generally acknowledged to have been found are Malton and York; and Collingwood, accordingly, argues that Cerialis confined his activities to "central and eastern Yorkshire."¹ Yet, as will be demonstrated in the following chapter, such a view is quite irreconcilable with the literary evidence, particularly that furnished by two writers whose references to Britain seem hitherto to have escaped general notice - the elder Pliny and Silius Italicus.² The argument will be fully worked out later; here, it must be sufficient to state that, with the conclusion of Cerialis' governorship, the Roman legions must be supposed to have penetrated, not merely to the northern limits of Brigantia, but to the borders of the Scottish Highlands.

At any rate, in spite of Tacitus' implication, so complete was the conquest of the Brigantes that Cerialis' successor, Prontinus (74-8), was able to turn his attention immediately to Wales where he carried out the subjugation of the Silures,³ and established the second legion at Caerleon-on-Usk.⁴

¹ OHE, i, 110.

² p. 55-7.

³ Agric. c. xvii.

⁴ OHE, i, 106.

The campaigns of Agricola, too, must be discussed more fully elsewhere.¹ He it was who was responsible for the probable transfer of the legion II Adiutrix from Lincoln to the new fortress at Chester. In his first year of office he reconquered the Isle of Anglesey. His second campaign has usually been assumed to have taken place along the west coast of Lancashire, Westmorland and Cumberland, chiefly because the description of 'estuaries and forests'² seemed most applicable to the geographical character of this coastal region. It will be suggested below,³ however, that Agricola spent both his second and third summers in reaching the estuary of the Tay. Having gained the Forth-Clyde isthmus in 81, he paused for a year to consolidate his position, and then advanced once more into the Highlands of Strathmore (A.D. 83), where he secured his famous victory, in the following year, over the Caledonians at Mons Graupius, the site of which has never been certainly identified. Nevertheless, there is reason to believe that Agricola was preparing to complete the subjugation of Scotland by the permanent establishment of a legion at Inchtuthill,⁴ when he was recalled.

Tacitus, in the Histories, comments bitterly on this frustration of Agricola's plans in the famous phrase, perdomita

¹ p. 63-7.

² Agric., c. xx.

³ p. 67.

⁴ OHE, i, 118-9.

Britannia et statim omissa.¹ This must mean that the conquest of Britain was actually complete, and straightway abandoned.² It is an exaggerated statement; but other passages in the *Agricola* show that this is not the only instance furnished by this biography.³ Sir George Macdonald has persistently held the view that the evacuation from Scotland did not take place until the second century.⁴ The case for a withdrawal by A.D. 95 is, however, overwhelming; and as it has recently been presented in full detail by Pryce and Birley,⁵ it would be superfluous to repeat the argument here. The outstanding factor is the contrast between the absence of characteristic Trajanic pottery from Scotland, and the abundance of the same ware on the Stanegate. Furthermore, Juvenal's references to trouble in Britain not only belong to the reign of Domitian, but one of them has a terminus ante quem of A.D. 86-7.⁶ The natural supposition must be that the decision to retire from Scotland was the result of a depletion of strength with the recall of the legion II *Adiutrix* from Britain in 86 to assist in Domitian's cherished project - the invasion of Germany.⁷

¹ *Hist.*, I, ii.

² cf. Pryce and Birley in *JRS*, xxviii, 142-3, on the Tacitean usage of omissa.

³ cf. *Agric.*, x; tum primum perdomita est; xxxiii: finem Britanniae non fama nec rumore, sed castris et armis tenemus: inventa Britannia et subacta.

⁴ *JRS.*, xxv, 187-200; xxvii, 93-8.

⁵ *JRS.*, xxviii, 141-52.

⁶ *ibid.*, 149.

⁷ Ritterling in *P-W*. s.v. Legio, col. 1443 f.

This departure would be all the more serious for the remainder of the British garrison if, as has been suggested,¹ the legion was accompanied by approximately the same number of auxiliary troops.

The reign of Trajan was, so far as Britain was concerned, one of consolidation and peaceful reconstruction. Preoccupied by great wars in Dacia and the east, Trajan was content to strengthen his hold on the province as he received it from Domitian, to create a strong frontier, and, reviving the policy of Augustus, to renounce the temptation of further conquests beyond it. That this Trajanic frontier was the Stanegate is unquestioned; Samian ware typical of this period is common in the forts along its line, while the Vallum, at one time regarded as early second century, is now known to have been part of the original Hadrianic frontier. The type of 'limes' thus introduced by Trajan to Britain - a road across country, studded with forts and signal-stations at regular intervals - was the standard type of Roman fortification, and persisted throughout the occupation of Africa. In a more complex form, it is paralleled in the Syrian desert by the Trajanic limes there.² With the gradual return to Augustus' conception of Rome as a satiated empire, the need for a more permanent form of obstacle became realised; but the construction of Hadrian's

¹ Pryce & Birley, loc. cit.

² Macdonald, Antiquity, viii, 373-80.

Wall did not represent a departure from previous frontier policy, for Trajan had already been responsible for the introduction of such a barrier in Germany.

The general replacement of earth-and-timber by stone fortifications in Britain under Trajan is to be regarded as an indication of a peaceful state of affairs rather than the result of general disturbance and destruction. At York and Caerleon the legionary fortresses shared in the general improvement, as did many auxiliary forts. The reorganization also took the shape of a reshuffling of garrisons. To this period date the construction of certain western forts; the pottery evidence from Hardknott, for instance, suggests a Trajanic foundation,¹ and it may be that the backward regions of the north-west only knew serious Roman occupation and development about this time. The redistribution of forces is further attested by the reduction in the size of forts along earlier routes, as at Long Preston and Castleshaw.²

Perhaps all this activity, and the obvious indications that the military occupation of their country was to be permanent, aroused the old feeling of hostility amongst the Brigantes. At any rate, there is no doubt that on the accession of Hadrian in 117, serious trouble prevailed in Britain. The literary evidence for this, and the significance

¹ CW,² xxviii, 341-7.

² p.176.

of the replacement of the Ninth legion at York by the VI Victrix between 108-9 and 122, are discussed in the succeeding chapter.¹ Archaeology testifies to no destruction along the line of the Stanegate, which would have been an inevitable result of invasion from the north. In the middle of that line, there was certainly no cause for alarm, for after a short occupation the fort at Haltwhistle Burn was peacefully dismantled. The trouble must therefore have been a localised one either north or south of this line. In view of their generally unruly character, and their proximity to the base of the Ninth legion, it is not improbable that the trouble lay with the inhabitants of the northern Pennines.

This view receives further support from the character of the frontier constructed by Hadrian, begun immediately upon his arrival in Britain in 122. The continuous barrier of the Wall, with its incorporated system of forts, mile-castles and turrets, was but an exceptionally good example of the standard Roman type of barrier against the enemy beyond. The purpose of the Vallum, on the other hand, is not so obvious, and has been the subject of much controversy. Realisation of the manifold nature of the Wall's defences has come slowly. Horsley refused to believe that it could have any relation to southern defence.² When the theory was put forward that it

¹ p. 69-70.

² BR., 126-7.

represented part of the old Trajanic frontier,¹ it was presumably thought of primarily as a defence against the north; and even today Collingwood prefers the ingenious explanation that it served the purpose of a customs barrier.² Once again, the detailed argument of the point must be left to a later chapter,³ only pausing here to state the writer's view that the construction of the Vallum was primarily associated with the disturbed state of affairs which had manifested itself in Brigantia since the accession of Hadrian.

The Wall was built by the legions, but garrisoned by auxiliaries; hence the need for a further reorganisation of the disposition of units south of the frontier. In certain cases, forts are known to have been abandoned about this time, as at Slack and Castleshaw, in order to permit the transference of the garrisons to the newly constructed forts on the line of the Wall. Even the strength of the second legion at Caerleon was reduced; and if further proof were required of the happy state of affairs prevailing in Wales by this time, it is furnished by the existence of large fortified hill-top towns of the type of Tre'r Ceiri and Dinorben,⁴ established not earlier than the second century,

¹ Birley, AA⁴, xi, 146 f.

² OHE, i, 133-4.

³ p. 74-7.

⁴ Wheeler, Prehistoric and Roman Wales, 259-66.

and apparently with official approval. The function of Roman troops in Wales, previous to their removal to the north, had evidently already developed into the protection of the inhabitants - whether from local brigands or sea-raiders from Ireland - rather than their intimidation. In Brigantia, on the other hand, the loyalty of the natives varied widely over different areas.¹

The new frontier, with its heavy concentration of the bulk of the troops in the province,² must have proved effective in restraining the lawless exuberance of the Brigantes as well as the open hostility of the enemy in Scotland, for no major reorientation of frontier policy was found necessary, until the accession of Antoninus Pius. The first and most important event of his reign was the reoccupation of Scotland between A.D. 140 and 142 by the governor, Lollius Urbicus, and the construction of a new barrier across the Forth-Clyde isthmus. Since these developments are closely concerned with the interpretation of the second-century history of the Brigantes in general, and of a reference to Britain by Pausanias in particular, a full consideration of the motives which inspired the reoccupation of Scotland is best deferred.³

The Hadrianic frontier scheme had already necessitated

¹ p. 91-3.

² OHE, i, 138.

³ p. 77-81.

a considerable withdrawal of troops from Wales and the southern Pennines. The new advance, in spite of the thrifty arrangements for the garrisoning of the new line, where there is evidence that cohorts were for the first time split up in order that two small forts might be manned by the personnel of one unit,¹ necessitated a further weakening of the garrisons south of Hadrian's Wall. For the latter line continued to be held, and evidently was still considered the main feature of Rome's northern frontier.² So pressing, indeed, was the need for troops to garrison the increasing number of forts, that further inroads had to be made upon the second legion, although the normal function of the legions was to serve as a mobile field-army. A detachment of II Augusta appears to have occupied Housesteads following the transfer of the First Cohort of Tungrians to Castlecary on the Scottish Wall.³

The obvious weakening of the Roman hold over many different districts must have proved a direct incitement to local discontented elements to engineer rebellious disturbances. Indeed, Haverfield related Pausanias' account of trouble created by the Brigantes to various pieces of archaeological evidence which together formed quite a convincing case for a widespread revolt on the part

¹ Macdonald, RWS, 417-18, 435-6.

² p. 86.

³ RWS, 475, and OHE, i, 143.

of that tribe, which was crushed by Julius Verus in 155. This reconstruction of events is, indeed, still generally favoured; but a reconsideration of the evidence necessitates a revised estimate of the importance of this affair.¹ There is no reason to assume that discontent had yet assumed serious proportions; rather, these were the first indications of the weaknesses of the new departure in Scotland - not, be it emphasized, due to any inherent fallacy in that policy itself, but to the inadequate strength with which the attempt was made to carry it out. The reoccupation of Brough in Derbyshire and the reconstruction at Birrens by Julius Verus, and the strengthening of the defences of Petuaria (Brough on Humber) against possible attack in the reign of Pius, testify to the unstable political atmosphere which had developed.

The whole issue has been obscured by Macdonald's attempt to relate the two destructions known to have occurred on the Antonine Wall to specific dates in the second century, on an insufficient basis of evidence. His fundamental misconception is the belief that that can have been no third century occupation of the Scottish Wall. This view relies principally upon the absence of coins later than Commodus from all the Scottish forts except Cramond; but in view of the scarcity of late second and early third century coins in the north of Britain, in particular at Housesteads,² where Severan occupation is

¹ p. 86-7.

² AA², XXV, 298.

attested,¹ and of the fact that the total number of coins from the Antonine Wall of any period is very small, this negative argument cannot have much weight. Much of the pottery from Scottish sites is third century. Furthermore, the literary evidence records a reoccupation of Scotland by Severus,² which has been demonstrated to have covered a period of at least four years, 207-211,³ though the actual occupation of the Wall line would hardly last for much more than a year. As Mr. Miller has pointed out,^{3a} this is the most likely way in which the Maeatae could be cut off from their northern allies in the second phase of the Severan campaign to which Dio refers. Since Caracalla is known to have made peace with the Maeatae and Caledonii and withdrawn his garrisons from their territory soon after the death of Severus,⁴ and the evidence from the Scottish Wall indicates a short period of reoccupation preceding the final, peaceful withdrawal, there is a prima facie case for assuming that the final structural period is Severan, rather than that it represents a formal gesture of authority by Rome after Marcellus' victories in c. 184, as Sir George is driven to assume.⁵

¹ AA⁴, ix, 233-4.

² Cassius Dio, lxxvi, 13.

³ Birley in PSAS, LXXII, 343-4.

^{3a} CAH, xii, 40-1.

⁴ Cassius Dio, lxxvii, 1; Herodian, iii, 15, 6.

⁵ RWS, 464, 479-82.

That the reign of Commodus did witness a reconstruction of the Scottish Wall it is reasonable to favour, although still not finally established. Cassius Dio states that Commodus fought a series of brilliant wars through his legates, and the Augustan histories refer, somewhat vaguely, to the repulsion of barbarian attacks.¹ Dio's account is that the barbarians broke through the wall which separates them from the Roman fortresses, and slew the Roman 'strategos' - here a governor of consular rank should be indicated. Commodus accordingly sent Ulpus Marcellus to retrieve the position, and he inflicted upon them a terrible defeat.²

The date of the governorship of Marcellus presents some difficulty. Inscriptions found at Benwell³ and Chesters⁴ indicate that Ulpus Marcellus was twice governor of Britain, once under either the ~~Equal~~ Emperors Marcus Aurelius and Commodus (176-180), or, but less likely, Lucius Verus and M. Aurelius (161-9), and again c. 182-4; though it is just possible that two men bearing the same name are recorded. During part of the decade 170-180, the governor was Antistius Adventus, who is mentioned in an inscription from Lanchester, where the milliary cohort of Vardulli was stationed. Antistius

¹ Hist. Aug. - Lampridius, 'Commodus,' c.xiii, § 5, c.viii, § 4.

² Cassius Dio, lxxii, 8.

³ CIL, 504.

⁴ EE, ix, 1171.

was probably succeeded by Ulpus Marcellus, who seems to have enjoyed a period of peace (176-80); but under the next governor, whose name is unknown, occurred the barbarian breach through the Scottish Wall, which resulted in his death and the return of Marcellus to repulse the invasion. There can be no doubt that it was the Antonine Wall which was overwhelmed in this disaster, for there is no trace of destruction on Hadrian's Wall at this time. That the attack was an invasion, and not a revolt by the Lowland tribes, is clear from Dio's description. If Marcellus be supposed to have reoccupied the northern limes, then this must represent the first destruction; the second would naturally occur in c.196, and be the first stage in the invasion which involved Hadrian's Wall in disaster also. The Scottish Wall periods would then be: (1) 142-c.182; (2) 184-196; (3) c. 207-211.

On the other hand, Dio does not specifically state that Marcellus undertook a permanent reoccupation; and if he merely confined his operations to the punishment of the offending tribes, it becomes necessary to assume that the northern Wall lay derelict for twenty years before its re-occupation by Severus. In this case, the end of the first period of occupation should be dated c.154, when there is evidence for disturbance in the north of Britain (though not in the immediate region of the Antonine Wall), the nearest

relevant piece of supporting evidence being the material for reconstruction at Birrens in 158.¹ Birrens, however, was essentially part of the Hadrianic frontier, as its position in relation to the Wall and the neighbouring advanced posts of Bewcastle and Netherby proves, as well as the fact that its occupation continued into the fourth century.² The trouble which rendered it necessary for Julius Verus to undertake building operations there was most probably purely a local affair; and the most likely dates for the two breaks in the occupation of the Antonine Wall are c.180-4 and c.196. As for the suggestion that a disaster to the Scottish Wall may have occurred under the governorship of Calpurnius Agricola, it is nowhere stated in the ancient sources that any outbreak ever occurred. Capitolanus only speaks of the threat of a British war,³ and in any case the incidence of inscriptions indicating rebuilding at that period suggests a Pennine rather than a Caledonian campaign.⁴ The later reference in the Augustan histories to an impending British war⁵ is obviously merely a recapitulation of the previous statement.

¹ EE, ix, 1230; PSAS, lxxii, 345.

² PSAS, lxxii, 345-6.

³ Hist. Aug. 'M. Aurelius Antoninus,' viii, 7.

⁴ p. 89-90.

⁵ xxii, 1-2.

Serious discontent in the army under Marcellus' successor, Helvius Pertinax, boded ill for the safety of the frontier, and the next governor's political ambitions brought the first great disaster which had yet befallen Hadrian's Wall. The wholesale withdrawal of troops by Clodius Albinus in 195 reduced the strength of Britain's garrison beyond hope of effective resistance when the Maeatae seized their opportunity to overrun the whole of the north as far as York and Chester. The evidence of pottery on the Wall, indicating an unbroken occupation till c.196, confirms this date for the end of the first Wall period.¹ By 198, as inscriptions from Ilkley² and Bowes³ show, Virius Lupus was already at work on the task of reconstruction.

The invaders, as we learn from Dio,⁴ were the Maeatae, a tribe or confederacy who lived 'near the Wall that bisects the island.' All our evidence indicates that the southern Lowlands harboured no such powerfully hostile element; moreover, in the previous instance when Dio mentions one Wall only, he is known to have meant the Antonine Wall.⁵ Furthermore, Dio states that the Caledonians lived next to them. Most

¹ AA⁴, vii, 164 ff.

² CIL, 210.

³ CIL, 273.

⁴ lxxv, 5; lxxvi, 12.

⁵ p. 23.

interesting of all, however, is the reference in the Life of Columba to Aedan's battle with the Maeatae at Circenn - the district of Angus and the Mearns. It is true that some movement of population may have taken place between the second and sixth centuries; but Watson's further objection, that the Antonine Wall was not held in the time of Severus, cannot be accepted as final evidence, even if the converse view is not held. Moreover, Rhys' connection of the tribal name with Dun-myat, a hill-site $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles north-east of Stirling, as 'Fort of the Maeatae,' and the etymology of Myothill, pointed out by Watson himself as "a conspicuous isolated height" near Denny in Stirlingshire, may be regarded as significant.¹ It is a reasonable conclusion, therefore, that the home of the Maeatae was in the region of the latter frontier; that they were descendants of the people whose numbers and power had been decimated by transportation half a century before;² and that they had, after twice encompassing the destruction of the Scottish Wall, finally seized their opportunity to wreck systematically the whole of the major frontier defences, and ravage the immediate districts of the province itself. Presumably their lust for vengeance was temporarily satiated by this orgy of destruction, for Virius Lupus found a substantial bribe a sufficient inducement for

¹ Watson, History of the Celtic Place-Names of Scotland, 56-9.

² p. 81-2.

them to return home.

The rebuilding of Hadrian's Wall restored order, at least for a time. Its effectiveness in this capacity is further attested by Spartianus, who remarks that Severus' extensive rebuilding of the Wall 'made the province secure.'¹ The comment is further proof, if it were needed, that at no time after the construction of the Hadrianic frontier did the Imperial government regard the main line of the province's defence as anywhere but on the Tyne-Solway line. Whether Severus' Scottish campaigns, accompanied by the reoccupation of the Antonine Wall, were seriously intended to herald a new period of permanent occupation in Scotland, is not quite certain; but in any case it is difficult to blame his successors for their decision not to prosecute the war further in the north. The behaviour of certain sections, at least, of the Brigantes at the time of the recent invasion had proved them to be still unreliable,² which meant that the conditions which had helped to cause the failure of the two earlier attempts at an occupation of the Lowlands were still to be reckoned with; so long as the northern Pennines had to be garrisoned so heavily as they still were, the number of troops available for the effective control of the northern isthmus was too small for safety. Mattingly suggests³ that

¹ Hist. Aug. - 'Severus,' xviii, 2.

² p. 91-3.

³ Antiquity, viii, 388.

the chief value of Severus' operations was the enhancement of the reputation, loyalty and self-confidence of the British army, which was now given the opportunity of serving under the Emperor in person, after previously supporting his defeated rival Albinus. While this may have been an incidental consideration, it cannot be supposed to have inspired such an enormous enterprise as the reoccupation of Scotland. Severus, no doubt, realised the importance of protecting his allies beyond the main frontier line, just as Pius had realised it in 142. Caracalla, however, recognising that the policy required more troops if it were to be effective than he could spare for this outlying province, preferred to negotiate an agreement with the barbarians which would at least secure a temporary peace. The imperial government had at length realised that Scotland was no longer permanently tenable. The region of the Antonine Wall, depopulated, as has been noticed elsewhere,¹ at the time of its construction, must in the space of a generation or so have been rapidly filled up, resulting in the renewed offensives which saw first the fall of the Antonine Wall under Commodus, and later the invasion of the province proper in 196. The Antonine barrier had outlived its purpose; the whole Scottish military system had originally been intended to control

¹ p. 81-3.

nothing stronger than a beaten and much depleted population, deprived of the pick of its warriors. Withdrawal had already been too long delayed; repeated rebuffs, despite the vengeance ultimately inflicted, had transferred the initiative to the enemy. Continued occupation must have necessitated the enlargement of the defences somewhat on the Hadrianic model. The alternative was retreat to the line of the latter barrier; and, as has been pointed out, any idea of removing the main frontier line from the Tyne-Solway isthmus had never been contemplated. The realisation of this situation was overdue, but once the logical principle of retrenchment had been applied, the results testify to the wisdom of the new policy. For almost a hundred years, in an age when on other fronts the empire was involved in constant troubles, the British frontier enjoyed unbroken peace.

Perhaps the revolt of Albinus made Severus chary of again vesting the control of three legions in one man. At any rate, he was responsible for the division of Britain into two provinces,¹ of which the Upper included the II and XX legions at Caerleon and Chester respectively, while the Lower comprised the north under its military administration based on York,² and also included Lincoln.³

¹ Herodian, iii, 8, 2.

² Dio, iv, 23; CIL, 280; JRS, xi, 101-7.

³ JRS, xi, 102.

Britain remained unaffected by the numerous fluctuations of fortune experienced by the third-century emperors. Reconstruction went on unhampered, and the numerous milestones of this era testify to the efficient attention paid to the improvement and upkeep of the provincial communications.

Following Carausius' brief enjoyment of independence, disaster on the northern frontier was at last precipitated by the ambitions of the usurper Allectus. In 296 Hadrian's Wall again fell before the invading tribes of Scotland, but again this was due, not to any fundamental weakness in the barrier itself, but to the withdrawal of the garrison.

Diocletian's radical reform of the whole imperial organization resulted in the ultimate control of Britain's civil administration being vested in Constantius Chlorus' viceroy, the praetorian prefect of Gaul. Britain became a diocese under a 'vicarius,' to whom the governors of the four new provinces into which it was subdivided were responsible. Of one of the four provinces, Britannia Prima, Britannia Secunda, Maxima Caesariensis, and Flavia Caesariensis, York as presumably the capital; but the areas they covered cannot be determined with any degree of certainty.

The military administration was entirely dissociated from the civil, but as its composition is only known from the fifth-century Notitia, its early character is somewhat uncertain.

Bury has, in any case, shown that the office of 'Comes Britanniarum,' which involved the command of the field-army, may have been a fifth century creation, and can in any case scarcely be earlier than 368.¹ On the other hand, the Notitia gives a list of garrisons occupying forts per lineam valli which were finally abandoned by 383. The Duke of Britain, who administered the frontier district from York, and the Count of the Saxon Shore, may however have been installed much earlier by Constantius himself.

Reconstruction by Constantius is a common feature in north of England forts and on Hadrian's Wall at this time; even the legionary fortress at York had suffered severely, and the Multangular Tower there is a testimony to the solid character of Constantius' work. With this period, however, comes the first definite recognition that other fronts existed as dangerous as that on the north. Indications had not been wanting over a long period that both the west and east coasts were vulnerable. Threatened by the sea-wolves on both sides, Constantius had to devise a new system of defence. The Saxon Shore forts henceforth guarded the coast south of the Wash. In Wales, the legionary fortress of Caerleon was abandoned in favour of a new post at Cardiff; at Segontium, too, the old principle of hill-fort defence was replaced by the occupation of a position tactically suitable for maintaining

¹ JRS, x, 131-54.

contact with the defending fleet.

One effect of these distractions on the flanks must have been that less attention could be paid to the northern frontier than ever before. Constantius' campaigns north of the Wall in 306 were never intended to culminate in the reoccupation of the Lowlands;¹ it was a punitive war, to restore Roman prestige, and emphasize that retribution must always follow an attack on the Empire.

For the duration of Constantine's lifetime the ruse was successful. It was not long, however, before the Picts began to realise that the coastal depredations of the Scots and Saxons gave them an irresistible bargaining weapon. In 342-3 their insistence was such that the new emperor Constans had to make a personal visit to Britain, where he made concessions to the barbarians in return for their promises of peace;² and it has been suggested that the terms involved permission to certain of the barbarians to immigrate and settle within the province, enjoying the status of 'foederati.'³ This interpretation is consistent both with general imperial fourth-century practice and with the account of the trouble which occurred under Julian in 360.⁴ But it is probable that the agreement made by Constans merely gave them

¹ Anonymus Valesii; Eumenius, Paneg. Constantino Aug., 7.

² Amm. Marc., XX, c.1.

³ OHE, 1, 282-3.

⁴ Amm. Marc., XX, c.1.

permission to settle in those parts of the Lowlands which had hitherto remained under direct Roman supervision. Since we know that the forts at Birrens and High Rochester were finally evacuated at this time, it is a natural conclusion that withdrawal from these areas was the chief concession made by Constans. The trouble, such as it was, did not assume sufficiently serious dimensions to involve the Wall.

The trouble which had been so serious as to necessitate a personal visit by the Emperor to Britain was not to be settled merely by piecemeal concessions, and a further outbreak is recorded by Ammianus Marcellinus under Julian.

On his visit to Britain, Lupicinus did not rely upon the existing garrison for support; he was accompanied by a force of unprecedented strength from the Continent.¹ The reason may be sought, not so much in the magnitude of the disturbance which had developed beyond Hadrian's Wall, as in the known unreliability of the Wall garrisons, which were soon to render active assistance in encompassing the downfall of that barrier. Handicapped as he must have been by this knowledge, Lupicinus' scanty success is not unexpected; and four years after he retired from the scene, the state of lawlessness and plunder again reigned unchecked.

That the general disaster which fell upon the whole province in 368 - the date of the end of the third Wall

¹ Amm. Marc., XX, c.1.

period¹ - was the result of a concerted plan by the different races of invaders is directly averred by Ammianus Marcellinus;² that this conspiracy also included part at least of the Wall's garrison is probable. The Theodosian reconstruction which followed saw the reoccupation of the forts of the Wall, but not the milecastles and turrets; and the Arcani whom Theodosius was compelled to disband, following the revelation of Valentinus' army plot, may well have been the patrolling garrison of the Wall.³ It is not unreasonable to suppose that a peasant militia, recruited from the little-romanized frontier districts, found it not unnatural to make common cause with their neighbours beyond the Wall against the wealthy provincials, with their widely different culture, whom they were supposed to protect.

The reorganization undertaken by Theodosius about 370 was very thorough. He realised that the real threat to the northern frontier still lay in a flank rather than a frontal attack. For this reason he constructed the series of signal-stations along the Yorkshire coast from Huntcliff to Filey, and by a supreme effort apparently occupied the corresponding sector on the western coast, which had almost been written off as lost.⁴

¹ AA⁴, vii, 164 ff.

² XXVI, c. 4.

³ As suggested by Birley, AA⁴, ix, 213.

⁴ Amm. Marcellinus, xxviii, 3; ~~RBS~~, 286.
OHE, i.

Unfortunately for the civilization of Roman Britain, the efficiency of successive restorations was doomed to waste owing to the instability of the political situation at imperial headquarters. In 383, the now familiar story of imperial ambition, withdrawal of troops, and consequent collapse of the Wall frontier, was repeated. After Maximus' adventure, difficulties nearer Rome prevented an immediate reoccupation; and when in 395 Stilicho eventually began to assert the sovereignty of Honorius, no attempt was made to preserve the Hadrianic frontier. Indeed, it is difficult to estimate precisely what form his reoccupation took. It has been assumed that the coastal defence of Yorkshire was discontinued, but this is quite uncertain; the scarcity of subsequent coin issues is too general a phenomenon to warrant such a conclusion. It may be supposed that Stilicho resorted to the old device of permitting certain of the less barbarous tribes to settle within the former boundaries of the province as 'foederati,' in the hope that, to preserve their new status and possessions, they would resist other more insatiable invaders. The movement of Cunedda and his Otadini from Scotland to North Wales, with perhaps a short period 'en route' in which they acted in the capacity of frontiersmen in place of the dismissed 'limitanei,'¹ and his establishment of a Western dynasty after driving out the Scottish invaders,²

¹ OHE, i, 288, n. 1.

² Hist. Brittonum, cc. viii, lxvi (A.D. 547).

may well be an illustration of the new method of defence now finally adopted without reservation. Yet there are signs that Stilicho retained direct control over a certain area of the old military region. It is a priori probable - though proof is yet lacking - that he made York the base for operations in this area; while at Bainbridge there is a suggestion of rebuilding even in this late period.¹

Quite apart from purely archaeological evidence, the testimony of the Notitia Dignitatum must also be considered. This document, a semi-official manuscript, contains details of the civil and military establishment and disposition of troops in Britain. Bury has argued that it dates from 428;² and it seems probable that it records the fifth-century state of affairs in part, at least, of Britain, for of the five counts of Italy, Strasbourg, Spain, Illyricum and Britain, each of whose establishment is listed in the Notitia, none can be proved to have existed before the fifth century. But whatever be the view adopted regarding the possibility of a permanent reoccupation of Britain after the rescript of Honorius, there can be no doubt that certain parts of the British section of the Notitia outline a state of affairs very much earlier than 428. The whole body of archaeological evidence from Hadrian's Wall is unanimous in indicating that that frontier was finally abandoned in 383; yet the Notitia

¹ p.216 ff.

² JRS, x, 131-54.

gives a list of regiments occupying forts per lineam valli, which proves that this section gives the arrangements which existed before the abandonment of the Wall frontier. On the other hand, it appears that the per lineam valli section cannot be earlier than the fourth century, for during the third century, and before the Constantian reorganization, Castlesteads, a Wall fort, was occupied by the second cohort of Tungrians;¹ yet there is no reference at all to it in the Notitia.

Certain of the forts given as situated per lineam valli are known actually to be further south, but this inaccuracy of course does not mean that they shared the fate of the Wall forts. One of them, Virosidum, may possibly be identified with Bainbridge, which may have been occupied right into the fifth century.² Although no definite conclusions can yet be reached, the Notitia is undoubtedly the key to the Roman occupation of the north at this time, and a reasonable if as yet unconfirmed explanation of the Notitia may accordingly be tentatively advanced. The list of forts under the Duke of Britain, whose headquarters were at York, may have been those actually occupied at a certain period after 383 - most probably, as Mr. Collingwood suggests, that of Stilicho (395-9).³ Then follows a list of forts situated in the

¹ CIL, 879.

² p. 216 ff.

³ OHE, 1, 289.

remoter regions regarded as temporarily, but not necessarily permanently, abandoned to the barbarians, comprising those of the Wall and the north-west coast, all included under the general heading per lineam valli. Had only one non-Wall fort slipped into this section, it might well be regarded as a clerical mistake; but with so many, and considering the fact that the compiler of the list obviously worked from east to west of the Wall, and then southwards down the west coast, such an explanation is not tenable. Even if Bainbridge be in fact identified with Virosidum, this does not necessarily mean the rejection of the theory; rather does it supply a justification for official optimism in retaining the list as an area whose eventual reoccupation was merely postponed. Bainbridge was the nearest of these sites to the district still controlled by the Duke of Britain; the coin of Theodosius, and the very late work on the East gate there, may quite well indicate that Stilicho had just embarked on a piecemeal reclamation of the 'lost' territory when he was compelled to return to Rome to resist the Gothic peril.

The 'foederati' installed in the north and west probably helped to maintain for a time some direct contact of trade and culture with those parts of the province still occupied by Roman troops. On civil sites as far north as Carlisle and Corbridge, coins go down to Arcadius and Honorius.¹ But

¹ Macdonald, Roman Britain 1914-28, 71-2.

their position was an unnatural one. Honorius' renunciation of all responsibility for the protection of the province in 410 must have decided any who had not already done so, that it would be wiser to act on personal considerations only. Whether or no a final reoccupation in the south-eastern counties occurred c.417 and endured for a decade, as Collingwood takes the Richborough reports and the Notitia section on the Count of Britain to indicate,¹ for the whole of the north, at any rate, Procopius' statement must hold good: that Britain was never recovered by the Romans after Constantine III, but was given over to the rule of tyrants. To adventure further into the obscurity of fifth-century history in the search for an intelligible narrative would require a degree of imaginative reconstruction out of place in this chapter.

¹ OHE, i, 300-1.

(ii) THE ANCIENT SOURCES.

IN reviewing the history of the Brigantes, a full and balanced consideration of the *Agricola*, *Histories* and *Annals* of Tacitus is essential. Tacitus is our most important authority, not only because he furnishes the greater part of the material for reconstruction, but also because his later works gave him the opportunity of revising any mis-statements made in his earlier writings; thus it is upon the later work that reliance must be placed in the case of any contradictory, or apparently contradictory, statements.

Tacitus' life of *Agricola*, written in A.D. 98,¹ was the first of three literary works which have some bearing upon the history of Britain. Although the scene of action is almost entirely confined to Britain, and his references are much more verbose than in the more general works which followed, his statements of fact in the *Agricola* are therefore liable to be corrected in the latter. Further, it must be remembered that this book is a biography of his own father-in-law, and that the natural bias tending to exalt all the achievements of the subject, all too common in ordinary biographies, is likely to be present to some extent at least in this case. The *Histories* began to be published about A.D. 104.² The

¹ P-W, s.v. 'P. Cornelius Tacitus,' col. 1572.

² ibid., col. 1574.

Annals, c. 115-16,¹ must therefore be presumed to represent Tacitus' considered and final judgment on the affairs therein mentioned.

Of the earliest Brigantian contact with Rome, the Histories give no account; but one clue comes from a reference in what is evidently a brief recapitulation of Brigantian history in the Annals. The wording of the passage implies that the period was treated more fully in one of the missing books of that work. It is stated that in the governorship of Aulus Didius Gallus,

"post captum Caratacum praecipuus scientia rei militaris Venutius, e Brigantum civitate, ut supra memoravi, fidusque diu et Romanis armis defensus, cum Cartimanduum reginam matrimonio teneret."²

The only intelligible interpretation is that for a considerable period of time the two sovereigns had both been content to accept a client status; and their decision must have been taken when Aulus Plautius first menaced the Brigantian frontier at two points with a total formidable strength of three legions. Indeed, the conciliatory attitude adopted by Cartimandua and her consort in all probability was largely responsible for the decision of his successor, Ostorius, to branch off towards Wales:

"iamque ventum haud procul mari, quod Hiberniam insulam aspectat, cum ortae apud Brigantas discordiae retraxere duces, destinationis certum, ne nova moliretur nisi prioribus firmatis, et Brigantes quidem paucis qui arma coeptabant interfectis, in reliquos data venia resedere."³

¹ P-W, s.v. 'P. Cornelius Tacitus,' col. 1576.

² Annales, xii, 40.

³ Ibid. xii. 32.

Before doing so, he clearly considered that the Brigantes had been brought peacefully into the Roman orbit; his return and intervention to put down the dissensions which had arisen upon the departure of the Roman troops were in support of a government whose policy had been approved by Rome, but which had aroused strong opposition amongst certain subjects of the state.

The only interpretation which can reasonably be deduced from these facts is that, on his advance to the north-west, Aulus Plautius induced Cartimandua to follow the example of Prasutagus and Cogidubnus in accepting Roman suzerainty; the bargain was doubtless sealed by subsidies from Rome, and the promise of help against the opponents of the new protectorate, whether internal or external. The armed protection stated to have been accorded to Venutius was in fulfilment of these conditions, and Ostorius' intervention may be taken as an instance of its application.

Cartimandua was well satisfied with the benefits resulting from her policy, however unpopular it might be among certain sections of her own people. Her intensely pro-Roman attitude was proved beyond question by her next act:

"Ipse [sc. Caratacus], ut ferme intuta sunt adversa, cum fidem Cartimanduae reginae Brigantum petivisset, vinctus ac victoribus traditus est, nono post anno quam bellum in Britannia coeptum."¹

The mode of betrayal - he was captured 'by a trick'² - is an eloquent commentary on the queen's unscrupulous character.

¹ ibid., xii, 36.

² Hist., iii, 45.

Caratacus can have had little hope of response when he made his last appeal for assistance against the invader. It is unlikely that he would have failed to sound the predominant military power in the north upon the prospects of co-operation, either before or during his organization of resistance in Wales. Moreover, by her early alliance with Rome, Cartimandua had enabled the Romans to concentrate on his defeat without fear of distraction, and had thus materially contributed to his downfall. But, like Mary of Scotland, Caratacus had no alternative; and, like her Tudor counterpart, though with less hesitation, Cartimandua was too much concerned for her own position to afford a gesture of generosity. Eagerly seizing such an opportunity of demonstrating her loyalty to her protective ally, she tricked the fugitive into placing himself in her power, and then handed him over to the Romans.

The subsequent sequence of events has frequently been misinterpreted, chiefly through failure to realise that Tacitus is, quite naturally, recapitulating in the *Annals* the same events already described in the *Histories* - an entirely separate work:

"Ea discordia et crebris belli civilis rumoribus Britanni sustulere animos auctore Venutio, qui super insitam ferociam et Romani nominis odium propriis in Cartimanduum reginam stimulis accendebatur. Cartimandua Brigantibus inperitabat, pollens nobilitate; et auxerat potentiam, postquam captum per dolum rege Carataco instruxisse triumphum Claudii Caesaris videbatur. inde

opes et rerum secundarum luxus: spreto Venutio (is fuit maritus) armigerum eius Vellocatum in matrimonium regnumque accepit. concussa statim flagitiorum domus: pro marito studia civitatis, pro adultero libido reginae et saevitia. igitur Venutius accitis auxiliis, simul ipsorum Brigantum defectione in extremum discrimen Cartimanduae adduxit. tum petita a Romanis praesidia et Cohortes alaeque nostrae variis proeliis, exemere tamen periculo reginam; regnum Venutio, bellum nobis relictum."¹

"sed post captum Caratacum praecipuus scientia rei militaris Venutius e Brigantum civitate, ut supra memoravi, fidusque diu et Romanis armis defensus, cum Cartimanduae reginam matrimonio teneret; mox orto discidio et statim bello etiam adversus nos hostilia induerat. sed primo tantum inter ipsos certabatur, callidisque Cartimandua artibus fratrem ac propinquos Venutii interceptit. inde accensi hostes, stimulante ignominia, ne feminae imperio subderentur, valida et lecta armis iuventus reginam eius invadunt. quod nobis praevium, et missae auxilio cohortes acre proelium fecere, cuius initio ambiguo finis laetior fuit. neque dispari eventu pugnatum a legione, cui Caesius Nasica praeerat; nam Didius senectute gravis et multa copia honorum per ministros agere et arcere hostem satis habebat."²

The mention in both cases of the queen's repudiation of Venutius as the immediate cause of civil war should be sufficient to discredit any assumption that two separate revolts are described.³ Nor is there any discrepancy between the two accounts as to the degree of success achieved by Roman intervention. Tacitus admits in the Histories that, following Cartimandua's rescue, a state of open hostilities prevailed. In the Annals he says that after a precarious start the issue was 'more cheerful,' which might well be taken to refer to the

¹ ibid.

² Annales, xii, 40.

³ Such as that made by Collingwood, OHE, i, 97-8, 107.

successful rescue of the queen; and that the governor, Didius, was content to 'hold off the enemy. The two accounts, in fact, closely agree in every essential. The outbreak of the war dates shortly after the capture of Carad~~ac~~us in A.D. 51, and the whole of the events detailed, including the rescue of the queen by Roman intervention, are known from the passage in the Annals to have taken place before the end of Didius' governorship in A.D. 58.

The sequence of events may now be reconstructed. In reward for her valuable aid, Rome showed its gratitude to the Brigantian queen by the bestowal of riches. Cartimandua, conscious of the strength of the power with which she was so closely allied, waxed more haughty and overbearing. The culminating point was reached when she rejected her husband, Venutius, and added insult to injury by replacing him with Venutius' own squire, Velloclatus, as her consort. The outraged husband, supported by the whole body of shocked public opinion, proceeded to make open war upon the queen. At first, Cartimandua's power was such that she had no need to call in Roman assistance. Moreover, by some artful means she succeeded in getting Venutius' own brother and some of his kinsmen into her power. The wave of indignation upon which Venutius had launched his rebellion was evidently subsiding

when in desperation he called in the assistance of auxilia from outside the Brigantian state.

Of the military power of these auxilia there can be no question. They not only achieved the defeat of the queen's forces, which the revolted section of the Brigantes had unaided failed to do, but also engaged the Roman troops, including a legion, with considerable success. Although Cartimandua escaped Venutius' vengeance, the initiative clearly now lay with him. Such was the prowess of his foreign forces that, according to the Annals, it was the expectation of their invasion that precipitated Roman intervention.

The district from which they were drawn cannot have been within Brigantia itself; the Histories draw a specific distinction between the revolted Brigantes and these auxiliaries, and the enemy are spoken of as 'invading' Cartimandua's territory. Nor can they well have come from the south, which was by now extensively occupied by the Romans. The Silures, it is true, still remained to be annexed. But they had just sustained a heavy defeat, and would obviously be too preoccupied with their own misfortunes to render such powerful assistance to a rebellious faction in another, far-distant state. Nor is there any reason to suppose that Venutius had any close connection with that tribe; he had

acquiesced in the alliance with Rome which had enabled that power to devote its undivided attention to the reduction of the Silures.

It must therefore be concluded that Venutius had a strong body of adherents somewhere to the north of Brigantia. It is possible that he was connected with this northern people by kin, perhaps a member of its ruling family, and that his marriage with Cartimandua represented an alliance of dynasties. Smaller tribes are known to have existed on the fringes of Brigantia - for example the Textoverdi in the Tyne valley;¹ but it may be doubted whether these would be sufficiently powerful to achieve the considerable amount of success credited to the auxilia. It is farther to the north, in the Lowlands of Scotland, that Venutius may be supposed to have obtained his non-Brigantian forces. The supposition that they lived a considerable distance from the Brigantian frontier helps to explain the delay which took place before he secured their aid.

By A.D.57, Venutius was left in full control of Brigantia; and for a dozen years he kept the Romans fully occupied with minor disturbances along the southern frontier. Yet he failed to take a great opportunity of annihilating the Roman armies at the time of the Boudiccan rising in A.D.61. That the Brigantes were not involved in this affair is beyond question,

¹ CIL, 712.

in spite of the fact that the Caledonian chieftain Calgacus is made to refer to the Brigantes as having revolted under a woman leader. The allusion is obviously to the rising of the Iceni under Boudicca:

"Brigantes femina duce exurere coloniam, expugnare castra, ac nisi felicitas in socordiam vertisset, exuere iugum potuere."¹

The reading 'Brigantes' may possibly be a manuscript error for 'Trinovantes'; Tacitus later stated specifically that the Iceni secured the assistance of the latter tribe.² Perhaps more likely is the explanation that it reflects a certain confusion in the mind of Tacitus at the time; later, when he had had more time in which to study the history of Britain closely, he achieved greater accuracy. The vague generalisations regarding political and geographical detail which pervade the Agricola support this view. In any case, since Venutius' successful rebellion Brigantia can no longer have been considered part of the Roman province. Its inhabitants need not, therefore, be included in a rebellio totius Britannae,³ nor can they be said exuere iugum.

Nevertheless, there is evidence that the Brigantes were ripe for trouble at this period and could not be left unwatched. The Annals state, briefly, that Petilius Cerialis, legate of

¹ Agric., xxxi, § 5.

² Annales, xiv, 31.

³ Agric., xviii, § 4.

the Ninth Legion, which was stationed at Lincoln, went out to meet the revolted tribes from the south and was routed, losing such infantry as he had, but escaping with the cavalry: "et victor Britannus Petilio Ceriali, legato legionis nonae, in subsidium adventanti obvius fudit legionem et quod peditum interfecit: Cerialis cum equitibus evasit in castra et munimentis defensus est." The significant phrase in this passage is 'quod peditum';¹ and when considered in the light of the following piece of information, it shows that only 2,000 infantry can have been lost, for Nero sent out that number of infantry to make good the loss of legionary soldiers in the Ninth.²

The implication must be that Cerialis took only one-third of his legion to meet the rebels; and it seems probable that the reason why he did not take the full legion was that the Brigantes were suspect, or even actually troublesome. Hence the main body of the legion had to be left behind at Lincoln to guard the Brigantian frontier, even when the position in the south was highly critical.

