DURING September 2007 Mr. Graham Ryan of Beckfoot uncovered part of a copper-alloy mount whilst using a metal detector on the foreshore (NGR NY 0870 4871) c.250 metres to the south-west of the Roman fort at Beckfoot (NGR NY 0898 4885). The find-spot is only c.175 metres to the north-east of the known extent of the Roman cemetery (NGR NY 0865 4850) associated with the Roman fort and vicus. The finder notified the present author and kindly allowed the recording of the object. The mount remains in the possession of the Mr Ryan at October 2007.

The find represents only the central element of a slightly convex, openwork circular mount, originally c.67 mm in diameter. All that survives is the figure of an eagle (Figure 1) facing to its right and holding its wings out. It is perched on a stylised standard of ‘Jupiter’s thunderbolts’ with, originally, a sphere below. There are broken edges above the head of the eagle, along the edges of both wings, at the ends of the stylised thunderbolts and below the eagle’s feet. Around the eagle there are the remains of a ring which provided the base for the letters OPTIME MAXIME CON. There are several parallels for the mount, including examples from High Rochester,1 Silchester2, York3, Corbridge4, Carlisle5, and Uley6 in Britain, and on the continent they are known from Kastell Obersheidenthal7, Kastell Dambach8, Zugmantel9, Saalburg10, Osterburken11, Strasbourg12 and Lauriacum13. A single piece has also been found at Thamusida14 in Morocco. These differ in their surviving condition, but it is quite clear that there are two distinct types - first those where the eagle holds its wings away from its body with the tips touching the thunderbolt and the edges touching the ring, and secondly those where the eagle holds it wings close to its body so that there are no gaps, and the tips, after touching the ring, curve inwards. These examples can be divided into: Type I, York and Kastell Obersheidenthal, and Type II, Carlisle, High Rochester, Silchester, Zugmantel, Saalburg 2 and Thamusida. The remaining parallels are too fragmentary to assign to a type.

The Type II examples appear to be the product of the same workshop on stylistic grounds, and a study of the details of size, lettering, etc., suggest that some may come from the same mould. Evidence from the German forts makes it clear that each of these mounts was part of a set worn on the military balteus or cross-strap. The circular mount was worn above a rectangular plate, from which hung a triangular terminal. All three parts had openwork decoration and, in the Type II examples, the openwork takes the form of an inscription divided between the three elements: circular: OPTIMA MAXIME CON (SERVA); rectangular: NUMERUM OMNIUM; triangular: MILITANTIAM; i.e., Best (and) Greatest protect (us) a troop of fighting men all.15 The term ‘Best and Greatest’ is an allusion to Jupiter, traditionally the God
of the Empire and the army. While the present example from Beckfoot shows some similarities to the Type I mounts from York and Kastell Obersheidenthal, it is not identical and therefore should be classified as a Type II mount.

Figure 1b shows the present find set within an outline drawing of a Type II mount based on the example from Carlisle. The surviving part of the mount measures 31 mm in width by 25 mm in height and 2 mm in thickness (Figure 1a). The surrounding ring was of c. 28 mm in diameter. The mount is corroded and has lost much of the surface detailing evident on better-preserved examples, and has presumably been washed out of the dunes from a burial in the Roman cemetery, the known extent of which lies well to the south of the find-spot. However, some of the feathering on the neck, body and wings, together with the division between the legs of the eagle, have survived. The back of the mount is plain, with a short tapering shank (length 7 mm) at the centre. A small spigot at the end of the shank originally passed through the flattened side of a D-shaped ring that allowed some movement of the balteus. The balteus was adopted by both the infantry and the cavalry, and Oldenstein (1976, 226) suggests a third century date for the mounts. None of the British mounts come from a securely dated context, as is the case with this example, but the indications point to a short period of manufacture either in the late second century or in the first or second quarter of the third century. The find is a notable addition to the relatively small corpus of the Type and to the Roman material recovered from the area of the Roman cemetery at Beckfoot.
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A Roman Coin Hoard from Morecambe Bay and its Possible Implications

DAVID SHOTTER

In 2008, a Roman coin hoard, potentially of considerable importance, was reported to Dot Boughton, Finds Liaison Officer for Cumbria and Lancashire in the Portable Antiquities Scheme. The findspot was located at the northern end of Morecambe Bay, north of Carnforth, but we have been requested not to place the exact location in the public domain at this stage. It will, of course, be recorded on the PAS database.

Fifty copper coins were recovered from a small area in a coastal location. Although there was no sign of a container or of a precise place of concealment, the types, short date-range and homogeneous condition of the coins leave little doubt that they should be regarded as a hoard. The coins were, with a single exception, large-flanned radiates, and the overwhelming majority of them were issues of the British rebels, Carausius and Allectus (AD 286-296); there were no tetrarchic reformed issues present. Such hoards are relatively rare in Britain. Of the two thousand Romano-British hoards recorded by the late Professor Anne Robertson (2000) only 44 terminate with coins of Allectus. Further, this is the first unequivocal example of an ‘Allectus-hoard’ to have been reported from north-west England, although it should be borne in mind that, in 1989, a hoard of more than a thousand radiates and copies was recovered at Boothsbank Farm, Salford (Nevell 1990; Shotter 2010). This hoard, which is in the
care of Ordsall Hall Museum, consists principally of a fused lump of corroded coins, although of the few loose coins the latest to have been identified is a radiate of Allectus. When a complete examination of this hoard becomes possible, it may, therefore, prove to be another ‘Allectus hoard’, and thus provide further evidence of military activity in the region under the two ‘British rebels’.

