

side of the military enclosure.

In the city centre, at least, any irregularity was eliminated in the next phase, when major re-planning took place. There is no doubt that this was the outward and visible sign of a radical change in the status and nature of Londinium. New north-south streets and a new E-W street on the north side were laid out, increasing the size of the central insula to accommodate the largest basilica and forum in north-western Europe. There is no doubt that Londinium was now a city with local self-government, and it must surely have been a city of the first rank—a *colonia*. The re-planning may therefore mark the transition from a military base and administrative centre with undefined status to official capital of the province. It was as drastic as any replanning operation that the city has since suffered, and it could not be implemented at once. First a new home had to be found for the governmental activities formerly carried on in the centre of the city. It is suggested that these were now accommodated in the vast new complex of public buildings built on the river-front and nicknamed by archaeologists — perhaps correctly — the “Governor’s Palace.” The building of this seems to have begun in the eighties, but it would clearly have been a number of years before the new forum site could be cleared of its earlier buildings. The final stage of the transformation was, of course, the building of the Cripplegate fort as a barracks for the military component²⁵ of London’s population, but this seems to have been delayed for some thirty years, during which the soldiers were presumably billeted among civilians.

Whether a completely new street grid was imposed on the whole of the central area is doubtful, but the opportunity was apparently taken to change the position of two major approach roads to it—the road from the north, which was probably then moved to its Bishopsgate position to meet one of the new N-S roads, and the road from Camulodunum, which was moved to its Aldgate position from a position further south (probably marked by the Alie Street burials),²⁶ presumably to meet the new E-W street north of the basilica.

Throughout this great upheaval, however, two

24. B. J. Philp, “The London Forum and other excavations” *Current Archaeol* No. 19 (1970) 219-22.

25. This would presumably have comprised mainly the Governor’s Guard and soldiers seconded for staff

streets remain unchanged — the E-W street under the eastern end of Lombard Street, on which the new forum faced; and the N-S street which had led from the river at the site of Old London Bridge to the main entrance of the pre-forum building, and now led to the main central entrance of the forum itself. The continuity of this central axis of Londinium strongly suggests that it was firmly anchored at its southern end to the Roman bridge.

It must be emphasised that our evidence relates solely to the century following A.D. 60. The earliest bridge, which would probably have been totally destroyed by Boudicca, may well have stood elsewhere, and there are hints, in the form of fragmentary stone foundations of very early date on the west side of Gracechurch Street, that the first centre of Londinium may possibly have been a little to the west. Similarly we know little or nothing about the internal lay-out of later Roman London, and it is not impossible that the bridge may eventually have been rebuilt elsewhere — or even that a second bridge was built. Nevertheless, the coincidence that Peter of Colechurch built his bridge on precisely the same site as that apparently occupied by its predecessor a thousand years earlier is sufficiently striking to force us at least to consider the possibility of continuity.

A hypothesis that is based on admittedly slender evidence has been put forward here to encourage the further investigation that could prove or disprove it, wholly or in part. It is hoped that it will also provoke discussion of a positive kind, in which alternative hypotheses are formulated, so that these, too, may be similarly tested.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Hugh Chapman and Irene Schwab for drawing the plans; John Earp for supplying the photographs; Graham Dawson, Eric Ferretti, Alan Graham, Geoff Marsh and Irene Schwab for providing information from the Southwark excavations; Hugh Chapman, Pat Evans, Donald Imber and Peter Marsden for giving additional information and helpful comments.

duties who were not accommodated in the Governor’s residence. See M. W. C. Hassall, “Roman Soldiers in Roman London,” in D. E. Strong (ed.) *Archaeological Theory and Practice* (1973) 230-7.

26. H. Chapman and T. Johnson *op. cit.* 13.

Local Societies — Amendments

The fifth list of amendments to the list of local societies published in Vol. 1, No. 15, is as follows:

Enfield Archaeological Society — Sec. R. A. Coxall, 64 Faversham Avenue, Bush Hill Park, Enfield, Middx.

Barnes and Mortlake History Society — Sec. Mrs. E. M. Evans, 22 Ranelagh Avenue, Barnes, SW13.

The list of archaeological and local history societies which was published in Vol. 1, No. 15, will be completely revised in the next issue. To ensure an accurate compilation, secretaries of societies are requested to send a postcard with their current address to: Gale Canvin, 58 Claverdale Road, SW2 2DP, by 1st November.