No really satisfactory explanation can be given for the failure of Venutius to intervene decisively to take advantage of this great opportunity. Perhaps his information on the state of affairs was inaccurate. Perhaps his hesitation was

¹ Annales, xiv, 32.

² ibid., xiv, 38.

due to an over-cautious streak in his character - it will be remembered that he took the safe course along with Cartimandua in accepting Plautius' terms instead of standing firm, with the nation's support, for complete independence; he is not known to have opposed the betrayal of Caratacus; in fact, it required an extreme form of humiliation to his personal honour to goad Venutius into active opposition to the queen's policy. A third possibility is that the northern allies upon whom he would naturally rely to a great extent would be reluctant to commit themselves to a war in support of a strange people, the full implications of which they could scarcely be expected to comprehend, and on unknown territory far distant from their homes. The internal history of Brigantia at this period is shrouded in obscurity; but whatever the reason, the opportunity passed, Rome recovered her grasp, and Venutius was compelled to bide his time.

In A.D. 69-70 it seemed that it had come. The Fourteenth Legion had already left Britain in c.67 for the continent. Now news of internal dissension at the heart of the Empire was confirmed by the departure of 8,000 men in all from the remaining three legions in support of Vitellius.¹ Increasing pressure from the Brigantes must have been a strong factor influencing Bolanus' unwillingness to respond to Vitellius' requests for still more troops.² Even Vespasian's ultimate

¹ OHE, i, 108.

² ibid.

triumph in 69 did not immediately ease the situation, for he was compelled to recall the Fourteenth, which had just returned to Britain, to suppress the revolt of Civilis on the Rhine. The opening words of the passage in Tacitus' Histories show that Venutius used these events to inspire bolder Brigantian onslaughts on adjacent Roman territory in Britain.

Unfortunately for the Brigantes, they reckoned without the personality of the new Emperor, who, unlike his successor (Domitian) did not concentrate his interest solely on the Continent, and the fact that he had available a general who was thoroughly acquainted with their country. Petilius Cerialis had commanded the Ninth Legion at Lincoln at the time of the Boudiccan rising; he had won honour in the Emperor's service against both Vitellius and Civilis, and the new legion II Adiutrix, which had served amongst his forces, was not required elsewhere. Vespasian himself had commanded the Second Legion in Britain under Aulus Plautius; and his personal knowledge of the province must have helped him to realise that Cerialis' experience afforded an excellent opportunity for at last resuming the offensive on the northern front.

The Histories and Annals do not carry the story beyond this point, and henceforth all Tacitus' direct information is provided through the biography of Agricola. From this

it is clear that Vespasian lost no time in taking up the challenge, and forthwith decided on the adoption of an aggressive policy in Britain:

"Sed ubi cum cetero orbe Vespasianus et Britanniam recuperavit, magni duces, egregii exercitus, minuta hostium spes. et terrorem statim intulit Petilius Cerialis, Brigantum civitatem, quae numerosissima provinciae totius perhibetur, adgressus. multa proelia, et aliquando non incruenta; magnamque Brigantum partem aut victoria amplexus est aut bello. et Cerialis quidem alterius successoris curam famamque obruisset: subiit sustinuitque molem Iulius Frontinus, vir magnus, quantum licebat, validamque et pugnacem Silurum gentem armis subegit, super virtutem hostium locorum quoque difficultates eluctatus."¹

Without question, the Roman forces in Britain were in better case for loyal and spirited co-operation than ever before, as Tacitus eloquently implies. The Second Legion was enthusiastic in support of its old commander, the new Emperor; II Adiutrix had played a distinguished part in putting down the revolt on the Rhine, and was, moreover, to continue in the service of the man who had then led the legion to victory, while the same general would be hailed by the Ninth as its former leader. With the whole inspired by Cerialis' military genius, the potentialities of the Roman forces in Britain are easily recognised. Tacitus does not over-estimate the new feeling of confidence which must have prevailed.

Tacitus indicates that the reinvigorated spirit of the

¹ Agric., xvii.

Roman army, and the decisive way in which Cerialis launched his attack, did much to demoralize the Brigantes from the outset. Nevertheless, fighting was frequent and fierce, though in the outcome Cerialis, by the end of his period of governorship, had occupied most of the hostile territory, and part of this had been completely reduced to surrender.

The extent of Cerialis' campaigns is the point of outstanding importance. It is obvious that his primary object must have been the subjection of Venutius; but since the latter derived a formidable proportion of his support from regions north of Brigantia, as the Romans had long known,¹ the occupation of these northern areas also must have formed an essential part of Cerialis' programme.

It is clear both from this passage, and also from a consideration of Agricola's campaigns,² that Cerialis' success was not only substantial, but practically complete. Tacitus, anxious that his father-in-law should compare favourably with all other governors, was unlikely to bestow unnecessary praise on the latter; yet in his brief mention he could not withhold from Cerialis terms of description which leave no doubt of the greatness of the man and his achievements. It is true that Tacitus also implies that some portion of Brigantia remained untamed. This may possibly be accounted for by the same

¹ Annales, xii, 40.

² p. 62-4.

pro-Agricolan bias. The alternative explanation is capable of greater substantiation; it may well be urged that the discrepancy is merely due to Tacitus' unfamiliarity with the political geography of this part of Britain - a defect of his early writings which has already been noticed.¹ Furthermore, Tacitus' failure to distinguish between the Brigantes and their northern allies, who also fell under Cerialis' control, is added confirmation of the vagueness of his information. It must be concluded that he is terming 'Brigantian' the whole confederacy established by Venutius, and is not confining himself to the Brigantian state proper as it existed under Cartimandua. Incidentally, his reference to a great population may perhaps be taken to support this view, for although Brigantia itself is known from other sources to have been extensive, the land contained many barren acres, and has never been capable of supporting an agricultural population in proportion to its wide area.

Fortunately, Tacitus' deficiencies can be supplied from no less than two other sources. The elder Pliny and Silius Italicus not only confirm the view that Cerialis advanced far beyond the limits of the Brigantes, but give a definite indication of the extent of that advance. The accuracy of their information is shown by the fact that, though both

¹

p. 49.

references are of an incidental nature, they closely corroborate each other. Pliny states:

"triginta prope iam annis notitiam eius Romanis armis non ultra vicinitatem silvae Caledoniae propagantibus."¹

The meaning is straightforward. It implies that, 'almost thirty years' after the Claudian invasion, that is, by A.D. 73 at latest, the Roman armies had reached the border of the 'Caledonian forest,' but had not yet entered that territory. Since Cerialis took up his appointment in 71, the statement must be taken to indicate the limit of his campaigns in the season before his retirement from Britain. Silius Italicus, too, writing under Domitian, remarks that Vespasian was the first to lead his columns into the groves of Caledonia:

"hinc pater ignotam donabit vincere Thylen inque Caledonios primus trahet agmina lucos."²

As Vespasian died in the summer of 79, Agricola, then in the middle of his second season, cannot be supposed to have reached this point before his death;³ Frontinus is stated by Tacitus to have concerned himself principally with Wales;⁴ and the conclusion must therefore be that it was Cerialis who had established himself on the borders of Caledonia.

¹ Nat. Hist. iv, § 102.

² Punica, iii, v. 597-8.

³ p. 66-7.

⁴ Agric., xvii.

The 'Caledonian forest' appears to have covered the greater part of the Scottish Highlands north of the Forth-Clyde isthmus. Cerialis may have been in immediate contact with the Caledonii (whom Ptolemy seems to place, approximately, in the region now corresponding to Inverness-shire and Perthshire),¹ for though Agricola did not encounter them until he had crossed the Tay, south of the Tay were some tribes who were apparently not unknown to the Romans before Agricola.² Yet the evidence of the elder Pliny and Silius Italicus makes it impossible to suppose that the latter ranged very far south of the Tay. They were, however, too small and weak to offer any effective resistance to Agricola's advance; a number of small clans may well have occupied the region between the Forth and Tay valleys, or at most have reached as far south as the line adopted by Agricola for his fortification of the isthmus, and later taken by the Antonine Wall; and if this line were also Cerialis' northern limit, he could still be described as having reached the neighbourhood of the Caledonian forest, without rendering it necessary to repudiate the truth of Tacitus' statement.

Since Cerialis, then, found it necessary to proceed so far, the allies of Venutius in all probability had their northern boundary somewhere in the region of the Forth-Clyde

¹ Geog., II, iii.

² Agric., xxii. Novas (here and in c.xx) = 'fresh,' as contrasted with ignotas (c.xxiv) = 'unknown.'

isthmus. This, of course, does not mean that they occupied the whole of the territory between that line and Brigantia, though in all probability they and the Brigantes exercised a dominating influence on the lesser peoples between them. It is suggested elsewhere that some such state of affairs was responsible for the friendly attitude of certain Lowland tribes towards Rome, and for Rome's decision to reoccupy Scotland in the second century, asserting her position as a protective power.¹ The friends of the Brigantes are not known to us by name. In view of their probable location, however, and their reputation as warriors, a tentative identification as the ancestors of the nucleus of the collective group later known as the Maeatae is perhaps possible. Venutius' allies are, at any rate, the only discontented element which we know to have existed in the Lowlands. It is possible that they were the people who, led by Arviragus, were responsible for Rome's inability to hold Scotland under Domitian;² and later for Urbicus' advance at the beginning of Pius' reign, when, because - unlike the Caledonii - they could not be geographically separated from the more peaceful elements in the Lowlands, they were reduced to impotence for nearly two generations through the transportation of large numbers of men.³ It may also be significant

¹ p. 81-5.

² Juvenal, Satires, xiv, 196 ff.

³ p. 81-2.

that in their invasion of the province at the close of the second century the Maeatae had the co-operation of the Brigantian hillmen.¹ National and tribal loyalties or hatreds are traditional and persistent; but even if the Roman occupation had destroyed the continuity of such friendship, common interests still remained. Fundamentally, their position at the close of the second century was unchanged from that of the first - both were powerful, independently minded peoples who were capable of looking after themselves, and resented Roman domination because it deprived them of the opportunity of themselves dominating the lesser tribes of the north, and plundering them at will.

Of the completeness of Cerialis' success there can be no better testimony than Tacitus' inability to record even a single battle which could afford the opportunity for a victory to Agricola until he had passed beyond the Tay.² Yet, partly through a wholly unjustifiable concentration upon archaeological evidence to the exclusion of the ancient sources, partly through a too casual acceptance of Tacitus' glorification of the exploits of Agricola, Cerialis has hitherto never been given the credit for his great achievements. Finds definitely datable to his period of governorship are rare; and in doubtful cases the dating of pottery types, swayed by the prevailing notion of Agricola as the conqueror of the

¹ p. 91-2.

² p. 63, 66.

north, has invariably been ascribed to the later rather than the earlier period.

On only two sites is Cerialian occupation universally acknowledged - at York¹ and Malton;² but only total unacquaintance with the essential passages in the ancient sources can account for the campaigns of Cerialis being therefore assumed to have been restricted to central and east Yorkshire.³ At Carlisle, the pottery has been widely taken to indicate a Cerialian foundation,⁴ but it must be noted that this view is not universally held.⁵ On the Stanegate sites of Chesterholm and Corbridge,⁶ also, there is a presumption in favour of occupation in this period.

The general lack of datable evidence for Cerialis, far from necessitating a restricted estimate of his activities, is, by its universal nature, a warning that in the existing state of archaeological knowledge, the authority of the ancient sources must be regarded as all-important. So long as Cerialis' presence is archaeologically unattested in districts where it is generally admitted that he must have operated, the absence of like evidence from the Scottish Lowlands cannot be allowed even as negative evidence against the recognition of

¹ JRS, xv, 192 (Miller).

² Corder, Malton, 61.

³ As in OHE, i, 110.

⁴ Bushe-Fox, Arch., lxiv, 311.

⁵ e.g. Haverfield and Atkinson, CW², xvii (1916-17), 235-50.

⁶ AA4, xv, 282.

his activities here. Even on sites such as Meltham and Kirklees in south-west Yorkshire, which have been attributed to him on other grounds,¹ and where no later occupation took place to confuse the evidence, excavation revealed no datable finds. The defences there were of a crude Flavian type, obviously of a temporary character; and it is obvious, on considering what Cerialis' objects were, that he had no time to plan a permanent occupation with careful attention to strategic position and communications. That function was left to Agricola. Cerialis' three years of governorship were active, his army mobile. There must be many temporary sites, hastily selected by Cerialis and later abandoned by Agricola in favour of positions more suitable for the permanent occupation of a district; perhaps Dent, on the line of the Craven Way between York and Carlisle, where no trace remains above ground, is a typical instance.² Such sites are difficult to establish, and even when excavated are singularly uninformative. Their more complete and thorough investigation is urgently required of Romano-British archaeological research.

It is therefore unlikely that Cerialis would attempt to construct such a solid type of castellum as Agricola found necessary. Possibly, too, Cerialis was somewhat inferior to Agricola as a military engineer, though as a field general

¹ Richmond, Huddersfield, 21-7.

² p. 174.

he had no superior. In this connection, it is significant that the traces of Frontinus in north Wales are much more numerous than those of Cerialis in the north of Britain; for Frontinus himself was a skilled engineer, a leading writer on military strategy, and author of the "Strategimata." On the other hand, the area occupied by Frontinus is much smaller than that covered by Cerialis, the finality of whose conquest of Venutius and his allies was in itself an amazing achievement in the time at his disposal.

Tacitus' accounts of the activities of Frontinus have a special significance, because they bear out the contention made regarding his description of the conquest of the Brigantes - namely, that he is not averse from belittling the achievements of Agricola's predecessors in order to enhance the glory of the object of his biographical eulogy. It is only from an incidental reference in a later passage¹ that we learn that Roman garrisons had been stationed in the territory of the Ordovices of central and north-west Wales before Agricola's arrival. The outbreak detailed by Tacitus apparently occurred in the interregnum between the departure of Frontinus and the arrival of Agricola; in all essentials, the ground must have been thoroughly prepared for Agricola to dispose of the people of that difficult country in the space of one short campaign.

¹ Agric., xviii.

Agricola, who succeeded Frontinus in A.D. 78,¹ reconquered the Isle of Anglesey in his first season, after completing the conquest of the Ordovices.² Next summer he took the field again:

"sed ubi aestas advenit, contracto exercitu multus in agmine, laudare, modestiam, disiectos coercere; loca castris ipse capere, aestuaria ac silvas ipse praetemptare; et nihil interim apud hostis quietum pati, quo minus subitis excursibus popularetur; atque ubi satis terruerat, parcendo rursus invitamenta pacis ostentare. quibus rebus multae civitates, quae in illum diem ex aequo egerant, datis obsidibus iram posuere et praesidiis castellisque circumdatae, et tanta ratione curaque, ut nulla ante³ Britanniae nova pars pariter inaccessita transierit."

The outstanding problem presented by this passage is the identification of the district in which Agricola was operating. Analysis yields the following points of information: first, it was characterized by woods and estuaries; secondly, it contained 'many states' which offered no resistance to the process of occupation, although they showed a certain amount of fearful resentment; and thirdly, although hitherto they had been permitted to retain their independence, it is clear both from the wording of this passage and from the contrast with c.24, where it is specifically stated that the Romans ventured forth into unknown territory, that this area was already known to the Romans. The natural explanation is

¹ OHE, i, 119, n.2.

² Agric., xviii.

³ ibid., xx.

that these were tribes who had threatened no trouble to Cerialis, who must throughout have concentrated on the conquest of the Venutian confederacy. Content that they should remain neutral, and realising that in any case they were weak and almost negligible as a military factor, he had not troubled to occupy their territory. This occupation, as he had expected, proved to be purely a routine duty; Agricola experienced no difficulty in bringing the natives under Roman sway.

The description of woods and estuaries has usually been taken to apply to the west coast between Chester and Carlisle. There is, moreover, good reason to believe that the north-west was occupied by people outside the scope of Brigantian influence, of a backward culture, who would fall easy prey to any military power which considered the occupation of that barren region worth while.¹ On the other hand, these people seem to have had no developed political organization such as would justify Tacitus' use of the term 'civitates'; and no evidence of Agricolan foundation has so far come to light in any of the forts of Cumberland, Westmorland and Lancashire-north-of-the-Sands.²

This description can, in fact, be applied equally well to the east coast, where lived at least one tribe which was

¹ p.123-5.

² Collingwood (Arch. lxxi, 7-8) postulated an Agricolan foundation at Hardknott, but Dr. Steer's examination of the pottery favours a date nearer Hadrian than Agricola (personal information).

sufficiently developed to be given separate recognition by Ptolemy, - the Otadini, credited in the Geographia with three oppida, of which Bremenium has been identified with High Rochester. The Gadeni were also placed hereabouts by Ptolemy.¹ Furthermore, there are indications that this area controlled by Dere Street was never hostile to Rome, and that its protection was, in fact, often something in the nature of a liability.² The association with Cuneda in the late fourth century is a further proof of the friendship which had developed between the Otadini and Rome.³ Between them and the Brigantes other peaceful tribes probably existed, not important enough to gain mention from Ptolemy, but nevertheless politically well-developed; one, at least, is known to have existed in the Tyne valley, where the curia of the Textoverdi was giving a lead to the people in religious affairs in the second century.⁴

That the east coast is preferably to be regarded as the scene of operations in Agricola's second season is supported by practical considerations raised by Tacitus' next relevant statement:

¹ Geog., II, iii.

² p.84-5.

³ p.84.

⁴ CIL, 712.

"Tertius expeditionum annus novas gentis aperuit, vastatis usque ad Tanaum (aestuatio nomen est) nationibus. qua formidine territi hostes quamquam conflictatum saevis tempestatibus exercitum lacescere non ausi; ponendisque insuper castellis spatium fuit. adnotabant periti non alium ducem opportunitates locorum sapientius legisse. nullum ab Agricola positum castellum aut vi hostium expugnatum aut pactione ac fuga desertum; nam adversus moras obsidionis annuis copiis firmabantur."¹

In his third season (A.D. 80) Agricola was still operating in territory already known to the Romans,² and progressed as far as the estuary of the Tanaus. This must unquestionably be identified with the Tay, as the marginal variant 'Taum' in the manuscript in fact suggests.³ Although it has been identified with everything resembling an estuary between Tees and Tay, it cannot be south of the Forth-Clyde isthmus, since the fourth season was entirely spent in securing the country which had been overrun; and there is no indication of any further advance before the fortification of the Forth-Clyde line, as Anderson wrongly assumes.⁴ It has been demonstrated that Scotland as far as the isthmus was well acquainted with the Roman arms by the end of Cerialis' governorship, so that the 'new nations' opened up by Agricola must have occupied the land approximately between the Forth and the Tay.

¹ Agric., xxii.

² Note 2, p. 57.

³ Agric., Introd. lvi, and p.106, s.v. Tanaum.

⁴ ibid., Introd. lvii.

Agricola must have progressed fairly slowly. His care in the selection and disposition of sites for forts is particularly noticed by Tacitus, who confirms the view that he was planning and putting into effect a scheme of occupation intended to be permanent. Such work must have taken considerably longer than a march merely of conquest, when camps were thrown up hastily and were only of a temporary character. It is therefore a priori probable that Agricola spent more than one season in his advance from the legionary base at York to the Tay, and that the first of these (his second in Britain) took him perhaps as far as Newstead in the Tweed valley, where the earliest of five superimposed forts has been dated to this period,¹ but possibly even to the Forth; Tacitus does not mention that the third year saw the conclusion of the work of consolidation before fresh conquests were embarked upon. This third season expedition beyond the isthmus satisfied Agricola that no better line than the latter was available for the consolidation of the ground won. It also served to establish that control of a certain area beyond the main line of defence noted elsewhere as a common feature of Roman policy.²

Under Agricola's governorship, the Brigantes appear to

¹ Curle, Newstead, 22 ff.

² p.83-5.

have accepted Roman overlordship without much outward protest, and to have shared to some extent in the general drift towards more intensive romanization which was then taking place. Neither literary nor archaeological evidence provides any indication that the fortification of the Stanegate, like that of the Stainmore road, was inspired by anything more than the general practical advisability of guarding the important lines of communication between the two coasts. A reference by Juvenal to the castella Brigantum has sometimes been taken to indicate that the Brigantes were still offering active opposition in the late first century:

"Dirue Maurorum attegias, castella Brigantum,
ut locupletem, aquilam tibi sexagesimus annus
adferat." ¹

The satirical context, however, makes it clear that precisely the reverse is the case. The castella may be interpreted either as puny works, whose destruction was a mere detail of the soldiers' routine labour, or as strongholds now unoccupied and falling into disuse.

There is, in fact, no evidence of a recrudescence of Brigantian power until the second decade of the next century, and it is extremely unlikely that a native leader could have been giving such trouble in this area that his name was familiar in Rome, when the Roman military establishment in

¹ Satires, xiv, 196 ff.

the northern Pennines was at its original strength, and where the archaeological evidence everywhere confirms the assumption of a peaceful state of affairs. Only in Scotland can Arviragus be reasonably supposed to have gained a reputation which could harass the mind of the emperor in Rome;¹ and Juvenal's reference² can scarcely be connected with any British affair other than the retreat of the Roman armies to the Stanegate frontier towards the end of the reign of Domitian³.

By the accession of Hadrian, however, there can be no doubt that discontent and active revolt were rife in Britain. Spartian mentions a successful British rebellion at the time of the accession:

"Adeptus imperium ad priscum se statim morem instituit et tenendae per orbem terrarum paci operam impendit. nam deficientibus iis nationibus quas Traianus subegerat, Mauri lacescebant, Sarmatae bellum inferebant, Britanni teneri sub Romana ditione non poterant, Aegyptus seditionibus urgebatur, Libya denique ac Palestina rebelles animos efferebant"⁴

His evidence is confirmed by Fronto:

"avo vestro Hadriano imperium optinente quantum militum ab Iudaeis, quantum ab Britannis caesum"⁵

That the trouble was in fact an internal revolt and not an invasion is clear from these writers, and confirmed by the

¹ ibid., iv, 126

² "Regem aliquem capies aut de temone Britanno excidet Arviragus"

³ p.13-15

⁴ Hist. Aug. 'Hadrianus,' V.2

⁵ Loebe ed. Vol. II, p.22

fact that no trace of destruction occurs on the Stanegate at this time. That it is likely to have been centred in Brigantian territory is probable from a variety of reasons to be considered, but principally from the disappearance from history of the Ninth legion, which was stationed at York. In 108-9 it is last mentioned on an inscription at York;¹ by 122 it was replaced there by the legion VI Victrix.² Taken in conjunction with the literary evidence of the period, the suggestion must be that there was a severe reversal to the Roman arms about the time of Hadrian's accession in 117. There are, however, no traces of a disaster at York at this time. It seems probable that in a contest in the open field the Ninth disgraced itself, and was discontinued as a fighting unit. Ritterling³ and Collingwood⁴ argue on these lines on the ground that later records of men serving elsewhere in the Empire who had previously served in the Ninth show that they only received promotion at a much slower rate than was the usual custom. Since both are laticlavii, however, (and therefore not serving at the same time, since each legion had only one laticlavus), they are wrong in attributing this laggardly progress to any one particular disaster.

¹ CIL, 241.

² P-W. s.v. Legio, col. 1606.

³ ibid., cols. 1668-9.

⁴ OHE, i, 129, n.2.

Yet the argument is not wholly nullified; their slow promotion may still have been due to the bad record of the Ninth legion which had been incurring disasters over a long period of time - instance the utter rout of a large vexillation of that unit when stationed at Lincoln at the time of the Boudiccan revolt - and which must have been a by-word for bad discipline and organisation.

The withdrawal c. A.D. 86 of one of the four legions in Britain (II Adiutrix) must have weakened the Roman position and inspired hope of regaining their independence among the Brigantes. The attenuation of the provincial garrison may have had a similar effect upon their former allies in Scotland, possibly led by Arviragus, where inability to police them effectively was responsible for the Romans' decision to retire to the Stanegate line. Encouraged by the successful example of a northern tribe, the Brigantes eventually burst into active revolt. Long before this occurred, however, unrest in the Brigantian area may have influenced the Romans in the resolve to concentrate their frontier garrison further to the south. Throughout the second century the Brigantes formed that most dangerous of enemies - the enemy within the state. Certainly there is nothing to suggest that the Brigantian political character had been moulded sufficiently for them so much as to approach the description of the Cornovii, from

the evidence of the Wroxeter inscription, as "in their corporate capacity the representatives of the Roman civilization."¹

It would, however, be unwise to suggest that the discontent which was rife in Brigantia at this period was corporate, in the sense that it pervaded a body politic and united it in an organised demonstration of active protest. All the evidence we possess indicates that as a state capable of unified and independent action, Brigantia was finally crushed in those critical years of the struggle with Cerialis. The monarchy, at any rate, must have vanished into oblivion at that time, and the evidence indirectly furnished by Hadrian's reorganization of the northern defences indicates that much of the district which had formerly been the centre of Brigantian culture and administration no longer threatened trouble to Rome. Apart from the Stanegate forts and that at Malton,^{1a} which were now abandoned, certain others in the Brigantian area were also evacuated, in spite of the fact that revolt is known to have been simmering of late in some parts of the tribal territory. There is no reason to suppose that the disaffection was on a large, combined scale; and the knowledge of forts whose garrisons could safely be transferred north at this time affords a clue to those districts which did

¹ Collingwood, JRS., xiv, 244.

^{1a} Corder, Malton, 69.

not share in the disturbances, or at least were not expected to give further trouble. Richmond has commented on the peaceful atmosphere in which the garrison and camp followers of Slack and Castleshaw - a station whose now inconsiderable strength had evoked no ill-consequences - in the Huddersfield district, had flourished;¹ and the fact that those garrisons could be withdrawn with confidence c. A.D. 125 confirms the view that what had formerly been the centre of the Brigantian state no longer harboured any considerable proportion of discontented spirits. It is further north, particularly in the fells of north Yorkshire, that we must look for signs of native resistance. There we find the Stainmore route heavily guarded, and continued occupation at Bainbridge. The excavations at Ilkley were too inconclusive to permit of reliable deductions as to its early history; but the numerous destructions and rebuildings indicate that it suffered heavily under local risings until it was finally abandoned altogether.² At North Stainley is the unusual feature of a strongly fortified country residence. A fairly accurate modern parallel may be drawn with the effects of the Italian occupation of Abyssinia. One result of the Roman occupation of Brigantia would be to drive into the remoter regions a few bold but isolated bands of men whose first not

¹ Huddersfield, 60-3.

² Woodward, Y.A.J. xxviii, 137-326.

unselfish inspiration gradually degenerated into the practice of brigandage, while they sheltered in lairs of North Yorkshire and Weardale (witness the Heathery Burn cave occupation).

It is quite likely, therefore, that the construction of the frontier conveniently known as Hadrian's Wall, though in fact the Wall is but one of several elements in that defensive system, was inspired by a Brigantian revolt in which the Ninth legion suffered so severely as to be disbanded, c.117.

Although York was apparently unscathed, the Parisian capital at Brough-on-Humber also seems to have suffered. Recent excavations show that rebuilding in Roman style early in the second century was interrupted, and "when building operations were again resumed, the defences received first attention. So secure had the Petuarians been in the Pax Romana that no attempt seems to have been made to defend the earlier town. Now they dug around it three great ditches and erected, on a firm foundation of flat stones, a rampart of laid turves."¹

Many students have been tardy in recognising the manifold character of the Wall's defences. Its purpose as a barrier to invasions by the aggressive northern tribes is obvious; equally important, however, was its relation to the enemy behind the frontier. Horsley, indeed, negatives such an idea,² and Collingwood is emphatic in his view that Horsley's

¹ Corder, Petuararia.

² BR, 126-7.

arguments against such a theory are irrefutable.¹ Yet an examination of Horsley's text in the light of present knowledge scarcely produces such a convincing effect. It is well known that the Hadrianic frontier consisted of two barriers, the Wall itself, and the Vallum - a ditch with mounds on either side and narrow crossings at frequent intervals, a little way to the south, but always within sight of the Wall. The theories as to the purpose and date of the Vallum have been many and various. It was until 1936 generally believed to have been an earlier barrier, later being superseded by the Wall because it did not prove effective enough. But excavations in milecastles along its western portion have now proved that the Vallum cannot have been earlier in date than the Wall, and was probably contemporary with it. Collingwood now suggests that the Vallum was intended to act as the financial customs barrier for traffic passing the frontier, a separate boundary from the military one being required owing to the fact that the functions of procurator and military commander were quite distinct. Such an argument has its weak points. It is at least equally likely that the Vallum was designed to afford protection against sudden attacks from the rear, as both Bruce^{1a} and Hodgson^{1b} supposed. This suggestion is

¹ A.A.,⁴ XV, 40-2.

^{1a} Bruce, Wall, 59.

^{1b} Hodgson, Northumberland, i, 43-8.

at any rate confirmed by the fact that excavations on the turf wall and at Milecastles 50 and 51 revealed crossings over the ditch and north mound, but not over the south mound.¹ It is, further, significant that the gateways at Benwell and Birdoswald are known to have closed from the north side; the the general body of evidence thus indicates that access to the ditch of the Vallum was readily provided to facilitate the ready marshalling of troops along it at required points, but that entrance from the south side of that long unbroken barrier was much more difficult to obtain.

There can be no doubt, if we pause to visualise the Vallum as it originally was - a wide, flat-bottomed ditch, with steep sides about 7 feet deep and 30 feet wide - that it would be quite sufficient to deprive the enemy completely of the advantage of a surprise attack, upon which the hillmen would naturally rely to a very great extent. Moreover, the sentries along the Wall would not be handicapped in their view towards the south by this form of barrier. It is now clear that the original arrangement of the Vallum at Milecastles was to have a crossing solely for the use of patrols, the south mound being carried through continuously, while at the complete Vallum crossings opposite forts, in the only two instances where evidence is extant, the gates were closed from the north side. In this way the Roman frontier cut

¹ CW², xxxvii, 157-77.

right across the province at a most convenient point, and was able to keep watch over both north and south at once.

The effectiveness of the Hadrianic frontier system in controlling the elements of unrest immediately within the province is demonstrated by the fact that there is no hint of further trouble until the reign of Antoninus Pius, when Pausanias, in the process of detailing the most important wars in that reign, writes:

"He [Antoninus] deprived the Brigantes in Britain of a great portion of their land, because with arms they had begun to overrun the Genunian district, which is tributary to the Romans."¹

The explanation of this passage demands a consideration of Roman frontier policy during the second century in the north of Britain.

The outstanding event in the reign of Pius was undoubtedly the reoccupation of Scotland by Lollius Urbicus soon after his accession. This important departure was precluded by important extensions to the supply base at Corbridge,² while Capitolinus states:

"nam et Britannos per Lollium Urbicum vicit legatum alio muro caespiticio summotis barbaris ducto."³

By 142, the victory was complete, for in an inscription of this year Antoninus Pius is designated as Imp. II,⁴ and coins

¹ VIII, xliii, 4.

² AA³, iv, 262-3; AA⁴, xiii, 274-8.

³ Hist. Aug. 'Antoninus Pius,' v. 4.

⁴ CIL, x, 515, - ILS, 340.

bear the legend Britannia, with designs signifying a victory.¹

It would be a mistake to assume that the step taken by Pius represents any fundamental reversal of Hadrian's frontier policy. Although the advance threw a great strain on the military resources of Britain, and necessitated the weakening of the Pennine garrisons, Hadrian's Wall continued to be held in strength. There is evidence for the evacuation of the forts at Brough-in-Derbyshire,² and probably Melandra,³ at this time. So pressing, indeed, was the need for troops to garrison the increasing number of forts that further inroads had to be made upon the Second Legion, though the normal functions of legionaries did not include serving as fixed police garrisons. A detachment of the Second Legion appears to have occupied Housesteads following the transfer of its garrison - not necessarily the First Cohort of Tungrians - to the Scottish Wall.⁴

Scotland had been evacuated in the closing years of the first century, seemingly because the depletion of their legionary strength had rendered it impossible for the Romans to cope with disturbances in that area inspired by a tribe or combination of tribes under the leadership of Arviragus, and with a situation whose difficulties were possibly

¹ Cohen, ii, 281 f., nos. 113-16, 119.

² Gillam, Derbyshire.

³ Manchester Guardian, July 11, 1938.

⁴ OHE, i, 143.

accentuated by unrest amongst the Brigantes. Since that time, the latter had been so troublesome that it had been found necessary to incorporate a special feature in the Hadrianic frontier to facilitate effective control of the territory behind that line. True, this policy had been so successful that no serious disturbance had since occurred in the Pennines; but the Roman authorities can have been under no misapprehension as to the true state of affairs. That the seat of trouble was the region immediately south of the Wall is shown by the fact that the Wall garrisons were retained, as were those of forts like Bainbridge in north Yorkshire. Further south, however, where, as has already been pointed out, the inhabitants had quietly accepted the pax Romana, it was considered safe to remove some of the troops to the new northern front.

The strain thrown upon Rome's military resources by the new advance, which meant that areas of disturbance as far apart as the Clyde basin and Yorkshire had to be controlled by a similar military strength to that which had already, half a century previously, been adjudged unequal to the task, suggests that the provocation must have been very great. The only possible explanation is provided by Pausanias, whose passage, taken in conjunction with Capitolinus, explains the whole affair.

The decisive argument for relating Pausanias to Urbicus is that, when he wrote this passage, he was detailing the principal wars of Pius; he cannot, therefore, be supposed to have omitted this, the most important of them - the only one, in fact, for which he accepted an imperial salutation. Furthermore, the wording clearly indicates that the raid on the Genuni was an act of aggression from outside, not a rebellion. Nor, again, unless the meaning is to be unduly strained, can a government well have punished a tribe within its territories by 'appropriating' the land of rebels, which in fact obviously already belonged to that government. Yet if the reading 'Brigantes' be faithfully retained, we are asked to accept these irrational conclusions, or else twist the meaning to fit ingenious but far from straightforward explanations. There is nothing revolutionary in the suggestion that Pausanias really meant 'Brittones' instead of 'Brigantes.' Perhaps it would be fanciful to suggest that Pausanias may be falling into the same error as Tacitus in referring to the allies of the Brigantes by the same name;¹ and the acceptance of Macdonald's interpretation of Capitolinus' summotis barbaris² would make the coincidence so close as to invite incredulity. It must, however, be supposed that either because the Brigantes were the only northern British tribe well known in Rome, from their warlike reputation, or

¹ p.55.

² p.81.

because he was writing from vague, third-hand information, Pausanias used their name as synonymous for Britons in general. Incidentally, it is just possible that Juvenal's satirical reference to the castella Brigantum may be another illustration of the former explanation, though in this case applying to other tribes. Independent positive evidence favouring the substitution of Brittones for Brigantes does in fact exist.¹

Since the Genuni are described as tributary to the Romans, the indication is that they were outside the Roman province, but nevertheless under its protection. The aggressors may therefore be supposed to have lived farther to the north, as other considerations indicate. That the Genuni occupied some district just beyond Hadrian's Wall is a reasonable assumption; and perhaps the occupation of the forts at Birrens, Netherby and Bewcastle at this time affords a clue to the whereabouts of the Genunian moira.

Support for the revised reading Brittones comes from a consideration of Capitolinus' phrase summotis barbaris. Macdonald has suggested² that it bears a similar meaning to the passage in which Tacitus describes the effect of Agricola's Forth-Clyde fortifications: "summotis velut in aliam insulam hostibus."³ In this case, the offenders must be supposed to have been driven into the Highlands, the Wall

¹ p. 81-2.

² RWS, 49.

³ Agric., xxiii, § 2.

serving as a locked door against the exiles. The more usual interpretation of the word summotis, however, favours the suggestion that the barbarians were actually transported to Germany, where numeri Brittonum are recorded to have acted as a patrolling garrison on the inner limes, following the Antonine reconstruction there.¹

If the offenders are supposed to have been the descendants of Cerialis' northern opponents, and therefore resident on or south of the Forth-Glyde isthmus, part of the depopulation, at least, must be supposed to have taken place within the Antonine frontier, though it may also have had its counterpart beyond the Wall;² and Haverfield's interpretation of the latter as a 'breakwater frontier' against possible depredations on Roman allies by the untamed Caledonii holds good. At the same time, the Antonine Wall garrison could control the area in its rear, just as Hadrian's Wall facilitated the control of the more troublesome Brigantes. In support of this view, it should be remarked that the southern defences of the fort on Bar Hill appear to have been stronger than those on the north; and the suggestion is therefore that in this particular district the elements of discontent were unusually strong. In general, however, the Antonine Wall was not constructed with the elaboration

¹ Fabricius, ORL, xlviiii (1932), 49-55.

² Richmond, JRS, xxvi, 190-4.

to be found on the Hadrianic frontier, and it would have been too much to demand of its simple form that its garrison should keep in subjection powerful tribes on both sides of it. Those rebels on the south could not be conveniently cut off from the inoffensive remainder of the Lowland tribes by means of an artificial barrier, as could the Caledonii; and the drastic remedy of transporting large numbers of the tribe was accordingly adopted. Such action, however, is not unparalleled in imperial history.

The existence of the Genunian protectorate, and the weighty action taken by Rome to prevent any recurrence of such an injury, provides a valuable illumination of Roman frontier policy in the second century. The Great Wall of Hadrian was not intended to mark the limit of Roman influence or interests in the north of Britain. It was part of general policy throughout the Empire to endeavour to preserve a controlling influence in the area beyond the nominal frontier, by maintaining friendly relations with the inhabitants, and affording protection when required. Such was the situation in Noricum. The contemporary frontier of Pius in Germany likewise consisted of a double line. In Syria, too, the Trajanic limes consisted of multiple fortified lines, all parallel to the main line of defence, designed to control the region in front and behind, and to

afford protection to the friendly Bedouin tribes.¹ In Scotland, the Genuni were probably not the only people who sheltered under Rome's protective alliance. It has been seen that the people of the east coast, chief among whom were the Otadini, offered no resistance to the first occupation of their lands by Agricola;² while at the other end of the period Cuneda's movements in the late fourth century testify to the long continuance of this tribe's friendly relations with Rome.³ Their attitude was probably the result of their position, being subject to the attacks of more powerful tribes like the Maeatae on the one hand and the Brigantes on the other; consequently they welcomed Roman control. Rome in turn benefited by the alliance, since they acted as a buffer between the main frontier and the openly hostile tribes farther to the north. She could not, accordingly, afford to ignore such a direct challenge to her authority as the raid on the Genuni. The reoccupation of Scotland up to the Forth-Clyde line was made with the intention, certainly of emphasising that she had lost none of her power, and so intimidating the barbarians that they would not dare to repeat the assault, but also, in all probability, with a more far-sighted motive; by occupying

¹ Macdonald, Antiquity, viii.

² p.63-4.

³ p.65.

the Lowlands for a period of two generations or so, she might hope to build up a more settled state of affairs, not only establishing an unshakable faith in the power of Rome, but perhaps also encouraging those friendly tribes to take stronger measures for their own defence. Pius probably hoped that when the more intractable elements of the offending tribe, perhaps the Maeatae, had been removed by transportation, the remnant could gradually be trained to adopt a pro-Roman outlook. As far as the Otadini are concerned, there is a suggestion that he may have encouraged the development of defence measures amongst them. Just as in Wales, when the garrisons were largely withdrawn for the manning of Hadrian's Wall, large fortified hill-towns such as Dinorben and Tre'r Ceiri made their appearance, so, in the region of Dere Street in Scotland, numerous hill-forts such as Warden Law are to be found whose construction is attributable to the second century. These forts frequently overlook that highway, and it is inconceivable that they were allowed to be built without official sanction. The most significant feature common to all, however, is that they have a northern rather than a southern outlook. It may reasonably be concluded that they were intended for the defence of the natives when Rome should consider herself in a position to retire once more to the southern frontier.

That Pius had such an ultimate withdrawal in mind seems very probable. The character of the Antonine Wall in itself suggests that it was constructed for a limited purpose and a limited time. It would last for a reasonably long period, but not indefinitely. It was built efficiently, but with the minimum of expense, lacking many of the elaborate features of the Hadrianic frontier. The explanation does not lie in any general Imperial policy of economy, for the contemporary German limes was being built on a scale fully equal to that of Hadrian in Britain. There is every reason to consider that the conception of Hadrian's Wall as the essential feature of Britain's northern frontier remained a fundamental principle of Roman policy; there was never any intention of departing from it.

The entirely different significance attributed to Pausanias by Haverfield has gained such widespread currency that some reference appears to be called for. By collecting various pieces of evidence from widespread parts of the north, and relating them to Pausanias' words, Haverfield built up a case for a Brigantian revolt of the first magnitude under the governorship of Julius Verus;¹ and Macdonald even wishes to extend it as far as the Scottish Wall, to explain the latter's first destruction.² Verus certainly brought reinforcements from Germany for all three British legions; coins of Pius

¹ Roman Occupation of Britain, 120.

² RWS, 10-11.

record that in 155 his troops gained a considerable victory in Britain; forts were being rebuilt c.156-8 as far apart as Brough in Derbyshire and Birrens in Dumfriesshire; and, finally, Haverfield saw in inscriptions recording building at different sites a hint of possible damage to Hadrian's Wall.¹ The repairs on the Wall, however, must be regarded as normal peace-time work rather than reconstruction necessitated by wilful destruction.² There is, moreover, no valid reason for including any of the sites where trouble is presumed to have occurred in Brigantian territory; as far as Brough is concerned, there is positive evidence against such inclusion.³ With Pausanias demonstrably referring to an earlier event altogether, there is, in fact, nothing to connect the Brigantes with disturbance at this time at all. The movement of large bodies of troops away to the Antonine Wall no doubt provided an irresistible incentive for revolt to certain disaffected factions, but there is nothing to indicate that the trouble was anything more than local and spasmodic.

Haverfield failed to explain why the Brigantes should be said to have been deprived of their territory by the Romans, when they were already included in the Roman province. Collingwood supplies the deficiency with a characteristically

¹ Haverfield and Macdonald, Roman Occupation of Britain, 119-21.

² Birley, A.A.4, vii, 169-74.

³ p.120-2.

ingenious solution. In brief, he suggests that the punishment may have taken the form of the appropriation of land hitherto under the administration of the native cantonal authorities at Aldborough for the establishment of the colony at York.¹ The whole situation is purely hypothetical. For instance, the existence of a colony at York is not attested until A.D.237.² Moreover, the whole trend of our evidence for the Brigantes points to a very definite distinction between the Brigantian hillmen's attitude towards Rome and that of the Aldborough townspeople.³ It would, therefore, have been punishing the innocent to have acquired a piece of territory from the native capital, whose inhabitants were most unlikely to have had either the inclination or the opportunity to perpetrate any serious outrage. The peaceful pro-Roman attitude of Aldborough is illustrated by the fact that its defences may actually have been strengthened about this time; there is a complete predominance of Antonine material in the ramparts.⁴ The position is thus similar to that at Petuaria where reconstruction of the defences also took place in this period.⁵ A gulf between the political outlook of the townsmen and the hillmen is plainly to be

¹ OHE, i, 171-2.

² JRS, xi, 101-7.

³ p. 91-3.

⁴ Regarded as distinct from the Wall first built in the early third century. See p.254-5.

⁵ Corder, Petuaria.

deduced; and its widening is attested, for example, by the construction in stone of the town wall around Aldborough early in the following century.¹

There is no specific mention of the Brigantes after this mistaken reference by Pausanias. Henceforward we hear only of 'the Britons. Nevertheless, Haverfield is probably correct in assuming that the Brigantes, though in ill-connected and spasmodic risings, were largely responsible for the perpetual state of unrest which prevailed in the north throughout the second century. Throughout the remaining disturbances of the second century, moreover, the available evidence continues to point the distinction between the Romanized inhabitants of Aldborough and the still uncultured hillmen. Under Marcus Aurelius there is mention of the threat of a British war in the Augustan histories which apparently materialised and was dealt with by Calpurnius Agricola;² and the incidence of evidence for building by this general confirms the view that the source of Brigantian disaffection was not the cantonal capital but the remoter fringes of tribal territory. While destruction at Ribchester may have been the work of Irish pirates, taking advantage of Rome's distraction in Scotland, it is also possible that it was the result of local disaffection

¹ loc. cit.

² p. 25.

similar to that in the neighbouring Craven Highlands, where the Ilkley garrison was finding difficulty in preserving order. In any case, it is unquestionable that there was still real need for strong supervision in the northern parts of Brigantia. It is significant that Calpurnius found it necessary to reoccupy Chesterholm on the Stanegate, a fort which had been superseded by Housesteads and lain abandoned for forty years. Perhaps to be connected with the tense situation in the northern Pennines is the presence at Lanchester under Antistius Adventus of the military cohort of Vardulli,¹ which may have been moved south from Castlecary at some period, possibly under Calpurnius Agricola. By thus enforcing a weakening of the northern garrison the Pennine situation must have been an important factor contributing to the second collapse of the Antonine Wall under Commodus.²

Events following on the invasion of 196 continue to provide support for the distinction already drawn between the capital of the Brigantes and its provincials. The latter had found ways of making trouble even when the Roman garrison was at its normal strength. When Albinus denuded the Wall of troops at the close of the second century to make his vain challenge to Severus in Gaul, the Maeatae, most powerful of the northern tribes, swept in and painstakingly

¹ CIL, 440.

² p.23-4.

wrecked the fortifications all over the north. But it is significant that the ordinary towns, with the outstanding exception of Aldborough,¹ escaped. It is not unreasonable to suppose that their inhabitants, most of them native Brigantes, did not remain in a state of semi-siege for about five years, as Collingwood would have us believe.² Rather is it likely that they saw the futility of opposing their fellow tribesmen from the neighbouring rural districts who must have welcomed the opportunity to run riot. By this neutrality, at least, they could purchase immunity from the common fate. Unless the native hillmen be supposed to have taken an active share in the work of destruction, it is difficult to account for the penetration far into the hills of the Pennines, and the careful destruction of every single fort there, while the civil settlements, more lucrative sources of booty, were spared. Aldborough, however, was too deeply committed to a pro-Roman policy in the past to escape retribution. It is a striking fact that while the strongest military stations and the capital town in Brigantian territory were ravaged, the Parisian capital at Brough-on-Humber reveals no sign of destruction.³ If the wrecking were the work of invaders alone, this discrimination would

¹ cf. Birley, AA⁴, vii, 167; and Miller, JRS, xv, 193.

² OHE, i, 157.

³ Gorder, Petuarria.

be inexplicable. Only by taking account of the different attitudes of Parisian and Brigantian tribesmen towards Rome, and recognising that the native inhabitants of the north of England must have been largely responsible for the state of each of their territories at this period, can an explanation be found for the sparing of a comparatively wealthy town like Petuaria, while bare military outposts in the heart of the Pennines were systematically destroyed.

The highly Romanised Brigantian capital must by now have been regarded by the natives of the dales, still essentially unaffected by the foreign civilization, as a mere instrument of the discipline and oppression to which they were still unamenable. They made no attempt to save their nominal capital from destruction, and perhaps took a leading part in the work. The Parisii, on the other hand, always more culturally advanced, as well as being on friendly terms with Rome, had a greater affinity between town and country than any experienced by their western neighbours. Surrounded by a peaceful population well satisfied with their prosperity under a Romanised form of government from Brough, that town was spared the fate of Isurium.

Any organised alliance which may have existed between the Brigantes and the Maeatae cannot have been very strong. Nor is this surprising, for it is essential to remember that

throughout the disaffected Brigantes lacked a co-ordinating influence. With the alienation of Aldborough, the remainder were compelled to act without unified leadership or control. In consequence, as the evidence consistently indicates, discontent was expressed merely in the sporadic outbursts of independent local factions, and was never able to develop into organised rebellion. The Brigantes and the Maeatae made no common resistance to the Roman reoccupation which followed this adventure. Virius Lupus, the new governor, had merely to buy off the Maeatae before beginning his work of reconstruction.

It is natural to expect that, if the local inhabitants of the Pennines assisted the enemy, Rome would visit appropriate punishment upon them. Such retribution is not mentioned in any of the ancient sources; but since it must have been a fairly common occurrence, a routine affair with no incidents of particular importance, this is not surprising. Such excavation as has so far taken place in the settlement sites of west Yorkshire does not appear to have revealed any distinct periods of occupation such as are commonly identifiable in the forts. It would seem that thorough treatment of a few chosen sites, on the lines of Kilbride-Jones' excavation of the Milking Gap settlement near Housesteads, is required for the establishment of a reliable chronology of occupation

in the native villages of Brigantia, rather than the sampling of numerous sites which has so far taken place. Since the latter has not usually been accompanied by individual reports, the attempt to assess the significance of the results must inevitably fall a prey to generalisation, the inherent dangers of which do not need to be stressed here. The evidence at our disposal, however, is consistent with the conclusions already drawn concerning Brigantian relations with Rome. A fairly settled agricultural life does not seem to have prevailed in west Yorkshire until the late third and early fourth centuries.

Originally fostered by Agricola, a certain development of a more settled agricultural life in the dales was no doubt possible so long as Rome could keep a firm hand on the probable sources of discontent. The reoccupation of Scotland necessitated some weakening of that control and minor disturbances followed. Successive punishments by Rome would have the natural effect of driving the natives back to their former nomad state. Those who were peacefully inclined would be unable to pursue any proper policy of land cultivation under such conditions, while the rebellious would soon discover that the confiscation of property provided a convenient and profitable form of punishment to the Romans. The careful investigation of individual sites may yet yield

evidence of periodic destructions which correspond with the aftermath of local risings; but in any case, the easiest, most profitable, and at the same time most telling, form of punishment that Rome could impose, the confiscation of flocks and herds, would leave no definite clue for the student of archaeology. Calgacus' significant comment, "ubi solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant,"¹ may have applied equally well as a description of second or third as well as first century Roman policy.

One form which the punishment took appears to be attested by inscriptions which show that certain portions of Hadrian's Wall were reconstructed by tribal communities of the province, doubtless at their own expense; an appropriate and profitable chastisement for disloyalty. It is possible that the Brigantes are actually mentioned on one of these stones (unfortunately now lost), but the reading is corrupt.^{1^a} Britain, too, must have suffered from Severus' oppressive treatment of the towns,² though the causes and incidence of this are too far-reaching to permit of any local explanation. It is, however, worth remarking that although the general effect of this policy in Britain was a spread of rural prosperity at the expense of the towns, and a development

¹ Agric., xxx.

^{1^a} CAH, xii, 283.

² OHE, i, 203.

of villa life, conditions in the north were such that even escape from the financial burdens of the towns did not compensate for the perils of the countryside. The number of villas in Brigantian territory is remarkably few; all had easy access to the capital by road, and the most distant, Gargrave, is less than thirty miles from Aldborough. One hardy owner, at North Stainley, met the situation by fortifying his house against possible attack.¹ At Bainbridge, in Wensleydale, conditions were so unsettled that a walled annexe had to be constructed, evidently for the protection of the civil settlement adjoining the fort.²

In view of the continuance of Brigantian hostility towards Rome, it would be natural to expect that the end of the second Wall period would result in a repetition of the Brigantian alliance of a century earlier with the invaders against Rome. It was at one time thought that the numerous coin-hoards deposited at this time, together with scraps of other evidence, were in fact an indication of a rising in the west Yorkshire dales about the turn of the century.³ Subsequent researches on the economic history of the empire at this period, however, make it clear that coin-hoarding was an economic phenomenon, the inevitable

¹ p. 259-60.

² p. 212-3.

³ Richmond, YAJ, xxvii, 211-18.

result of general conditions which the north of Britain felt just as much as other provinces,¹ and the evidence of coin-hoards as a pointer to the local political situation must therefore be discounted. There is no evidence either way to illustrate the attitude adopted by the Brigantes in this crisis.

At this stage, indeed, the history of the Brigantes becomes increasingly difficult to dissociate from that of the general population of the north of the province. This is probably due to the fact that the fourth century brought the realisation that enemies more rapacious than Rome existed, and in fact were only held in check by the latter's military power. It may be significant to note the difference in character of the destructions of 196 and 296; the damage done on the later occasion was much more indiscriminate. Thus Petuaria, which had previously escaped harm - presumably owing to the peaceful tendencies of the Parisii - this time appears to have suffered the common fate; at any rate, rebuilding of the defences early in the fourth century was found necessary.² This latest invasion was not, like the earlier, the work merely of one tribe or confederacy of related tribes, like the Maeatae, but was shared by several different races, attacking on east, west and north. The

¹ Sutherland, CCRB, 72-3.

² Corder, Petuaria.

assistance of the natives against the large towns and military strongholds was no longer needed, and the Brigantes thus found themselves deprived of their chief bargaining weapon for securing their own immunity from barbarian attack. No doubt the increasing pressure on the province's defences encouraged a certain amount of panic in the vulnerable areas, which had just experienced the most ruthless ravaging that the province had yet known; and such restlessness is always an incitement to petty brigandage. This may partly explain why forts like Elslack, Melandra, Brough-in-Derbyshire and Templebrough, which had been abandoned at different periods in their history, were reoccupied in the early fourth century. On the other hand, the increasing possibility of further invasion made the strengthening of communications south of the frontier essential. Justly or not, Hadrian's Wall can no longer have been regarded as the infallible barrier that it was in the second century, either by those it protected or by those who sought to encompass its downfall. Furthermore, stronger reserves in the territory behind the frontier were necessary since Constantine I's reorganisation of the military system, whose effect was to deprive Britain of adequate mobile reserves, the nearest field-army being on the Continent.

As far as the ancient sources for the Brigantes are

concerned, by the fourth century this tribe had long ceased to exist as a separate entity. By means of the analysis of various pieces of evidence, their history has been carried on for two hundred years beyond the last genuine appearance of their name in ancient literature; but the steady disintegration of the Brigantes as a tribal unit with a distinctive character and outlook is throughout a pre-dominating note. With the final merging of their interests with those of other provincial native inhabitants, they cease to have a separate history, and are lost in the welter of events which heralded the approaching end of Roman rule in Britain.

III. THE ORIGIN OF THE BRIGANTES

The connection of the East Riding Parisii with the Parisii of Gaul, and the analogous cases of the British Atrebates and the Belgic Atrebates, and the British Catuvellauni and the Belgic Catuvellauni, suggest a similar connection between the Brigantes of Britain and the Brigantii of Central Europe, with their cities Brigantium - the modern Bregenz - on the south-east shore of Lake Constance, which, significantly, was known to the ancients as the "lacus Brigantinus", and Cambodunum.¹ It is significant that there is a Cambodunum in the territory of the British Brigantes. Bede refers to it as in the province of Deira,² and it seems highly probably that this place and the Cambodunum of the second Iter of Antonine are one and the same. Ptolemy also mentions a tribe of Brigantes in south-east Ireland.³ The name "Brigantes" has been taken by some scholars to mean "free", by others to mean "hillmen". If the latter is correct then the connection becomes more apparent; for, as Elgee points out, whereas the British and Irish tribes did not all live in the mountainous districts, the home from which they sprang was in the heart of the Central European mountains.⁴

¹ P-W, s.v., col. 845

² Hist. Ecc., c. XIV

³ Bk. II. c. 1, 102

⁴ Early Man, 206 ff.

The historical grounds for assuming such a derivation are thus very impressive. The archaeological evidence to which one looks for confirmation of these premises, however, is unfortunately just as indistinct. Radically conflicting views on the character and chronology of Late Bronze and Early Iron Age movements are still held by the highest authorities on the period. The confused state of affairs is graphically described in a joint publication by C. F. C. Hawkes, J. N. L. Myres, and C. G. Stevens:

It is already only too clear what confusion has prevailed concerning the important movement of peoples which apparently brought the first Celts to Britain, and produced among so many others the settlement on St. Catharine's Hill. Crawford's and Peake's invaders, whether they came in one or several waves, are Q-speaking Goildels: Dr. Fox's invaders are P-speaking Brythons. The Deverel-Rimbury and the All Cannings Cross people may or may not be identifiable. Late Bronze and Early Iron cultures are here merged, here distinct: some cremate, others inhume: some flake flint, others do not: skulls at Old England are Alpine and round, in East Anglia apparently long. Dates fly about: 1200-1175, 900, 800, 700, 600, 500 B.C. and later have all been attached to one movement or another, or been claimed to serve for a majority; while Continental origins have fluctuated between the Pyrenees, the Swiss Lakes, Central Germany, the Rhine, Flanders, and the Netherlands, and the folk who relinquished these divers spots for our shores figure variously as war-lords, traders, refugees, and cultural jetsam. Our provisional conclusion can only be, in all fairness to the distinguished scholars who have written on this intricate problem, that all of them are right - right, that is, in interpreting the evidence with which they have been immediately concerned, and that all the elements that have been detected, and perhaps more besides, went to make up the complex of immigration. Accordingly, we still have the notion with which we started, of an extended period of

penetration by varied though generally related groups.

In view of this confusion concerning the proper identification of the archaeological material, it would appear that main reliance ought to be placed on the historical evidence wherever, as in the case of the origin of the British Brigantes, that is in itself convincing, provided that the known archaeological material may reasonably be construed to fit and illuminate the picture thus already drawn. The connection between the Brigantes of Britain and those of Central Europe does appear to be well substantiated. How and when they made their way to the district in which we find them at the dawn of the historic age is not so apparent.

Elgee, basing his argument on the increased elaboration of metal equipment, and in particular on the appearance of a new weapon in Yorkshire - the bronze leaf-shaped sword - builds up an attractive theory of a Late Bronze Age invasion of Yorkshire by the Brigantes.² He follows Peake in arguing that the wanderings of the Brigantes from the Alpine region can be traced by the trail across Europe of these bronze swords, which have been found abundantly in both Yorkshire and Ireland, and which Peake claims originated in the mountain zone of Central Europe and Switzerland.³

¹ St. Catharine's Hill, Winchester, 149

² Early Man, 206 ff.

³ The Bronze Age & the Celtic World, 98-9

Elgee therefore draws a parallel between the typical Yorkshire swords and the evidences of lakedwelling culture in the Vale of Pickering and Holderness on the one hand, and the Swiss lake-dwelling culture on the other. He accepts Peake's picture of a group of "Celtic lords and the bravest of their henchmen", bearing bronze swords, leaving Central Europe between 1200 and 1175 B.C. and reaching England via E. France and the Rhine.¹ To this earlier group is attributed Peake's sword type E; type G is supposed to have been used chiefly by the last of this intermittent stream, who were finally driven from their ancestral lake-dwellings c.900 B.C. by a fresh wave of Celts of Hallstatt culture from the upper Danube, who were armed with the new iron swords.² This last influx appears to correspond to that recognised by Crawford - Gaelic-speaking Celts, who are characterized by their bronze implements, in particular the leaf-shaped sword and the socketed axe with 'vestigial-wing' ornament; Crawford's dating is c.800-700 B.C.³

The great weakness of these theories is that they depend primarily upon the appearance of new characteristics in bronze implements, which cannot be satisfactorily related to the different types of continental pottery which undoubtedly were imported at vaguely varying periods in this complex age,

¹ Peake, op.cit., 102-3,129,161; and Elgee, Early Man, loc.cit.

² Peake, op.cit., 101-3,130,164

³ cf. the controversy on Crawford's paper by several authorities [Peake, Bushe-Fox, Reginald Smith and Wheeler, ibid.,225-6] Ant. J. iv, 220 ff.

and have been distinguished at various sites in southern England. Pottery is the best, and probably the only final criterion by which an invasion by a people of different culture can be deduced; implements alone may, generally speaking, be accounted for equally well as the objects of commerce - and in the case of weapons in particular, new ideas and improvements must have been borrowed with hardly less rapidity in prehistoric times than in the present day. In southern England there can be little doubt that the Late Bronze Age brought Celtic invaders from the Continent who introduced pottery such as has appeared at All Cannings Cross and other sites, including the Deverel-Rimbury ware of the types first noted by Abercromby¹ as indicating foreign penetration in this period. The leaf-shaped swords, too, are generally acknowledged to have had a continental origin, though in the years which followed their introduction they underwent many changes and developments in Britain. Until the different types of pottery and implements can be grouped more distinctly, however, it is difficult to attempt to distinguish individual movements very precisely in an age of constant change.

Elgee assumes that the invasion of the Brigantes was by the Humber and North Sea, direct into Yorkshire. Such a view is, however, quite untenable, for the leaf-shaped sword

¹ Bronze Age Pottery, ii:

upon which he chiefly relies for his evidence of an invasion - the type found in Heathery Burn cave and most common in Yorkshire - is now definitely regarded as indigenous to this country, and characteristic of the Late Bronze Age here.¹ The Yorkshire swords are a characteristic native development of foreign models - a development which took place in south-east England. Nor, with the exception of Scarborough (a settlement of later, Hallstatt, period and North German affinities), and possibly the pile-dwellings of Holderness, has any continental pottery been recorded from the Brigantian area, as might, if this view is correct, be expected.²

While there is thus no case for a direct invasion of Yorkshire from the Continent in the Late Bronze/Early Iron age, there is nevertheless still a possible explanation of this Brigantian penetration which is consistent with both the historical evidence and our present knowledge of racial movements of the period both on the Continent and in Britain. It is generally accepted that from c.1200 B.C. there was a movement of peoples associated with the lake-dwelling culture outwards from the Central European mountains, and particularly Raetia and the Alps around Lake Constance. Some moved to Greece, others to Spain (where the Brigantian name also occurs)³, and others, again, down the Rhine. These apparently

¹ A.A 4, x. 189 ff.

² But cf. p. 246 f. on the lack of pottery evidence from our area.

³ P-V, s. v., col. 847.

crossed over to the south of Britain, and after the lapse of some considerable time thrust or were thrust (possibly in the form of warrior bands without women) gradually northwards into Yorkshire. The Celticism of these early invaders from the Continent, while not definitely established, is usually accepted, and is in consonance with what is known of the Brigantes in the historic period. Their original tongue may, as Crawford¹ and Elgee² assume, have been Gaelic, although their place-names recorded in the Roman period are undoubtedly Brythonic in character; if there was a change, it may have been inspired by the later invasions of La Tène peoples, of whom the Parisii were the Brigantes' nearest neighbours.

At any rate, these Celtic pioneers in north Britain appear to have established an aristocracy over the native mid-Bronze Age population - some of whom, rather than submit, retired to the high, desolate moors of the region conveniently termed Blackamore.³ Maintaining their position into late La Tène times, the Brigantes would be in touch with their neighbours of their own blood to the south and east, and in sympathy with their ideas and the development of their civilisation; and therefore the more ready to adopt such innovations as coins (which, as has already been noted,⁴ were derived

¹ loc. cit.

² Early Man, loc. cit.

³ ibid.

⁴ p. 135.

from the eastern counties, not direct from the Continent, as was the case with the Belgic tribes of the south), and possibly the walled hill-fort, or the oppidum of the Belgic model at Stanwick.

Such an explanation, while under existing conditions of archaeological knowledge necessarily tentative, appears to be the one which is most suited to all the facts, historical and archaeological. Though the reliability of much of Peake's work has recently come under suspicion, there is no reason to doubt the correctness of his reasoning in tracing the leaf-shaped sword from the Alps of Central Europe to Britain; and the theory of an eventual penetration of Yorkshire from the south of Britain allows sufficient time to elapse to permit of the imported type of sword being adapted and developed on native lines, so that by the time it reaches the northern counties it is regarded as to all intents and purposes of indigenous manufacture. Moreover, it has the additional advantage of explaining why there is no Brigantian concentration on the east coast - always the weakness of Elgee's theory, which had to assume that the warlike Brigantes were driven inland by a tribe of whom we have no indications of anything but peaceful characteristics.¹ Naturally a mountain race, the Brigantes

¹ Corder (Petuaria), for instance, suggests that fear of the Brigantes was one reason why the Parisii apparently welcomed the protection of Roman arms.

probably moved along the slopes of the Pennine Chain, keeping to the dales, until they had reached the Yorkshire dales, whither the later Celtic peoples, preferring the more fertile Lowland Zone, did not follow them. Perhaps, too, their cultural development had by this time reached the stage which called a halt to their nomadic tendencies. There is no evidence for emigration via the Stainmore route into Ireland, where they are only recorded in the south-east of that island by Ptolemy,¹ nor of any attempt at permanent settlement in the north-west of Britain. The three swords in the Ambleside hoard cannot be accepted as belonging to the leaf-shaped sword type on the evidence of the extant description.²

It will be claimed that the evidence of a correspondingly new type of pottery ought to be present to make the theory of the sword-bearers acceptable. Under conditions which are favourable to such discovery, this argument is a sound one. But in the first place, inasmuch as the Brigantian invasion of Yorkshire is assumed to have been gradual - a penetration, in fact, rather than an invasion - their domestic utensils are not likely to present any very striking new features; as with the swords, the pottery must have acquired the characteristics of indigenous manufacture.

¹ Geog., II, ii.

² Arch., v. 115.

Moreover, it is unfortunate that there is no body of evidence as to the type of pottery in use in Yorkshire, Lancashire and Durham at this period of the merging of the Bronze and Early Iron Ages. An area of which only a very small proportion is ploughed land, one cannot expect to find here the list of finds such as was collected, for example, years ago in the south-east, unless specific excavation on a large scale is undertaken.¹ It must be borne in mind, too, that the occupation of the more fertile land of the Home Counties was naturally much more intensive. Previous to the recent work of Dr. Raistrick, excavation on native sites in the Brigantian area has been negligible. The absence of evidence in such circumstances is not the equivalent of negative evidence, as it has not been searched for. Unless future work produces definitely negative results, the most acceptable explanation of the Brigantian occupation of the north is surely that to which the available evidence for the history both of the period generally and of this particular people points most strongly.

While the view of the Brigantes as an early Celtic people arriving in the north of England during the period which witnessed the gradual transition from the Bronze to the Iron Age appears to accord best with the available evidence,

¹ cf. the fortress Manching in Raetia, similar in size and construction to Stanwick, which has produced large quantities of pottery, etc., simply from constant ploughing during many generations (Paul Reinecke in Der Bayenische Vorgeschichtsfreund, ix (1930) 29 ff.).

it must be acknowledged that there remains a possibility that they were actually a branch of the Middle La Tene invaders who were responsible for the introduction of the Iron Age B culture to the south-west and north-east. This is the interpretation apparently accepted by Collingwood.¹ The Brigantian invasion must in this case be placed almost contemporaneous with that of the Parisii. Elgee's arguments against the possibility of a later invasion appear to be sound, because there is no shred of evidence, historical or archaeological, to justify such a conclusion. Nor, indeed, is there any evidence to suggest the arrival of a La Tene people in east Yorkshire shortly before the charioteers; if the Brigantes are not identified with the sword-bearers, Brigantian and Parisian culture must be regarded as identical. Here again we are lacking the results of extensive excavation, to clear up the point as to whether the chariot-burials persist in the West Riding in proportionate numbers to those in East Yorkshire. In the meanwhile, however, such an assumption fails to take account of the earlier culture which Elgee has discerned in the lake-dwellings of Pickering and Holderness;² for there is no people other than the Brigantes with whom they can be identified. If, on the other hand, the latter are assumed to have reached Yorkshire

¹ OHE, 1. 25, 67

² Early Man, 182-4

from the south-west, it is suspicious that they do not appear to have shared the ideas of those middle la Tène folk on the subject, for example, of fortification. The complete (or almost complete) absence of earthworks with inturned entrances in the Brigantian area, though the country to north-east and south-west is thickly studded with them, is one of the most striking features emerging from a personal investigation of the fortified sites in the whole area. One must conclude that had the Brigantes arrived along with the rest of the Iron Age B folk, they would have put these principles into practice from the first. Being already established, however, they would not be likely to depart from previous custom unless experience proved it necessary; and their high military reputation, coupled with the apparent reluctance of Rome to commence serious hostilities throughout a full generation after the Claudian invasion, must have confirmed this belief in their own infallibility and enhanced their sense of complete security. When Cerialis did strike, the blow was swift and comprehensive, with no delays which might permit the enemy to develop a new form of defensive technique. It is evident that the acceptance of Collingwood's view raises awkward points to which our present evidence furnishes no satisfactory answer. In all the circumstances, the view

of the Brigantes as a much earlier Celtic people appears the most reasonable on our present evidence.¹

¹ Dr. H. N. Savory, considering the evidence for the Iron Age culture in East Yorkshire from the Danes' Graves, has arrived at similar conclusions regarding the improbability of a direct movement of this culture from the Continent to the Yorkshire coast (letter to the writer, 22 May 1939, summarising some conclusions on this subject contained in a D. Phil. thesis deposited in the Bodleian library, Oxford). Shouldered jars and brooches from the Danes' Graves are closely paralleled at Swallowcliffe (Wilts.), Solsbury (Bath), and more recent examples are being discovered in Herefordshire.

IV. EXTENT

OUR most valuable authority on this subject is undoubtedly the Alexandrian geographer, Ptolemy. His work covered the period A.D. 127 to the time of Marcus Aurelius,¹ though it appears that his sources for Britain were much earlier. The fact that there is no reference in his work to the Hadrianic frontier has been taken to indicate that the sources of his information were pre-Hadrianic; in this case it is necessary to explain the mention of the VI legion at York as a late addition, since the legion is not recorded before 122. In the south of Britain, too, the non-inclusion of Glevum (Gloucester) as a town of the Dobuni² may be noted for what it is worth as indicating a still earlier date; for ILS 2365 (cf. EE, ix, 519) dates the foundation of the colony there to A.D. 96-8. On the other hand, Lindum (Lincoln), where a colony was established under the Flavians, is mentioned by Ptolemy - though admittedly as a 'town' of the Coritani, not as a colony.

While negative information is frequently admissible as evidence, however, a consideration of the nature of Ptolemy's work prevents its application in this case. It must be

¹ Geog., II, iii; Prosopographia Imperii Romani (2nd ed.) II, C. no. 981.

² It should be remarked that inscriptions give Dobunnus as the form.

emphasised that he was concerned in giving a geographical framework for Britain, and not a gazetteer; and it therefore follows that all towns, even all the important towns, are not necessarily mentioned. This observation must be borne in mind in considering the degree to which his records indicate the development of town life in Brigantia. In this connection it may be stated at once that the nature of his work affords little valuable evidence. A consideration of those identified sites which he includes in Brigantian territory makes it clear that he was working from different sources of information. Vinnovium (Binchester), Olicana (Ilkley), and Eboracum (York) are well known as military sites where pre-Roman occupation is unknown, in spite of excavation. Isurium (Aldborough) was of course the civil capital of Brigantia in the Roman period, but here again there is no evidence for a pre-Roman foundation. On the other hand, as will be demonstrated later, Camulodunum and Rigodunum must be regarded, from internal philological evidence, as native strongholds; while Caturactonium (Catterick) seems to have been unique in this tribal area in that Roman military occupation was established close by a pre-existing native settlement. It is clear, therefore, that no more definite observation can be made on the character of Ptolemy's 'towns' than that they indicate some kind of occupation at each point about the early

second century. Whether that occupation was military rather than civil, Roman or primarily native, was immaterial to the geographer's immediate purpose.

Nevertheless, in spite of these limitations, the fact remains that Ptolemy's map is the only document of its kind bearing on our particular problem, and that it does give an approximate indication of the extent of the different tribes, with the names and position of many other landmarks. It is true that Scotland has been rather badly handled, and lies askew, so that what is really the west coast appears as the north, the north as the east, and so on; but by turning it through a right-angle it can be brought back to its true perspective, and it then appears that, generally speaking, the land immediately to the north of the Tyne-Solway isthmus was occupied on the west by the Novantae, in the centre by the Selgovae and the Gadeni, and on the east by the Otadini. Four towns are allotted by Ptolemy to the Selgovae of which Trimontium has been identified as Newstead. One of the two towns ascribed to the Otadini has also been identified, namely, Bremenium (High Rochester). Müller believed that the Gadeni never existed at all; he takes the view¹ that the name is a ghost-word, the result of copyists' errors, made out of 'Otadini.' In support of this, it may be noticed that no town is assigned to them, and that they are not mentioned

¹ Müller, 93.

later with the Selgovae and the Otadini as bordering on the Brigantes. On the other hand, it is difficult to explain the Risingham altar deo Mogonti Cad¹ except on the assumption that the dedication refers to the local deity of the Gadeni. Moreover, the Novantae are likewise destitute of towns; while according to Ptolemy's conception of the lie of the land, the Gadeni lay to the north of the Otadini (or perhaps the Selgovae are referred to) and would not therefore be regarded as immediate neighbours of the Brigantes.

The identification of the remaining towns in these territories would help considerably in the more accurate determination of the northern boundary of Brigantia; even though Horsley's observation on the frequent disposition of principal towns on the borders of various countries² is far from being a general rule, their situation should inevitably supply a clearer view of the nucleus and extent of each tribal domain. Yet though Ptolemy supplies no definite frontier line (and indeed it is probably that precise territorial demarcation of political dominion was unknown before the Roman occupation), he affords certain approximate indications

¹ CIL, 996. cf. also CIL 997, Deo Mouno Cad, from the same place, the alter Deo Mog(on)ti (CIL, 320) from Old Penrith, CIL, 958, deo Mogonti Vitire, from Netherby, and CIL, 1036, dis Mountibus, from High Rochester. The find-spots indicate that it is another example, as with the goddess Brigantia, of the local deity being adopted by the soldiery and in certain cases transferred outside the tribal area. The significance of the dedications has been discussed by Birley (AA⁴, xii, 222-3).

² BR, 364.

of the general area where Brigantian authority ceased to operate and was replaced by that of the more northern tribes. Geographical considerations point to the Tyne-Solway isthmus as a likely boundary; it cannot be without significance that from the Roman period, at any rate, until modern times, that narrow neck of land had accommodated a major frontier line, fixed always on the west at the Solway Firth though with explicable deviations towards the east. Furthermore, while military considerations would naturally be paramount in the choice of a line for Hadrian's Wall, it is reasonable to suppose that as far as possible the Brigantian civitas would be kept intact; and finally, from the Tyne valley comes evidence of a tribe which possessed its own active curia, and was probably one of those less important peoples on the fringes on Brigantian territory proper whom Ptolemy does not trouble to mention specifically, though incidental references are traceable.¹ Dealing only with the more important peoples, Ptolemy merely states that to the south of the tribes which we know to have occupied Scotland lay the Brigantes, 'reaching from sea to sea.'²

The full implications of this reference will be examined later. Meanwhile, there is the problem of the southern boundary of the Brigantian kingdom. This appears to have

¹ p. 129-31.

² Müller, 96.

corresponded, very approximately, to a line joining the Humber and the Mersey. The extensive valley marshes of the western estuary would form a natural boundary between Manchester and Chester. On the other side of the Pennines, near Doncaster, are remains apparently connected with the native fort at Wincobank which seem best interpreted as lines of defence against the early Roman invasion of Brigantia, or against neighbouring tribes like the Coritani, or indeed against both alien elements. The Don valley forms a natural frontier on the south-east side of these defensive lines, whose eastern flank was ideally protected by the expanse of Hatfield Chase - a great swamp of 70,000 acres, reaching for about 50 miles between Lincoln and York. The Chase was a famous physical feature in the Middle Ages, and was not effectively drained until the reign of Charles I. In this region, where 'Lowland' and 'Highland' zones begin to merge, the dateable evidence for Roman occupation is very instructive. The Brigantian frontier cannot have penetrated further south-east than Templebrough, which lies on the opposite side of the Don valley to the native fort at Wincobank; for though Mr. May's general remarks assuming the establishment of a fort here by A.D. 54¹ are not justified by any reference to definite evidence, he illustrates examples of figured Samian which make pre-Flavian occupation certain;² and it was not

¹ Templebrough, 5.

² ibid., Pl. XXII, 1, 2, 4-5, 9, 12, 19.

until the governorship of Petilius Cerialis (A.D. 71-4) that any real attempt at permanent occupation of Brigantian territory was made. The discovery of typical Brigantian coins beyond this point does not affect the validity of the argument, any more than the altars to the goddess Brigantia in the region of Hadrian's Wall prove that the sites of their discovery were in Brigantian territory.¹ These coins were in the first place derived from the Eastern Counties; and in any case trade could account for an even wider drift. There is no reason to suppose that inter-tribal commerce was at all unusual.

The evidence from the other forts on this southern boundary is unfortunately negative. Excavation in 1938 disclosed a Flavian earth fort underlying the second century stone fort, but as yet nothing pre-Flavian has appeared. Nor have recent excavations revealed anything pre-Vespasianic at Melandra.²

North Wales was certainly occupied by the Ordovices, who are mentioned in both Tacitus³ and Ptolemy⁴, and by the Degeangli, whose existence is known from the stamp on pigs of lead mined in that country,⁵ in addition to a reference by Tacitus.⁶ Tegeingl, moreover, was the medieval name

¹ p. 128.

² Manchester Guardian, 11 July, 1938.

³ Agric., xviii,; Annales, XII, 1, c. 33.

⁴ Müller, 98-9.

⁵ EE, ix, p. 642.

⁶ Annales, XII, c. 32.

for a district roughly corresponding to Flintshire.¹

The Cornovii, with their capital at Wroxeter,² inhabited approximately the counties of Cheshire and Shropshire, and the Coritani a stretch of country to the east corresponding roughly to Lincolnshire and Leicestershire; Lindum (Lincoln) and Rage - or more correctly in the Ravenna List,³ Ratae Coritanorum, evidently the capital - (Leicester), are ascribed to them by Ptolemy. Between these two tribes there appears to be a gap which was under no tribal organization. That this was the case in Roman times is confirmed by two types of epigraphic record from that district. In the first place, there is the milestone from the Silverlands district of Buxton inscribed A NAVIONE.⁴ Apart from the trunk routes which normally give the distance to the capital of a province from some distant place, the mileage on a local, secondary road is usually given from a local self-governing centre,⁵ and the milestone is set up by the authority of the centre in whose area it stands. But this milestone from Buxton indicates that it stood in an area organised on Navio, which our evidence does not allow us to regard as a centre of self-government. Roman occupation at Brough was, it seems, definitely military in character.

¹ Haverfield and Macdonald, Roman Occupation of Britain, 256.

² JRS, xiv, 244.

³ Ravennas, 431-2.

⁴ cf. Dessau, 1338.

⁵ As Mommsen first pointed out (CIL, viii, 859).

Moreover, in the Foligno inscription¹ a man (probably T. Haterius Nepos) is described as having been (P)RAEF EQVIT ., CENSITO(R) BRITTONVM . ANAVION(EN), at some date (from internal evidence) just before A.D.114. The inhabitants of this district obviously composed no separate civitas, but were merely regarded as those Britons whose administrative centre was Navio. It is to be presumed, therefore, that there was no tribal organization in this district to be developed along cantonal lines in accordance with the usual Roman practice.² The inhabitants of south Derbyshire appear to have been organized in a similar way. The stamp LVT or LVTVD on eleven, and possibly twelve, pigs of lead must refer to the place LVTVDARVM,³ and represents a contraction of the collective name LVTVDARENSES. If the area had been organized on a tribal basis, the stamp would probably have been a tribal name, as further north, in west Yorkshire, we find BRIG,⁴ and in the west DEGEANGL.⁵ Could the authenticity of the Hopton inscription (now lost) be allowed - and it is certainly suspicious that it is said to have been found on land owned by a certain Mr. Gell - it would thus, as Gillam has pointed out,⁶ acquire a new significance. Haverfield's

¹ CIL, xi, 5213.

² cf. Jones, Companion to Roman History, 48.

³ Ravennas, 429, gives Lutudaron.

⁴ CIL, 1207.

⁵ EE, ix, p.642.

⁶ Derbyshire.

version¹ is: GELL / PRAE C. III / LV BRITT. This officer, like Haterius, was of equestrian rank, and apparently held a similar position, as Censitor to the Lutudarenses Brittones. Both were probably under the joint control of the Procurator and the Governor, since both imperial estates and auxiliary forts were concerned. The inscription IMP.CAES.HADRIANI. AVG.MET.LVT. on a pig of lead from Cromford Nether Moor,² besides proving that the mines were imperial property, indicates that these centres of political organization existed approximately contemporaneously. There is thus good ground for believing that the administrative organizations of the Pennine district now corresponding to Derbyshire was non-tribal in character. Neighbouring peoples evidently varied a good deal in their degree of political organization - an observation of great significance which, as will be seen, must also be applied to the north-west corner of England, and to north-east Yorkshire.

Although Ptolemy gives no other tribe than the Brigantes for practically the whole area of the six northern counties, except the Parisii who occupied approximately the East Riding of Yorkshire, and states that they 'reached from sea to sea,' it does not follow that the Brigantes did in fact occupy the

¹ VCH Derbyshire, i, 230-3. Haverfield did not actually see the inscription; his reading is from an eighteenth century drawing by Major Rooke.

² ibid.

whole of this area.¹ Ptolemy's arresting phrase may be literally true in that the Brigantes had a sea frontier on the west in Lancashire, probably between the Mersey and the Ribble, and on the east in Durham. But for Cumberland, Westmorland, and Lancashire-north-of-the-Sands, archaeology has important qualifications to make. Mr. R. G. Collingwood has shown² that there is formidable evidence of a distinct difference between the pre-Roman culture of the north-west and that of the country east and south of the dividing range of the Northern Pennines. He distinguishes two streams of settlers in this region in the first half of the second millenium, of whom the Neolithic were much more numerous than the Beaker folk. There is no evidence of any later invasion before the Roman period, and the bronze implements which appeared after c. 1000 B. C. were probably acquired very gradually by way of trade. Even in the Roman period it was a district left very much to itself. Roman finds are few. The Ordnance Survey Map of Roman Britain marks no civil settlement of any kind in this area apart from Carlisle, a town which obviously owed its importance to the Hadrianic frontier. It would appear probable that the area was

¹ Though Hübner (P-W, s.v. Brigantes, col. 843-4) makes this unjustified assumption.

² CW², xxxiii, 163-200. Miss L. F. Chitty has expressed to me her doubts concerning the justifiability of such views, partly on the ground that Collingwood failed to examine all the available evidence; but I do not think his main conclusions can be challenged.

considered unimportant so long as it remained peaceful - and all our evidence points to the view that the inhabitants were insufficiently organized to give serious trouble, even had they so desired. The absence of Roman civil sites is only equalled by the lack of native hill-forts or other strongholds of any consequence. For instance, an exhaustive survey of Westmorland revealed nothing more formidable than the enclosure of about one-sixth of an acre on Castle Crag, Mardale, and the tiny earthwork of Castlesteads in the parish of Natland.¹ There are many hut-villages, but their defences are no more formidable than would be required to resist the ravages of wolves, and an authoritative conclusion is that "the settlements were doubtless occupied for the most part by pastoral communities who also practised a sort of garden-agriculture."²

There is, in fact, no plausible alternative to the view that there was no connection of any significance between the people who inhabited the north-west corner of England, and the Brigantian civitas. In the whole area of Cumberland, Westmorland, and northern Lancashire, "we have not a single Hallstatt or La Tène brooch or potsherd,"³ and of the few remaining Early Iron Age articles which have been found, "some came into the district after the Roman conquest, and the remainder are 'strays' come in by trade or left by

¹ RCHM, Westmorland, Introd., pp. xxviii-xxxvi.

² ibid., p. xxxiii.

³ OHE, i, 188.

travellers, and do not point to the existence of any local culture to correspond. We must infer," concludes Collingwood, "that the Iron Age B civilization which took firm root in the north-east and centred in the great Brigantian fort of Stanwick, left our district altogether unaffected. If a school of Romano-Celtic art arose, under Roman tuition, in the metal-working shops at places like Brough-under-Stainmore and Kirkby Thore, this was not the continuation of a pre-Roman La Tène art; it was the introduction of something new, something partly Roman and partly of the Celtic Iron Age, into a district where that Iron Age had not yet penetrated."¹

Apart from the cultural differences which are so apparent, it seems clear that there was in the north-west no political organization comparable to that of the Brigantes to the south-east; the population appears to have been split up into small clans and septs. The possible reading C(ivitas) Carvetiorum on a stone seen at Voreda (Plumpton Wall) and since lost² may perhaps be an illustration of this separatism; though it should be noted that C(ohors) Carvetiorum is equally possible. Stevens, who believes that the north-west and Wall region were originally part of Brigantian territory,³ considers that both Carlisle and Corbridge were, amongst others, created civitates by the Romans in the third century, in order to

¹ ibid.

² CIL, 325.

³ AA⁴, xi, 141.

spread more evenly the increasingly onerous burden of local administration and taxation.¹ On this view, the Plumpton Wall inscription might be regarded as a late one, referring to Carlisle.

Mr. Stevens bases his case for the extension of Brigantia sufficiently far north to include the Wall region partly on the fact that Ravennas does not include the Textoverdi amongst other tribes of which he gives the cantonal capitals - though admitting that this is inconclusive, inasmuch as Isurium (Aldborough), the capital of the Brigantes themselves, is not even mentioned.² That the Textoverdi were in the civitas of the Brigantes he says "is proved not only by the evidence of Ptolemy, who takes the Brigantian territory as far west as Lancaster, as far north at least as Binchester, but also from the distribution of altars commemorating the goddess Brigantia, which have been found at Corbridge, Castlesteads and even Birrens;" and in a footnote he specifically states: "I agree with Sir George Macdonald, Arch Ael. 4th ser. viii, p.9, in admitting the validity of these inscriptions for determining the territory of the Brigantes."³

First of all, however, the problem of the Textoverdi. Stevens has put forward an elaborate explanation of the

¹ EHR, lii (April, 1937), 199-200.

² But see below, p252f, on the possibility of a 2nd or 3rd century shifting of the capital to York.

³ AA4, xi, 141.

appearance of another curia within what he takes to be the civitas of the Brigantes, explaining it as "a Celtic word meaning 'army', which was used not only as a subdivision or pagus of the tribe, but as a place-name to describe the meeting-place of the pagus."¹ The case is well-argued and may well have applied in certain districts. The fact remains, however, that it is an exceptional rather than the normal explanation of the word's significance; and it is a wise rule to assume the existence of the normal state of affairs wherever this is consistent with the other evidence - as in this case; for Stevens' grounds for rejecting the possibility of the Textoverdis being an ordinary independent (if somewhat insignificant) tribe, must be regarded as unsound. The fairly numerous inscriptions on altars in honour of the goddess Brigantia, which have been found in two geographical groups nearly 100 miles apart, cannot be accepted as definite indications in themselves that the sites of their discovery were all within Brigantian territory.² The data they afford shows that they belong to the late second or early third century when Celtic religions were spread far afield by the soldiery garrisoning the military frontiers of the north. They have been found at Greetland, near

¹ AA⁴, xi, 145.

² See Appendix D for a further consideration of the altars and their dedicators.

Slack,¹ Woodnook near Castleford,² Longwood near Greetland,³ and Adel near Leeds,⁴ all in the West Riding of Yorkshire; and at South Shields,⁵ Corbridge,⁶ Castlesteads,⁷ and Birrens,⁸ all on or within reasonable reach of the line of the Wall, and connected with the military frontier system. The army's propensity for adopting native deities, who thus often came to journey far beyond the bounds of their previous spheres of influence, is well known. The adoption of the local deity of the Gadeni and its worship in forts both north and south of Hadrian's Wall,⁹ is a case in point. The whole of the group must be disregarded in any consideration of the problem of the Brigantian frontiers. The main principle of Birley's forceful though hyperbolic remark about the Birrens altar, in fact, applies to the whole group: "The dedication to Brigantia from Birrens need prove that Birrens was in Brigantian territory no more than the Carvoran inscriptions to the Syrian goddess, that the Wall was in Syria."¹⁰ Whatever may be the boundary to which other considerations point, the value of these dedications one way or the other is precisely nil.

The distribution of the southern group, however, is more interesting, because of the difference in the character

1-8 See Appendix D.

9 p. 116, n.1.

10 AA⁴, vii, 172.

of the find-spots. The existence of a fort at Castleford has yet to be proved, while at the other three sites the non-military character of any occupation seems sufficiently assured. Richmond regards Longwood as a definite local shrine, and most recent excavations favour a similar interpretation for the site of the Greetland altar. Taken in conjunction with the distribution of the three hoards of pre-Roman Brigantian coinage - at Almondbury, Lightcliffe, and Honley, all in the West Riding - and the evidence for Brigantian lead-mines in the same area,¹ the conclusion is irresistible that here was the true heart, commercial and industrial, religious and political, of the Brigantian country.

Mr. Stevens declares that Ptolemy's information favours the supposition that the Textoverdi were included in the Brigantian civitas.² Such a statement is misleading. Even if Calatum were certainly identified with Lancaster (which it is not), that would not affect this particular problem; and Vinnovium (Binchester) may very well have been a border station. Rather does Ptolemy - albeit unconsciously - provide cogent reasons for a precisely opposite view. The Textoverdi are not alone in their failure to win recognition by Ptolemy; he mentions neither the Degeangli, whose existence apparently as a separate

¹ p. 306.

² AA⁴, xi, 141.

tribe is otherwise well attested,¹ nor the Genuni, who would seem from the wording of Pausanias' famous passage to have been outside the Brigantian civitas. The latter may be regarded as a small and politically unimportant tribe similar to the Textoverdi, who were doubtless over-awed into a meek acquiescence in the major aspects of the foreign policy of more powerful neighbouring tribes. This may be one reason for their omission by Ptolemy. Furthermore, his reference to the 'harbour of the Setantii' on the Lancashire coast must be regarded as showing that small sub-tribes existed which may or may not have come under the hegemony of that dominant tribe, but which were in any case so unimportant that the geographer did not consider them worthy of special individual mention. A further illustration of this habit of Ptolemy's comes from his chapter on Ireland:²

Outlets of the river Logia
Next to these, the promontory Rhobogdium
Next to the Rhobogdii, on this same side, dwell the
Darnii.

The fact that there was a tribe known as the Rhobogdii, from which the promontory took its name, thus slips out almost accidentally in his description of coastal geographical features; it is not inconceivable that in Britain likewise

¹ Unless the name is contained in 'the promontory of the Caeangani' immediately to the south of the Seteia estuary (Muller, 85).

² II, ii.

the names of several small tribes are concealed in the names of prominent landmarks, but find no other expression. Such indications, indeed, may well consort with Stevens' idea of the Brigantian civitas ruling over several dependent communities. If Camulodunum be regarded as the pre-Roman Brigantian capital, for example, it is difficult to account for the name Rigodunum, meaning 'King's town,' unless one supposes that it was the capital of one of these sub-tribes; and since it is definitely included in Ptolemy's list of Brigantian oppida, there is here a strong prima facie case for such an interpretation.¹

As far as the north-west and the Wall region are concerned, however, the available evidence does not justify the assumption that the confederacy extended far enough to include those districts. The north-west must have had a widely differing mode of life. It was a backwater into which the succeeding waves of culture which came to Britain hardly ever penetrated, and in which Neolithic characteristics survived to a remarkable extent. On the east side of the Pennines, too, the traces of Iron Age and Romano-British culture such as we know to have been associated with the Brigantian nucleus in the West Riding become sparse indeed as one proceeds further north.² This is the case in Durham,

¹ p. 114.

² See Plate I.

and it lends colour to the view of Vinnovium as a border town.

In the East Riding of Yorkshire, it is beyond question that a dominant people called the Parisii, doubtless collaterals of the Parisii of the Seine valley in France, a branch of whom invaded Britain about 400 B.C., held sway over a people whose daily life was still typical of the Bronze Age.¹ The boundary of the two tribes must have been the obvious geographical one represented by the marshes of the Vale of York. Dr. Raistrick has stated that "from the Humber to the Tees, the Vale of York, until late historic times, was one great alluvial tract, swampy, and almost uncrossable, except at York where the York and Escrick moraines of the Vale of York glacier provide a double ridge of well drained clay and gravel... A smaller and more broken causeway crosses the valley by Northallerton, where the solid rocks come to the surface above lake muds and alluvium in the low hills around the town and towards Bedale, but this is rather a chain of low islands than a high level causeway such as that by York."² The York and Escrick routes, however, would be sufficient to ensure commercial contacts between the two tribes. Brough-on-Humber was in all probability the chief port from which the lead mined in

¹ Elgee, Early Man, 206 ff; and I. A. Richmond's review of Clark, E. Yorks, in AA⁴, xiii, 323-7; and Arch. J., xciii, 284-8.

² YAJ, xxix, 361.

the northern Pennines was exported to the Continent. The recent discovery of Arretine ware at the adjacent North Ferriby settlement¹ points to the importance of the Parisian sea-board in Yorkshire as a means of commercial communication between the interior of the north of Britain and the Continent.

The occupation of north-east Yorkshire was very different from that of the Wolds. This was due to the different character of the terrain. Cut off from Brigantia by the Vale of York and the Tees marshes, this barren and inhospitable region was naturally shunned by the Parisii, who were able to settle on the more fertile country to the south. The paucity of Roman influence is well illustrated by Miss Kitson Clark's distribution map;² and Elgee has shown that this area, to which he applies the convenient name 'Blackamore', served as a retreat for the Bronze Age peoples of East Yorkshire upon the invasion of the charioteers about 400 B.C.³

Evidence for the situation of some, at least, of the Brigantian lead mines is afforded by a pig of lead from Hayshaw Moor, between Pateley Bridge and Grassington, inscribed BRIG and dateable to A.D. 81.⁴

Inscriptions attesting the presence of men of Brigantian

¹ YAJ, xxxiv, 234-5.

² E. Yorks.

³ Early Man, 191.

⁴ CIL, 1207.

nationality have been found as far apart as Mumrills,¹ on the Scottish Wall, and (a more doubtful instance) at Ford near Canterbury.² The former was an army recruit who must have been drafted away from his native district on joining the second cohort of Thracians; it is interesting because it may indicate an attempt to kill two objectionable birds with one shrewd administrative stone, by removing young fighting men from the troublesome Brigantian area at some time in the second century and compelling them to serve the empire by repelling invaders in the far north. The latter is more likely to have been a civilian, e.g., a merchant.

Single coins of the pre-Roman period have occurred in Yorkshire, but the three hoards previously referred to throw more light than could otherwise have been hoped for upon the condition of Brigantia in that important period just before, and during the early stages of, the Roman conquest. The designation CART on one of the series, identifiable only with the notorious queen Cartimandua, makes their attribution to the Brigantes certain. Two coins from Almondbury in the York Museum are inscribed on the convex side VO LI SIO, and on the concave DVM NO CO VEROS; of the five British silver

¹ CIL, 1091, and EE, ix, p.623.

² JRS, xxiv, 219. Certain missing letters must be supplied, and B(rig)ANTIS appears to be a probable, though not certain, reading.

coins from Honley, VOLISIOS occurs on the convex side of all, while four of them bear the name DVMNOVEROS on the concave side. The fifth reads CARTIOVE, an obvious reference to Cartimandua. Oman has made the interesting suggestion that Volisios was a British king who associated with himself as colleagues first Dumnocoveros, perhaps his son, and later Cartimandua, apparently his daughter and heiress.¹ Richmond, on the other hand, views these coin inscriptions from an entirely different angle: to him "the name Volusius, which appears in Celtic form as Volisios on certain Brigantian coins of which copies are in the Tolson Memorial (Huddersfield) Museum, looks Roman, and may show that Roman financial agents or moneyers were at work among the Brigantes, just as according to Caesar they worked in Gaul a century before."² It should be noted that the Brigantian coinage was probably the poorest and latest of the pre-Roman issues in Britain, of low metallic standard and crude design. The coins were, in fact, third-hand copies, derived from the Eastern counties and not - as was the case with the coinage of the tribes of south and east Britain - direct from Gaul.³

As has already been pointed out, Ptolemy's direct

¹ Elgee, Arch. Yorks., 116-7.

² Huddersfield, 14.

³ See G. C. Brooke, NC5, (1933), 118-20.

references to the towns of the Brigantes cannot be taken as any key to the development of their civil life. Indeed, our evidence strongly favours the view that despite the Roman foundation of Isurium, the Brigantes resembled the Parisii in at least one respect - their preference for village economy.¹ But when it is remembered that Ptolemy's purpose was to give a series of observation or calculation points, suitably spaced, these sites acquire a new and no less valuable significance; it is evident that if they could all be identified, the problem of the extent of the tribe would be crystallized and resolved into narrow limits.

Tacitus' observation: "Brigantum civitatem, quae numerosissima provinciae totius perhibetur, adgressus"² demands consideration at this point. Bearing in mind the qualification made in another connection, that he may be vaguely referring to the whole of Venutius' adherents - an important part of whom were not Brigantes - it must be admitted at once that the evidence of the accompanying Gazetteer and distribution map fully confirms this statement. Ptolemy's evidence for the mere extent of the area does not in itself affect the question quite so closely as might be imagined; the whole area has always been noted for its many barren acres, and Raistrick has pointed out that peat (rendering

¹ AA⁴, xiii, 325-6, where Mr. Richmond has drawn a comparison with the Allobroges and Vocontii of Gaul

² Agric., xvii

human occupation impracticable) had made considerable accumulations on the fells as early as the Bronze Age; while the advent of the cold, wet sub-Atlantic period had the effect of encouraging the growth of coarse and swampy vegetation on all the hill slopes and summits except those possessing naturally good drainage.¹ Nevertheless, it is clear that all the suitable sites for habitation were quite thickly populated. In the central and north Yorkshire dales the extensive remains of villages and associated fields are still visible; and though - doubtless largely through modern industrial development - these fortunate conditions do not prevail in south Yorkshire, the profuseness of casual finds goes far towards confirming the view that this area formed the heart of Brigantia. The number of coin hoards collected in the Gazetteer (Appendix A) is a particularly striking feature, especially when it is remembered that by far the greater part of the land under review has never come under the plough. The inhabitants of the West Yorkshire Pennines, in particular, appear to have been at least as prosperous as the Parisii; for the East Yorkshire district Miss Kitson Clark can quote only eleven coin hoards.

Five of Ptolemy's 'towns' are definitely identifiable with certain sites. It is noteworthy that the identification in four of these cases is due to the presence of military

¹ YAJ, xxxiv, 145-7.

posts. On the other hand, the existence of an extensive civil settlement outside the fort at Ilkley (Olicana)¹ is a reasonable presumption,² while similarly at Catterick there are indications of considerable civil occupation, and possibly a native fortification existed about the site of the present village a mile or so away from the fort.³ There is, moreover, a Celtic stem in Caturactonium which cannot be disregarded, for racte is derived from the Celtic, meaning a fort,⁴ thus implying that adjacent earthworks existed at the time the Roman station was first established. In other cases, of course, the Celtic element does not necessarily imply a pre-Roman settlement; it would be the normal procedure to name sites after the most striking physical features of the neighbourhood, such as a river. Instances of this are Isurium - probably from the river Ure - and Lavatrae (or probably more correctly in Ravennas, Lavaris) - Bowes, where there is no evidence of pre-Roman occupation of any kind. Lavarae, according to Richmond, is "plainly a river-name, cognate with the modern Welsh Llafar (Ekwall, English river-names, 238, s.v. Laver), Gaelic Labhar (Watson, The History of the

¹ For a discussion of the evidence for the identification, cf. Woodward, YAJ, xxviii, 311-13.

² Woodward, YAJ, (1925), 152-4.

³ See Gazetteer, s.v.

⁴ Holder, s.v. cf. Irish rath, and the Gallic hill-fort Bibracte.

Celtic place-names of Scotland, 432), and Gallic Labara Labarus. The name means 'babbling,' and the river, now Greta, falls in noisy rapids below the fort."¹ Isurium appears to have been of Roman origin as far as one can deduce from the results of successive excavations at Aldborough, though non-military in character. It was in fact the tribal capital, the seat of civil administration, at any rate in Roman times, for in the Fifth Iter of the Antonine Itinerary, that valuable second-century roadbook of Britain, it is referred to as "Isubrigantum." All the other known cases where the tribal name is thus attached to that of the town have been proved to be tribal and cantonal capitals. Viroconium Cornoviorum - Wroxeter; Durovernum Cantiacorum - Canterbury; and in Gaul Lutetia Parisiorum - the modern Paris - are amongst other examples which come to mind. Eburacum (York), the chief city in the northern military zone of Britain, in the third century, at any rate, combined both civil and military characteristics. Not only is it known to have been the capital first of Severus' northern province (Lower Britain), but there is just a possibility that in the second century it usurped Aldborough's position as capital of the Brigantes.² But since there is no evidence of the existence of a colony as early as Ptolemy, it cannot be assumed that the existence of a civil settlement

¹ AA4, xii, 336, n. 54.

² p. 252 f.

was a factor which inspired its inclusion amongst the Brigantina oppida. The earliest record of the colony at York, in fact, is in A.D. 237¹; and it has been pointed out that the growing diseases of the barracks for quartering troops would enhance the importance of adjoining settlements, thus suggesting a Severan foundation for the colony at York.

At Vinovia² (Binchester), likewise, only evidence for military occupation is available. It is true that excavation here has been confined to the known fort site, and even this has not been intensive enough to warrant the conclusion that there was no civil settlement either on the site or nearby; the difficulty recently experienced in recovering the outline of the earliest fort was so great that the chances of finding evidence of still earlier occupation there are negligible.

The identification of these sites, apart from the exceptional case of Aldborough, is unquestionably due to their military character. Not only are tell-tale inscriptions more plentiful, but compilations like the Antonine Itinerary, the Ravenna Cosmography, and the Notitia Dignitatum, naturally noticed these stations as more important than native centres which, lacking any direct connection with the main trunk roads, rapidly lost their former dignity and were not superseded or supplemented by a Roman military post. Calatum or Galacum,

¹ JRS, xi, 102.

² Ravennas, 431-2, gives this form of the name, as does the Antonine Itinerary (ed. Cuntz, 71). Vinovie (CIL, 427) is apparently a rustic form of Vinovia.

since it appears more than once in such publications,¹ must owe the perpetuation of its name to such an establishment. The remainder - Rigodunum, Epiacum, and Camulodunum - must have been important settlements when Ptolemy's source was compiled, but whether they subsequently faded into oblivion as completely as our records of them is unknown. More than any of the others, they would seem to have been purely Brigantian in character; and, if so, the chances of direct identification such as inscriptions afford are extremely slight, even under the most favourable conditions of intensive excavation.

Camulodunum, indeed, must have been an extremely important site. It should be noted here that Horsley's identification of it with the Cambodunum of the Antonine Itinerary² is probably a mistaken one, as the etymological derivations of the two names are entirely different. Camulodunum means the hill-fort of Camulos - a native deity, equated with Mars, the Roman god of war;³ whereas Cambodunum is the crooked or twisted hill-fort.⁴ Horsley placed the site at Greetland in the Calder valley, not far from the fort at Slack. From Greetland, of course, comes

¹ Ant. Itin., 74; Ravennas, 431-2.

² BR, 366.

³ Holder, Alt-Celtischer Sprachschatz, i, col. 725-6, s.v.

⁴ ibid., col. 714-5, s.v.

one of the dedications to the goddess Brigantia;¹ but it is now clear from the results of the excavations of 1937-8 that there can have been no extensive occupation of this site. Widespread trenching did not produce a single potsherd. Castle Hill, Almondbury, whence comes one of the three hoards of Brigantian coins, is, as Richmond has suggested, much more likely to have accommodated this ancient town.² Furthermore, while the size and formidable defences of Almondbury, together with its fine position, its situation in what we suppose to have been the heart of Brigantian territory, as well as the finds it has produced without excavation, all indicate that it was probably the chef-lieu of the area, there is a strong presumption on other grounds in favour of Camulodunum having been the pre-Roman native capital. Ptolemy is again the authority, though in this case unwittingly. In the Syntaxis Mathematica he writes:

'The twenty-second parallel ... is distant from the equatorial division 55° and is drawn through Brigantium in great Britain: the twenty-third parallel ... 56° ... is drawn through the centre of great Britain: the twenty-fourth parallel ... 57° ... is drawn through Caturactonium of Britain.'³

The point of interest is that while there is no town called Brigantium known to us in the south (or indeed any other part) of Britain, Camulodunum (Colchester) is placed precisely at

¹ CIL, 200.

² Huddersfield, 84.

³ Syntax, II, 6.

55° latitude.¹ The only reasonable explanation of the presumption that this is the town to which Ptolemy is really referring is that he confused Camulodunum Trinovantum with Camulodunum Brigantum; the latter place was no doubt referred to by other tribes as Brigantium, qua caput civitatis. The conversion of the tribal into the town name, while unusual, is not without parallel; the modern Paris owes its name to the Celtic tribe of that region. If this is correct, it implies (bearing in mind the customary attachment of tribal names to capital towns) that the northern Camulodunum was customarily regarded at that time as the Brigantian capital. It will be noted that Ptolemy does not write Isurium Brigantum in the Geography, and it may well be that his sources describe a state of affairs previous to the transference of the capital to Aldborough. The Antonine Itinerary, which gives the reference to Isubrigantum, is at any rate usually ascribed to Caracalla (though here again the sources may be somewhat earlier), and it may be that the transfer did not take place until the early third century when the town wall at Aldborough was first constructed.² But even if Isurium was the capital from the time it acquired a municipal character, it is still possible that Ptolemy is perpetuating the customary description of the former native capital by writing Brigantium.

¹ Müller, 100.

² YAJ, xxxiv, 232-3.

The cause of the error may very likely be Ptolemy's misplaced trust in the reliability of Tacitus, in copying from the speech of Calgacus in the *Agricola*,¹ which gives Brigantes where Iceni must be meant. There is another instance of this habit in the *Geography*,² where Siatutanda appears in the list of towns in Germany - obviously, as Müller points out,³ due to ignorant copying of Tacitus' *Annals*, iv, 73: "soluta iam castelli (i.e. Flevi) obsidio et ad sua tutanda digressis rebellibus."

In any case, Isurium cannot have been the original native capital. Successive excavations at Aldborough only add conviction to the conclusion that there was no pre-Roman occupation there of any note. Dr. K. A. Steer, in a review of the work of 1937, writes: "No finds suggesting a pre-Roman occupation of the site have been found at any point within the city walls, and it is incredible that if such traces existed they should have been missed. Wherever Queen Cartimandua held her court, and the problem is not yet solved, Aldborough can no longer be considered a serious claimant."⁴ It can only have become the capital after the Roman hold on the district had been established late in the first century, when the Brigantes appear to have relinquished

¹ *Agric.*, xxxi, §5.

² *Geog.*, II, xi, §12; Müller, 266.

³ Müller, 266.

⁴ *Yorkshire Post*, 20 September, 1937.

their monarchy, and to have come more directly under Roman rule. It was a normal Roman practice to allow client kingdoms - instance the Regni - to retain their existing monarch but to prevent any succession to the throne by an heir. No mention is made of a Brigantian king after Venutius, about A.D.70, and it seems that the Brigantes must be included in Tacitus' general statement, made at the end of the first century, that "the British tribes were formerly governed by kings, but at present they are divided in parties and factions among their chiefs."¹ It is inconceivable that a warlike tribe with mountain affinities like the Brigantes would choose a situation like that of Aldborough, which lies quite exposed on a plain, for the heart of their dominion. The Romans probably chose it as the site of the new capital deliberately, because it lies in a position under easy surveillance of the legionary fortress at York. As a commercial and industrial centre, too, Aldborough was advantageously situated.²

Camulodunum is not the only candidate for the dignity of pre-Roman capital of Brigantia. On philological grounds alone, Rigodunum has a strong claim, for it is the latinized form of the Celtic name for "King's town."³ Unfortunately,

¹ Agric., xii.

² p. 251-2.

³ Holder, op. cit., ii, col. 1186, s.v.

its situation is unknown, and the problem is made all the more difficult by the fact that the latitude and longitude given by Ptolemy - or more fairly, perhaps, by the surviving transcriptions of Ptolemy's text - are far from dependable, even when corrected to comply with modern Greenwich reckoning. For example, even when the relative positions of known sites like Olicana, Eboracum and Caturactonium are established, Vinovia, which from epigraphic evidence coupled with that of Ravennas must be placed at Binchester,¹ is nevertheless, according to Ptolemy's figures, situated somewhere near the west coast. While Glazebrook Rylands' intensive research² has shown that the position of the sites on the east coast must be moved half a degree farther north than the degrees of latitude ordinarily given, there is absolutely no indication as to whether this also applies to sites in the centre and on the west side of the island. Before speculative theories can be converted into reasonable presumptions based on fact, excavation on likely sites is essential in order to obtain confirmatory evidence.

A recent suggestion³ that Rigodunum may perhaps be identified with the remains at Ingleborough⁴ is, however,

¹ p. 140.

² The Geography of Ptolemy Elucidated, 64.

³ Which I owe to Mr. I. A. Richmond.

⁴ See Gazetteer (Appendix A), s.v.

interesting from more than the immediate consideration of thus disposing of one of the unidentified towns. In the first place, if excavation proved this to be a reasonable assumption, it would effectually establish that Ptolemy was not giving a mere list of the chief Roman stations in the district - whether military or civil in character. As far as the question of the Brigantian capital is concerned, Rigodunum need not necessarily have been the chief town of that tribe; the name may be but a further indication of the existence of sub-tribes of one of which Ingleborough was the capital. Or again (an intriguing idea) it may have been the chief stronghold of Venutius following his split with Cartimandua to which he perhaps clung even after her departure under Roman escort, or possibly utilized a second time during the struggle with Cerialis. Such an explanation does not interfere with the very strong case for regarding Camulodunum as the native capital under normal political conditions; and certainly the imposing majesty of Ingleborough, commanding as it does a wide sweep of the western dales, would seem to assure it of a much greater importance than the centre of a local sub-tribe could expect.

It is interesting to note that if Rigodunum were indeed at Ingleborough, Ptolemy's figures for Epiacum would, on the same scale of measurement from an established base like

Gatterick, and ignoring the latitude which is so frequently inaccurate, be quite consistent with the placing of that town precisely on the eminence of Blackrod in Lancashire where traces of a considerable settlement have been observed.¹ But these can be no more than mere possibilities until excavation of the sites can be undertaken. The urgent need for such investigation is self-evident, if tentative theories are to be given the opportunity of acquiring a factual basis, and the main features of the problem elucidated.

Such must have been the outward extent of the Brigantian kingdom at the time of the Roman invasion and during the years immediately following. There are many gaps in our knowledge, but the broad outlines at least must be substantially correct. The picture of the Brigantes drawn from the available evidence is that of a powerful tribe centering in the West Riding, whose hegemony extended over the whole of the north of England south of the Tyne-Solway isthmus with the exception of East Yorkshire and the backwater of the marshy valleys and estuaries of the north-west. Their high degree of military organization is suggested by the strength and size of their strongholds, such as are known, and confirmed by the history of their stout resistance to the skilled armies of the conquerors of the known world. Though in time of peace primarily an agricultural or pastoral community, practically

¹ Appendix A, s.v.

untouched - unlike the British tribes of the south-east - by the romanizing influences which had long been penetrating gradually from Gaul, archaeology supplements Ptolemy in proving the existence of a fairly well developed civil life, indicated by certain settlements, beyond which romanization never made any great impression in the north: but this development was limited in a regional form even within the Brigantian state.¹

Largely because of the great extent of territory comprised in the Brigantian civitas, and the wide differences of living conditions and culture prevailing in different parts, it is impossible to generalize about the condition of the Brigantes as a whole. It is not surprising, when these factors are considered, that there should develop such widely differing interests and political attitudes as have already been noticed in tracing the history of this people.

¹ See Econ. Conditions, (iii).

V. THE ROMAN MILITARY OCCUPATION OF BRIGANTIA

(i) GENERAL.

In order to consider the history of the Brigantes in its proper perspective, it is essential that it should be viewed against the background of the purely Roman features of the occupation. For this purpose, the accompanying map illustrates the system of communications adopted by the Romans in holding down and exploiting the area under review. A comprehensive and detailed survey is not intended and, in doubtful cases, except where more recent investigation has produced conclusions which may reasonably be accepted, reliance is placed upon the O.S. Map of Roman Britain (second edition) as the final authority. While, however, for the greater part of the area a brief summary of the existing position must suffice, special attention is paid to North Yorkshire, whose communications appear to have been based on the Roman fort at Bainbridge in Wensleydale; partly because this small district illustrates so well the general Roman policy in the occupation of the Northern Pennines, and partly because of the writer's closer acquaintance with the problems of the Bainbridge area - both in connection with the native settlements of Swaledale and Wensleydale, and

with the military occupation at Bainbridge. It may thus be regarded as an illustration of the way in which regional re-surveys over the whole area would contribute to the elucidation of some of the most important problems of the Roman occupation.

The Vespasianic forward movement against the Brigantes, under the direction of Cerialis, in all probability began from Lincoln. The initial fact around which any historical reconstruction must be built is the establishment of the legionary fortress at York in this period of governorship.¹ A trans-Pennine route from Manchester leading in the direction of York, which may belong to the period of Cerialian conquests, is indeed known,² but in view of the abundant evidence of occupation at York by the IX Legion, which was previously stationed at Lincoln, and of the absence of any record that either the XIV or XX Legions ever visited York, it may be assumed that the first advance came along the east coast with the design of outflanking the Brigantes and securing a foothold at a strategic point before attempting to penetrate the hill-country.

The strong position of the legionary fortress here, commanding the moraine crossing of the Ouse marshes, has already been pointed out.³ There is no reason to believe

¹ JRS, xviii, 98.

² p. 175.

³ p. 145.

that the choice of the site was at all influenced by the existence of a native settlement, of which there is no evidence, although Gordon Home was inclined to favour Benson's postulation of such an occupation in the neighbourhood of the Mount.¹ None of the evidences of civil settlement at York is so early as to be irreconcilable with the Cerialian date of foundation of the fortress, bringing with it the inevitable train of camp followers.

To the end of the occupation of the north of Britain by Roman troops, York continued to house a legion, and to be regarded as the reserve base, not only for the whole of the northern Pennines, but also for the northern frontier, whether fixed for the time in Scotland or between Tyne and Solway. In 122 came the replacement of the IX Hispana by the VI Victrix,² but there was no further change; the latter unit became the permanent garrison. York shared in the disasters at the close of the second and third centuries,³ but its fortunes under the successive barbarian invasions of 367 and 383 can only be surmised. Stilicho must have made it his base for the reorganisation of A.D. 395-401, but whether the legionary garrison was amongst those troops which he was compelled to recall for the Gothic war is a moot point; the

¹ Roman York, 20 n.

² p. 69-70.

³ JRS, xviii, 98.

absence of later coins, in view of the great reduction of issues of western mints about this time, and of the uniform rarity throughout Britain and north Gaul,¹ is no proof that occupation here ended with Stilicho. Whether it was abandoned as a military centre or not, there must have been some continuous civil occupation, however poor and meagre, at York into the dark ages, for it is mentioned in Nennius (as *Caer Ebrauc*).²

The original advance from Lincoln to York probably took place along the East coast route via Brough-on-Humber, and thence along the 'Humber Street.' With the establishment of the Fosse Way as the Roman frontier from Exeter to Lincoln, the Humber must have been the virtual boundary between Romans and natives on the east coast. The Parisii, who occupied East Yorkshire, seem always to have been friendly towards the invaders, and the discovery of very early ceramic types in the native settlement across the river at Brough indicates that peaceful trading with the Romans had already been in progress for some years before Cerialis established his temporary camp on this site.³ Incidentally, the dating of the large camp beneath the existing fort at Malton⁴ raises the possibility that Cerialis decided to secure the defence

¹ OHE, i, p.295.

² Historia Brittonum, (ed. Mommsen) 147 ff.

³ Corder, Petuarria.

⁴ Corder, Malton, 64.

of the Parisian country before turning to enter Brigantian territory via the York moraine crossing. In either case, the Brigantes were effectively outflanked as a result of this angle of approach.

The importance of the geographical division between East and West Yorkshire caused by the then marshy expanse of the Vale of York as far north as the Tees is clear from the fact that a Roman road ran northward along each side of the marshland. That on the west, which was to become the main northern trunk road both of Roman Britain and of later ages, was the vital communicating line of York and Aldborough, military and civil capitals of Roman Brigantia respectively, with the whole area under their administration. That on the east, starting from the important road-junction at Stamford Bridge, probably acted in a similar way for the administration of Parisian East Yorkshire from Malton and Brough, and the backward regions of Blackamore, though it can never have been so important. Its most useful purpose would appear to lie in the fact that it afforded an alternative route to Hadrian's Wall for the legion stationed at York, and it is probably for this reason that we find its line - admittedly as yet largely a hypothetical one - extended across the Tees at Middleton-one-Row,¹ through the barren coastal regions of county Durham (incidentally, be it noted, avoiding Binchester), and reaching

¹ Elgee, Arch. Yorks., 134.

the fort at Chester-le-Street before forking to Newcastle on the one hand and South Shields on the other. The reason for preserving a separate line must obviously have been the necessity of avoiding any possibility of the legion's direct communications with the Wall being cut, as would otherwise have happened, had even one station en route fallen into hostile hands. While the exact line is for long distances uncertain, the most important part - on both sides of the Tees crossing - is fortunately the most authentic.

The precise course between Stamford Bridge and Easingwold has not been definitely established,¹ but from Thornton-le-Street (Roman remains)² it is shown with confidence proceeding west of Northallerton to cross the Tees at Middleton-one-Row, where Wooler thinks a Roman fort may have stood on Tower Hill, to guard the river passage.³ It should be noted that two Roman lamps were found in 1875 during the excavation of the foundations of a house in Pontey's Lane near this site, and that one of them bore the potter's stamp ANNISER.⁴

The date during which this eastern Great North Road was in use is quite uncertain. As only the secondary route to the Wall, it is unlikely to have preceded the construction of

¹ Clark, E. Yorks, 41.

² Whellan, NR, ii, 337.

³ JRS, xii, 245-6.

⁴ ibid., Loeschcke, Lampen aus Vindonissa (Zurich, 1919), is non-committal, but Mr. Birley's opinion is that they are more likely to be second than first century in date.

the more westerly roads which carried the Roman army on its earliest campaigns over the Brigantian territory.

From Thornton-le-Street there is some evidence of a road branching off via Northallerton to meet the more westerly trunk route just north of Catterick Bridge (where the fort is on the opposite, or south, bank of the river). While Elgee cites Roman remains as having been found at Northallerton,¹ his assumption that a station existed there has been discredited by excavations at Castle Hill in 1938. Roger Gale and John Warburton as early as the second decade of the eighteenth century were agreed upon the existence of a Roman road along this line. In a letter to Warburton (17 August, 1717), Gale says, "I am very much mistaken if there is not a military way running along the northern bank of Swale, from Catterick Bridge eastward towards Bolton. Now I take the course of this road to have gone by Thornton in the Street to Thornbrough, and by Romandby, near Northallerton."²

In his reply (21 November, 1717), Warburton states that "the military way that comes from Easingwold to Thornaldby, shews itself very plainly in the village of Romandby, from which place it goes to Yafford, Langton, Bolton upon Swale, Brunton, and by the north side of the friery wall in Richmond to the top of Richmond Moor, where I lose it, but believe it

¹ Arch. Yorks., 144.

² Quoted by W. Hutchinson, View of Northumberland, i, 116.

shoots north-west, and meets with that which goes north from Ethelburgh [Addlebrough, near Bainbridge], some where about Barnard Castle."¹ The recent discovery on this line of "fragmentary remains of what may have been the 'pitching' of a Roman road,"² at a depth of six feet in the parish of Thornton-le-Beans, affords the first material evidence in support of this theory. If this line could be established it would serve to explain part of the problem of industrial transport in the dales; for this would be the natural and the easiest way to convey lead from the Hurst mines in Swaledale to Brough-on-Humber for exportation. Unfortunately, the suggestion of Gale and Warburton appears to have been hitherto overlooked, with the result that no investigation of this line has so far been attempted.

With the establishment of the legionary fortress at York achieved, a river crossing two miles broad would have been an intolerable encumbrance for a main route, and perhaps the Lincoln - Doncaster - Castleford - York road is to be attributed to the period when Agricola was putting the occupation of north Britain on a more permanent basis. Branching westwards from the Lincoln - Brough road, it ran via Littleborough to Doncaster - the first available point at which the Don could be forded above the swamps

¹ ibid.

² YAJ, xxxiv, 236.

at Hatfield Chase.

The name of the station at Doncaster - Danum - is known, and occurs in the fifth and eighth itineraria of Antonine.¹ Unfortunately, no excavations have taken place at Doncaster, where most of the site is now built over. The casual finds, however, are sufficient to support the theory of a Flavian foundation; and in view of the still earlier evidence of occupation yielded by excavations on the site of the neighbouring fort at Templebrough,² it is not beyond the bounds of probability that both served as advance posts, supported from the legionary base at Lincoln, whose purpose was to guard the Brigantian frontier in the long period when Rome was busily engaged in subduing other parts of the province. Such posts would be particularly valuable in checking possible Brigantian intervention at the critical time of Boudicca's revolt. Lacking any published survey, a brief review of the extant material and an estimate of the nature of the occupation may be attempted here.³ The whole of the Samian ware at Doncaster is of late first and early second century types, and the bulk of the whole collection of pottery (including coarse ware) dates from the late first to the mid-second century. The finds outside the presumed

¹ Ant. Itin., 73-4.

² p. 161-3.

³ The following conclusions are largely based on an unpublished study by Dr. K. A. Steer.

fort area indicate the existence of a fairly large vicus, after the style of those at Housesteads, Ambleside, Papcastle and Brougham elsewhere in the north of England. Such settlements were not always directly dependent on neighbouring military posts - Corbridge and Carlisle, for instance, illustrate this point. But Doncaster apparently had nothing in the way of forum or baths to indicate that it was anything more than a link in the trade route of Ermine Street. It had also a certain importance as a road junction through which the pigs of Derbyshire lead from Lutudarum were probably transported to Brough-on-Humber for exportation.

After the mid-second century there appears to have been a decrease in the size of the settlement at Doncaster, though a few pieces of pottery carry the occupation somewhat tenuously through to the third and fourth centuries. The coin evidence, on the whole, confirms that of the pottery. Single coins of Claudius, Vespasian, Domitian, Nerva, Trajan, Severus and Constantine I. have occurred in and around the fort, and there are also three hoards. Two of these, neither of which has been noticed in print, were discovered in 1929.¹ Of the first, the last of 67 remaining coins - about 40 having been lost - dates to A.D. 169. The last of a batch of 53 coins of the second, sold in bulk, was one of M. Aurelius (177 A.D.), and many others of this hoard

¹ Information from Mr. P. G. Bales, per Dr. K. A. Steer.

have been lost. The last of the third hoard of 24 coins¹ was an issue of Faustina. It is interesting and perhaps significant that the Templebrough hoard² and that from Bentley, $1\frac{1}{4}$ miles from Doncaster,³ are of very similar content. The total evidence certainly indicates that serious occupation at Doncaster ceased in the latter half of the second century; the military reoccupation may not have taken place until the last phase of the Roman occupation of the north under Stilicho when the Notitia Dignitatum records that at Danum was stationed a prefect of the Crispian horse under the command of the Duke of Britain.⁴ While the accidental nature of the finds does not permit of any dogmatic statement on the point, it may be that any intermediate occupation between the mid-second and mid-fourth centuries was non-military -- perhaps that of small tradesmen eking out a living from the traffic along the main trunk road. The decline in the importance of Doncaster indicates that the region within immediate reach of the legion at York, at any rate, was peacefully settled. Perhaps another reason for the station's decline was a falling off, or even the discontinuance, of the lead exportation trade from Derbyshire.

¹ Communicated to the Doncaster Chronicle - date unknown (perhaps c. 1925).

² May, Templebrough, 11.

³ N.C. V (1863).

⁴ ed. Seeck, 209.

It is significant that by far the largest proportion of evidence for official mining in the north of Britain belongs to the first half of the second century. In fact Whittick¹ does not date any of the Derbyshire pigs later than Hadrian; and the latest of the four pigs from the Brigantian area (that from Grassington) is only A.D. 138.²

Following the Pennin foothills northward to Castleford, Ermine Street here bridges the narrowest gap between the Humber marshes and Pennines, by means of the belt of magnesian limestone upon which it is carried through Yorkshire. Castleford corresponds by distance with Legiolium of the fifth and eighth Itinera, which may be equated with the Logentium of Ravennas.³ While there is abundant evidence of Roman occupation here, including tessellated pavements, coins and pottery,⁴ no military occupation has yet been proved. A milestone found in Beancroft Road gives the distance to York as 20 or 22 miles.⁵

Templebrough, which lies to the west of Doncaster, and, like the latter, on the south bank of the river Don, is an extremely important site, because of the evidence of pre-Vespasianic occupation which indicates that it was a Roman

¹ Newcomen Society Trans., xii, 57-84.

² ibid.

³ Ravennas, 431-2.

⁴ Pearson, R. Yorkshire, 66.

⁵ EE, ix, 1253 b.

frontier post in the long period of stalemate between the Brigantes and the invading Roman power before Cerialis' incisive advance.¹ To this period, when the Ninth Legion was stationed at Lincoln, may belong the tile stamp of that unit which has been unearthed at Templebrough.² This evidence lends colour to the belief, in itself probable from geographical and other reasons (such as the ancient linear earthworks in the neighbourhood, which may have represented the Brigantian lines of defence, and the fact that a little to the south-west was the non-tribal area organized on Brough) that the Don valley marked the south-east limit of Brigantian territory.

Templebrough was linked with Littlechester, the south Derbyshire fort, by the Riknild Street, and the existence of a road connecting it with Brough on the west and Doncaster on the east is accepted by the O.S., though its precise line is conjectural. A branch connecting the Templebrough - Doncaster and Doncaster - Castleford roads was evidently constructed to shorten the northward journey for traffic from the south-west and centre of the Midlands; and it is reasonable to suppose that this section of road may have been constructed as a result of the evacuation of the fort at Doncaster in the latter half of the second century.

¹ p. 48 ff.

² May, Templebrough, Pl. XXXVII, M. A similar stamp was found at Slack: Castleshaw, Pl. LV, B. fig. 7.

There can be little doubt that Templebrough enjoyed its greatest importance while Brigantia retained its independence. The earliest fort, apparently occupied as early as A.D. 50, was large ($5\frac{1}{2}$ acres) and nearly square, with turf ramparts resting on gravel and clay. At some unknown period it was reconstructed and the size reduced by $1\frac{3}{4}$ acres. An interruption in the pottery sequence indicates that it was abandoned at the time of the building of Hadrian's Wall where its garrison, Cohort IV Gallorum, was more urgently needed - first at Castlesteads, and later moving to Risingham c. A.D. 140. If May's suggested identification with the Morbium of the Notitia could be confirmed, a subsequent reoccupation would be attested.¹

North of Castleford, Ermine Street is clearly distinguishable as far as Aberford by a straight ridge about eight yards wide and often as much as five feet high. Thence it is traceable over Bramham Moor to the fort of Longbrough (Newton Kyme) at St. Helen's Ford on the south bank of the Wharfe. This large station² was occupied from the later part of the first to the fourth century.³ Unless it be regarded as a rival to Tadcaster for identification with Calcaria, the Roman name of this fort is not known.

¹ Templebrough, 12.

² Described in 1862 (G.M. i, 807) as measuring 340 yds. by 210 yds.

³ Elgee, Arch. Yorks., 126.

Probably because it is on a route which by-passes York, it is not mentioned in any of the Northern Itinera. From the north side of the ford, the line of the road is continued in the direction of Aldborough by a grass-grown road now called Rudgate, and runs into the York-Aldborough road at Providence Green.¹

From the character of the junction which the road from Castleford makes with the York - Ilkley road, the latter would appear to have existed earlier. This view gains colour from Dr. Villy's independent suggestion that the York - Ilkley - Long Preston road, which continues as the Craven Way to Brigg Flatts near Sedbergh, where it joins the Ribchester road to Carlisle, is of Cerialian origin.² In view of the important implications of the results of Dr. Villy's recent work, his conclusions deserve special attention.

Personal examination of the terrain and the lines of the two roads tends to support the correctness of his demonstration that the manner of the crossing of the Rawthey near Sedbergh by the Craven Way and the Ribchester roads respectively indicates that the former was in existence before the construction of the latter. The Craven Way, descending from the slopes of the hills, takes advantage of the first possible gap in the Rawthey gorge to swing north-

¹ Codrington, 134-5.

² Bradford Ant., n. s. VI, pt. 29 (1938) (reprint).

wards over the river to Brigg Flatts. The Ribchester road, on the other hand, whose natural course would have been straight on via Holme - near which a convenient ford still exists - evidently made a sharp turn at the point where it is now cut by the railway, in order to take advantage of the river crossing quite out of its line to the east, which must originally have been prepared to carry the Craven Way.

Dr. Villy also makes the point that the southern part of this difficult cross-Pennine route was not primarily a communicating road between York and Ribchester, with the road to Settle and beyond a mere branch thrown off at Skipton. "The lay-out at Skipton," he writes, "is quite conclusive as to that. As in the case of the Rawthey crossing, the road coming north-west from Ilkley after five miles faces impossible ground, and has to swing west for two and a half miles in order to reduce the descent, and to open up an outlook in front. It reaches the first possible jumping off place opposite Skipton, and at once resumes its north-west direction, crossing the quite independent road east of Ribchester soon after. A glance at the map will explain the point."¹

If it be assumed that the Ribchester - Carlisle route was the earliest along the west of the Pennines, one implication of this interpretation is that the north-west was first reached from York and not from Chester. This is

¹ ibid., reprint p. 8-9.

consistent with the reconstruction of Agricola's campaigns from the ancient sources. Thus, from the very beginning of the Roman occupation, Chester's concern with the northern regions must have been only secondary. Villy further suggests that, as the Stainmore route is so superior to that via Ilkley and Long Preston, there would have been little point in constructing the latter as a main through road (which Villy demonstrates it to have been) had the Stainmore road already been in existence. The Craven Way, then, was the earlier of the two; and he believes that it may represent the line of one of Cerialis' earliest expeditions, "a more or less tentative exploratory way towards the north-west before Agricola began his great move into Scotland."¹

It is unfortunate that of the three possible Cerialian routes to Carlisle, - from Chester via Ribchester, and from York by the more southerly Craven Way, and the northern Stainmore Gap - none of the intermediate stations has produced definite evidence of Cerialian occupation; but it is worth pondering, in this connection, the fact that neither Meltham nor Kirklees actually yielded finds which could independently date them to this earliest period of occupation to which, on other grounds, they have generally been assigned.² Moreover, with the establishment of the

¹ ibid., reprint p.9.

² p.175.

Craven Way as a through route, another fact in favour of its early origin emerges - namely, the fact that it does not appear as one of the recognised main roads in the Antonine Itinerary; it had evidently been superseded by roads whose course had been more leisurely selected and more carefully engineered.

It is doubtful whether a fort ever existed at Tadcaster, the first permanently occupied site along this road from York, although the outlines of a camp are discernible in the grounds of Castle Hill Farm on the bank of the river. It seems a priori unlikely that garrisons would be simultaneously established both here and at the neighbouring Long Brough. Nor is it altogether certain to which of these sites should be allotted the Roman name Calcaria. Calcaria is not mentioned in either the fifth or eighth Antonine Itinera, both of which run via Tadcaster, Castleford and Doncaster to Lincoln; and while this may perhaps be due to its proximity to York, which would considerably lessen the importance of Tadcaster as a road-station, it must be remembered that Calcaria is given as a station on the second Iter (to Manchester), IX MPM from York, and XX MPM from the hitherto unidentified station of Cambodunum;¹ and the discrepancy is most plausibly explained if it be supposed that Long Brough, and not Tadcaster, was Calcaria;

¹ Ravennas, 72.

for while the former site is on a York - Manchester road, it is definitely off the line of the road between York and Castleford.

Two roads leave Tadcaster for Ilkley; the southern is for part of the way the route of the fifth and eighth Itinera, while the northern appears to be a continuation of the road from Manchester. After leaving the Castleford road between Home Farm and Headley Hall, the former swings gradually north-west and crosses the Manchester - York road near Scarcroft. Thence, running on the north side of the civil settlement at Adel, it crosses Carlton Moor under the name of York Gate. Percival Ross traced it for nearly a mile over Guiseley Moor where sections showed it to be $13\frac{1}{2}$ feet wide and kerbed.¹ Whitaker states that the present main road runs on the line of the Roman road through Ilkley.²

The Roman fort at Ilkley was obviously an important road junction in the Roman period; at least four important roads meet here from different parts of the country. Mentioned by Ptolemy as Olicana, one of the Brigantian 'oppida,'³ no evidence of pre-Roman settlement has yet come to light, and excavation has indicated a Flavian foundation for the earliest $2\frac{1}{4}$ acre fort.⁴ Nevertheless,

¹ Bradford Ant., vi, 56.

² Manchester, i, 193.

³ Muller, 96-9.

⁴ YAJ, xxviii, 303-4.

though there is insufficient evidence to justify the assumption of previous occupation by Cerialis, in view of the short and probably tentative character of that occupation, and the difficulty of dating pottery types with certainty to a short period of years, the possibility of such an early establishment is not removed. The surrounding civil settlement, which later made Ilkley a place of no small importance, had formed a considerable nucleus before the end of Agricola's governorship.

The Ilkley station appears to have had an unusually uneventful career. Mr. Woodward suggests that the terminal date of the occupation of the first fort coincided with the defeat of the IX legion late in the reign of Trajan. Re-occupation was not long delayed, though the excavators could not particularise further than to suggest some date under Hadrian or Antoninus Pius. There was certainly reconstruction in the early third century following the collapse of Hadrian's Wall in 296, and the ravaging of the north which resulted.¹ The fort was garrisoned during the greater part of the third century by the Second Cohort of Lingones, one of whose soldiers set up an altar to the goddess Verbeia,² and whose stamp has been noticed on hypocaust bricks.³ There is an abrupt break in the coin series after Carausius,

¹ CIL, 210.

² CIL, 208.

³ YAJ, xxviii, 309.

however, and until the final brief occupation about A.D. 370 the fort at Ilkley seems to have been abandoned.¹ This desertion permitted the transfer of the Second Lingones to Congavata (possibly one of the stations on the Cumberland coast) by the time to which this section of the Notitia Dignitatum refers;² and the equation of the Olenacum of that semi-official document with Olicana is by no means certain. If they are one and the same, then the place of the Lingones at Ilkley in the late fourth century occupation was taken by a cavalry regiment, the First Herculean Ala.³

In view of its great strategical position, the abandonment of Ilkley in the critical period of the late third to the late fourth centuries comes as a surprise. The period was admittedly one of peril for local garrisons and peaceful settlers; little weight can be attached to the political significance of the sudden ending of coin hoards in the neighbourhood about this time, but there does seem to have been destruction at the villas of North Stainley and Gargrave.⁴ The fort at Bainbridge, however, continued to be held, though obviously under difficulties.⁵ A partial explanation is to be sought in the transfer of the police duties of the Ilkley

¹ ibid., 307-8.

² Not. Dig., 209-12. Hubner (CIL, 83) identified Congavata with Moresby.

³ Not. Dig., 209-12.

⁴ Appendix A, s.v.

⁵ p.214 ff.

garrison to the neighbouring fort at Elslack - a relief impossible to the isolated station at Bainbridge. At Elslack the early quingenary Flavian fort was replaced some time after A.D.210 by a stone structure double the size.¹

Perhaps this second occupation was a fourth century one, for there is a possible direct connection between the name 'Elslack' and the 'Olenacum,' the fort given by the Notitia in the 'per lineam valli' section. As has been seen,² this does not necessarily mean that Olenacum was a Wall fort. Mr. E. V. Gordon states that "if the 'e' in Olenacum is a writing for 'i', then the late British form of the sixth century when the Angles came would be 'El(i)noc.' The '-slack' was added later, by Scandinavian settlers. The earliest form recorded in English is, I believe, Domesday Book c. 1086, 'Elslac,' practically the modern form, so that we can only conjecture the history in the oldest English period."³ Before its abandonment, however, Ilkley was situated in an area of more than usually settled agricultural development; and its importance must have lain at least as much with the control of commercial traffic communications as with the more purely military duties usually demanded of Pennine garrisons. That this traffic was by the third century chiefly of a local character is shown by the

¹ YAJ, xxi, 125-33.

² p. 38-9.

³ In a private letter to Miss Kitson Clark.

non-appearance of Ilkley in the Antonine Itinerary, although in the second century it was one of the 'towns' of the Brigantes. Obviously, while its geographical situation prevented Ilkley from being - at any rate after the first century - a principal highway junction, it was nevertheless a centre of first importance in local affairs.

Leaving Ilkley for the north-west, the Roman road is identifiable with 'The Street' at Addingham, and thence runs in a straight line over Addingham Low Moor.¹ It continues over a broad shoulder of Skipton Moor, and traces of it have been noticed along Short Bank Lane between Skipton and the railway bridge.² At this point it crosses the road from Ribchester and Elslack, which maintains an undeviating line onwards in the direction of Droughton and Aldborough.³ The alignment of these two roads and the character of their junction certainly support Dr. Villy's contention that their primary purpose was not the connection of Ribchester and Ilkley.

Queen Street, a road of recognised Roman character, continues this trans-Pennine route across the Aire to Gargrave, close by the Kirk Sink villa, and thence to Long Preston where, east of the churchyard, a large 6-acre fort

¹ Whitaker, Manchester, i, 193.

² Codrington, R. Roads, 102.

³ ibid., 101, and Bradford Ant., n.s. VI pt.29 (1938) p.9 (reprint).

of Flavian type underlies a later structure of only half the size.¹ While precisely datable evidence is lacking, this discovery supports the interpretation of the Craven Way as one of the earliest Roman routes during the occupation of Brigantia; and the reduction in the size of the fort is a further testimony to the decline of that route as a main highway of any importance.

Beyond Long Preston the line is continued along Green Bank Lane over the moor into Ribblesdale which is entered at Settle. A Roman origin has been suggested for the camp on the summit of Castleberg, but its position is too difficult of access to have been very suitable from a Roman point of view, while its elongated shape is distinctly un-Roman. Finally, the absence of gateways suggests that it would be more suitably ascribed to the class of medieval folds or stockades, common in the district, such as that excavated at Grinton.² The Roman road crosses the Ribble at Settle and continues to High Paley Green aiming at the fort of Overborough. Six miles further on, in this alignment, pieces of the road are recognisable on Clapham Common.³ If the Craven Way be accepted as earlier than the Ribchester road this must have been a mere branch from the main line

¹ YAJ, xxvii, 410-12.

² p. 577-80.

³ Bradford Ant., loc. cit., 1-2 (reprint).

passing through Overborough and on into the Lake District.¹

The Roman road forks on descending the hills into Settle, and that which goes right by Castleberg Lane seeks out the easiest natural route up the valley to the north-west. The details of its course have been faithfully outlined by Villy,² and it is sufficient here to note that he has satisfactorily traced this ancient road via Great Stainforth village, Helwith Brigge, Blind Beck and Selside to Ribbleshead; thence over the north-east shoulder of Wherside it survives in its original form. Here it is obviously well-cambered and kerbed, with numerous culverts, and the manner of its descent, pointing on the West House (Dent) site, of whose Roman character Dr. Villy is very confident, is strikingly typical of Roman engineering. At West House, trial trenches dug by Villy in 1936 revealed a ditch, clay bank (the possible rampart) and a gravel road, but no dateable finds were made. Once again, however, the character of the remains similar to those at Meltham and Kirkclees - where there was also a total absence of dateable ^{Roman} finds - is such that it is at least not inconsistent with the supposition of a Flavian foundation of the earliest type; and if permanent occupation should in forthcoming excavations be definitely disproved, this would accord with the belief

¹ CW², xxxvii, 49-51.

² Bradford Ant., loc. cit.

that the Craven Way was almost immediately replaced by the Stainmore road as the principal highway from York to Carlisle.

The road runs from West House up the south side of Dentdale until it reaches the crossing of the Rawthey to Brigg Flatts, which has already been discussed.¹ From Brigg Flatts the line to Low Borrow Bridge is the recognised Roman one along Howgill Lane.

The problems of the north-west passage of the Yorkshire Pennines are in an interesting state of development. Those of the south-west, on the other hand, may on the whole be satisfactorily resolved. There is no reason to question Richmond's reconstruction of the character and period of the semi-permanent forts at Meltham and Kirklees as being posts erected on the first, Cerialian, line of communication between Chester and York.² The forts, both of early Flavian character, were soon abandoned, and no properly engineered road is known to have connected them.

The evidence for the Agricolan foundation of Slack, above the Colne valley, and of the first fort at Castleshaw, on a south-western spur of the Pennines below Saddleworth, together with the identification on this new line of a Roman road taking a carefully selected course across the Pennine watershed, explains the abandonment of the temporary Meltham

¹ p. 164-5.

² Huddersfield, 21-7.

and Kirklees route. Both Slack and Castleshaw I. were stations of some importance in the Agricola period, and Slack in particular became the nucleus of a large and prosperous civil settlement. Reconstruction in stone, common to the Trajanic period in Britain, took place twice before, early in the reign of Hadrian, the fort was abandoned¹ - presumably that the garrison might be transferred to the new Wall frontier. The first fort at Castleshaw resembled Slack in size and structure, but the absence of late first century pottery or coins indicates that it was abandoned throughout the last decade. Probably owing to the difficulties of moorland travel, however, a tiny police post only 160 feet by 190 feet externally was erected on the site during the succeeding Trajanic reorganisation,² similar to that known as Maiden Castle, which served the Stainmore route between Brough and Bowes.³ But even this small site was evacuated under Hadrian that its small garrison, which cannot have numbered more than about 100-120 men, might swell the defences of the new northern frontier.⁴ Nor is there any sign that either station was ever reoccupied.

The natural assumption from such a state of affairs is that this particular line of communication was abandoned c. A.D.

¹ YAJ, xxvi, 85.

² CW², xxvii, 170-7.

⁴ Castleshaw.

³ Collingwood, Arch. of R. Britain, 42-3.

122-5. With the discovery of another Roman road of the finest type over Blackstone Edge - thus taking a still more northerly line from Manchester - which continued towards the Calder valley via Moston, Burnedge, Hollingworth, Ripponden and Greetland, rejoining the old line at Rastrick, the problem of the maintenance of communications between York and Chester is solved.¹ This must have been the route which remained in use until the end of the Roman occupation, and therefore along which the Antonine road-book takes the Second Iter mentioning the following posts and intermediate distances:-²

Eboracum.

Calcaria VIII M.P.M.

Camboduno XX M.P.M.

Mamucio XVIII M.P.M.

The only flaw in the reconstruction for some time has been the fact that no fort to correspond with Cambodunum was known; and the suggestion that Greetland, with its Brigantian altar, might afford such a site³ has been discredited by extensive trenching in 1937.^{3a} Yet an intermediate station, at the end of a day's march from Manchester, must have existed.

¹ Richmond, Huddersfield, 89.

² ed. Cuntz, 72.

³ Richmond, op cit., 94-6.

^{3a} YAJ, xxxiv, 93-4. The possible existence of a small site is still not absolutely ruled out; but on the existing evidence the Cleckheaton site must be preferred.

This extremely important point would seem to have been satisfactorily cleared up by Dr. Villy's work on the site at Snelsins, near Cleckheaton. We are informed by Richardson's note in Hearne's Leland¹ that "In the Heaton fields, nigh the Hedleshaw where the Roman coins before-mentioned were found, in a piece of high ground called Stunsteads, there have been ploughed up several coins (one of Septimus Severus and one of Pertinax, both of silver, I have now by me), and also foundations of buildings. I have sometimes thought this was Cambodunum" Moreover, in the field Hedleshaw (Richardson's own property) were found several hundred coins dating between 218 and 268 A.D.² "Stunsteads" may reasonably be identified with an open field marked "Townsteads" on the Cleckheaton Allotment Award Map (1795);³ but though no remains exist above ground Dr. Villy's trial trenches have revealed, near Snelsins farm, "a quadrangular ditch with rounded corners which can hardly fail to be the sole existing remains of a Roman fortification."⁴ The site is strategically a strong one, with the Spen and two small tributaries flowing on three sides; and when the character of the small post at Castleshaw is recalled, the small size - about half acre - of this enclosure does not

¹ 3rd ed. i, 148.

² Hearne's Leland, (1714), ix, 144.

³ Bradford Ant., vi, pt.26 (1933), 1 (reprint); and Richmond, Huddersfield, 113.

⁴ Bradford Ant., loc. cit., 2 (reprint).

require particular explanation. The distance from York and Calcaria corresponds to that given in the Itinerary, and while further excavation is obviously desirable at Snelsins, the sum total of evidence justifies the assumption that on or about this site we have the missing station of Cambodunum. Moreover, there is support for this conjecture from another source; W. G. Collingwood identifies the Campodunum of Bede¹ with the Anglian abbey near Dewsbury;² and the claims of a Roman site in the Dewsbury district, such as Cleckheaton, are thereby strengthened.

At this point a discrepancy in the reading of the second Iter must be considered. The total distance from York to Manchester is there given as XLVII M.P.M., whereas in fact it is nearer 60 miles. Some clerical error in the text must be presumed. Richmond's suggestion, that an X was accidentally omitted from the distance between Calcaria and Cambodunum,³ automatically lapses with the elimination of Greetland from the list of possible fort sites. Villy has, however, made a suggestion which may reasonably be accepted. He shows⁴ that the Cleckheaton post is about 21 miles from Newton Kyme (or Tadcaster); and that the distance to Manchester from Cleckheaton is about 28 miles. Slack, on

¹ Hist. Ecc., xiv

² Northumbrian Crosses of the Pre-Norman Age, 116

³ Huddersfield, 98

⁴ Bradford Ant., loc. cit., 5 (reprint)

the Agricolan route to Manchester, is 8 miles from Snelsins; and it seems most likely that the entry: 'to Slack (i.e. under its Latin name) X M.P.M.' originally appeared between Camboduno and Mamucio. Villy, however, unaccountably takes the second Iter along the Agricolan road via Slack and Castleshaw even after the evacuation of Slack; whereas, as has been pointed out, this event was probably contemporary with the replacement of the western section of the York - Manchester road by the new line over Blackstone Edge. The new loop road would add only an inconsiderable distance to the journey, so that little revision of the list of Second Iter stations would be necessary; but a careless clerk, ordered to erase the name of Slack from the official Itinerary, in doing so, failed to add the X to the mileage between Cambodunum and Mamucium.

A further interesting point is that the sources of the road-book seem to be official records dating from the first permanent occupation of the district. If the elimination of Slack from an already existing record be assumed as the only alteration, then the Cleckheaton site must have been occupied in the same period as Slack and Castleshaw; and this assumption is strengthened by the fact that the new Hadrianic road from Manchester rejoins the old one at Rastrick, just west of Cleckheaton - probably in order to

avoid the necessity of constructing a new post to serve as the half-way station between Manchester and York.

The precise course of the road to the east, which certainly led to York via Long Brough or Tadcaster, is somewhat uncertain. It runs about one-third of a mile south-west of the entrenchments at Snelsins, and $2\frac{1}{4}$ miles on, at Kittle Point Beck, the ridge is well preserved for a stretch of 70 yards. It is seen again north of the Whitehall road opposite Dean's Farm, on entering Drighlington, and a section here showed it to be $15\frac{1}{2}$ feet wide with a ditch on each side. Stonegate Road, between Meanwood and Moortown, appears to be a continuation,¹ and at Hawcaster Rigg, on this line, another Roman earthwork is recorded,² which excavation indicated to be a small campaigning camp.³

The Hadrianic road out of Manchester to the north-east served a double purpose, for it also carried the road to Ilkley, from which the road to Cleckheaton and York forked at Westgate Head. It continued onwards across the Calder to Newland, thence via Hunter's Hill to Cock Hill on the Halifax - Keighley road, where it is joined by a direct road, reputedly Roman, northwards from Slack. The latter came by Sowood Green and Stainland, over Greetland Moor, crossing the Calder at Sterne Mill, over Skircoat Moor to Illingworth and

¹ Bradford Ant., loc. cit., 3 (reprint).

² MBAN, vi, 407; Allen, Yorks., iv, 469.

³ BRAC, v, (March, 1928) (with plan).

thence in a straight line to the junction (at c.45°) with the Blackstone Edge road.¹ Were this truly Roman, then the road northwards from Cock Hill must have been in use before the evacuation of Slack, and the Blackstone Edge sector would be the only new part of the Manchester-Ilkley road which was constructed by Hadrian; but the line is not accepted by the Ordnance Survey.

North of Cock Hill, the road is traceable by various pieces of evidence² via Denholme Edge, Coldspring House, Eller Car, along the south side of Cradle Edge allotments on Harden Moor, Spring Gardens Lane (north of Keighley), and The Hollins near Steeton, to Ling Haw and a terrace under Well Head Lathe. Between this point and Ilkley its course is somewhat obscure, but according to Warburton it crossed Rumbold Moor by Morton High Gate and Black Knowl, while Villy has found traces of an ancient road between this point and Keighley Gate. Thence the Roman road is generally assumed to coincide with the line of the present road into Ilkley. Villy has recently confirmed the Roman passage of Airedale from Back Shaw (near Haisworth Shay) via Long Lee, Curry Lathe, Marley, Uncra farmhouse - where the Aire is actually crossed - and up the opposite slope on the east side of How Beck through West Morton to Bradup Beck.³

¹ Watson, Halifax, (ed. Leyland), 141; Codrington, R. Roads, 85-6.

² Codrington, op cit., 93-7.

³ Bradford Ant., n.s. vi, pt. 27 (1935) (reprint).

The continuation of the Manchester-Ilkley road is supposed to have crossed the Wharfe east of Ilkley Bridge. It has been revealed by digging near Middleton Hall, and the old O.S. map carries it on to the south-east of Round Hill, where the road turns sharply to the east, over Blubberhouses Moor in the direction of Aldborough.¹ It can still be traced as far as the crossing of the Nidd at Hampsthwaite Church.² The reason for this sudden change of direction is apparently to be found in the knowledge that the Ilkley-Long Preston Roman road is definitely crossed by another road coming from Ribchester in the direction of Aldborough. Although the latter's course between Skipton and Round Hill has not yet been traced, it would appear, from the alignment, to be one and the same road as that which goes eastward from Round Hill - a through route from Ribchester to Aldborough, cutting out any deviation to Ilkley, which would have been an unnecessary delay to the Swift Imperial courier coaches between these two important places. Moreover, Villy believes the road from Ilkley to have continued straight on towards Hayshaw (where pigs of lead dated to Domitian have been found),³ and perhaps via the doubtfully Roman station at Castlesteads near Pateley Bridge,⁴ onwards to Catterick.⁵

¹ Codrington, op cit., 97.

² ibid., 98; BRAC, vi, (1928).

³ See Appendix A, s.v.

⁴ See Appendix A, s.v.

⁵ Bradford Ant., n.s. vi, pt. 29, (1938), 11-12 (reprint).

Much more definite evidence is needed, however, before the existence of a Roman road in this direction can be accepted.

The Ribchester-Elslack-Aldbrough road was the more northerly of the two Roman crossings of the mid-Pennine watershed; for, as has been seen, only one of the three routes between Manchester and York was in use at any one time. Indeed, the reason for the evacuation of Ilkley in the late third century may have been an official decision to discontinue the use of the Blackstone Edge road, perhaps inspired by an unusually dangerous state of disaffection in the hill-country through which part of it passed, though not necessarily actually in Wharfedale. If this were the case, the construction of the Elslack stone fort and of the road east of Ribchester may possibly date from the late third century evacuation of Ilkley. The course of this road is easily determined;¹ its main points are at the fording of the Ribble at Little Town, the still existing ridge called Brede Street east of the Calder, and the crossing of the Pendleton Brook, before it follows the municipal boundary of Clitheroe for two miles to the east of Chatburn. Then, beyond Worston, comes a sweep to the east to Hey House, Howgill, Brogden Lane, Greenlees, Thornton Rectory, and so to the fort of Burwens Castle, Elslack. Beyond this site the line of the modern road is closely followed as far as

¹ Codrington, op cit., 100-1.

Skipton where it is crossed by the southern portion of the Craven Way; from here it appears to have gone by Droughton over Blubberhouses Moor towards Aldborough.

Incidentally, a secondary road also led south-east from Elslack, apparently in the direction of Castleford, which crossed the Manchester-Ilkley road near Keighley where Roman coins and a Roman bronze eagle found in the neighbourhood are preserved in the town's museum. After crossing the Cleckheaton-York road near Drighlington, its course becomes uncertain. Villy believes that this same road was continued in the opposite direction north-west past Elslack towards Long Preston. He has observed traces for a short length near Bank Newton,¹ but further investigation appears necessary.

Manchester, whose Latin name reads 'Mamucium' in the second Iter, and 'Mancunium' in the tenth, was undoubtedly a road junction of importance commanding the foothills of the south-western Pennines. From it radiated roads in directions as diverse as Wigan, Ribchester, Ilkley, York (via Cleckheaton), and Brough in Derbyshire (via Melandra). The results of excavations are unfortunately obscure; the pottery belongs mainly to the second and third centuries with a few pieces of first century date.²

To Manchester came the road from Chester which appears to have been the chief west-coast route between that legionary

¹ Bradford Ant., loc cit., 12.

² Bruton, Manchester, 186.

fortress and the Wall. It was connected with Ribchester by a well-known road, of which during the whole distance of 25 miles, "no part of the road is three-quarters of a mile out of a perfectly straight line."¹ The only slight deviations occur on Rushton Height and Bowstock Hill. There was, however, an alternative route to Ribchester, via Wigan, (Coccium), which is taken by the tenth Iter. The precise line is in parts uncertain, but it has been identified for nearly a mile between Hope Hall and Chorlton Fold and was found again during the construction of the Eccles - Wigan railway near Worsley. It has also been traced near Brick House on Mawdesley Common; near Cleworth Hall, east of Tyldesley; in the lane between Chowbent and Hindley; on the south side of Hindley Vicarage; and where the railway crosses Amber Common, two miles from Wigan.² This road passes a little to the west of Blackrod, the significance of whose remains has been discussed elsewhere.³

The post at Wigan, which was placed on an elevation in the centre of the town now occupied by the Parish Church, has never been excavated. Watkin regarded it as an unimportant connection between Manchester and Ribchester, and his view seems to be supported by the paucity of finds made.⁴ Coins of Probus, Victorinus, Gallienus and Tetricus indicate a late

¹ Codrington, op cit., 99.

² Codrington, 88-9.

³ p. 147-8.

⁴ Lancs., 201.

third century occupation; and, of course, since it is included in the Itinerary, the site must have been occupied at least as early as the reign of Caracalla.

From Wigan a road ran southwards to Warrington,¹ where it would cross the Mersey to Wilderspool, the site of an extensive civil settlement.² In the opposite direction the road led via Standish Wood Lane and Bamber Green to Walton-le-Dale where there is some suggestion of the existence of a Roman post on the bank of the Ribble.³ The course of the final link with Ribchester is unknown.

The cavalry fort at Ribchester may satisfactorily be identified with Bremetonnacum of the tenth Antonine Itinerary. Its distance from Wigan and Manchester accords with the table given in the road-book; moreover, the Notitia places here the Cuneus Armaturarum,⁴ which must be a mis-spelling for Sarmatarum, and the presence of the Sarmatian cavalry is attested by inscriptions.⁵ From the ceramic evidence, it is clear that the initial occupation was Flavian and occupation appears to have continued with the minimum of interruption until the end of the fourth century.⁶ Both

¹ Codrington, op cit., 89-90.

² May, Warrington's Roman Remains.

³ See Appendix A, s.v.

⁴ Not Dig. (ed. Seeck), 209-12.

⁵ CIL, 218, 230.

⁶ Johnston, Roman Lancashire, 42, 58; Atkinson, Ribchester.

from the size of the fort - $5\frac{1}{2}$ acres - and the profusion of the finds, it appears to have been one of the most important in Lancashire. The remains attracted the attention of both Leland¹ and Camden.² The coin list given by Watkin ranges from Nero to Diocletian.³

It is now accepted that the tenth Iter started from Ravenglass (Clanoventa) on the extreme north-west coast, and traversed the Lake District inland via Watercrock (Alone). The next step - 19 Roman miles to Galacum - only fits satisfactorily with Lancaster as the latter fort;⁴ but unfortunately Lancaster is by no means the 27 Roman miles from Ribchester given by the Itinerary; the distance measures 22 M.P.M. in a direct line. The only way of explaining this discrepancy, while retaining the identification of Lancaster with Galacum is to suppose either that a devious route was necessary between the two forts, or that a clerical error occurred with the insertion of an extra V in the mileage from Galacum to Bremetonnacum; and as the total mileage of the Iter tallies with the individual entries, this involves the additional presumption that the total was also faked to

¹ Hearne's Leland, iv, 22.

² Gough's Camden, iii, 391.

³ Lancs.

⁴ Haverfield (Arch. J. lxxii, 81) favoured this interpretation.

cover up the mistake. In view of the usual reliability of the text of the Itinerary, such an explanation, unbacked by supporting evidence, seems very unsatisfactory. The alternative is, however, quite possible, for a direct connection between the two sites is not yet definitely established, although Codrington marks such a road running from Ribchester by Windy Arbour, Snape Rake Lane, Stanygate, and Methurst.¹ Perhaps the true explanation emerges from the fact that the road west of Ribchester towards Fulwood and beyond, on the line of the Danes' Pad to Kirkham,² is apparently crossed at Fulwood by the road from Wigan and Walton-le-Dale, which Codrington then traces northward to Lancaster over Fulwood Moor and by Cadley Causeway, Broughton, Barton, Fleet Street in Claughton, and Burrow.³ The same line seems to appear at Windy Arbour, near Forton, but for the remainder of its course there is no clue. The distance round by the Fulwood cross-roads is, in fact, approximately 27 miles. Neither of Codrington's routes is regarded as sufficiently convincing to be shown on the O.S. map of Roman Britain; but that there must have been some road leading south from Lancaster is obvious. Only the precise course remains to be definitely established.

¹ Codrington, *op. cit.*, 105.

² *ibid.*, 104.

³ *ibid.*, 104-5.

Overborough, if regarded as a candidate for Galacum, fits splendidly with Ribchester by distance, but is 8 Roman miles too close to Watercrock, at least in a direct line. No connecting road with the latter station is known.

The pottery evidence from the fort at Lancaster indicates a first century occupation,¹ and the argument is supported by the early form of the dedication (DIS MANIEVS in full) by Apollinaris.²

North of Lancaster, the O. S. map of Roman Britain marks a road of uncertain course leading to Watercrock (Alone of the tenth Iter), passing by the Warton Cragg hill-fort and Dog Holes cave, which has produced evidence of occupation in the Roman period.³ In 1882, paving 16-17½ feet wide was discovered pointing to Scaleford, on the river Lune, and on the north side of this river, 4½ miles from Lancaster on the way to Kirkby Lonsdale, a supposed Roman road was found ten years later, and the line was continued for a mile by a parish boundary.⁴ It must have been joined by the road going north-west from Overborough which Villy has traced as far as the Lupton Beck pass on the north side of Farleton Fell.⁵

Much more easily recognisable is the more westerly route

¹ Johnston, op cit., 61-2.

² CIL, 285.

³ Appendix A, s.v.

⁴ Codrington, op cit., 105-6.

⁵ CW2, xxxvii, 49-51.

which linked Ribchester with the Overborough and Low Borrow Bridge forts, joining the Stainmore road at Brougham to run on to Carlisle. Owing to physiographical obstacles, this road is by no means so straightforward in lay-out as its counterpart on the east of the Pennines. The greatest deviations are over the fells between Ribchester and Overborough, particularly in the region of the Forest of Bowland. The course of the road is traced in detail by Codrington.¹ Unfortunately, too little is known of the occupation of the Overborough and Low Borrow Bridge forts, neither of which has been excavated, to furnish any further information with regard to the period in which this road was in use.

Best known of all is the course of the Roman road from York via Aldborough, Catterick, Piercebridge, Binchester, Lanchester and Ebchester to Corbridge, which station must, at any rate until about the close of the second century, have served as an immediate base for supplies to the Wall garrisons. Bearing the general name of Ermine Street, its local Yorkshire name is Leeming Lane, while in the middle ages in Durham it acquired the appellation 'Dere Street.' Whether it represents an original advance by Agricola, or whether Agricola merely perfected the route selected previously by Cerialis, archaeology alone cannot as yet determine. Excavations at Aldborough, Piercebridge, Binchester, Lanchester, and

¹ op cit., 106-9.

Ebchester, though admittedly incomplete, have yielded nothing in the way of positive material to indicate a pre-Agricolan occupation. On the other hand, it must be remembered that even on sites where there can have been no subsequent occupation, to which other considerations ascribe a probably Cerialian foundation, such as Meltham, Kirklees, and perhaps Dent, dateable finds were markedly absent. Catterick, a large and probably important station with evidences of a considerable civil settlement nearby, remains substantially unexplored.¹

At the other end of the route, however, the presence of the stamp of the potter MVERRANVS on plain Samian from both Corbridge and Chesterholm, and decorated Samian in his style from the former site, is some indication of a Cerialian foundation.² If this view is correct, then Cerialis' troops were established at both ends of the Stanegate frontier before the close of his governorship - a state of affairs consistent with the purely historical evidence. Moreover, as Cerialis was primarily concerned with a rapid conquest of the Brigantes, his use of the easy east-coast route to the north is a priori most probable. In this case, he could hardly overlook the advantages of the Stainmore gap,

¹ Trial excavations were carried out by Messrs. W. V. Wade and E. J. W. Hildyard in April, 1939.

² AA⁴, xv, 282.

which may none the less be later than the Craven Way, since Cerialis' earliest campaigns would presumably be concerned with paralysing the power of the Brigantes by the penetration of the heart of their country in south-west Yorkshire. The problems of the dating of the Stainmore road are rendered more inconclusive by the lack of excavation in the forts along its line. One can only say that Bowes, at least, was occupied under Hadrian,¹ and rebuilding took place there under the governor Virius Lupus.² Greta Bridge was also occupied in the third century.³ At Brough, the bulk of the pottery unearthed in incidental work was late fourth century in date.⁴ In the late third century, a period when the upkeep of roads was a particularly prominent feature of imperial administration, the important Stainmore pass received a good share of attention.⁵ Some idea of this importance may be gained from the fact that no less than four forts guard the nine miles of road between Greta Bridge and Brough.

¹ CIL, 275.

² CIL, 273.

³ CIL, 280.

⁴ RCHM Westmorland, 48.

⁵ Four milestones are attested from or near Spital: cf. CIL, 1182a; JRS, xvi, 241; xvii, 219; Elgee, Arch. Yorks., 156-7; YAJ, xxix, 107 (illus.).

(ii) BAINBRIDGE

(a) The Antiquarian History of the Site.

If Ilkley was the centre of communications for the populous, prosperous mid-Yorkshire dales, Bainbridge occupied a similar position with regard to those of north Yorkshire. It was founded in the Agricolan period and occupied continuously, apart from destructions following on the collapse of the Wall's defences. Bainbridge was excavated in 1926, and 1928-29-31, but in view of the unsatisfactory character of the excavation reports, and of the writer's opportunity for the further investigation of some of the problems of the site and its neighbourhood, a brief review of the evidence and the conclusions to be drawn from it seems desirable. The history of this site sheds valuable light on the nature of the Roman occupation of the northern hinterland behind the Wall frontier; and has an additional interest in view of its close proximity to Addleborough and the native settlements which cluster on the shoulders of that imposing hill.

The earliest evidence of any significance relating to Brough-by-Bainbridge is that provided by the Elizabethan antiquary, Camden, whose observations form the basis for the majority of remarks concerning the site by later historians. The fort stands on a hog-backed mound of

boulder-clay at the confluence of the tributary Bain on the west with the river Ure on the latter's south bank. Here Camden saw "foundations of an fortification, inclosing near five acres, and below it to the east many traces of houses." He also mentions two inscriptions from the site, whose accepted reading is:-

(1) (EE, ix, p. 563) -

IMP CAESARI . L . SEPTIMIO
 PIO PERTINACI . AVGV
 IMP CAESARI . M . AVRELIO . A
 PIO . FELI AVGVSTO . FIPS

 BRACCHIO CAEMENTICIVM
 VI NERVIO T . SVB CVRA . L . A
 SENECTION IMPLISSIMI
 OPERI . L . VIYS PIVS PRAIA
 F . CIO

(2) (CIL, 270) -

..... CAESARI AVGVSTO
 MARCI . AVRELI . FILIO

 SENISIOVIS . AMPLISSIMI
 VENTS PIVS

Horsley himself contributed no new knowledge of the site, but an original piece of information comes from a manuscript note in the margin of page 313 of the volume of Horsley's Britannia Romana in the Durham University Library, which appears to have been made by T. D. Whitaker, the North Riding antiquary. The note reads: "On a visit to Brough A.D.1796 I found a rude Basso Relievo of Venus Anadromene with her Attributes; a Comb and Fish - The Inscriptions etc. were lost."

This discovery is apparently referred to again in his History of Richmondshire, as "a very rude but apparently Roman sculpture of a mermaid over the door of the school."¹

This literary evidence, small though it is, affords a background of information which was, unfortunately, somewhat neglected during the conduct of recent excavations on the site. The result is that the archaeological evidence obtained bears too little relation to the problems indicated by the literary evidence as likely to be most profitable for further examination.

Of these problems, chief interest centres round the inscriptions discovered by Camden. From the sixth line of the first inscription, Camden inferred that Bracchium was the name of the fort. It is now believed, however, that it refers rather to a rampart or annexe of the fort.² It is suggested that the real name of the fort is Virosidum, from the fact that the Notitia Dignitatum places the Sixth cohort of Nervii at Virosidum,³ and, so far as is known, that name was applied to no other fort. If this is the case, then the Notitia is incorrect in placing Virosidum per lineam Valli - a not improbable error, in view of the many inconsistencies noticeable in the Notitia. Incidentally, the

¹ Richmondshire, i, 411.

² CIL, vii, note on no.269.

³ Not. Dig., ed. Seeck, 212.

possibility of Virosidum being a Yorkshire fort - and a fort which is known to have been occupied very late in the fourth century, and possibly by Stilicho - whilst yet being included in the per lineam valli section, scarcely supports Collingwood's theory¹ that this section is an anachronism, giving a list of Wall and Cumberland forts which had been lost and were regarded as irrecoverable, whilst the fourteen units which appear to have been stationed in Yorkshire, Durham and Westmorland represent the garrison with which Stilicho carried out his reorganisation of the hinterland. It is, of course, possible that the VI Nervii, who from the first inscription are known to have been at Bainbridge under Severus, had moved elsewhere by the opening of the fourth century; if so, the equation of Bainbridge with Virosidum naturally falls to the ground.

In view of the attempts which have occasionally been made to connect Virosidum with the name of the river 'Ure', Mr. E. V. Gordon's opinion discountenancing this is of value:- "it is not phonologically plausible to derive Ure from the first element in Virosidum, which would give Wir or Wer in English."² As he points out, the group V + vowel cannot be avoided (cf. Verulamium, given in English (Bede) as Uerlama - caestir); while the earliest English forms of Ure are Jor,

¹ OHE, i, 289.

² Letter to Miss Kitson Clark.

Yor, etc., which are entirely different. Incidentally, Yore is still the accepted dales name for the river.

The most valuable information contained in both inscriptions, however, is the reference to the governorship of Alfenus Senecio.¹ This makes it improbable that the second inscription refers to Commodus, and since it is mentioned in connection with building operations, in the first inscription, provides evidence for a Severan reconstruction at the site.

Atkinson, in an article on "The Governors of Britain from Claudius to Diocletian,"² argues that Senecio was probably governor of Britain from A.D. 204 to 208. It is known that he was in Syria by 209,³ but there is no justification for the assumption that he proceeded direct to Syria from Britain. The Risingham inscription⁴ may belong to any of the years 205-8 A.D., and Birley has brought forward convincing arguments in favour of the view that it marks the completion of the work of restoration in the north, and the close of Senecio's governorship.⁵ He believes that Senecio was Lupus' immediate successor, in c. A.D. 200, and

¹ The reading 'Alfenus' seems preferable to 'Alfenius.' cf. Birley, AA⁴, vii, 167.

² JRS, xii, 60-73.

³ CIL, iii, S, 6709-10.

⁴ CIL, 1003.

⁵ AA⁴, vii, 167-8.

that Pollienus Auspex succeeded Senecio. He bases this view on the absence of records of rebuilding by Auspex and the fact that separate inscriptions from Bowes record both Lupus¹ and Senecio² engaged in building operations. Auspex must, moreover, have been in Rome in circ. 200 A.D.³ M. Antius Crescens Calpurnianus, the Juridicus Britanniae vice-legati or deputy, was presumably in charge of the province between the departure of Lupus and the arrival of Senecio. He concludes that Senecio was governor of the province c. A.D. 200-205, and since this view obviates the difficulties arising from Atkinson's dating, it must be accepted.

The literary evidence thus definitely implies a Severan, and, in all probability, a Constantian building period also. It ought to have been the principal object of excavations to confirm these indications, and also to discover whether the building periods under Hadrian and Count Theodosius were also present at Bainbridge as on Hadrian's Wall.⁴ Unfortunately, this objective does not appear to have been clearly borne in mind, and the result is that though the conclusions from the literary evidence are not contradicted, they still lack definite archaeological confirmation on several of the most important questions raised.

¹ CIL, 273.

² YAJ, part 116.

³ Cassius Dio, LXXVI, ix, 3.

⁴ Birley, in AA4, vii, 164 ff.

The fort, of the quingenary type, encloses a trifle over two acres - a fact which, when compared with Camden's admittedly rough estimate of five acres, indicates that that antiquary must have been privileged to view a considerable area of an external civil settlement of whose existence there is other evidence, and included it in his estimate. The most striking features of the site are the precipitous northern slope to the river and the multiple-ditch system on the dead ground between the western rampart and the edge of the hill where it drops steeply to the banks of the Bain. There is a gentle slope from the east and south ramparts, and a road is still clearly visible ascending the latter slope diagonally to turn in at the south gate across a causeway. The appearance of tituli outside the north and west gates is a most unusual feature in a permanent fort, but may be taken to indicate that they were little used; it is significant that these are the steepest sides of the mound, where normal entrance and exit would be extremely difficult. The recent excavations did, however, reveal the existence of a road leading out of the north gate and turning along the wall of the fort to the east (thus avoiding the titulus), but it does not appear to be earlier than the third century.¹ On the other hand, the tituli may belong to the latest period of occupation of the site and represent a time and labour-

¹ Report 2, 80-1, and Report 4, 34 (Pottery in outer ditch).

saving substitute for closing the gates by walling them up, which happened in several Wall forts in the fourth century. The internal arrangements of the existing fort are normal and show that the east gate is the porta praetoria.

Both Collingwood¹ and Whitaker² consider the situation of a Roman fort upon a hill-top to be unusual; but Collingwood does not appear to realise that one reason for the choice must have been the vital necessity for occupying positions of tactical strength in the turbulent hill-country. It must be remembered that the advance which resulted in the establishment of a fort at Bainbridge, whether made by Cerialis or Agricola, had as its primary object the conquest and subjugation of the country with stations judiciously placed. The forts planted by Agricola along the Forth-Clyde line in Scotland provide a fairly close analogy, for their fine strategic position is specially noted by Tacitus,³ and many of the sites later re-occupied by Lollius Urbicus were situated on hill-tops.⁴

The suggestion that the fort was deliberately planted near the British camp on Addeborough may be dismissed by quoting the comment of Dr. Wheeler, in an unsigned review of May's Templebrough, on a similar suggestion by May:

"It [Templebrough] was certainly not, as Mr. May thinks,

¹ Report 1, 262.

² Richmondshire, ii, 211.

³ Agric., xxii.

⁴ Collingwood, Arch. of Roman Britain, 86.

intentionally erected over against a British hill-fort --- which 'though over two miles away in a direct line westwards overlooks Templebrough from a superior height of 400 feet. It is unnecessary to reiterate Haverfield's diatribes against this sort of armchair strategy. Nevertheless, the fort was obviously first planted as an advance-guard and then retained for some time as a rearguard, with the Derbyshire forts, against the wild Brigantes¹" The reasons for the occupation and retention of the Bainbridge fort were probably very similar, though its continued occupation would be more essential than that of Templebrough.

¹ JRS, xi, 119-20

(b) Archaeological Problems.¹

A consideration of the problems of the fort at Bainbridge, in view of the evidence of general history and local literary references, naturally looks to excavation on the site to produce valuable evidence which should do much to clear up these problems. Yet the reports of the excavations in 1926, 1928, 1929, and 1931, cannot be regarded as other than unsatisfactory. This is all the more disappointing in that sufficient work was done to show that a wealth of material lay ready to be discovered by the spade. Had this been arranged and interpreted in the light of such antiquarian evidence as could already be adduced - and it has been seen that this is far from negligible - much more could have been learnt about the construction, occupation, and purpose of the fort. Something might have been added to our knowledge of Roman policy as regards the conquest and administration of the hill-country. Unfortunately, the most valuable features of other evidence seem to have been neglected. Excavation appears to have been somewhat haphazard and, if not entirely purposeless, at least without any clear conception

¹ In dating many of the groups of pottery, which are a vital feature here, I am indebted to marginal MSS. notes on the reports by Mr. Eric Birley, and in several instances these are given as the authority for conclusions reached. Appendices containing a full classification of coins, early and late pottery, an index of pottery illustrated in the reports, and inscriptions, referred to in the text, are included in the writer's unpublished thesis on The Roman Fort at Brough-by-Bainbridge, in Wensleydale, deposited in the Archaeological Seminar Library, Hatfield College, Durham.

of the problems likely to be cleared up by the work on any particular part of the fort.

The result is a mass of material which is disjointed and confused. Archaeology, from which so much might have been learnt, has little positive information of value to contribute to what is already known, and some of the most important discoveries are arrived at only by disregarding false interpretations of the facts in the official reports. It is often possible, however, to find negative confirmation of the major assumptions arising out of anterior evidence. The most that can be said of the excavation reports, as regards their contribution to a more thorough and clear comprehension of the chief features and problems of the site, is that they are not contradictory to the main postulations made from a study of the other available evidence, general and particular. It must necessarily, therefore, be with a view to demonstrating this, rather than to eliciting much original evidence from the confused mass of material available, that the reports of work on certain parts of the fort - selected as the most interesting and characteristic specimens of the method and results of excavation at Bainbridge - will be considered.

No part of the fort has been excavated altogether satisfactorily, but since most attention has been concentrated

on the east gate, the barracks, and the rampart, these areas will be most suitable for consideration. It may be advisable, however, for the sake of completeness, briefly to indicate the chief results of excavation in other parts of the fort.

The headquarters building was merely 'sampled,' only the sacellum being thoroughly explored. The chief feature of interest is the strong-room beneath it, an unusually fine specimen, probably of late date,¹ though nothing was found to enable its construction to be assigned to any period. The stairs leading to it, however, revealed two building periods of which the later did not reveal the polished workmanship of the earlier. Perhaps Severan and Constantian reconstructions respectively are indicated. The presence of black pitted ware on the floor of the cellar proved that it was in use during the fourth century occupation. Outside the sacellum was found a base which, as Collingwood observes, may have supported the very statue seen by Camden; but his attribution of the statue to Marcus Aurelius appears insupportable, unless he is referring to Commodus in most unusual terms.²

Two paved floors, associated with early and late pottery respectively, were found in what was probably the commandant's house.³ The granaries revealed a confusion and variety of walls and levels resembling that later discovered in the

¹ Report, 1, 273.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid., 274.

barrack area.¹

The road to the south gate revealed two levels, and below the early surface was a mortarium which may have been Hadrianic or even earlier. The upper level produced evidence of fourth-century use in the shape of black pitted ware which, together with a variety of other pieces of earlier date, suggested a period of long use.²

The work in 1926 revealed a composite rampart,³ built over a foundation of cobbles. Originally of clay, a stone revetment had been added at some subsequent date, "bringing it into line with the composite type which seems to have come into use early in the second century." Mr. Collingwood goes on to say that "this sequence recalls the discoveries recently made at York, Caerleon, Carnarvon, Brecon, and elsewhere, where in each case an earthen rampart of the first century was revetted with an outer face of stone about the beginning of the second century. We thus get a prima facie case for a Flavian fort at Bainbridge reconstructed in stone at a date which may fall as early as the reign of Trajan." He adds that "this hypothesis is neither proved nor disproved by the results of 1926, but its proof or disproof will doubtless be among the first objects of any future work on the site." Unfortunately, although the presumption is a likely one, a

¹ Ibid.

² Report 2, 77-78.

³ Report 1, 264-268.

solution of the problem has not been arrived at, and the state of our information on this subject is characteristic of the bulk of the knowledge resulting from the excavations.

Droop states that "the appearance of what was left of the first clay-moss rampart - a little by the north gate and a considerable amount at the north-east corner - suggested strongly (though it did not prove) that the revetting was not a mere remodelling of an existing rampart, but a rebuilding of a rampart that had been destroyed. A destruction of the fort in the troubles of 115 seemed indicated."¹ He thus appears to distinguish two early second-century building periods (although the assumption of 'troubles in 115' appears quite unjustified), for in 1928 he said that "the rampart was rebuilt and given revetments, and the outer ditch made at the same date, viz., the turn of the first and second centuries."² It must be noted that the pottery evidence from the outer ditch, however, favours a later date.³ Perhaps there was only one period of reconstruction; but it seems safer to postulate two separate periods of activity in the absence of further evidence.

Two separate black charcoal layers behind the rampart to the south are possibly the result of two fires in each of which the timber work of the rampart was destroyed. In

¹ Report 4, 20.

² Report 2, 80.

³ Report 4, 34.

the lower, a late first century group of pottery was discovered.¹ This may be connected with further indications of fire on the east, where a black stratum lying on virgin soil yielded a first-century potsherd.² The three black strata on the north, of which the two lowest are associated with pottery of Trajan or Hadrian, however, were probably not caused by an accidental conflagration.³

Collingwood believed that he found traces of a roadway, in the western and eastern sections, in the mass of clay behind the stone rampart, and concluded that "these sections not only demonstrate the distinction, above described, between an early earthwork-and-timber period and a later earthwork-and-stone period, but also suggest a third period when the original clay rampart went altogether out of use and was oversailed by a roadway running, probably, right up to the stone revetment now standing as an independent stone rampart." He observes that "this disuse of the earthen member of a composite rampart has been observed fairly frequently elsewhere, notably in the forts on Hadrian's Wall; it is sometimes associated with disuse of the corner-towers."⁴

This assumption of a third period cannot, however, be accepted, since there is no evidence for the disuse of the

¹ Report 1, 284.

² Report 1, 267.

³ Report 2, 82.

⁴ Report 1, 267.

earthen rampart at Bainbridge, nor indeed on Hadrian's Wall. A similar situation occurs at Castlecary,¹ Cadder,² and Balmuildy.³ Because the layer was uniform, and some distance below the top of the stone revetment, Collingwood took it to represent a road-surface. But he failed to realise that a rampart of earth is normally neither so high nor so steep in the face as a stone rampart; the normal height of the former is about five feet, that of the latter up to twelve feet. The contrast between the two is evident not only in a composite rampart, such as that at Bainbridge, but where an earth backing has been added to an originally complete stone rampart. The bank ran behind the rampart, not to broaden the rampart walk, as Miller suggested,⁴ but to form a platform whence the rampart walk could easily be reached. Naturally, it became necessary periodically to add fresh material to the bank to keep it up to its proper level owing to the soil becoming compressed and sinking; and the stony layer found by Collingwood must have represented such an addition, although he took it to be a road-surface.

Thus, only two certain structural periods emerge from a consideration of the rampart evidence - first the construction of the clay rampart in the latter half of the first century,

¹ Macdonald, RWS, 243-4.

² Clarke, Cadder, 13-16.

³ Miller, Balmuildy, 8 ff.

⁴ Ibid., 8.

and the later addition of the outer stone revetment probably early in the second century, though not dateable very closely. The 1928 excavations revealed an inner as well as an outer stone revetment on the north-east, though the inner was of slighter construction.¹

Two ditches were revealed on the north and north-east, the outer of which had been filled in and a roadway built over it.² The outside bank of the outer ditch had been built up of dirty clay "clearly brought from some floor-level, in order to form an artificial lip, owing to the natural slope of the ground, and this contained some pottery, of which the Samian appears to be chiefly South Gaulish, and the coarse ware *mostly Flavian, though some of the mortaria look to be Hadrianic or a bit later."³ Droop, therefore, appears too definite in stating that these sherds "point to a date not later than the end of the first century for the destruction of the floor from which the bank was built, and the construction of the outer ditch." The wide range of pottery suggests that the fort had been occupied for a considerable time before the outer ditch was constructed, and a tentative suggestion is that the outer ditch is contemporary with the addition of the stone revetment to the rampart in a Hadrianic reconstruction. The pottery in

¹ Report 2, 78-80.

² Ibid., 79-81.

³ Birley, note on Report 4, 34.

the revetment of the rampart has an early Trajanic terminus post quem.¹ On the other hand, it must be remembered that Trajanic pottery was associated with a drain at the north-east corner which rests on virgin soil, and which was probably built at the same time as the revetment walls.² Droop's surmise that the rampart received its revetment at the turn of the first and second centuries may still be correct, and the outer ditch belong to the Hadrianic building period.

Apart from this problem, there is the question of the date of the abandonment of the outer ditch and the construction of the roadway over it.³ The ditch was filled with soft soil and mud which immediately suggested that it had gone out of use some time before the road was made over it; otherwise it would presumably have been filled with stones if the road were being made at once. The pottery within the ditch has a terminus post quem of the late second century.⁴ Hence the ditch was probably closed up, and the roadway made during the Severan reconstruction. Droop, however, says that "the road surface produced" several pieces of figured Samian, and on this evidence suggests "an early date in the Antonine period for the construction of the road."⁵ Yet in his

¹ Ibid., 32.

² Ibid., 30.

³ Report 2, 79-81.

⁴ Birley, note on Report 4, 34.

⁵ Report 2, 80-81.

remarks on the pottery finds he includes these pieces among those having no stratification.¹ This is an instance of the unreliability of Droop's arguments and even his statements of fact throughout the reports.

The suggestion that the road is Antonine in date must, then, be rejected, and the conjecture first made during the progress of the excavations, that the ditch was in disuse for some time before a road was made over it, must be accepted as most probable.

The road appears to have proceeded out of the north gate, but turned east almost immediately, perhaps because the slope down to the river is very steep. At the north-east angle of the fort, however, it took a sharp bend southwards, through the vicus wall at that point; excavation at this gateway revealed that the road had an earlier and a later surface. Though nothing was found to date either with certainty, two mortarium rims between the two indicated a date possibly Constantian for the construction of the later road.²

Droop considers it "highly probable that the wall and road are contemporary constructions,"³ but this is based on his erroneous belief that the road north of the fort is Antonine. The wall was continuous under the road at this

¹ Report 4, 35.

² Report 3, 236-237.

³ Report 3, 234-7.

gateway, and this suggests that the wall was built first. The discovery of a Samian base with the stamp of the Antonine potter Dagodubnus in the core of the wall does not, however, necessarily mean that this was the case. The piece may be a survival and road and wall still be contemporaneous, though Severan and not Antonine. Camden's first inscription may refer to the actual building of the wall, not merely the addition of caementicium to it. Bracchium probably means the whole annexe, caementicium the wall in particular.

Droop notes two outstanding facts in connection with the wall - "confusion of strata by the wall and absence of pottery of the fourth century." The first seems to indicate that much of the deposit was present previous to the building of the wall, and probably accounts for the presence of first and second, as well as third century pottery. The absence of fourth century pottery in connection with the wall seems to place the latter some time in the third century at latest. It also suggests, taken in conjunction with the evidence from the point where the road from the east gate passes through the Vicus wall,¹ that the latter may have been destroyed in the troubles towards the end of the third century.

The value of this conclusion is, however, rendered almost negligible by another of Droop's self-contradictions, for in

¹ Report 4, 24.

1931 he stated that "as in 1929, a comparative absence of Huntcliff ware was noticed."¹ This implies that there was, after all, some late fourth century pottery associated with the wall, and therefore it may have existed, and the area have continued to be occupied, until the end of the fourth century, though perhaps less intensively than during the third century. This conjecture receives some support from the presence of a building of large stones in the Vicus area, the level of whose foundations showed that it was not built before the top surface of the roadway from the east gate, but whose interior was not excavated. The fact that it was hastily and badly built in itself favours the presumption of a late date for its construction.² The fact that it had collapsed leads Droop to the casual mention of a ditch "cut dangerously near to the east wall," which was evidently outside the normal scheme of the fort's defences, and is one of several indications that a radical re-arrangement of the lay-out of the fort may have taken place at some period.³ The area outside the east gate resembles in some respects the forts at Slack and Housesteads, where cobbled areas come up to the wall of the fort, and there is no ditch. A fortified annexe on the east side possibly necessitated the obliteration of that ditch at Bainbridge.

¹ Ibid., 25.

² Report 4, 25.

³ Ibid.

The annexe cannot be dated with any approach to accuracy. The bulk of the evidence favours its third century occupation, but the type of the wall around the Vicus is such as to raise doubt as to whether it is really as early as Severus. A free-standing wall with no bank or ditch is more characteristic of the fourth than of the third century. Until further evidence is forthcoming, however, the presumption of a third-century date for the occupation of a fortified annexe cannot be seriously questioned.

Of all the excavated areas of the fort, the results connected with the east gate, at any rate as described in the reports, are the most unsatisfactory. The account given in the official reports is misleading, and there are several difficulties which prevent their unqualified acceptance.

In the first place, it seems evident from a consideration of the reports of Collingwood¹ and Droop² that Collingwood mistook the cobble foundation of the early clay-moss rampart for an earlier road-surface, and that there is no real evidence for the existence of such a road. Mr. Eric Birley, who was personally engaged in 1926 on the excavations at the east gate, informs me that only one road surface was revealed, that referred to by Collingwood as the upper, or 'Road II.' The space of some 18 or 19 inches between it and the former rampart foundation was filled with a mass of rubbish and débris,

¹ Report 1, 268-270.

² Report 3, 237-242.

and almost on the flags of the rampart foundation, certainly sealed, was the coin of Theodosius, which cannot be earlier than A.D. 390. Hence this roadway through the east gate belongs to the last decade of the fourth century, and there can have been no roadway through the east gate previous to this. This disposes of the difficulties of Droop and Collingwood in explaining away the presence of third and fourth century pottery and coins beneath what they imagined to represent an earlier road surface, both inside and outside the gate, and renders unnecessary the invention of Droop's highly original 'worm-drift' theory.¹

The coin of Theodosius is not entirely alone in indicating a very late fourth century reconstruction and occupation, probably the first evidence of its kind of Stilicho's activity in the north of Britain. Five other coins discovered beneath the 'upper' surface by Droop are post—Constantinian, and the coin of Valens (364-375 A.D.) is valuable in that it connects these more satisfactorily with the coin of Theodosius and supports the evidence of the latter.²

The coin evidence is largely confirmed by the pottery deposits.³ Two mortarium rims of the type of Wroxeter I, 166 and 178, together with two pieces of pitted ware,

¹ Ibid., 240.

² Pedley, Bainbridge MSS. Coin Appendix (A).

³ Ibid., Appendix of late pottery (D).

"characteristic of the same period of Poltross Burn," provide a terminus post quem equivalent to the end of the third period of Poltross Burn, i.e., 368 A.D.¹

The construction of a new east gate and Via Praetoria as late as 390 A.D. may involve the assumption of a fort without a Porta Praetoria during the main part of its occupation. Although this would be most unusual, there is something approaching a parallel at Chesterholm, where no 'porta principalis dextra' existed. Thus the conclusion from the available evidence that there was no 'porta praetoria' need not be rejected on that account. The fact that the road from the north gate is known to have proceeded east and to have entered the Vicus area may be taken as a confirmation and explanation of this assumption. The reason may be that, contrary to Collingwood's view,² the east was regarded as tactically the weakest side of the Bainbridge fort.

On the other hand, since irregularity in construction seems an unavoidable complication, it is possible that the existing outline of the fort was not the original one. The east rampart may have occupied a different position and alignment, and the discovery of the ditch near the building of large stones supports this view.³ An east gateway may have existed if this were the case, or again if the breadth

¹ Report 3, 240-1.

² Report 1, 262.

³ Report 4, 25.

of the fort from north to south were altered at some period, so that the centre line, along which ran the Via Praetoria, would be altered accordingly.

Pieces of evidence from other parts of the fort support this conjecture. It is unlikely that a scheme of fresh planning would be embarked upon as late as Stilicho, even though the roadway through the present East gate appears to have been opened out then. But there are indications of a Constantian reconstruction. Thus the pottery in the outer ditch on the north-east seems to ~~place~~^{date} the roadway over it to the early third century. Again, the presence of the statue of (probably) Maximian Herculus in the Headquarters Building suggests that the latter may be Constantian. It is possible, too, that the road to the south gate from the south-west may be in alignment with an earlier fort, as may be the case at Castlecary.¹ As it is, the road has to enter the fort at a considerable angle. The discovery of first and second century pottery in the ramparts, moreover, cannot always be accepted at its face value. The ramparts of the Constantian fort at Chesterholm, for instance, have produced much second and some first century pottery; the east section through the rampart there revealed a top layer of Theodosian material, below this some second century pottery, and finally the original Constantian rampart. The material for the

¹ Macdonald, RWS, 252.

middle layer had evidently been brought from floor-levels of the earlier fort to build up the bank.

Thus, while it must be borne in mind that the whole question of a late reconstruction is necessarily speculative, a replanning of the fort by Constantius Chlorus is at least not improbable, and forms a convenient explanation of several ambiguities resulting from archaeological research. If this were the case, a fairly drastic reconstruction of the ramparts and roadways would be inevitable; but it is possible that it was found unnecessary to plan entirely new headquarters and barrack buildings. Nevertheless, some reconstruction would almost certainly take place, and this may be the reason for the multiplicity of levels and confusion of building periods evident in the barrack area; a circular summarising the work in 1931 was compelled to state that "the portion of the barracks opened out proved too much broken down to reveal the plan of the buildings at any period."

Collingwood's excavations in the south-east quarter of the fort revealed "at least five distinct floor levels,"¹ which may be summarised as (1) 1 ft. down, fourth century; (2) 18 in. to 2 ft. down, system of walls connected with a system of floors about 2 ft. 6 in. below the surface, which floors were overlain by third century material - suggesting a Severan date for construction; (3) at 3 ft. 6 in., another

¹ Report 1, 274-5.

floor system, whose "associated walls seemed in some cases differently planned from those belonging to the floors above," covered with Hadrianic-Antonine pottery and perhaps belonging to a Hadrianic building period; (4) 4 ft. to 4 ft. 6 in. down, undated flagged floors which undercut the above walls; and (5) the earliest, dirt floor found at a depth of five feet, and associated with early sherds. Collingwood's warning must be noted, that levels associated in date varied considerably in their depth below the surface, and hence this means of comparing the different levels must be largely disregarded.

In 1931, Droop distinguished three distinct building periods in the form of walls in this barrack area. Connected with these were at least seven and probably eight different floor levels.¹ Most reliance for the correlation and dating of these levels must be placed upon the pottery evidence.

The earliest walls (1 and 2) ran north and south, and contemporary with them was a floor (a) of gravel. Droop, having rejected without reason the evidence of a piece of Samian ware with the stamp of Crestus (Claudius-Vespasian)² on the virgin clay, and also that of other pottery, concludes that "the first gravel floor and the early walls belong to the time when the revetment walls were built and the 'via prætorial' first paved, circ. 120 A.D." But the pottery

¹ Report 4, 16-22, 28-30.

² Pedley, Bainbridge MSS. (Appendix of Inscriptions (B)).

associated with this gravel floor, which may correspond to Collingwood's earliest floor, appears late Flavian-Trajanic,¹ and thus this first building period may best be dated to the end of the first century, and may correspond to the addition of the stone revetment to the rampart.

The next building period is represented by the first stages of walls, 3, 4 and 5. They lay above a floor of small flags, the pottery above which was Hadrianic only;² this floor seems best correlated with Collingwood's flagged floors 4 ft. to 4 ft. 6 in. down, which also underlay a system of walls. This level may be provisionally dated to the early years of Hadrian's reign. The third, cement, floor, above which was third century pottery,³ seems most likely to be Severan, and to be connected with Collingwood's second floor system 2 ft. 6 in.^{down} and the associated walls. Ceramic evidence also shows the fourth floor (d) to have been occupied between 300 and 368 A.D. Droop connects it with his second wall system, dating it to the Severan reconstruction. But a close consideration of the details throws doubt upon his assumption that the flagged floor (d) is in fact contemporary with the second wall system, and it would assort much better with the available evidence were the view of Mr. Abraham and Miss Kitson Clark accepted as correct: "Above

¹ Birley, note on Report 4, 28-30.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

the earliest floor was a floor of small flags. Immediately on this lay two walls running east and west; in connection with them was a cement floor, above this was a floor of flags and above that again was a floor of clay which had been burnt in a conflagration."¹ The cement floor and the second wall system could then be attributed to the Severan reconstruction, and floor (d) to the Constantian building period.

The fifth floor of clay bears traces of destruction by fire, and since pottery of 300-368 underlies it, this conflagration must be placed circ. 368, indicating a disaster in the Picts' War rather than at the end of the second century, to which Droop inclines.

The sixth floor (e) was found "definitely overlying the clay floor," and this proves that there are at least two floors (with the floor or floors (f) and (g)) later than 368. These are probably connected with the rebuilding of the east-west wall and the building of a new east-west and a new north-south wall, that is, the third of Droop's building periods. This in all probability represents a Theodosian reconstruction after the havoc wrought in 368, or it may even be the work of Stilicho, who appears to have been occupied at the east gate. But it seems most likely that we have here the only positive evidence for the Theodosian building period at Bainbridge. The precise date of the activity in the early years of the

¹ Circular summarising the work of 1931.

second century has not been established, whether it is Domitian - Trajanic or Hadrianic, or both. Some reconstruction took place, almost certainly, under both Severus and Constantius Chlorus.

Thus there is every indication that all the four chief Wall building periods are represented - the last three almost certainly; and the east gate would appear to provide evidence, in addition, of the activity of Stilicho.

It is possible that a radical replanning of the fort's lay-out took place at Bainbridge, but this has not been definitely established. Against it must be set Collingwood's statement that "when allowance has been made for the thickness of the rampart and the breadth of the necessary road behind it, the praetentura, or area in front of the central buildings, is exactly twice as deep as the retentura or area in their rear. This, in spite of the elongated shape, which can be explained by reference to the nature of the ground, connects the Bainbridge fort with the earliest type of Roman fort found in Britain."¹ This alone is not sufficient to dispose of the possibility of a drastic reconstruction, however, and the only means of solving the problem, as with several minor questions already indicated, appears to be by further excavation. This must, however, unlike that in the past, have for its chief aim the solution

¹ Report 1, 263.

of problems presented by a careful review of the evidence already available. It is probable that the south gate is the really crucial point and that a season's work there would throw valuable light on many of the most perplexing features of the site. There is also the need for further investigation of the area to the east of the fort, with a view to learning more about the fortified annexe, a unique feature in a Pennine station. The 'Principia,' too, might with advantage be further explored.

(c) The place of Bainbridge in the Roman road-system.

In view of its strategical position and length of occupation, the fort at Bainbridge must have been a vital link in the communications of the Northern Pennines. The possible existence of several roads in different directions from the site has been mooted from time to time, but the only one marked with assurance by the O.S. map of Roman Britain is that leading south-west, apparently aiming at Lancaster, though it has only been traced as far as Ingleton. On leaving Bainbridge at the south gate, it holds a magnificently straight course for four miles up the Cam High Road. It reaches a height of 2,000 ft. on the south-east side of Wether Fell, and thence passes, somewhat irregularly on account of the difficult nature of the terrain, over Cam Fell to Ribbleshead. Between Ribbleshead and Ingleton it appears to be overlaid by the modern road. It is termed by Warburton "The Devil's Causeway," and marked as branching near Overborough from the main Ribchester - Carlisle route.¹

A further link whose existence seems to be now sufficiently established, though its precise course is still a matter of controversy, is that between Bainbridge and Ilkley. The Ordnance Survey map does not mark this road, although it indicates one tentatively leaving the fort on

¹ Lansdowne MSS., 1911.

the south and climbing the shoulder of Addleborough. Presumably this line is based on the line taken due south of the fort by Dr. Kirk and Mrs. Collingwood towards Carpley Green, and accepted by O'Neil.¹ Miss Kitson Clark also adds the information that there is a tradition concerning the discovery of a Roman pavement at Brough Hill Farm, near this line and 200 yards south of Bainbridge, when the dairy was built there, and that a Roman 'bottle' from the same place lies in Horne's private collection at Leyburn.²

On the other hand, there are difficulties about accepting this line. In the first place, it takes the road over the wet and boggy stretch of Hukermire; it is worth remarking that the droughts of 1933-4-5 burnt up the nearby fields which are known to have been inhabited in the Roman period, but left little impression on Hukermire and the marsh south of Addleborough. As Raistrick has pointed out,³ the growth of peat and formation of marsh land coincides with the advent of the sub-Atlantic climate about the close of the Bronze Age, and conditions in the Roman period cannot have been very different from those of today. In the second place, the private and unpublished researches of Mr. R. M. Chapman appear to disprove the Roman character of this

¹ Report 1, Appendix II, 39.

² Ibid., 41.

³ YAJ, xxxiv, 145-7.

supposed route, and even to question its legitimacy as a road at all. Similar ridges to those which O'Neil considers to represent the road are a common phenomenon in the dale; two well-defined ones run, for instance, along the contours of Scargill Park on the opposite side of the valley. Trial trenches by Chapman at five points on O'Neil's "road" merely revealed a solid clay bank;¹ and it is worth considering whether this particular ridge did not represent the pre-Enclosure boundary between the common lands of Worton and Bainbridge. Villy's line, the only reasonable alternative, is presumed to have followed a footpath branching west off the present road to Buckden and rejoining the present road after crossing Bracken Hill; thence it ran to Birk Rigg near the foot of Semerwater where Villy claims "the first clear identification."² His explanation of the double loop of road is very feasible, the wider, easier line being attributed to the work of the Bainbridge Constable whose accounts for 1798 reveal that he received a trifle over £20 for making a road in Cragdale. This line also chooses a firmer course than that which leads due south from the fort. It would be unjustifiable to prefer the latter because of its superficially Roman characteristic of straightness, whereas Villy's route is really the sounder.

¹ Private information.

² Bradford Ant.

Both writers agree to accept the present ~~covering~~^{crossing} of Stake Moss as of Roman origin and take it via Cow Close Gill as far as Buckden. O'Neil notes that this was the road traversed by Lady Anne Clifford in 1663,¹ which in itself argues a Roman origin. O'Neil's suggestion (unbacked by reasons) that the road, instead of turning down the dale towards Starbottom, continued straight over the fells into Littondale, seems a little pointless. Raistrick postulated a Roman road consistently following the east bank of the Wharfe, but as this deduction was somewhat hypothetical, made with the object of linking up certain Roman finds and pieces of old road at various points along the dale, without any attempt to follow a particular line closely on the ground, the suggestion carries little weight. In point of fact, Villy² has already demonstrated the fallacy of such a generalisation.

The key-stone of Villy's carefully built edifice of evidence for a Roman road down Wharfedale is undoubtedly his claim to have discovered an intermediate station near Coniston, where he traces the road across the Wharfe, thence to proceed via Barden Beck (where the ancient bridge foundations still exist)³ presumably to fall into the Preston-Ilkley Roman road near Addingham. The site is on a slight

¹ op cit., p.40.

² loc. cit., 13-15.

³ loc. cit., Appendix II, plan and photograph (Fig.II).

eminence on the east bank of the Wharfe, and trial digging established the existence of a V-ditch and clay rampart of Roman outline. Although the minimum of excavation took place, there was nevertheless a lack of finds which suggests that, if Roman, occupation was not very permanent or intensive. Further excavation is, however, essential for the proof or disproof of such an important point. In favour of Villy's ^{that} claim/it is "almost certainly Roman,"¹ it should be noticed that the distance from Bainbridge to Ilkley is thirty Roman miles as the crow flies, and that the distance by road must actually have been about thirty-five Roman miles - a distance between neighbouring stations never approached in any of the northern Itinera of Antonine, and only occasionally equalled on southern routes. Moreover, the Antonine Itinerary gives main trunk roads only; travelling must have been more laborious on the secondary roads, few of which can have rivalled that between Bainbridge and Ilkley for difficulties of terrain. From these considerations, some kind of intermediate post must be postulated if the communication between north and mid-Yorkshire be supposed to have had any military or official administrative value at all. Villy's line, while still requiring more definite evidence at certain points to secure complete acceptance, must hold the field in the existing state of knowledge. The long period of occupation of both

¹ Letter to the writer, 16.vi.'38.

terminal forts does not necessarily imply that the connecting road is of like longevity; and from this point of view also the dating of the earthwork at Coniston is a matter of urgent interest.

With the construction of roads over the difficult country to the south and south-west so well attested, it is highly unlikely that the most natural approach to Bainbridge up the dale from the east would fail to carry a road connecting the fort with the great trunk route from York to the Wall. There are several possible lines for such a road to the east, but attention must be confined to those of which some positive indication exists.

The existence of this road was first mooted early in the eighteenth century in a correspondence¹ between Roger Gale and John Warburton, - the 'Somerset Herald.' Gale speaks (Aug. 17, 1717) of "Thornbrough, near Nosrefield Moor, and just by the Via Vicinatis that led from Ethelburg [Addlebrough] over that Moor into Leeming-lane (part of the Ermin-street), and not far from Well, where any of the inhabitants can shew you a Roman tessellated pavement;" and adds that the Roman road here mentioned ran close by the oval earthworks at Thornbrough, "and falls into Leeming-lane not far from Wath, and I think another ancient way seems to cross the road between Exelby and Carthorp, towards the same line."

¹ Quoted in full from Gale's MSS. in Hutchinson, 'View of Northumberland,' i, 112-18.

In his reply (written at Bedale on 21 November of the same year), Warburton claims to "have traced the Roman way that comes from Ethelburgh into Leeming-lane, and find that it passes through Thornton, Aysgarth, Bolton Park, Middleham, to Ulshaw-bridge, where it crosses the Ure, and continues its course by Danby, Thornton Steward, Watlass Church, and over Watlass Moor, where there are several Tumuli of different sizes, to the west side of Causick Park; thence it goes by Thornbrough to Middleton-Quernhow, and enters Leeming Lane about half a mile south-east of the last place." Warburton's reputation has suffered considerably since then,¹ but there is no doubt that he spent a considerable time in north Yorkshire compiling the material for his map.

In addition to this south-easterly route, there is some possibility of a direct road between Bainbridge and Catterick. In 1911, when the Ordnance Survey were making enquiries preparatory to issuing a new edition of their maps of the district, considerable controversy arose amongst local authorities on the question of the road east of Bainbridge.² Horne, the Leyburn antiquary, who had a more familiar acquaintance with the dale than anyone else, opened up the question (7 February).

He took the road to leave Leeming Lane about Kirklington,

¹ AA4, x, 40-3. (Macdonald); 79-80 (Bosanquet).

² Copies of Correspondence bound in O.S. Ordnance Notebook; Book 67, N.E. Yorks.

proceeding to Ulshaw Bridge via Well and Thornton Steward; he interpreted the large earthwork there as a 'ford camp,' and gave its exact position - "on the north side of the present bridge behind Mr. Scroops Chapel." Passing the remains of the villa, it went through the upper part of Middleham and on to Wensley. In a ploughed field west of Middleham "the farmer always finds the road when ploughing;" there was good evidence of the road as it crossed the field. The Ure was, according to Horne, recrossed at Wensley Ford, where there were traces of a camp north-west of the bridge on land later used for burial. In front of Bolton Hall it was cut through in making a drain "some years ago"; thence "through Lord's wood by Redmire Church past the bottom of Redmire on where the present highway goes for some 400 yards and then up the narrow lane straight forward into Thoresby." Here, it should be noted, was found a hoard of 1,600 Roman coins¹ which may be some confirmation of this line. From this point he considered that a branch road crossed the river at Slapstone wath and went up Bishopdale to join the road leading immediately south of Bainbridge at Kidstones Bank. The main road continued through Thoresby, south of Carperby, "through the Rabbit Warren on to Nappa Mill just on the north side just South of Askrigg and forded the river to the Roman Station at Bainbridge. There appears to have been a ford

¹ See Appendix A, s.v.

camp at Hall South of Askrigg Railway Station." On 12th June, Horne added further information of a stone road found in Ballar Field, and two pony shoes nearby. "It will come in the line from lane (?) near Carperby in a very straight line on fairly even ground going through the Rabbit Warren, will come out very near the place where the Roman things were found near Mead Hole ---- it bears out my own suspicion where the road would go within a few yards."

Sir Nathan Bodington (10 April) confirmed Horne's report of a paved road "a little below the surface in a field between Middleham and the river," and also its appearance in front of Bolton Hall. Mr. H. B. McCall, of Kirklington Hall, Bedale, (16 Feb.) supported Horne's opinion of the course of the road, though in a very general way. Moreover, by his own admission he was not an authority on the subject. Incidentally, he mentions the existence of a paved causeway at Preston-under-Scaur.

J. N. Dickons, however, (8 June), was unwilling to sacrifice Warburton's line in favour of that of Horne, chiefly on the ground that "local knowledge in 1720 would be more reliable than Mr. Horne's or Sir Nathan Bodington's in 1911." He also states, however, that he personally could find no trace of any Roman road on the north bank of the Ure. Percival Ross, too, a contemporary authority

on Yorkshire roads, in a letter to Dickons (5 September) said: "I have always looked upon the road as going somewhere near the hypocaust at Middleham thence by Middleham Moor to Aysgarth S.W. of the latter is Castle Dykes Camp thence by Riggs House, High Gill, and Thornton Rust dropping down to Bainbridge from the higher ground at Worton or further West directly South of the Camp at Bainbridge - I have not gone the full length of route, but have it from different points."

Captain Mozley, the Ordnance Survey officer in charge of the matter, clearly preferred Horne's line. In a letter to McCall (31 August) he stated that he had walked over the ground with Horne, who had shown him credible pieces of road; and he also makes the shrewd observation that Warburton, in the Lansdowne MSS. gives no definite statement that he has personally investigated the ground between Middleton (?ham) and Bainbridge, on which he shows the road on his map; and that it is drawn straight on the map, whereas there are pronounced natural obstacles which must have rendered this impossible on the actual surface. It may also be observed that Warburton's mention of Bolton Park as a point in the route between Aysgarth and Middleham shows that he is using other people's information, and does not know the country at all well; he must be confusing the accounts of two separate roads. This practice of glossing over his own shortcomings

is certainly typical of Warburton's methods; for instance, Haverfield, in the same series of correspondence (12 December) noted that, though he records his journey to Wensley and Bolton¹ he says nothing of Roman remains hereabouts.

On the subject of a road east of Bainbridge, Horne wrote that "from a road-maker's point of view the Northern slopes of the river are far more suitable." The latter is decidedly a matter of opinion; and to the writer the meandering course of Horne's route, with its double crossing of the river within the short space of $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles, and its hugging of low land, seems decidedly unnecessary and therefore un-Roman. This is particularly the case since the writer has been able with the prod to trace pieces of a road, typically Roman in layout, crossing Bishopdale Valley near Edgley and then holding to a broad shoulder of Penhill above West Witton as far as Spigot Lodge. Over Middleham Moor the course was lost - though Horne's piece west of Middleham is probably part of this line - but was retrieved again just west of the rectangular earthwork at the crossing of the Ure near Ulshaw Bridge. The course then seems to follow that generally agreed upon as far as Leeming Lane; but its proof by excavation is still desirable.

The probability of this route being Roman does not mean that Horne's observations are all to be disregarded. It is undeniable that the crossing of the river at Nappa is the most

¹ Quoted in YAJ, xv, 65

convenient for a road descending northwards from the fort; moreover it may not be mere chance that the second Bainbridge inscription was first recovered from Nappa Hall,¹ and that a considerable hoard was found at Thoresby. It may well be that we have here the starting point on the north side of the river of one or both of the roads into Swaledale and to Catterick which have been postulated from time to time.

As far as the latter route is concerned, Villy has noted the existence of a deserted grass-grown road south of Bolton Castle, mentioned by Pearson² as pointing towards Catterick, and locally reputed to be Roman. Moreover, from Bolton Park comes the second Wensleydale coin hoard. From Thoresby the road may well have passed via Castle Bolton and climbed to higher ground via Scarth Nick - the only really suitable pass for miles - and, incidentally, native Roman settlements are to be noticed on each side of the road at this point. The unusual shape of the village of Redmire - across the valley, instead of from west to east - may indicate that it grew up by the side of an ancient road which crossed the river at the ford below the village and ran north to Scarth Nick. From the top of Scarth Nick until Halfpenny House comes in sight, the modern road takes a straight line from ridge to ridge, conforming to Roman principles of lay-out by sighting from the highest points along the route, as distinct

¹ Gough's Camden, loc. cit.

² Roman Yorkshire, 115.

from the fairly straight but winding medieval pack-horse tracks. Above all, there are obvious traces of the existence of a much wider road than the present one in this sector, and the ditches are still to be seen. Where the modern road turns off downhill to Halfpenny House, the Roman line would keep straight on over Barden Moor (where an old bridle road continues the line exactly) descending gently to the fort of Caturactonium at Thornborough. Near the line of the road after leaving Scarth Nick, significantly enough, is the hamlet of Stainton, and Stainton Lane converges on the line described. Until certain points on the route have been proved by trenching, however, the line is too nebulous to be accepted.

Equally uncertain is the course of the supposed road northwards from Bainbridge into Swaledale for which there is a strong local tradition. The general belief is that it ran over Askrigg Moor down into Swaledale via Summer Lodge and Crackpot, thence across the valley to Feetham, and up over the moors to Arkengartndale, where it took the line of the modern Stang road on towards Barnard Castle. Near this point, at Startforth, it presumably joined the road from Bowes to Binchester whose existence has only recently been established.¹ Warburton must have known of this

¹ AA4; This confirms Roger Gale's conjecture as to the ultimate destination of the road north from Bainbridge (letter to Warburton, quoted in Hutchinson, op cit., i, 116).

tradition early in the eighteenth century, for in his Yorkshire map he shows it in broken lines as far as Feetham, thence by hard lines over Hope Moor, crossing the Stainmore road and so on to Barnard Castle (Lansdowne MSS, 1911). Warburton's language is inconsistent with the map, for in a letter to Roger Gale (21 Nov. 1717) he implies that he actually traced it in Swaledale, but not beyond. He refers to this road as "a new discovered military way, of the same dimensions and work with that on which Glanoventa stands and Galana, and which runs from Ethelburgh full north over a moor called Windgate, and at a small village called Crackpot crosses the river Swale and soon after enters another named Feetham, where I must leave it at present --- At my parting with it, it seemed to point at Barnard Castle and, if so, probably Stratford, near that place, was where it crossed the Tees, both on account of its name and being in a direct line to Old Town, in Alondale, where I have chosen to place Alone."¹

In support of the first half of this route, there is the likelihood of the Ure crossing near Nappa Hall, whence a road could easily climb the shoulder of the scar (perhaps somewhere about the present old lane through Newbiggin) on to Askrigg Common. Moreover, in view of the fact that the road is supposed to have led down into Swaledale by Summer Lodge and Crackpot, it is interesting to note the significant report that a pig of lead was

¹ Hutchinson, loc. cit.

discovered about the middle of last century by the workmen of Mr. Garth of Crackpot by the side of the lane leading between Summer Lodge and Crackpot. Mr. E. Fawcett, of Muker, informs me that it was inscribed, but unfortunately the object was melted down before any record could be made of it, and met a utilitarian end. From Feetham the road climbs on to the moor in a straight line, being banked with stones on the lower side to form a narrow terrace (cf. Villy's photograph of the Bainbridge - Ilkley Roman road at Rakes Wood, Buckden);¹ and this line is an exact continuation of the lane which can be seen from here, descending Crackpot Ghyll. The possibility of a Roman origin for the "Auld Gang" mines is both itself strengthened by this evidence, and in turn affords some support for the Roman origin of this route.

As far as the Stang road between Arkengarthdale and Barnard Castle is concerned, however, Mr. Gordon Manley has expressed to the writer his conviction that it is in origin a medieval pack-horse track, made when the town of Barnard Castle was an important centre of the wool trade in the north during the later Middle Ages. There is certainly no sector which can be pointed to with confidence as typically Roman in lay-out.

The distance between Bainbridge and Bowes or Greta Bridge could easily be covered in a day's march. This

¹ Bradford Ant., n.s., Pt.28, vi, (1936), Fig. 1.

may account for the fact that no Roman station appears to have existed in Swaledale. A familiar acquaintance with the dale reveals only one possible site - at Grinton, opposite the natural gap towards the north represented by the mouth of the Arkle, a tributary of the Swale. On the south bank of the river at Grinton stand two glacial mounds in a strong defensive position, with earthwork defences, and marked on the O.S. 6 in. Map of Grinton, 1857, Sheet 37, as "Roman". Excavation, however, revealed only evidence of medieval occupation and the form of the earthwork defences was certainly not Roman.¹

Maiden Castle, the Harkerside earthwork, is also un-Roman in every essential feature of construction and position, and seems much more likely to have been connected with the impressive series of linear intrenchments which sweeps from the eastern brow of Harker Hill down across the dale and climbs part of the way up Fremington Edge on the opposite side - obviously a defence against the east, cutting off the approach to both Swaledale and Arkengarthdale at the shortest and most easily defensible point.² Below the Maiden Castle enclosure is a ford at Scabba Wath, where popular imagination makes the "Roman" road from Maiden Castle cross the Swale.³ 200 yards west of this ford

¹ Appendix B, s.v.

² Appendix A, s.v.

³ e.g. Pontefract, Swaledale, 131.

is the artificial but un-Roman earthwork of How Hill, on the south bank of the Swale - at such close proximity that the river has washed away part of this mound.¹

The most positive evidence of any ancient road in this neighbourhood is furnished by an old local map, rescued from the dusty store-house of the lord of the manor, which marks a Roman "causey" (causeway) a little way to the south-east of Maiden Castle.²

The Swaledale moors have been extensively worked for lead, particularly in the nineteenth century and, at any rate at Hurst, in the Roman period. The reputed find of a lead pig at Crackpot, therefore, bears the stamp of probability, and suggests that the metal was carried south to Bainbridge by this road. On the other hand, its ultimate destination was almost certainly Brough-on-Humber via York, so that the natural and most efficient line of transport would seem to be to Catterick and so down the easy and rapid traffic route of Leeming Lane.³ The industrial activity of the district makes the existence of more lines of communication with the nearest main roads than would be required by purely military considerations a distinct probability; but it may be difficult to identify those in use in the Roman period. For such minor roads there is no doubt that the

¹ Appendix B. s.v.

² Map of the Parish of Grinton (Anthony and J. A. Clarkson), 1848.

³ p.

Romans occasionally made use of existing native tracks, improving the surface here and there without altering the course of the road.¹

Finally, the possibility of a road having gone westward up the dale from Bainbridge must be considered. The uselessness of the west gateway as a normal means of approach scarcely affects this question, as such a road would naturally branch from that which leaves the south gate at an angle bearing south-west. The writer, together with Mr. R. M. Chapman, has followed a line which first appears as a ridge in the field behind Bainbridge workhouse. Sections dug by Mr. Chapman in 1933 revealed a cambered road below the grass ridge about 12 feet wide. A footpath follows the ridge as far as a field with the significant name of "Borwins." The road disappears near Goodman Syke, where the ground is marshy, but is picked up again about 200 yards beyond, on the north side of the Hawes road where the ridge can be detected climbing a slight hill between the road and the river. At one point where it crosses a tributary stream on the north side of the Ure, repeated floods have caused a displacement of the line; and further on, it can be seen climbing in a straight line to a gap in the hills and heading for the east side of the Mallerstang gorge.

Although this road, where sectioned, does not approach

¹ cf. Codrington, op. cit., 310.

the best type of Roman road in structural form, it can never, owing to the difficult country it had to traverse, have been a principal route. Some connection between the stations of Brough-under-Stainmore and Bainbridge, however, was desirable, particularly in view of the probable character of each as a centre for local military (and perhaps other) administration.¹ There is no evidence for the use of this road either in the Middle Ages or more recently; and it can only be explained by supposing that it aimed at reaching the fort at Brough via the Mallerstang Pass.

The course of a medieval road to Dent, west-south-west of Bainbridge, is also known to the writer; and in view of Villy's postulation of a Roman fort near the former village, it is quite probable that this follows a Roman line.

A scrutiny of the map reveals the fact that the Pennine occupation was based on the two trunk routes running in a north-south direction along the western and eastern foothills of the watershed. The area between them was divided into three main groups - although the division may not have been the result of a conscious policy but rather a natural development of several years of practical administration. In each of these areas one station stands out from the rest - whether in size, continuity of occupation, or strategic position,

¹ cf. Richmond, *CW*², xxxvi, 104-25, on this aspect of the function of the Fort at Brough. The Mallerstang hoard (*CW*², xxvii, 205-17) may carry some significance in connection with the problem of the actual course of the road.

either military or for purposes of communications - as the dominating factor in the Roman occupation of that district.

The most northerly area is dominated by the fort at Whitley Castle above the South Tyne, which was connected with Kirkby Thore on the one side and Carvoran, the Wall fort, on the other. There is also some indication of a link with Corbridge to the north-east via Old Town in Allendale.¹ This region is a more distinct entity than the other two, as it is cut off from the south by the Stainmore gap.

The communications of south Yorkshire undoubtedly centred on Ilkley; through this point passed also most of the trans-Pennine routes between those posts on the two great trunk roads which were at all within reasonable reach.

The fort at Bainbridge commanded the dales of Ure and Swale, and possibly some part of the fells between Swaledale and Teesdale, and its garrison probably also co-operated with that of Ilkley in the supervision of the upper reaches of the Ribble, Wharfe and Nidd. Of the three stations mentioned, Bainbridge is the outstanding example of this system of regional control. In a populous district of early industrial activity, and later political peril, there is no known supporting post for miles around. Further research will probably establish the present tentative

¹ Excavations by the writer of road and bridge-head at Alston in May, 1938; publication forthcoming.

presumption that it was supported by roads leading in all directions, and the most important of these would appear to have been those which follow fairly closely the natural east-west lines of communication dictated by the physiography of the country. Warburton¹ was anxious to prove the existence of a north-south route following the Pennine watershed from Portgale on the Wall via Old Town and Barnard Castle to Bainbridge; but although this line could have been extended to Ilkley and beyond, the northern part is, so far as we can judge from our present evidence, purely imaginary. Physiological features militated against the development of any important north-south traffic route over the fells; and although forts immediately to the north or south might often be closer in actual distance, in actual fact the easiest and closest connection would be maintained with those parallel stations on the main roads to the east and west.

¹ Letter to Gale, loc. cit.

VI. ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

(i) Introductory.

THE distribution map is an essential corollary to any balanced study of the economic development of such an extensive area as that which we have termed Brigantian. An examination of the map (Plate I) reveals certain points of outstanding interest.

First comes an overwhelming confirmation of the concentration of Brigantian tribal life throughout the Roman period in the West Yorkshire Pennines, which has already been postulated for the period immediately preceding the beginning of the Roman occupation.¹ The slopes of the Aire and Calder valleys, as well as those of the Yorkshire dales farther to the north, have produced ample evidence of habitation.

There is, however, a striking contrast between the type of remains in South as opposed to North Yorkshire. In the more northerly dales, particularly the basins of the Ure, Nidd, Wharfe, Ribble, and upper reaches of the Aire, native villages and hutments with their associated fields occur frequently. In the lower valley of the Aire, and the district of the Calder and the Don, this type of

¹ p. 129.

discovery is as yet entirely absent. No doubt this discrepancy is to some extent artificial, in that serious field-work on the native settlements of Brigantia has hitherto been confined to the former area. A more important factor is the fact that the North Yorkshire dales are largely composed of limestone strata which greatly facilitate drainage and were therefore particularly favourable to the primitive form of agriculture then obtaining. But even so one would expect that in the predominantly millstone grit areas, especially where there is an occasional outcrop of limestone, odd settlements similar to those small examples noticed in Swaledale and Weardale, for example, would occur, if only at rare intervals. The lack of purposeful research over the whole of the area explains a great deal; in the case of Weardale, for example, the case for any permanent occupation has been very recently rejected by Steer,¹ but now that a native settlement of typical Romano-British form has been identified near Stanhope, the odd finds in that region acquire a much greater significance than he would allow. One is also disposed to give greater credence to the evidence in favour of Roman lead mining in Weardale, while yet refraining from accepting the case as proven pending the appearance of confirmatory information.

Yet the essential barrenness of the Durham dales is

¹ R.D., 332.

not called into question; rather does the isolation of this settlement near Stanhope serve to emphasize the general truth of Steer's judgment. Almost all the finds from Durham County are connected with the military occupation, or represent casual losses in travel along the main trunk roads. The coastal occupation seems most important, but is to be accounted for by sea traffic rather than internal trade with the main centres of Brigantia. Incidentally, the spacing of finds of permanent occupation along the Durham coast renders it difficult to believe that this coast between the Yorkshire signal-stations and the Wall had not its posts of similar character to the former, thus completing the defensive line of the north-east coast. Durham County, though formally part of the Brigantian civitas, can never have accommodated any considerable portion of that people. Lancashire, too, though more populous than Durham, represents the outer regions rather than an important centre of tribal territory. South Yorkshire is vastly different. In the place of settlement sites are recorded finds of pottery, buildings, burials, and, above all, coin hoards. It is rarely possible to reconstruct the type of occupation represented by these finds.

The general cause of this state of affairs must lie with the modern intensive industrial development of the South

Yorkshire valleys, as opposed to the continued pastoral condition of the more northerly dales. One has only to view the hillsides of Huddersfield and neighbouring districts, with their intermediate terraces covered with the dwellings of factory employees, to realise that the most suitable sites for Brigantian occupation have found new inhabitants, and that all trace of any Celtic villages which may have existed must frequently be completely destroyed. The same difficulty is experienced in searching for recorded earthworks; it is a rare experience to find one's quarry in such a perfect state of preservation as is common in the northern dales, and neither wholly nor partly destroyed by modern industrial development. Moreover, it is often from precisely such situations that casual finds are reported. In order to form a general estimate of the true distribution of the Brigantian population, then, it would be unwise to pay too strict a regard to the different character of the symbols displayed on the map, since in large part this merely reflects the subsequent form of exploitation which each particular area has undergone.

The richness of Brigantian territory in coin hoards is a point which deserves special mention. From the area in general a low yield is to be expected in comparison with the number of original deposits; cultivation by the plough has

affected only a very small fraction of the total area, and even this can rarely have affected Brigantian settlement sites on their hillside terraces. Industrial development has resulted in an increased proportion of finds in certain areas, but in general the archaeologist of the northern Pennines lacks the extraneous aids provided for his southern colleagues by intensive agricultural exploitation. It is clear, despite these handicaps, that the number of people handling coins must have been great; Tacitus' testimony on the populous nature of the tribe¹ is fully confirmed. It should be noted that in order to avoid overcrowding of symbols, hoards and other odd finds are not shown separately on the map where there is evidence for permanent occupation on that site.

¹ p. 53.

(ii) Isurium Brigantum.

A comprehensive survey of the Roman capital of Brigantia would, for our immediate purpose, be both unwieldy and unnecessary.¹ It will be sufficient to indicate some of the points of general importance which emerge from a consideration of the evidence for this site in the light of general Brigantian history.

The name Isurium is most satisfactorily derived from the river Ure,² being the Latinized form of the British river name. It does not follow, of course, that this implies the existence of a pre-Roman city or settlement on the site. In fact, recent excavations have practically disproved such a possibility, and we must look elsewhere for the native capital of Brigantia.³ Occupational evidence favours a Flavian origin for the town, but though the conquest of the Brigantes was undoubtedly carried out by Cerialis, it may well be that the inauguration of a new cantonal capital amongst other details of civil organisation, was left to Agricola.

The position which was chosen for the new capital is of interest. Commanding the crossing of an important river

¹ The chief sources of antiquarian history for this town are extensively quoted by Mr. M. H. Callender in an unpublished thesis deposited in the Archaeological Seminar Library at Durham.

² Ekwall, English River Names, s.v.

³ p. 141-5.

and situated on the York moraine - the more important of the two main trade routes between east and west Yorkshire - it has often been suggested that it had at first a military character. This theory, while quite feasible, has received no archaeological confirmation, and the favourable position with regard to both river and land communications is sufficient to account for the choice of this particular site for a purely civil settlement. Pearson reminds us¹ that before the construction of the first lock at Naburn in the eighteenth century, the Ouse was tidal as far as York, and would be easily navigable for light Roman galleys as far as the junction of the Ure and the Swale near Aldborough. Quite apart from its suitability from a commercial and administrative viewpoint, it was probably thought desirable to have the headquarters of such a powerful tribe under the close supervision of the military centre for the area.

Scarcely has the controversial subject of the early character of Isurium been resolved than the maintenance of its status as a cantonal capital comes into question. Its importance has been stimulated by Collingwood's ingenious interpretation of Pausanias, which, as has been seen, cannot reasonably be accepted. His suggestion that the colony at York may have been founded under Pius immediately raised the possibility of tribal administration being taken over by York,

¹ R. Yorkshire, 41.

since the land of which the Brigantes were (hypothetically) deprived possibly included Aldborough. The town lay sixteen miles from York, but that such an extent of territory under colonial administration was not exceptional is shown by the fact that the area belonging to the colony at Lincoln extended to the west for fourteen miles as far as Littleborough (Segelocum).¹

In a brilliant article on Gildas and the Civitates of Britain,² Stevens has pointed out that Roman practice in this respect was not stereotyped, but adapted itself to individual circumstances. The evidence of Ravennas and local milestones,³ for example, shows that after Lincoln (Lindum) had become a colony, Leicester (Ratae) remained the tribal capital;⁴ and similarly with Gloucester (Glevum) and Cirencester (Corinium Dobunorum). Though the Antonine road-book probably made use of earlier sources, there is no reason to doubt that the use of the name Isubrigantum indicates the loss of its status as cantonal capital at least until the reign of Commodus; it must be remembered that the existence of the colony at York is not attested until A.D.237. It is true that Isurium does not appear in the Ravenna list.

¹ Haverfield, Romanization, 58, n. 1.

² EHR, lli, 193-203.

³ On the same grounds as discussed above, p. 120.

⁴ Ravennas, 429, 6 (Rate Corion).

On the other hand, the remains indicate the vigour and longevity of its urban character. Moreover, the growing tendency in Roman administration favoured the more complete dissociation of civil from military functions. There was no need to complicate the predominantly military character of official business at York. This is emphasized by the completely Romanized and pro-Roman character of Isurium. Its attitude must always have been a severe handicap to the rebellious ambitions of more distant tribesmen; to have deprived the citizens of Aldborough of their political authority would have been a blunder of the first magnitude. There is no reason to believe that it was ever committed. Partly, perhaps, owing to its sheltered position near the legionary base, and perhaps partly due to the fact that its allegiance in a crisis was still unproved, Aldborough did not acquire defensive walls in the early second century as did most towns. The excavations of 1938 definitely dated the construction of the walls to the early third century;¹ and the desirability of this step may well have been forced home by the ravaging which followed the fall of the Wall frontier, and by the revelation in subsequent events of the widely different attitudes towards Rome adopted by the town-dwelling Brigantes on the one hand and the rural population on the other. It may be possible that the rampart, in which

¹ YAJ, xxxiv, 232-3.

Mr. Myres found a predominance of Antonine material,¹ was constructed as an independent feature in the middle of the second century; but on this point it would be wiser to defer judgment until the full reports are available.

The fact that Isurium was the only town in Roman Brigantia is a striking indication of the general mode of life in the "Highland Zone." Other civil settlements than the rural villages grew up, it is true - at Adel, for example: doubtless a ribbon development dependent upon the traffic along the trunk road; and perhaps at Cawood, characterized by pottery or other industrial production. None of these sites, however, so far as we know, possessed that corporate entity which distinguishes the town proper; and the Northern Pennine area must therefore be regarded as one of completely predominating rural economy, in which the characteristic pursuit was pastoral agriculture, and the common settlement was the village.

In view of the existence of only one town in our area, it is impossible to draw very decided independent conclusions concerning the true condition and development of Romano-British urban life. This is more particularly the case since excavations at Aldborough have not been nearly so complete or - until recent years - so satisfactory as on other sites in the south of England. From the available evidence,

¹ ibid.

however, it would seem that Isurium does not support Collingwood's exaggerated view of the decrepit state of the towns of Britain in the third and fourth centuries.¹ In general, while the towns were admittedly dependent upon the countryside for food supplies, their legal, political, cultural and commercial services fully compensated for this economic dependence. Aldborough, as the only centre for a vast area, must have enjoyed considerable importance in these spheres when the prosperity of the countryside was reaching its apogee early in the fourth century; not until the early third century when, according to Collingwood, decline was already setting in, did it acquire sufficient importance to justify the erection of a town wall. Moreover, with the gradual disappearance of animosity towards Rome amongst the rural population, commerce and other communication with the pro-Roman capital would naturally be expected to increase.

On the general subject of the survival of Romano-British town life, it is significant that while in Gaul the return to tribal conditions is indicated by the perpetuation of tribal names in the modern versions of the old chef-lieux, Britain supplies not a single instance of this. Thus, Venta Silurum becomes Caerwent, Venta Belgarum Winchester, and so on; where the Roman name persists, therefore, it is that of the

¹ OHE, i, 201-7.

town. With the problem of the early occupation virtually decided, future work at Aldborough must be devoted very considerably to the close consideration of this question of the character of the later occupation. While remembering that Isurium's position was somewhat exceptional, it may well be that it can supply a useful corrective to the unduly deprecatory assessment under which the towns of Roman Britain still labour.

(iii) Villas.

TO think of the Romano-British villa as the typical residence of the more prosperous class of invaders is, of course, to betray quite a wrong conception of the nature of the romanization of the British countryside. The occupant was usually a prosperous native who had acquired a veneer of romanization of which he and his family grew increasingly proud. The density and distribution of villa sites is, indeed, a remarkably accurate index of the degree of romanization which the native population of any particular district has undergone.

Judged by these standards, it is clear that Brigantia as a whole was extremely backward; for the whole area can muster but six definitely established sites. Much of the blame for this sparsity must of course be laid with the inhospitable nature of the northern fells, whose population has always been of the meagrest. It is only natural to expect in the more clement and fertile areas of the East Riding that higher standard of everyday life to which the existence of no less than eleven known villas is abundant testimony; and the geographical position of the East Riding renders its inhabitants much more accessible and susceptible to new influences; the spread of the Iron Age ~~British~~

culture here, as contrasted with its comparative absence further west, is but one illustration in point.

From an examination of sites which have yielded some indication of Roman occupation, it appears possible that excavation will, when undertaken, make some small addition to the total number of villas at present boasted by Brigantia. Nevertheless, the accompanying distribution map does present a generally truthful picture of the situation. The explanation of this is largely to be sought in the story of recurrent turbulence in the Northern Pennines, even at a time when Roman Britain generally was peaceful and prosperous. By the time the Brigantian political sore had ceased to chafe, provincial and imperial conditions were too dark and uncertain to warrant the construction of luxurious country residences - particularly in a district never favoured for such resorts, and now under the threatening cloud of barbarian invasion.

That this was the state of affairs in the third century is shown by the measures which had to be taken by the occupant of the villa at North Stainley, in order to enable him to continue to live there with any feeling of security. Just as it had been found necessary to protect the small vicus outside the fort at Bainbridge with a walled annexe, so at North Stainley a defensive system consisting of a double mound and central ditch had to be constructed. Miss M. Kitson Clark,

in a typescript report on work at the site in 1929, appears to be somewhat dubious about the propriety of accepting this interpretation of the purpose of the entrenchments, raising such points as: "Whether the entrenchments are defensive or merely to keep in cattle: whether they are contemporary with the villa, or with one of its reconstructions or previous to it and why was the site chosen?" Moreover, "Professor Stewart pointed out that the opposite slope was far more suitable for defence." These queries are, however, discounted if one can presume - with good reason, it would appear - that the defences were not an original feature of the house, but that, like the annexe at Bainbridge, they were constructed after the site had known sack and pillage, at a period when the dangers of sudden insurrection were more real and incipient than in earlier years when the house was first built. Nor is this interpretation based solely on local evidence. At Ely, near Cardiff, a fortified villa also existed beyond the zone of civilian safety at that time.

Life at North Stainley was evidently a precarious affair early in the third century. North of this point, at Well and Middleham, conditions were scarcely likely to be improved; and excavations at Well in the last season have in fact shown that the floruit of the site was at the end of the third and early part of the fourth century, before came destruction by fire. This, however, whether due to political or accidental

causes, proved no set back to the development of the estate, for the reconstruction actually witnessed many improvements and extensions which testify to a remarkable degree of prosperity in the late fourth century.

The historical development of Well from the second to the early fourth century is quite normal, and corresponds to the general development of villa life in Britain.¹ The evidence for a late fourth century occupation - and that a prosperous one - is, however, of particular significance, especially in a region which was continually being exposed to the dangers of invasion. The evidence from this villa site is supported by that from the villages. Rural prosperity came late to Brigantia; and it must be more than a coincidence that the evolution of a settled agricultural economy corresponds closely to the gradual disappearance of political unrest amongst the Brigantes. Collingwood suggests that slave and peasant risings, such as those in Gaul, did much to wreck the villa system.² In Brigantia, on the other hand, it would seem that this local factor worked in the opposite direction, and that it was the gradual reconciliation of the native population to Roman rule which stimulated rural development into the last decades of the occupation. One must therefore suggest that the development

¹ Collingwood, Econ. Survey, 81-7.

² ibid., 84.

was dependent on local conditions rather than on any general cause such as the financial burdens laid upon the towns by imperial policy, upon which Collingwood lays such stress.¹ Moreover, as has been seen, the advancing prosperity of the countryside did not necessarily result from, or entail, the decay of the towns.² Indeed, such a view would be incomprehensible under the normal laws of political economy.

Apart from the numerical scarcity of villa sites, the question of the distribution of the known few is of interest - bearing in mind that much greater reservation in the drawing of conclusions is required where the material is slight than when it is profuse.

North of Wensleydale there is no known villa, despite the fact that the area is studded with Roman forts at regular intervals along a network of roads, and that the northern dales knew considerable industrial activity, particularly in the lead mines of Swaledale and the Alston district. The predominantly military character of the occupation of the region is usually invoked as the explanation of this phenomenon; moreover, where the economic life of a country was under direct imperial administration, there was little opportunity for private enterprise.

This explanation, though undoubtedly of great importance,

¹ OHE, i, 201-7.

² p. 256-7.

does not entirely explain the surprising fact that all the Brigantian villas are gathered roughly between Wensleydale and Wharfedale, while the large and important area south of Ilkley is as barren of these evidences of rural romanization as the district between Wensleydale and the Wall. It is a remarkable fact that every one of our villas (Gargrave is the most distant) is embraced in a mere 29 miles radius from Aldborough, and that all have easy communication with the capital available by road. This situation obviously points once more to the mutual dependence of town and country life in Brigantia. There is no reason to suppose that south Yorkshire was materially more discontented than the district immediately to the north of it.

Rural development, of course, depended to a very great extent upon the physiographical condition of the different areas. New light is thrown on the problem by a comparison of villa distribution with that of villages and cultivation areas over the whole area. The coincidence of both types of remains is striking; and it is probable that the settled civilian life to which they testify accounts for the presence of the villas, rather than that the villas themselves were the centre of attraction for other forms of native civil life. The limestone plateaux of Wharfedale, Ribblesdale, Nidderdale, and Wensleydale, were more suited to the development of a

settled agricultural mode of life and work (under the existing conditions of agricultural development) than the dales to the north and south, where millstone grit predominates, and is not nearly so favourable for purposes of drainage and cultivation of shallow surface soil as the limestone strata of the middle dales. The latter, having adopted a more stable and therefore more prosperous economy, were not only more desirous of peace, but more likely to incur the ravages of any lawless elements which still existed on the fringes of this district. Hence the necessity for defensive precautions, admirably illustrated in two distinct units of rural organization by the fortified villa at North Stainley and, for example, the village with its specially strengthened central enclosure at Whitcliffe Scar in Swaledale. The traces of permanent villages and associated fields, so common in the mid-Yorkshire area, are a comparative rarity in the country reaching north and south from it as well as westwards into Lancashire. But this in itself does not mean that the latter regions were sparsely populated; as has been seen, the different type of finds produced in south Yorkshire is equally legitimate evidence for the intensive habitation of that district.

Not only were the peoples of the outer fringes of the romanized civitas of Brigantia far removed from the stabilizing

influence of the capital, but they were handicapped in any attempt to develop a settled mode of life by the inability of even the most advanced Roman methods to overcome the agricultural limitations of their soil. In consequence, they were never seriously confronted with the opportunity of settling down to a more permanent and responsible occupation. They simply continued the old nomadic, pastoral existence which had been general up to the Roman period. The materials associated with the so-called "Iron Age" villages excavated by Raistrick are predominantly late Roman, and there is hardly anything before the second century A.D. This points to the development of village life as being one result of the gradual acceptance of the pax Romana.

Since the occupants of villas were generally romanized Britons of more than usual affluence, very often wealthy farmers, they would naturally prefer to reside in a district where the inhabitants were settled, industrious and respectable, and where the economic standard of life was high, rather than in an undeveloped area with a shifting population which had little regard for the rights of property. The villa at Gargrave, though far from similar residences, and in the heart of the Pennines, was nevertheless right in the heart of a considerable, and apparently quite settled, farming community.

(iv) Native Settlements and Agriculture.

West Yorkshire is peculiarly rich in the remains of villages, and their close investigation is one of the most important archaeological tasks awaiting prosecution at the present time. Their general character may be clearly understood by the field worker, and the extensive excavation which has taken place in the Grassington area is a valuable help in the reconstruction of native field-systems of the Roman period. Outside Grassington, there has been a considerable amount of haphazard excavation, whose procedure seems to have lacked a clear direction of purpose, and whose results, while they could not fail to yield much interesting material, have fallen an inevitable prey to the defects of generalization. In addition, the conclusions which have been drawn therefrom¹ are sometimes invalidated by an inexpert treatment of the pottery evidence.

In direct contrast to these methods is the excavation of the isolated hutment site at Milking Gap, whose careful investigation by Mr. Kilbride Jones affords an excellent model for the future treatment of west Yorkshire sites. Individual reports of detailed, patient work on carefully selected sites must form the future method of treatment if regional and typological characteristics are to be clearly

¹ YAJ, xxxiv, 115-50.

differentiated, and structural periods properly distinguished. In order to facilitate excavation aiming at the solution of specific problems, therefore, the present survey endeavours to elucidate and present some of the outstanding features of Brigantian agricultural and village life, rather than to attempt a detailed description of all the remains. Discussion of particular sites is confined chiefly to the sites in Swaledale and Wensleydale, a district which has already received special consideration in a different connection as the area administered from the fort at Bainbridge.

The general situation of the settlements is throughout very similar. They are placed on the middle terraces of the hillside slopes, frequently but by no means always sheltered by a limestone scar, and their choice of ground is undoubtedly determined by prehistoric conditions of drainage and vegetation. The limestone dales of mid-Yorkshire were particularly suitable for the primitive type of agriculture then practised, for the soil was light and well drained. The foundations of these settlements have, moreover, been the better preserved for that same reason, since the areas occupied in Roman times were unsuitable for the more advanced methods of cultivation which led to the clearing and habitation of the valley bottoms.

The distribution map of known sites over ^{the} Brigantian area

reveals a distinct concentration of population around Wharfedale and neighbouring valleys. The cold, wet sub-Atlantic climate which then prevailed naturally made these long terraces, well-protected from storms, very suitable and favoured occupation sites. Such a climate encouraged the formation of marshes and the growth of coarse, swampy vegetation on higher ground, except on such sites as were well drained. The limestone plateau was eminently suitable for occupation by a people desiring to carry on an agricultural life under primitive conditions. Beyond Craven the rock outcrops are, however, principally of millstone grit and since, as Raistrick rightly remarks,¹ the grits do not form plateaux so readily as the limestone areas, it is natural to find the density of inhabited sites thinning out considerably north, south and west of Craven.

It would, however, be unwise to insist that the density of distribution of known village sites is a completely reliable index of the distribution of population in the area. It has been demonstrated that the original concentration of Brigantian power was in the Huddersfield district; yet sites on the Grassington model are extremely rare. In the north and west, too, where the Romans found it necessary to establish strong military posts, a comparable number of

¹ ibid., 147.

village sites to those in Wharfedale will be sought in vain. The Craven area cannot have been overwhelmingly superior in population to the other parts of Brigantia; it was merely better suited to the establishment of permanent settlements. The latter, moreover, owe their excellent state of preservation to the fact that they are not suitable for cultivation by modern methods; even the Grassington enclosures, though well cleared of small stones, are strewn with large boulders which make ploughing, as a general rule, impossible.

Human occupation has always adapted itself to local conditions, and there can be no doubt that the stone wall character of the Craven sites was due simply to the abundance of available material. This is well illustrated by local structural differences within the limestone areas themselves. While the field banks at Grassington are composed of earth and turf as well as stone, in the upper part of the dale and also in Malhamdale, Upper Ribblesdale, Wensleydale and Swaledale, purely stone walls are the rule. In Weardale, however, on the Park Crag site, the earth and rubble banks bear a marked resemblance to those of Lower Wharfedale such as Grassington and Burley Moor (Ilkley). But stone huts were not essential for dwelling-places, nor stone walls for pastoral agriculture, though they must have helped to raise the standards both of living and of agricultural methods and

organisation. The pit-dwellings which occur frequently in moorland districts are a Late Bronze Age type whose use probably persisted throughout the Roman period, and their construction could most easily be completed by the use of turf or timber, thatched with ling and rushes.

The formation of peat and heather in the millstone grit areas did not prevent the use of that land as pasture by Iron Age and Romano-British inhabitants. For a statement of this point I am indebted to Mr. B. W. J. Kent, F.S.A.Scot., who combines with his archaeological knowledge long and intensive agricultural experience: "Sheep live and thrive on the heather quite as well as on the grass, and before burnt lime was applied to the grassland even the limestone land would be very acid and matted. Cotton sedge, which has formed most of the peat, is a valuable food for moorland sheep."¹

The limestone sites should, then, be regarded as types of permanent settlement, with a favourable situation, which encouraged a more advanced and stable form of agriculture than was possible to the inhabitants of other districts, rather than the homes of "a poverty-stricken pastoral and hunting people," the conclusion somewhat unaccountably reached by Raistrick. Though the latter states that the pottery and other evidence indicates an occupation belonging

¹ Letter to the writer, 7.iv.'38.

belonging mainly to the first and early second centuries, some of the pottery he illustrates¹ is certainly fourth-century signal-station ware; late coins also occur in the caves, and occupation must be assumed to have continued with increasing vigour, rather than early attenuated, throughout the Roman period.

Furthermore, the selected specimens of pottery, brooches, personal ornaments, tools, weapons, and even textile-weaving instruments which he has himself published² show a degree of civilization well in advance of any remains from native sites outside the Craven area, and easily on an equality with the finds from the Milking Gap settlement which, actually situated within the Wall frontier, had every opportunity for romanization. The coin series, e.g. from Dowkerbottom, is further proof that the inhabitants were by no means cut off from commercial life. The remains from west Yorkshire are very similar to those of Derbyshire, which Haverfield³ regarded as indicative of a prosperous native population.

Perhaps the most remarkable feature about the village

¹ loc. cit. The bulk of the illustrated pottery is fourth century, and most of this belongs to the second half of the fourth century. Apart from a Flavian reeded rim (Fig. VII (s) - ? Settle) the other pieces are indeterminate. Types of special interest are those from Grassington (Fig. VII) corresponding to Crambeck types 1, 5a and 8, with a hammer-head variant of type 6.

² ibid.

³ VCH Derbyshire, i, 191-263.

sites on the Grassington model is the fact that they have not so far produced evidence of occupation before the Roman period. This is a further confirmation of the view that the sites in Wharfedale and the surrounding valleys represent a more settled, and therefore more advanced, state of existence. The number of La Tene finds from Brigantia is small, and it seems certain that such Late Bronze Age sites as had any permanent character continued to be occupied well into the Roman period in many districts. On a terrace of Burley Moor, south of the Wharfe, for instance, a lengthy occupation through different periods seems highly probable. Neolithic and Bronze Age flints have been found in abundance, and there are several cup-and-ring marked stones still detectable; while the remains of hut-circles and field walls are typologically identical with those at Grassington.

In general, however, Bronze Age remains in the north are restricted to burials and odd finds, indicating a nomadic rather than an agricultural or even pastoral existence for the people of that era. Whether the Craven sites possess evidence of such continuity must be one of the problems whose solution can only be attempted by careful excavation in the future. It should be noted that Raistrick evidently uses the description 'Iron Age' as a general geological term, covering both the archaeologically distinct Iron Age and

Romano-British periods.

The character of the examples of isolated hutments and associated fields has recently been fully described;¹ examples of this group of one or two huts, with adjoining yard and one or two small fields, have been noted in north Yorkshire, occupying small areas where the terracing afforded by the limestone outcrop was insufficient to accommodate more than one small holding. This is the case at Hooker Mill Scar, on the west slope of Kisdon in Upper Swaledale, and at the Ramps Holme site across the gorge east of Kisdon. The best example occurs on the ground above Scarth Nick in Wensleydale (Pl. VII). Below the scar are extensive remains of the native village. The hutment site, however, occupies high, unsheltered ground. The hut circle, 18 feet in diameter, is in this case (contrary to the general rule) situated within the main enclosure, approximately in the centre. The enclosure is rectangular, apart from a rounded angle at the north-east - a peculiarity which is paralleled at Milking Gap.² It appears to be due to the presence of an entrance 12 feet wide here, opposite a cairn about 30 feet in diameter, which lies 50 yards away from the wall of the enclosure.

Grassington must be regarded as the model for comparison of all the larger village sites in the north, since it has

¹ Raistrick, loc. cit.

² AA⁴, xv, 340 (Pl. XXII).

been fully excavated and described, with the aid of air-photography. Here the village covers some two acres and the associated fields about 80 acres of land. Two types of field have been distinguished - "(a) square with slight stone and turf banking, about 300 feet, mostly made on nearly level ground and often enclosing smaller circular or oval 'crofts' 50 to 100 feet in diameter; (b) a more numerous set of fairly regular fields 70 to 80 feet wide and 350 to 400 feet long, with massive banks up to three feet high and six or seven feet wide."¹ The latter is the typical Celtic field-system found in other districts of west Yorkshire.

The outstanding feature of interest is the separation of the village from the fields which the inhabitants cultivated, though the two, of course, were not far distant. Roads leading from the village to the fields have been identified at Grassington. The concentration of population appears to have been inspired by a need for defensive solidarity. It is noteworthy that enclosures adjoining the huts were present in the village, for the safe keeping of stock.

An interesting feature at Grassington, indicating that the village was an unusually important one, is the oval area 150 feet long and 75 feet broad, locally known as 'The Druid's Circle,' which Curwen has suggested may represent the public

¹ Raistrick, loc. cit., 119.

meeting place of the community. The single or double row of stones surmounting three-fourths of the encircling bank may have formed the seats of the elders. "The characteristics of this earthwork - a level central arena largely below the level of the surrounding country, encircled by a broad vallum which has an inner slope of easy gradient and no external ditch - bring it into line with those earthworks elsewhere which Mr. A. Hadrian Allcroft believes to have been the sites of the communal meetings of early Iron Age and later peoples, whilst the line of stones surmounting so great a part of the surrounding vallum recalls the larger stone circles. Mr. Allcroft has drawn our attention to Homer's description of the reception given by Alcinoüs to Ulysses at the gate of the city of Scheria, in which are depicted the king and city fathers sitting on the stones of just such a circle, and it may be that we have here in Grassington a work that blends the two types of ancient moots found in our country, namely the larger stone circle to be found in the north and west where stone is plentiful, and the earthen Circus met with in the chalk country where suitable stone is not forthcoming."¹

The distinction between the position of the village and the associated fields is present also in the smaller type of

¹ Antiquity, ii, 171.

village, in which the huts (up to twenty in number) are grouped still closer together, a common wall frequently serving as part of two or three huts. Raistrick wishes further to distinguish them from the larger villages as being "only rarely associated with fields,"¹ but since he admits that field enclosures are present in the vicinity, and that they were used by the village people, the distinction is not a very real one. A more important feature of this smaller type of village is the material used in the construction of the walls. They are entirely of stone, and the blocks are extremely large, being usually roughly dressed, if at all; an average size at Whitcliffe Scar (Swaledale) is 4 feet x 2 feet x 1 foot 6 inches.

The concentration of the residential area was not entirely inspired by sociable motives. The more compact area was more readily defensible against the ravages of beasts or the raids of hostile brigand bands - or perhaps local rivals - upon these more prosperous and respectable farmers. An examination of the many different groups of village sites reveals that in every case there was some area available, rudely defended or defensible, which would afford a rallying-point against any brief and temporary attack. The defences of such enclosures were, it is true, not comparable with those of even a small hill-fort,

¹ YAJ, xxxiv, 119.

but they did afford a temporary shelter against sudden raids. From this generalization must be excepted one important class; it does not apply to those sites associated with cave-residence, as in the Settle district and on Leyburn Shawl. That the exceptions can be thus classified by one common characteristic is, however, in itself a valuable point, indicating that the caves provided a measure of refuge and protection which the purely open sites did not naturally possess.

Such an arrangement must have been necessitated by the rarity of hill-forts throughout Brigantia; not every district had a strong centre such as sheltered the settlers on Ingleborough's slopes, or could, like the inhabitants of Grassington, fall back upon the superb defensive position of Far Gregory. It will later be suggested that the Upper Wensleydale inhabitants made use of Addleborough's strong natural position. The small population which clustered round Kisdon at the head of Swaledale would be insufficient to man any defences there, and it is not surprising that no trace of such exists; but the position of the mountain itself made its summit a sufficiently safe retreat for ordinary purposes.

Where such lofty sites were absent, or too far away, advantage was taken of nearby spurs of land, which were cut

off in rude fashion after the manner of promontory forts, but on a much slighter scale. It seems, indeed, that their primary purpose was the protection of stock hurriedly collected at the threat of a raid. There would be little virtue in the inhabitants taking shelter and permitting the aggressors to drive off their means of livelihood with impunity. It is a general condition of petty hostilities amidst small factions in any age or country that possessions, and not lives, are the most coveted element. The west end of the spur in Cam Houses Pasture (shown as a separate part of the 1750 feet contour in the 1 in. O.S. sheet 20, square F.9), examined by Mr. Chapman and the writer, seemed to have been artificially cut off from the main spur by a broad ditch forming an angle in the middle. The half-acre thus roughly separated, if further enclosed by a timber palisade, would form an admirable fold for the flocks of those people, the remains of whose settlements are here strung along the line of the Bainbridge - Lancaster Roman road.

An identical site in both position and form of defence is to be seen at the eastern extremity of the Nab End settlement, in Wensleydale, where the broad, deep cutting is certainly artificial (Pl. VIII). The area enclosed is slightly smaller than at Cam Houses. Above Redmire, further down the valley, is a similar but still smaller site, around

which the markings of a ditch are visible from the top of the high scar above, though not clearly distinguishable at close quarters. In this case, however, no attempt has been made to cut through the approach from the settlement, which lies 100 yards to the east.

For other villages, particularly those lying immediately under a steep scar, such advantageous positions were not available, and it was therefore considered necessary to strengthen one of the main enclosures in the village, - usually a central one. An instance of this occurs in the native settlement at Preston (between Leyburn and Bolton), below Scarth Nick, and also in the Deepdale village. The best example, however, is at Whitcliffe Scar (Pl. IX, and Figs. 39-40). Here, the central rectangular enclosure, some 80 yards square, shelters beneath the vertical height of the cliff on its north side; from its south edge the ground naturally falls steeply, but additional scarping has taken place, and the edge is further strengthened by a wall of massive boulders. This wall is at present 3 feet thick, but the outer face has crumbled away down the slope. Speight, indeed, remarked that in some places the walls and foundations were from ten to fifteen feet thick.¹ On the east and west sides, the walls are also massive - Speight notes that on the east as 13 feet thick and still

¹ Richmondshire, 400.

5 feet high - and enormous ditches or ravines separate it from the neighbouring enclosures; Speight gives the distance across the eastern ditch as 50 feet. The entrance is on the east side. In the south-east corner of this fortified enclosure are the remains of a fine hut-circle, about 30 feet in diameter, which is built on to the inner face of the main south wall. In other instances, a rectangular shape for hut-dwellings seems to have been adopted, but it never became general. Examples have been observed at Gordale Scar, Malham (Fig. 38), and Park Crag (Weardale).¹

One peculiar and noteworthy feature of the abutment of huts and crofts in this smaller, purely stone built type of village, is the fact that it gave rise to many spaces and narrow passages between the walls; this feature was extended both at Whitcliffe Scar and in the Hukermire (Addleborough) and Nab End (Carperby) settlements, to the existence of galleries or passages within the most massive wall structures. The complex was described by Speight, though his imagination led him to some curious interpretations:- "A curious feature in connection with these archaic enclosures is the fact that a gallery or passage with several apartments has been constructed in the thickness of the walls. One of these remains tolerably

¹ cf. also Park Brow, Sussex (Collingwood, Econ. Survey, 86), where pre-Roman round huts were replaced by small rectangular houses of wattle and daub, with tiled roofs.

perfect and is at the east entrance to the moated enclosure where the wall is 13 feet thick. It is entered from the outside like an Esquimaux dwelling by creeping along a short low passage 3 feet wide, the jambs and lintel of which are still in situ. The apartment entered is of the usual horse-shoe pattern.---- The present depth is 6 feet, but the floor is filled with stones and rubbish, detracting somewhat from the original height. Inside on the left of the passage upon entering is a sitting recess, 30 inches wide, or it may have been used as a pantry or open cupboard for the placing of vessels or cooked meats. A careful examination of the walls disclosed a fine rubbing or grinding stone.---- At the south-eastern angle of this apartment is a rude staircase of two steps connecting a small upper apartment, probably a sleeping-room. It is approached by a low passage 12 inches wide, the roof or lintel of which remains. The external wall at this point is about 7 feet high, and has probably not been much higher, both apartments having been roofed with the branches of trees covered with turf and sods to match the other parts of the wall."¹

The difference in the types of walling in the limestone settlements is not confined to the simple distinction between the earth-and-rubble banks of the Grassington fields, and the purely stone enclosures of the smaller village sites. There

¹ Richmondshire, 91-2.

is always present the regional qualification which necessitated the use of whatever local material was most available; thus at Deepdale, Hukermire (Addleborough), upper Gordale (Malham), and Preston (Wensleydale), in villages of the Grassington type, stone is used much more exclusively than on the latter site. Furthermore, megalithic walls were in use in certain parts of Malhamdale.¹ In certain places, (e.g. Gordale Scar, Malham) the wall consists of a single thickness of undressed stones (Fig. 35). More generally, the wall has a double-facing, which has been filled with rubble. This type is well illustrated in the fields above Redmire (Wensleydale), where the foundation of the facing stones has been preserved, but the intervening rubble has disappeared. Another characteristic form is represented by the large limestone slabs, stood on edge to act as facing stones, of which particular examples have been noted in Malhamdale, Swaledale (Whitcliffe Scar near the Fremington Dyke), and at Cast Hills (Kirby Malzeard) (Figs. 32, 33) and on the slopes of Buckden Pike. But though these general type distinctions are of interest, the art of stone-walling was not sufficiently developed to follow regular forms, and it is well to remember that even on one particular site the character of the work often varied considerably. Speight writes of Whitcliffe Scar that "the stones of the inner

¹ Antiquity, iii, 166.

courses are in many places well-faced and laid on, and display some knowledge of the use of metal tools; in others they are rough and undressed and have been built up anyway."¹

The number of settlements which form typology alone or with the confirmation of finds are to be attributed to the Romano-British period is too large, and their features too similar, to justify individual examinations here. The distribution of the main village sites is shown on the accompanying map, but isolated hutments are too numerous to be shown. Their omission, however, does not invalidate the general distribution picture thus provided.

The occupation of caves, like that of the villages, is for geological reasons chiefly confined to the limestone areas. Furthermore, it is clear that there was a close connection between the two. Fields of Romano-British type are almost invariably associated with an inhabited cave site, and any exceptions are probably apparent, the traces being destroyed by modern activities, rather than real.

The west Yorkshire caves were occupied as early as the Azilian period, and Neolithic and Bronze Age pottery, amongst other finds, carry the occupation down to the Roman period. The Romano-British layer is in all cases the uppermost, thus proving that there has been no subsequent permanent occupation,

¹ Richmondshire, 91-2.

e.g. in the Dark Ages. Coins of Edward I have, however, been found in the caves of the Craven area (Speight, Craven, 254). As Raistrick has remarked,¹ a sheltered platform exists at or near the mouths of the caves which, equally with the interior, is composed of stratified occupation layers. Since this platform usually contains the remains of charcoal hearths, and was evidently used for cooking, it is not surprising to find that much of the pottery comes from this part of each site.

Just as the development of permanent agricultural settlements was characteristic of the later years of the Roman period, so was cave life amongst the Brigantes. In their earlier, nomadic mode of existence, Iron Age or early Roman finds are scarce indeed; and the only instances which can be cited - at Bishop Middleham and Warton Crag - do not show that profuseness of utensils and other material which so characterizes Victoria and Dowkerbottom. Moreover, both of the former lie on the external fringes of Brigantia. In west Yorkshire, the centre of turbulent politics, cave life was not favoured until more peaceful conditions prevailed. Far from being the abode of a fearful refugee population, there can be no question that cave dwelling was a normal feature of rural life, and that with the development of peaceful conditions locally it advanced steadily in favour.

¹ YAJ, xxxiv, 121-2.

The Roman occupation of Britain did not make any immediate impression upon the agricultural methods in use in the north. While Curwen has shown that agriculture was practised to a varying extent all over England in the late Neolithic period and the Bronze Age,¹ on existing evidence we must conclude that the Celtic Brigantes were primarily a nomadic or at least a pastoral tribe, as their mountain origin would lead one to expect. There is no evidence for the pre-Roman occupation of the villages of the Yorkshire dales so far excavated. The tardy improvements effected by the Roman occupation in this sphere were never, indeed, very great. While this was partly due to the exceptionally unruly temper of the native population, it must also be recognised that the Romans were little in advance of the Celtic tribes of Gaul and southern Britain in agricultural technique.

The fact that the fields were actually used for the cultivation of grain is shown by the frequent occurrence of implements connected with this work. A complete iron sickle was found in the Grassington enclosures,² while portions of similar sickles have occurred at Settle. Raistrick states that the type is definitely later than the Early Iron Age sickles of the south, which tends to confirm the presumption that exploitation of arable land did not seriously begin in Brigantia until some time after

¹ Antiquity, i, 261.

² YAJ, xxxiv, 129, and Fig. IV, 6.

the first Roman occupation of that area. Raistrick also believes that a few iron points represent the remains of shoes of foot ploughs or hoes.

Querns, or grain rubbers, usually of the "beehive" type, are a common feature of all sites. More interesting are the grain pits of the type described by Diodorus¹ and Strabo,² evidently used for storage purposes, such as that found in Pennyent Gill in the upper Skirface valley in 1937,³ and paralleled elsewhere, as for example at Park Brow and Cissbury in Sussex.⁴ A few ears of wheat from Upton are preserved in the Settle Museum.

The chiefly pastoral character of Brigantia may be indicated by the fact that Roman garrisons were compelled to cultivate their own fields; at Housesteads, cultivation terraces - both horizontal and up and down the slope - have been identified as Roman.⁵ Moreover, the bronze model of a ploughing team from Piercebridge indicates that in the extensive vicus here agriculture was an important occupation. Perhaps the same conditions existed in the vici of forts elsewhere, before the local population adopted a more settled form of agriculture.

1 V, 21.

2 IV, 201.

3 YAJ, xxxiv, 131, and Fig. I.

4 Arch., lxvi, 1 ff.; Ant. J., xi, 26.

5 AA4, ix, 225-6, xi, 186.

Collingwood has distinguished¹ between the open fields of the villas, each of which was economically an Einzelhof, or isolated farmhouse, and the small enclosed ones of the villages. He has applied to Britain the theory of Marc Bloch² which ascribes the difference between the long narrow strip and the small rectangular enclosure to the use of different types of plough. The caruca, or wheeled plough, was too long to be turned quickly, and hence the ploughman was encouraged to draw a long furrow. The small rectangular plots were made by a short wheelless plough, the aratrum, which, ploughing less deeply and turning more easily on narrow headlands, enabled cross-ploughing in rectangular plots, which would ensure better cultivation. This is the type which is represented on the Piercebridge statuette. The aratrum was probably in common use for a considerable time in Roman Britain before the wheeled plough was introduced. The term caruca, originally meaning a carriage, was not applied to a plough by classical authors; thus Gow has shown³ that it is highly improbable that Vergil's plough was wheeled. Moreover, as Orwin has recently pointed out, "the elder Pliny, writing in the first century A.D., speaks of the addition of wheels to the plough as a

¹ OHE, i, 210-11.

² Les Caractères originaux de l'histoire rurale française, 51-7.

³ Journal of Hellenic Studies, xxxiv, 274.

novelty invented by the Rhaeti, who called the implement plaumoratum (Nat. Hist. xviii, 48). The device, he says, was a recent one, and obviously it had not been adopted by the Romans in his day. Nor do wheels appear as parts of any of the ploughs portrayed on their coins, vases, reliefs, etc."¹ Nor is it correct to emphasize any imagined superiority possessed by the wheeled plough over its wheelless counterpart as regards depth of ploughing. The former has no greater penetrating power than the latter; in fact, the wheelless plough is still in common use on some of the heaviest clay lands in England as well as on the thinner soils. "The advantage of the wheeled plough is not that it can undertake heavier work, but that it enables the ploughman more readily to control the depth of his ploughing."² The provision of wheels was not in itself an essential feature for strip ploughing on the villa estate; any more developed type of aratrum or swing-plough than was commonly used in Britain, equipped with coulter and mould-board, would have been equally efficient. These improvements were, in fact, soon introduced,³ and by the fourth century A.D. a type of aratrum was in use on flat land which could throw the soil into ridges with intervening furrows into which the water could drain.⁴

¹ The Open Fields, 10-14.

² ibid.

³ Varro, Res Rusticae, i, 29, § 2; Pliny, Nat. Hist., xviii, § 180.

⁴ Palladius, De Agricultura, i, 42.

For the rocky soils of the Pennines, however, the most primitive type of aratrum was often all that was required, or indeed effective. Similar types, which merely scratch the soil, producing a few inches of fine mould upon which the corn seed was broadcast, are still in use on similar land - instance the caschrom in Skye, and an Arab plough of the present day.¹ To physiographical as well as political conditions must be ascribed much of the responsibility for the overwhelming predominance of village as opposed to villa agricultural economy.

As to the question of the ownership of village land, one can only conjecture. There is no general indication of social distinction within each village, though Collingwood fancies he detects some such indications with a petty chief inhabiting the largest hut in the village, at Ewe Close in Westmorland.² It is possible that a stretch of communal land was divided into small fields and parcelled out among the villagers, on lines resembling the medieval open-field system; but of the method of allotment we know nothing.

The scarcity of villas in the north meant that agricultural development was very restricted. The villagers lacked the accumulation of capital which was so necessary for the introduction of reforms. Following the Roman occupation, too, it is unlikely that any settled communities which may have

¹ Orwin, op cit., Plates 5 and 6.

² Economic Survey, 87; CW², xxxiii, 202.

existed would continue to be property-owners; they probably became coloni, their lands being confiscated as part of the imperial estates, or perhaps, in the more civilised regions, absorbed in the estates of villa-owners. The personal condition of the natives became increasingly servile, resembling that of the serfs in the Middle Ages.¹ This loss of economic freedom must have been even more irksome than the loss of political liberty, and it helps to explain the persistence of Brigantian revolts in spite of continued failures. But personal servitude meant decreased opportunities for revolt, which eventually ceased altogether. The more fortunate and influential tribesmen doubtless retained or acquired villas for themselves, in which a considerably greater degree of romanisation than in the villages is evident. Others stayed in the towns and gradually fell in completely with Roman ways of living. It was probably these growing differences in economic status and culture which did most to snap the bonds which had united the Brigantian tribe in resistance to foreign invasion, and made class distinctions eventually appear more important than those of race.

¹ Rostoftzeff (Social & Economic History, 209, 212) says that Britain was not a land 'of peasants and small proprietors.'

(v) Native Strongholds and Dykes.

"Diverse hilletes cast up by hand, and many diches ---
Thes dikes and hilles were a campe of men of warre,
except men might think they were of ruins of some old
towne." - Leland, iv, 27.

IN view of the reputation of the Brigantes as a warrior tribe, the subject of their military fortifications is of particular interest. The striking feature resulting from a perusal of previous commentaries on the subject is the apparent absence of such evidences of warlike propensities. When Elgee states¹ that "the most outstanding field antiquity of the Early Iron Age in Southern England, the more or less circular or oval hill-fort, is rare in Yorkshire," there is no dissentient voice. Yet the density of a native population is frequently judged by the number of these earthworks; thus the density of hill-forts in the Lothians has been taken to indicate a concentration of population in the region of Dere Street,² while on the other hand Willoughby Gardner remarks that the lack of such fortifications testifies to the sparsity of population in west Lancashire in the Iron Age and Roman periods.³

Examined from a more particular point of view, the same results occur. South-west Britain is thickly distributed with hill-forts whose chief common characteristic

¹ Arch. Yorks., 117.

² Ant. J., xiii, 8-12.

³ VCH Lancs., ii, 514.

is the inturned entrance. These reach north-eastwards into Shropshire and Cheshire, while in Southern Scotland the type recurs in profusion. But of these forts with inturned entrances, which have been proved to be, in the south-west, linked with the Iron Age B culture, none is marked on Miss Chitty's map as identified in any of the six Northern Counties.¹ In certain parts of this area, such absence is explicable. Strong hill-forts of the type of Titterston Clee, St. Catherine's Hill (Winchester), and Maiden Castle (Bickerton) are a sign of a developed tribal organisation. From other evidence, we know that Cumberland, Westmorland and Lancashire north of the Sands formed a regional backwater which had not arrived at this stage of development.² North-east Yorkshire (or, to adopt Elgee's convenient appellation, Blackamore), was in like condition.³ The remainder of east Yorkshire, occupied by the Parisii, was well acquainted with Iron Age B culture, which had reached an advanced stage of development there; but the Parisii were a small and peaceful people who appear to have concentrated on economic improvements rather than on political rivalry with other tribes. Indeed, occupying as they did the fertile ground of Holderness and Pickering, and cut off from their western neighbours by the natural barrier of the Vale of York swamps, there was little

¹ Fig. 2.

² pp. 123-6.

³ pp. 132-3.

incitement to indulge in militant pursuits.

The Brigantes, however, were in different case. Ethnically part of the complex Late Bronze Age exodus from Central Europe, this had not prevented them from absorbing some of the later influences of the Iron Age which came to Britain. No doubt these contacts, evidenced by the adoption of a currency based on that of the south-eastern counties, and occasional finds such as the chariot-burial and associated material at Stanwick, and the Celtic hoard at Fremington Hagg, furnished a stimulus to the development of Brigantian tribal organisation. It is therefore clear that the Brigantes were acquainted with the Iron Age peoples and their methods of living. When, in addition, these forts of similar type are found in Scotland, it must be assumed that the Brigantes were aware of this form of more advanced military technique, and would adopt it if occasion warranted.

At this point it is necessary to review the evidence furnished by field-work, before attempting to relate it to the historical situation. The blankness of Miss Chitty's map is not quite preserved, for the western entrance to the hill-fort of Ingleborough closely resembles the simplest type of the classified list of inturned entrances published in the report on excavations at St. Catherine's Hill,

Winchester. Furthermore, the oval hill-fort of Wincobank, which is associated with the formidable and extensive 'Roman Rig' in south Yorkshire, undoubtedly has an outturned entrance to its north-east side (Fig. 15). None of this type is figured elsewhere in England, but Miss Chitty marks four in the Lowlands of Scotland. This illustration of a connection of the military engineering methods of the Brigantes with those of the Lowland tribes is especially interesting when Venutius' alliance with a northern people is recalled.¹

Elsewhere in Brigantia, however, generally speaking the hill-forts are of a much cruder type. Exceptions must be made to such a generalisation; later occupation adaptation of the defences of certain sites, such as Almondbury (Figs. 8-10), has rendered observation of such principles impossible without the aid of excavation, and in this connection the forthcoming excavations on Castle Hill are of particular interest. Stanwick, too, if its Iron Age character be admitted, is an oppidum on a scale quite distinctive and exceptional in the north, being paralleled rather by the Belgic sites of Verulamium and Maiden Castle (Dorset) than by the more purely military defensive hill-forts of the south-west. Perhaps, too, the slight tendency to an inward curve on the south side of Far Gregory, near

¹ p.45 ff.

Grassington, may indicate an Iron Age B influence.

Against this, must be noted the definitely simple forms of entrance - merely a break in the defences - on imposing sites like Castercliff (Colne) and Gayles (North Yorks), whose attribution to our period is, however, much less certain.

The modified evidence is, nevertheless, perfectly consistent with the historical development of Brigantia. In the first place, it must be insisted that the number of hill-forts in a given area is by no means a reliable index to the population of that area; what it does indicate is the extent to which that population is sub-divided into groups who fear the attacks of neighbouring people. Where tribal organisation is on a large scale, the expectation is rather of a comparatively few forts, evenly distributed for the protection of each district, but each of them on a large scale. The Brigantes are stated by Tacitus to have been 'the most populous tribe in the whole of Britain';¹ and though his statement may not be literally accurate, their extent, at least, is confirmed by Ptolemy,² and their power is indicated by the influence they exerted on Roman policy before Vespasian,³ and the stout resistance put up to Cerialis' war of conquest.⁴ The indications are, then,

1 Agric., xvii

2 p.53

3 p.117

4 Agric., xvii

that the powerful Brigantes would have little need of a large number of hill-forts, elaborately defended, such as were necessary to smaller tribes who were in constant close contact with other militarist peoples.

Early Brigantian relations with Rome indicate that this tribe had, in fact, few direct connections with the southwest. There was no attempt at an alliance with any of the tribes to the south, or in Wales, against the Romans. Brigantia acted throughout independently. Some cultural contact with Iron Age B races was inevitable, but its paucity is confirmed by this aloofness. Brigantia's connection with the northern tribes was much more intimate, and incidentally supplies a further argument for regarding the Brigantes as an earlier immigrant people than the Parisii. The parallel between Wincobank's outturned entrance and those of the Lowlands of Scotland, indicating a common engineering technique (or perhaps the constructional design was imported by those allies who helped to guard the frontier against Cerialis), is confirmed by the literary record of Venutius' northern alliance. It is not unreasonable to suppose that together they preyed on the weaker Lowland tribes who (significantly) offered no opposition to the initial Roman occupation, and later regarded Rome in the light of a protector. While Brigantia was too large to be attacked

with impunity by the smaller tribes who had pushed their way to her southern frontier, that state in turn must have preferred to confine its activities to the exploitation of more backward peoples whose military technique was not nearly so advanced.

Brigantia thus never experienced the necessity of adopting more advanced methods of fort-building until it was too late. Cartimandua's policy of conciliation with Rome enhanced the feeling of security for a time. The indications of more advanced ideas revealed at Ingleborough and Wincobank may perhaps best be ascribed to the later period under the undivided sovereignty of Venutius; but until Cerialis' swift and unexpected onslaught, the initiative lay with the Brigantes, and the necessity for highly-developed defences on the more northerly sites must have seemed remote.

So far as can be judged, lacking adequate evidence from excavation, Ingleborough is the only hill-fort known to have been permanently occupied. Perhaps this exception may be due to its felicitous state of preservation; but it is significant that it is also the only site revealing, in its elaborate stone wall (Pl. IV) and inturned entrance, advanced ideas of defence. If it were indeed the Rigodunum of the Brigantes, the royal residence would go far to explain its exceptional features, and it is reasonable to expect the

excavations at Almondbury, which has yielded a hoard of Brigantian coins, to produce remains of a similar character. Generally speaking, however, Brigantian forts were constructed for a temporary defensive purpose, as Raistrick's explorations on Far Gregory have indicated. No pottery finds, and no definite remains of hut-foundations have come to light on the earthworks of Warton Crag, Castercliff, or Addleborough, though all have characteristics which provisionally favour an Iron Age date of construction. Indeed, the existence of such sites in close relation to known areas of native settlement is an outstanding feature of those districts within Brigantian territory with which the writer is most intimately acquainted. This connection has already been discussed from another angle;¹ but it is important to emphasize it here, because it shows that while the Brigantes were not sufficiently assured of peace to live entirely unprotected, the refuge which may occasionally have been sought in a better defensive position than was occupied by their normal dwelling-places was never of long duration. During the Roman period of occupation, of course, fortification of such positions would be forbidden; but the negative evidence indicates that, unlike Ingleborough and the hill-forts of Wales and the Marches, with most Brigantian fortresses previous permanent occupation was also unknown.

¹ p. 277.

This strategic relationship between sites of natural defensive position and native settlements is extremely valuable, for it supplies that presumption of an identical period of use which even excavation might fail to produce on a site not permanently occupied. The connection is equally valuable in other respects, for it may well afford a clue to the date and purpose of some of the linear intrenchments in the area.

In one case, at least, the relationship of the intrenchment to a native settlement is direct. At Park Rash, near Kettlewell; a plateau of well-drained land, which still retains patches of short turf against the encroachment of heather, is protected on the south side by a rampart which runs for about a mile along the edge of a natural sharp declivity (Fig. 17). At the foot of the latter, the earth has been cleared out to form a rough ditch some 15-30 feet broad, with a counterscarping bank (Figs. 18-19). The significant feature is the presence of the remains of a dozen hut-circles visible in one sector just behind the protecting rampart; furthermore, the huts are associated with small rectangular enclosures. Typologically, both the hutment foundations and the adjacent fields are similar to those hut-and-croft settlements distinguished elsewhere in west Yorkshire whose date has been established by

excavation.¹ The plateau is here protected on one side only, which indicates that defence against a planned attack which might exploit other avenues of approach was not considered necessary.

In Swaledale a double line of intrenchment appears to have guarded the eastern approach to the valley (Pl. V) At Fremington, just west of which place the mouth of Arkengarthdale gives access to the north, a univallate rampart, with a ditch on the east, is still traceable covering the valley at its narrowest and most defensible point (Fig. 25). At High Fremington the dyke is definitely associated with a native settlement of typical Celtic form (Figs. 26-8). About a quarter of a mile behind it, to the west, a similar dyke runs down Harkerside towards the river (Fig. 22), and the line can be picked up again North of the Arkle. This dyke, which the accompanying plan shows to be related to the more easterly line, is particularly noteworthy because it forms a continuation of an intrenchment along the east side of Harker Hill which bears a striking resemblance to that at Park Rash. There are, it is true, no visible remains of occupation on Harker Top as at Park Rash. It is, however, significant that this flat hill-top, guarded on the south side by a natural ghyll, commands the earthwork of Maiden Castle which lies on the slope of Harkerside but

¹ p.270 ff.

300 yards behind (i.e. to the west of) the dyke which runs down from the east face of Harker. If Speight's statement is correct, its Roman or (probably) pre-Roman origin obtains some confirmation from the fact that "Mr. G. A. Robinson, of Reeth, had a Roman coin (now in the York Museum) which was picked out of the soil of this intrenchment where it crosses Fremington Edge."¹ Furthermore, Whitaker records that four brass celts were dug up near it in or about 1785, apparently (from the O.S. 6 in. map) where the earthwork runs past Draycott Hall. Further evidence of native occupation is provided by the Whitaside enclosure,² also protected by these intrenchments, and certainly by the highly interesting Celtic hoard of fibulae, harness, and other unidentified pieces recorded from Fremington.³ Furthermore, arrow-heads and a "stone plough" are in Darlington Museum, found here and presented by Mr. Tom Ward.⁴ The two fortified mounds on the north bank of the Swale, quarter inch east of the first long dyke, cannot be assumed to have any connection with these defences; recent excavation revealed only evidence of medieval occupation.⁵

Eleven miles east of the Swaledale intrenchments runs Scots Dyke, whose significance would appear to be dependent

¹ Richmondshire, 222.

² p. 614-7.

³ p. 409-10.

⁴ Pontefract, Swaledale, 153.

⁵ Appendix B, s.v.

upon the interpretation assigned to the Stanwick earthworks, with which it seems to be beyond reasonable doubt associated (Pl. VI). This connection is clear from MacLauchlan's map, the result of a careful survey of the remains as they existed 90 years ago. Attempts to identify Scots Dyke as a continuation of the Catrail of the Lowlands, and Black Dyke of Northumberland,¹ are too conjectural to merit further consideration.

Stanwick itself, covering an area of some 800 acres, is such a formidable enclosure (Figs. 11-12) that the great implications of accepting it as representing a Brigantian oppidum have tempted several antiquaries to evade that responsibility by seeking an alternative explanation of its purpose. Elgee's suggestion that it is a medieval deer-park must be summarily discounted. Even disregarding the remains associated with the enclosure, the Norse derivation of the name Stanwick ('Stone walls') and the nearby 'Aldborough',² which most probably refer to the earthworks, render a medieval origin highly unlikely.

If a military purpose can be assumed, the immense extent of rampart to be defended betokens tribal conditions, and that on a large scale.

Much has been made of the fact that the late Celtic

¹ e.g. Wooler, PSAN³, ii, 64-76; and Clarkson, Richmond, 344-5

² PNNRY, 296-7

hoard of armour and horse-trappings, possibly the remains of a chariot-burial,¹ occurred (according to Maclauchlan) outside the ramparts. The presumed association with the enceinte does not, however, appear to be greatly affected thereby. Other and less famous finds are equally significant. MacLauchlan records "a bronze spiral armilla, part of a fibula found near the church, and two or three celts; the two former objects are probably late Roman, the latter British."² The present whereabouts of these finds is unknown; but Late Bronze Age weapons are still preserved which are known to come from within the ramparts,³ and thus afford valuable confirmation of the presumption of Brigantian occupation there.

On the other hand, there is also a good case for assuming that Stanwick and Scots Dyke were in use in the Dark Ages. A bronze buckle of Dark Ages or pagan Saxon date from Stanwick is in the British Museum.⁴ Catraeth, that northern kingdom of the Dark Ages, has usually been identified with Catterick, and boundary dykes of this period are common.

There is, then, some evidence for the connection of Stanwick with two distinct periods of occupation; and this presumption is in fact borne out by an examination of the defences. At two points in particular - on the south side,

¹ Appendix A, s.v.

² Arch. J., vi, 337-9.

³ p. 503.

⁴ Ant. J., xi, 128.

and around Henah Hill on the north east - a duplication of the rampart seems certain, while further complications appear to be associated with the pre-Norman church and the circular walled churchyard. Naturally, final proof is impossible without excavation; but the available evidence seems to justify the tentative assumption of a first Brigantian foundation, followed (whether or not separated by a long desertion in the Roman period) by a reoccupation and adaption of the defences in the Dark Ages. This explanation leaves open the date of construction of Scots Dyke, which may quite well have been built to incorporate in its line of defence the earthworks already in existence at Stanwick.

Roman Rig, the great rampart which is traceable, with intermissions, between Wincobank and Mexborough in south Yorkshire, is also associated with a possible Brigantian fortress. Excavation at Wincobank (Figs. 15-16) has established its pre-Roman origin, if nothing more definite;¹ and while the absence of evidence for permanent occupation is consistent with previous observations on this subject, the presence of an outturned entrance may well indicate Brigantian adaptation of the site, if not original construction by them.² The line of the Rig is admirably suited for defence against the south-east; it keeps on

¹ Appendix A, s. v.

² ibid.

the north side of the Don valley, on the opposite side of which river was the Roman fort of Templebrough, whose early establishment independently suggests that it should be interpreted as an outpost on the Brigantian frontier.¹

¹ p. 161-2.

(vi) Industry and Trade.

THE most important industrial product of the northern Pennines in the Roman period was undoubtedly lead. Lead mining is definitely attested north of the non-tribal Derbyshire region as early as the seventh consulship of Domitian, whose stamp occurs on a pig of lead from the Greenhow Hill mines of Nidderdale, evidently lost on Hayshaw Moor in the process of transportation to the capital at Aldborough, and perhaps thence for export from Brough-on-Humber. Between Grassington and Pateley Bridge - in the same locality - a later pig of Trajan is recorded.¹ Further north, at Hurst in Swaledale, the mines were being worked under Hadrian, for a pig bearing the inscription ADRIAN was found when miners broke through into old workings "exactly similar to those of the Roman mines at Golgofau, near Lampeter, South Wales, and at Shelve, Shropshire."² Moreover, as Raistrick has pointed out,³ the name of the 'Auld Gang' mines between Swaledale and Arkengarthdale indicates that to the Saxon or Anglian settlers in the sixth and seventh centuries, this group of mines was already old.

The two main Brigantian mining centres appear to have enjoyed a particular importance. Largely because of the

¹ Newcomen Soc. Trans., vii, 81.

² ibid. (Raistrick).

³ ibid.

abundance of the ore, Roman mining rarely progressed beyond 'open-cast' working; the elder Pliny, indeed, stated that British lead was so plentiful that some restriction of production had to be enforced;¹ possibly it was thought necessary to restrict the production of silver, which might otherwise flood the market and cause disastrous inflation. No doubt much of this work went on in the Pennines in addition to the main centres of the industry. The practice of driving levels or adits was only occasionally pursued, and no instances of timbering are known from Britain. At Shelve, in Shropshire, however, the trenches following the veins reached a considerable depth, up to 50 feet, and it is evident that the same plan was pursued in Swaledale. The old working in which the pig of lead was found was probably a true adit, as was the Jackass Mine at Greenhow Hill;² and the rarity of this development clearly emphasizes the importance of these sites as productive centres. At Grassington, on the other hand, the known workings were all shallow; the period is well attested by the Samian ware in the accompanying debris. At both Greenhow Hill and Hurst, as well as at Shelve and the Mendips, oak spades or shovels have been found which were used in loading the

¹ Nat. Hist., XXXIV, xvii, 164.

² Newcomen Soc. Trans., vii, 83.

ore into baskets which were then taken away for washing and smelting.¹ The Greenhow Hill spade is now in the Craven Museum at Settle.²

'Hushing' has throughout several centuries been the common method of obtaining lead ores from surface deposits in Swaledale; and it is probable that the same method would be practised by the Romans, if not introduced by them. Pliny³ gives a description of very similar methods, involving the damming up and sudden release of water, and the physio-graphical conditions there described correspond closely to those of the Yorkshire dales. In particular, the method is economical, and is used extensively over areas permeated by a number of poor veins.

While desilverization was unknown in Britain before the Roman period, this was evidently one of the chief objects of Roman exploitation.⁴ The process adopted was that of cupellation.

Comparing the weight of the Roman pigs with those of the present day, approximately 176 $\frac{1}{4}$ lbs., Raistrick considers that the proportions indicate "an unbroken tradition from the Roman occupation to the present day:"⁵ thus the Hayshaw Moor pigs were approximately 175 lbs., and those from Greenhow and Hurst 85 and 170 lbs. respectively.

¹ Whittick, Newcomen Soc. Trans., xii, 59.

² Appendix A, s.v.

³ loc. cit.

⁴ Whittick, ibid., 73.

⁵ Newcomen Soc. Trans., vii, 82.

It seems clear from the epigraphic evidence of the pigs of lead that the organisation of lead mining in Brigantia, as opposed to that in Derbyshire, was directly controlled by the state. There is no indication of the practice of sub-letting or contracting in the northern groups of mines. The division appears to fall between the Brigantian tribal area and the non-tribal area of Brough; but any political or administrative reason for this is not readily apparent. Perhaps the distinction lapsed after the first half of the second century when imperial stamps on pigs of lead cease to appear. Small producers would scarcely go to the additional trouble and expense of having each product stamped with their own name. It is easier to ascribe this absence of evidence to the cessation of state control than to the general abandonment of lead mining throughout this extensive area.

The mining of iron does not appear to have been officially organized, probably on account of its plentiful supply nearer Rome, noticed by Pliny.¹ The auxiliary regiments probably worked sufficient for their own needs, as with lead mining and other industries; the garrisons of forts must frequently have been almost self-sufficing.² In some areas, at least, the work was thoroughly organized

¹ loc. cit.

² cf. e.g., May, Templebrough, 55-8. On the subject of associated fields and food supply, cf. Collingwood, Econ. Survey, 64-5.

and the products went to a central station for redistribution. Brough, in Westmorland, acted as such a depot, and amongst the consignments it received were lead and (probably) silver from Whitley Castle.¹ But the great resources of the north were never seriously exploited, the British industry concentrating in the Weald and the Forest of Dean.

Coal was certainly known to the Romans, and was stored in several forts, milecastle and turrets along the Wall - notably at Housesteads, where "nearly a cart load" was found in the south guard-chamber of the east gate,² and at South Shields.³ It was occasionally used in mining operations.⁴ The abundance of wood fuel, however, rendered the demand for coal of an exceptional rather than a general character, and there is no definite evidence that its exploitation assumed any development beyond the use of outcrops, though a Roman date has been assumed for some old shafts at Benwell.⁵

Many of the peasants were doubtless pressed into service to assist in the working of the lead and iron mines throughout Brigantia. Calgacus' speech affords a striking reference to the early incidence of this sort of forced labour.⁶ Conditions varied throughout the Empire, but in some of the worst cases the labourers, whether condemned criminals, slaves,

¹ Richmond, CW², xxxvi, 104-16.

² Bruce, Guide to the Roman Wall (1863), 119.

³ Arch., xlvi, 170.

⁴ Whittick, Newcomen Soc. Trans., xii, 62.

⁵ Horsley, BR., 209; Bruce, Roman Wall (ed. 1867), 118.

⁶ Agric., xxx-xxxii.

or local peasants, were lodged underground and had to live and work in fetters.¹

During the early part of the Roman occupation, at any rate, mining was officially controlled and most of the north was probably in military hands. The bronze-working industry was more localized; it must have been very common and have existed in most towns of any size. In Brigantia proper there is no important manufacturing site, but on its outer fringes brooch-making certainly developed in the settlements around the forts of Brough-under-Stainmore,² Kirkby Thore,³ and Stanwix,⁴ near Carlisle. This occupation is particularly interesting because it was one of the chief means whereby Celtic art was able to give itself expression and so survive, though much corrupted by Roman influence and the attempt to combine two fundamentally different conceptions of art and design. Individual types continued to flourish until the middle of the second century, but subsequently it becomes increasingly difficult to differentiate between bronzes of the same common type all over the country. As the Brigantes gradually cease to be politically distinctive, this submergence of individuality is reflected in the development of their art.

Internal trade in Roman Britain was at first chiefly carried on in the forum of the nearest town. But in the

¹ Davies, Roman Mines in Europe, 14 ff.

² CW², xxxi, 81 ff.

³ RCHM Westmorland, 145; Arch., xxxi, 279-88.

⁴ CW², xxxi, 69 ff; Ant. J., xi, 37.

country, and particularly in the north where communications were so difficult, there must have been small local markets where people could meet and exchange their goods.¹ Only by some such explanation can one account, for example, for the diffusion of Samian ware throughout the native villages. Following the partial decay of the towns in the third century, though the countryside became more prosperous than ever, the need for such periodical meetings would greatly increase; and it is likely that some of our old fairs were in existence and used for this purpose in Roman times. Collingwood, for instance, remarks: "A German scholar [Drexel] has pointed out that old-established fairs of the present day are often, in his own country, held on sites which have been used in the same way ever since Roman times; and it is tempting to conjecture that Stagshaw Bank Fair, held on Dere Street just south of the Wall, is the lineal successor of the market where traders from the unconquered north sold the goods that they had brought past the customs-house at Portgate."² In Roman times, the fairs were probably held near some military station so that an eye could be kept open to prevent suspicious conferences being held which might lead to a rising. Brough Hill Fair, held near the fort of Brough-under-Stainmore, and Askrigg Hill Fair, near the fort of Bainbridge in Wensleydale, are examples of time-

¹ cf. such a site at Woodeaton, (Oxon.), JRS, xxi, 101-9.

² OHE, i, 245.

honoured fairs fulfilling this qualification which spring to mind. Brough Hill Fair is still held in the September of each year. On the subject of its antecedents, John Hodgson's remarks may be of particular significance: "all kinds of merchandise are brought to it, and a prodigious quantity of cattle, horses and sheep ... In casting up the new turnpike road over Brough-hill, were found in a direct line, and at equal distance, three secures, or hatches of the ancient brass."¹ In the Roman period, moreover, Brough was certainly a highly important official traffic centre.² Bainbridge, too, was the obvious focal point for the commerce of the north Yorkshire dales.³ Many fairs probably had a pagan origin which began with religious rites connected with the worship of the dead in the Bronze Age; later, games came to be associated with the religious ceremonial, and finally trade was introduced. With the coming of Christianity the religious element faded out, leaving us with trade and games - a phase well represented in English medieval fairs. Now the business side has practically disappeared - though Brough Hill Fair and Stagshaw Bank Fair, Portgate, are notable exceptions to this, and so was Askrigg until its abandonment at the end of last century - and we are left with the merry-go-rounds of the present day. Perhaps it is only the really

¹ Westmorland, vol. xv, Beauties of England and Wales, pt.ii.

² CW², xxxvi, 104-16 (Richmond).

³ p. 243-5.

ancient fairs which have retained the business element to any great extent.

The fact of these fairs being held on hills is extremely interesting; prehistoric trackways frequently meet on a hill where Bronze Age burials often took place. St. Ann's Hill, Wiltshire, where the Tan Hill Fair is held, is a case in point.¹ Thus there is a connection between the place where ceremonial rites for the dead were held, and the most convenient meeting-place for trade, at the junction of the communicating roads from all parts of the district. The preservation of the word 'hill' in the names of Brough Hill Fair and Askrigg Hill Fair, therefore, each the most renowned fair in its district, argues strongly in favour of their pagan origin.

Though many fairs must have originated in connection with the celebration of Christian festivals, it thus appears likely that the institution itself cannot be said to have a purely Christian origin, as some writers have argued, but dates back to pagan times, probably the Bronze Age, and was in great demand during the Roman occupation.

But in between the periodical fairs there was still scope for trade in this wild hill-country, and the occasional requirements of daily life were satisfied by travelling tinkers who went pack on back from village to village and

¹ Dexter, The Pagan Origin of Fairs, 20, § 30.

town to town living from hand to mouth on the small profits gained in each day's journeying. At Andover in Hampshire has been found a hoard of broken fragments of swords and spearheads, which must have fallen from the pack of some wandering pedlar as he floundered through the marshes of a stream at exactly the point where it is crossed by an undoubted ancient trade-route.¹ The pottery trade may also have relied considerably upon this method of distribution.²

The external trade can scarcely have been as great as the internal, though many of the products of Brigantian mines were undoubtedly exported in the Roman period. There may also have been some external trade between the Brigantian kingdom and the Continent during the former's independence; but in general, Brigantian culture was a gradual internal development, and it is therefore probable that commerce shared the same limitations. The Brigantian coinage, for instance, was copied from the issues of the Eastern Counties; there would therefore appear to have been comparatively little direct commercial contact with Gaul.

On the whole, the economic life of the Brigantes, both before and during the Roman period, must have been characterised by the primitive element to a very great extent, though at Aldborough and in the more accessible regions

¹ Crawford, Man and his Past, 144-5.

² Sumner, New Forest Pottery Sites, 82.

of the countryside, Roman influence produced a considerable improvement in the degree of civilisation of the native people. In many places, even amongst the hills of the Pennines, the discovery of mineral wealth meant the exploitation of those districts to an extent which can scarcely have been surpassed until the Industrial Revolution of modern times. In this sense, though the pastoral or agricultural life of the native inhabitants was never seriously altered by Roman exploitation, Brigantia gave indication of its potential development into "the Industrial North" of the distant future.

VII. ART, LANGUAGE, RELIGION.

(i) Art.¹

IN the sphere of art, Celtic craftsmanship was undoubtedly vigorous and active. The chief feature was the concentration on beauty of line and design for its own sake. It was seen at its best in the engraved bronze mirrors of which the best examples come from Birdlip and Desborough. Celtic art was abstract, Roman Imperial art naturalistic. The coming of Rome unfortunately meant that an attempt was made to combine Celtic style with classical motives, which resulted in failure. In the Highland zone the effect of romanization was not seriously felt for some time; moreover, the Celtic north had developed a style of its own, less delicate and more vigorous than that of the south. Collingwood says that "in Brigantia and in Scotland Celtic art is more like modelling and less like draughtsmanship; forms are plump and solid, recalling those of early La Tène work on the Continent; and it is thanks to the heritage of what Lees has called the northern 'boss' style that the bronze-workers of those parts made, in the early second century, so many brooches distinguished at once for solidity and elegance, and the greatest genius of them all, applying La Tène

¹ cf. Leeds, Celtic Ornament; Haverfield, Romanization of Roman Britain, 67-73; Collingwood, in OHE, 1, 247-60; and in Arch., lxxx, 37-58 (Romano-Celtic Art in Northumbria).

patterns to a Roman type of brooch, produced at some time not later than the first century what Sir Arthur Evans once called 'the most fantastically beautiful creation that has come down to us from antiquity,' the gold fibula found at the Roman fort of Aesica."¹

But the La Tène tradition, even in Brigantia, could not survive the degrading effect of the ill-fated union with Roman ideas of art. Here and there in the second century some unconventional treatment of a conventional Roman motive reveals the triumph of Celtic artistic spirit over difficulties; but these instances are rare. Only in the decoration of brooches, found principally in Northumberland and Westmorland is there a continuous tradition behind the facade of romanization. To the layman, at any rate, Romano-Celtic art, which was localised, according to Kendrick and Hawkes,² in Brigantia, was with a few outstanding exceptions definitely second and sometimes third class. It is indicative of the demoralizing effect of Roman influence that not until after the Roman period did Celtic art begin to revive; yet though the Celtic craftsman has in the meantime forgotten much of real value, "he has preserved intact the ideal of a symbolic art, and is able at last to begin again the task of realising it."³

¹ OHE, i, 257.

² Archaeology in England and Wales, 276-7.

³ Collingwood, OHE, i, 260.

(ii) Language.

The Brigantes were certainly a Celtic race. This is evident both from their own name and from the place-names which they bestowed. Some of the most important have been preserved by Ptolemy.¹ Apart from these, in the North Riding there survive British names such as Alne and Leeming - old river names; Crayke - referring to the precipice on which the village was built; Dinnand and Penhill - names of hills; while Catterick is the only surviving name of a British inhabited settlement in the North Riding.² From Lancashire³ may be quoted Colne, a British river-name; Werneth, identical with the Gaulish Vernetum, derived from verno-: 'alder.' Walton (as in Walton-le-Dale) signifies the tun of the Britons; and several other examples could be adduced. Their distribution affords some indication of the chief centres where the British population survived during the Anglian invasions; one such area (Alt, Chadderton, Hanging Chadder, Glodwick, Werneth, and the stream-names Beal, Irk and Tame) must have been the hilly district east and south-east of Manchester.

Both Peake⁴ and Elgee⁵ advance a strong case for the

¹ p.114.

² Smith, PNNRY, s.v.

³ Ekwall, PNL, s.v.

⁴ The Bronze Age and the Celtic World.

⁵ Early Man, 225.

belief that the language of the Brigantes was at one time Gaelic. The Brigantes were Late Bronze Age invaders who also established a branch in south-east Ireland; and since no British or P language was known in Ireland, Elgee argues that the original invaders of Britain as well as Ireland must have been Gaelic Celts. But those British place-names which have survived the wholesale substitution of Saxon and Danish names in the north show clearly that in later times, probably during the Roman occupation, they were speaking British. The change, it is suggested, must have been brought about at the same time as La Tene culture was gradually assimilated from the more recently-arrived British speaking Parisii in the early Iron Age: "Such language changes are familiar in history, and as the differences between Gaelic and British are so small, the transition from one to the other would have been easy, especially as British sprang out of an ancient Q language."¹

Elgee points to the survival of the Gaelic name Calaton (or Galacum), which he believes may be identified with Lancaster, as an indication that Gaelic elements survived in north-west Lancashire - a region far removed from British influence - in the second century A.D. This, however, is the only example of a Gaelic place-name definitely dateable to Roman times, because of the difficulty of distinguishing

¹ ibid.

others introduced by the Gaelic-Scandinavians. Moreover, as the language changed, so might place-names equally well become British under the influence of later British-speaking inhabitants.

The theory is an attractive one, and may well represent a fairly accurate picture of the actual state of affairs. It is weakened, however, by the tendency of recent research to discount altogether the supposed P and Q distinction between the two forms of the Celtic tongue. The truth as to whether such a change of language did take place will probably never be known. What does appear certain, from the evidence of surviving place-names, is that during the final centuries of the Brigantian occupation of the north, the British tongue was generally spoken.

(iii) Religion.¹

The Romans interfered with the economic life of their subject peoples to a very great extent; and consequently it comes in the nature of a surprise to observe the tolerance with which they regarded native religious beliefs, and even adopted them themselves. The official cult of the Romans was, of course, the worship of the Emperor, which served to develop a spirit of loyalty. But until she embraced Christianity, Rome was devoid of real reverence for anything

¹ cf. Collingwood, OHE, i, 261-73.

which laid claim to divinity and she paid lip-service, through her soldiers, to hundreds of petty local deities all over the world. Having no spiritual convictions of her own, she treated all religious beliefs from a purely contractual point of view; if to tolerate or even encourage the cult of some local unimportant god would conciliate the native population, she was prepared to do so without reserve; if, on the other hand, a religion was so powerful as to have political influences which were hostile to the Roman power, then it was ruthlessly and mercilessly stamped out. Thus Druidism was one of the strongest of the forces behind the spirited opposition to Rome both in Gaul and Britain; secret society methods are harmful to the authority of any organised form of government; and realising that its continued existence could not be reconciled with the Roman imperium which it defied, Rome suppressed it harshly and thoroughly. The necessity for the complete extirpation of Druidism was a powerful motive prompting the invasion of Britain, its real home; and it will be noted that Suetonius Paulinus hastened to attack the Isle of Anglesey, its last retreat, as soon as he possibly could; so eager was he, indeed, that he was almost cut off and the Roman power annihilated in the Boudiccan revolt of A.D. 61. Agricola's first care, too, on arriving in Britain, was to complete the conquest of the

Isle of Anglesey.¹

The object of the religious devotions of the Brigantes, troublesome though these people were, evidently did not come within the same category as Druidism. The cult of Brigantia was actually adopted by both the soldiery and other Roman officials of high standing;² and the worship extended throughout the military region of Hadrian's Wall, as the distribution of altars to the goddess shows.

The Birrens altar, with its winged and armed female figure, is the only realistic interpretation of the goddess that we possess, for the sculptured figures on the Corbridge altar do not appear to have any special reference to Brigantia, who is only one of three objects of the dedication. The inscription reads: "To eternal Jupiter Dolichenus and to celestial Brigantia and to Health [or possibly Safety], Gaius Julius Apolinaris, centurion of the sixth legion, dedicates (this altar) as bidden (by the gods)." The word Caelestis probably merely means 'celestial,' though it is just possible that we have here an example of the way in which local deities were frequently identified with better-known Roman gods. Caelestis was the Latin name of an old Carthaginian deity, Tanit, and under that name she was worshipped both in Roman Africa and to some extent in Italy;

¹ Agric., xviii.

² cf. the Castlesteads altar, dedicated by a procurator.

but her cult does not seem to occur north of the Alps.¹

As far as can be judged from their style, as well as from general historical considerations, the majority of the dedications to Brigantia, scattered from the southern Pennines to Hadrian's Wall, belong to the third century.

It was in the region of Hadrian's Wall in particular that numerous local cults were fostered. Celtic religion, far from being persecuted, asserted itself strongly. There was no question of romanization; it was a co-operation between the garrison and the natives in which the Celt took the lead. It is true that a large proportion of the known dedications to local deities were set up by the soldiery; but this is due to the fact that unromanized natives continued to worship in their own way in which the expression of their beliefs in epigraphic records had no place. An important exception is the altar from the Tyne valley set up in the second century by the curia of the Texta verdi; it is dedicated to a goddess whose name, though not quite legible, appears to be Saitada, the 'lady of grief.'²

There are many altars of third century date erected to a god apparently called Vitiris, though his name is spelt in a multitude of different forms. He was popular along the central part of Hadrian's Wall, and his cult spread southwards

¹ cf. Haverfield, AA³, vii, 176-7.

² OHE, i, 266.

into Durham and Yorkshire. Several of the other cults popular with the army, however, had their centre farther west, spreading into Cumberland. It is clear from this evidence that the national worship of Brigantia had no more of a monopoly amongst the Brigantes than had the official Emperor-worship amongst the Romans. Neither was at all inclined to be monotheistic. If either introduced the other to a new god, it was a common practice to identify it with one already familiar; thus we have the cases of Mars Belatucadrus, Mars Cocidius, Sul Minerva, and also the possible case of Caelestis Brigantia. Quite frequently the wording of an inscription or the spelling of a name reveals clearly that, as perhaps with the Longwood altar, the Roman dedicator was hopelessly ignorant of the real character of the Celtic deity whom he professed to reverence. But that was an unimportant point. So long as the material dominion of Rome was not affected, religion might develop as many forms of worship as it pleased, and local gods might become almost as numerous as pebbles on the beach; so long as the common religious element between the soldiery and the natives existed, it was indeed a practical advantage, for it cemented the loyalty of the local tribes to Rome.

The influence of pagan cults upon local life did not cease completely with the coming of Christianity, or with

the end of the Roman occupation. An outstanding instance of this is the way in which the familiar Romano-British figures of the three Mother-Goddesses, the Deae Matres, may perhaps be connected with the three Norns of Germanic myth; and the conception also survives, though in a debased form, in the three Witches of Macbeth. Many of the superstitions known to local folk-lore must be derived from these innumerable petty cults which flourished, particularly in the North of Britain, in Roman times.

In the fourth century, following the last persecution of Diocletian, Christianity took a firm hold on Britain. In the north, tombstones are found whose change of dedicatory phrase shows that Christian influences had penetrated there, as well as in the more civilised south. The substitution of Hic jacet and the like for the old Dis Manibus is a reliable testimony to a Christian burial. Archaeological evidence is scarce in the north, though the existence of a British church at Eccleshill in Lancashire appears probable from the derivation of the place-name from the British word eclēs, - a church;¹ but by the beginning of the third century Tertullian could claim that parts of Britain which were inaccessible to the Romans had been conquered by Christ; and this seems to imply that Christianity had obtained a hold beyond the more romanised parts and had spread into the

¹ Appendix A, s.v.

highland zone.

In 314, at any rate, there was a bishop of York, accompanied by two other bishops from Britain, present at the Council of Arles. Three bishops from Britain also attended the Council of Ariminum in 360; and perhaps they were too poor to travel at their own expense, since they accepted the Emperor's offer to have their expenses paid by the Imperial treasury.

Altogether, the position seems to have been that British Christianity, even in the north, was well established and organised in the fourth century, but that it was poorer than most of the provincial churches in the Roman Empire. Its hold was on the more impoverished sections of the town population, while it appears to have been progressing slowly but surely among the peasantry. As yet it had few supporters among the wealthy traders and villa-owners.

Paganism was far from extinguished, however, and in many cases the Christian Church must have been compelled to tolerate the retention of old superstitions and customs amongst the newly-converted peasantry. We may instance the practice of holding fairs in churchyards, often on Sundays, which the church did not attempt to suppress until Charlemagne first forbade it on the Continent in 789. The Anglo-Saxon witan also issued decrees against Sunday fairs. But Sunday trading

was difficult to eradicate. For example, "it is on record that at Bury St. Edmunds in the reign of John, the Church moved the Sunday fair to a week-day, and was fined for it!"¹ Tolerance in early times was evidently a wise policy, for while these relics of the old beliefs rapidly became meaningless and, to the simple minds of the peasants, quite harmless, a complete breach in daily habits and modes of worship would never have been accepted by the conservative peoples of the northern hills and dales.

It has often been supposed that the Christianity of Roman Britain disappeared under the flood of the barbarian invasions; but in the north, at any rate, this was not the case. British Christians of great personality were active at the end of the fourth and during the fifth centuries - Pelagius and Fastidius abroad, the former causing great disturbance in the Church by his promulgation of heretical doctrines; and Ninian at home, both in Galloway and in the region of Hadrian's Wall. Collingwood says: "It may have been Ninian who destroyed the local cults of the Wall region; he certainly blazed the trail along which, in the seventh century, Irish missionaries travelled from Iona to the Tyne and Yorkshire. A tombstone, perhaps of the late fifth century, to a Christian called Brigomaglos (the name is given with its Celtic termination), found at Chesterholm

¹ Dexter, op.cit., 35, § 53.

close to Hadrian's Wall, shows how this evangelization of the Border country made its mark in the villages that still existed on the sites of Roman forts."¹

British Christianity did not die out at the end of the Roman period. In the backwaters of the northern hills and mountains, whither the Brigantes stubbornly retreated and fought for the right to survive along with their new neighbours, the flame was cherished and kept alight; flickering, indeed, but ready to burn up and shed a glow of welcome to Aidan and his fellow-missionaries from Ireland two hundred years later.

¹ op. cit., 310-11.

VIII. CONCLUSION.

SUCH was the fame of the Brigantes in Rome that their name must frequently have been used as synonymous for Britons in general. Instances of this probable misapplication vary from Seneca's light reference to 'the blue-shielded Brigantes' in his skit on Claudius,¹ to the highly important passage in Pausanias. These early references testify to the importance of their tribal power and organization, overshadowing that of lesser peoples, rather than imply any lack of distinctive character. From the third century A.D., however, it becomes increasingly difficult to follow the history of the Brigantes as distinct from other British tribes. There is no evidence that the second great destruction of Hadrian's Wall aroused any demonstration of a surviving spirit of independence amongst the Brigantes, such as it seems possible to detect following the first disaster. Increasing romanization inevitably meant an increasingly stereotyped culture and the elimination of peculiar tribal characteristics. There is no definite finishing-point for the history of the Brigantian tribe; it merges gradually and imperceptibly into the general history of the north of Britain.

Any attempt to pursue the Brigantes further into the

¹ Apocolocyntosis, xii.

mists which obscure the closing years of the Roman occupation must be frankly conjectural. With this important qualification, glimpses of later developments may perhaps be caught here and there. It is possible that the Arcani - the peasant militia who betrayed the Wall to the Picts in 368, and were subsequently disbanded by Theodosius¹ - were a subdivision of the Brigantes who still cherished something of the ancient animosity towards the dominant power. Perhaps, too, the name Bernicia is derived from the Brigantes;² Myres has suggested³ that the name was taken north from Deira, the area which had previously been the real focus of the tribal population. But these traces are extremely nebulous. The Brigantian stock almost certainly lived on, intermingling with that of neighbouring tribes and invaders; but as a separate people the Brigantes cease to exist by the close of the Roman occupation.⁴

Relentless pressure from the Roman administrative and military machine had produced the inevitable result upon the Brigantes. Their open defiance became more infrequent, and with the advent of the 'golden age' for the rural population in the early fourth century, it must have ceased to be regarded as an essential factor in domestic politics.

¹ cf. Birley, AA⁴, ix, 213.

² cf. Clark, YAJ, xxxiv, 82, n.7.

³ OHE, i, 421.

⁴ Though British tribal government of a kind probably continued, while lacking a co-ordinating force; hence the invitations to leaders of personality like Vortigern.

Perhaps the Brigantes were at last beginning to realise the advantages which the Pax Romana could afford, as compared with the savagery and destruction which accompanied the barbarian invaders. In any case, when, towards the end of the fourth century, the latter clamoured ever more insistently at the gates of this northern outpost of Empire, they found no general response from the Brigantes within. Henceforth the story of the Brigantes is essentially the same as that of other Romano-Britons, fighting a losing battle against the fresh, virile forces of reaction and barbarism.

In these circumstances the standards of culture and economic conditions must rapidly have been debased; the chaos which intervened between the withdrawal of Roman supervision and the desperate temporary revival under Ambrosius Aurelianus must have largely destroyed British civic consciousness. The villa system, too, broke down; but the evidence for discontinuity between British and Saxon villages is not so certain. Myres states that "it is no longer possible to make a clear-cut distinction between the systems of cultivation employed in this country before and after the Teutonic conquest";¹ nevertheless, in the Yorkshire dales the contrast in situation, at least, between the Brigantian hillside terraces and the valley settlements

¹ OHE, i, 442.

of the Germanic invaders seems well established. In any case, the structure of the rural world must have received such a series of shocks that we cannot, on our present evidence, suppose the major elements of Brigantian society as it existed in Roman times to have survived into Anglo-Saxon England.

On the other hand, there is no evidence for any wholesale massacre of the population. Gildas' hysterical generalizations from what he saw in the south-west are wholly unreliable, and Myres states that "the best anthropological opinion would appear to envisage a very considerable degree of British survival."¹ The place-name evidence from Lancashire, at least, supports this view.² That the Brigantes existed for at least two more centuries alongside their new neighbours, constantly struggling to maintain their independence, but afterwards falling into a state of subjection, is the most likely explanation of their fate during this darkest age. Collingwood believes that the famous Arthurian legend is woven around the fight of some noted Romano-British leader against the encroaching Anglo-Saxons.³ One would like to go further and fancy that King Arthur was a Brigantian of the old stock, in blood as in spirit, fighting gloriously, if without avail, for the independence of his race.

¹ ibid., 446.

² cf. Ekwall, PNL, Introd.

³ ibid., 320-4.