It was once fashionable to view Carausius and his ‘chief minister’, murderer and successor, Allectus, in a decidedly negative light, although John Casey has in recent years done much to achieve a more balanced interpretation, in particular regarding Allectus (1994). Rather than seeing the two rebels as representing a slightly troublesome prelude to the coming of the Constantinian dynasty, it is now generally recognised that Carausius and Allectus were well-organised in their ability both to withstand attempts by the central government to remove them, and also to make a significant contribution to the preparation of the provinces of Britain to meet contemporary challenges to their territorial integrity. It is now held, for example, that new coastal installations, which were being built in Britain at the turn of the third and fourth centuries, probably had as much to do with intelligence, supply and logistics as with straightforward military defence (Mason 2003). Despite the fact that new sites on the west coast do not present as coherent an appearance as those in the south east of Britain, the present find does serve to highlight the likelihood that some elements of the reorganisation of the west coast have yet to be recognised, but may have been in hand as early as the period of Carausius’ and Allectus’ rebellions.

In the west, there were major forts employing the new ‘Saxon Shore’ architecture at Cardiff, Caer Gybi (Holyhead) and Lancaster, as well as a substantial structure (Hen Waliau), in addition to the earlier fort, at Caernarfon. None of these was exposed to the open sea, but they were situated at a short distance upstream on major rivers. At Lancaster, a Numerus Barcariorum (‘Unit of Bargemen’) was probably in garrison (RIB 601; Shotter 1973), and we may assume that it was able, with its shallow-draughted vessels, to work between the open sea and the fort at Lancaster, as well as further upstream on the river Lune – prior, that is, to the construction of a weir at Skerton in the thirteenth century (Horsfield 2001); it may not be accidental that the dedication to Mars made by the Numerus Barcariorum was recovered from Halton-on-Lune, a short distance upstream of the fort at Lancaster.

These sites were complemented by a series of earlier major forts further north along the coast – at Ravenglass, Moresby, Burrow Walls, Maryport, Beckfoot and Bowness-on-Solway, all of which were established in the first or second centuries, but appear to have remained active until at least the middle of the fourth century and, in some cases, later. It seems also that some of the smaller elements of the Hadrianic coastal system may have been brought back into service in the later years, including the mile fortlet at Cardurnock (Simpson and Hodgson 1947) and some of the smaller installations (Shotter 1995 and 2000). Further, there are reported finds of Roman material which may point to coastal sites awaiting discovery between Ravenglass and Moresby (Daniels 1978, Shotter 1996, 2004, 2007, Breeze 2004). It should, however, be emphasised that such sites remain in the realm of speculation; nor is it intended to convey the impression that, even if they did exist, they necessarily represented a
continuation in either purpose or chronology of the Hadrianic system (Bellhouse 1989, Breeze 2004).

A number of very late Roman coins have been reported from coastal locations in the North West. Lancaster, for example, includes coins of Valentinian II (1), Theodosius (2), Arcadius (1) and Honorius (2) in its record (Shotter 1990). Ravenglass has produced a *solidus* of Theodosius (AD 379-95), which may have been part of a hoard (Shotter 1990, 2011), and another coin of Theodosius has been reported from Maryport (Shotter 1990). Further, a coin of Magnus Maximus (AD 383-8) is said to have been found in 1785 in Broughton-in-Cartmel (Baines 1836, although see Watkin (1883) who states – evidently incorrectly – that Baines put the findspot of this coin at Broughton-in-Furness). Recently (in 2002) a fourth-century hoard was recorded from Distington, which included 22 Valentinianic issues and one of Valentinian II (Caruana and Shotter 2002).

In the case of the present find of coins, it should be noted that in recent years the same locality in Morecambe Bay has produced a number of small medieval and post-medieval coin-hoards, suggesting that there may have been a long history of naval activity (military and/or commercial) from the late Roman period onwards associated with coastal sites or beaching-points in north Lancashire and south Cumbria. Indeed, only recently a shift in the channels in Morecambe Bay uncovered a small stone jetty at Hest Bank (Iles 2005), which appears to have been operative between the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and was evidently intended to facilitate the movement of goods between the open sea and the new canal system.

If a potential threat was envisaged in the late Roman period as emanating from Ireland, then it would have been strange if the coast had been left relatively thinly defended between Caer Gybi and Carmel Head to the south and Ravenglass to the north. As we have seen, a new fort (or defended embarkation point) was put in place at Lancaster (Jones and Leather 1988) replacing the earlier conventional auxiliary fort. Whilst a date in the early fourth century has been regarded as appropriate for the construction of this new fort, it remains possible that work started earlier. It is worth noting in this connection that, in recent years, Lancaster has produced two small coin-hoards terminating with issues of Carausius (Shotter 1990), one of which was recovered from debris in the subfloor level of the *caldarium* of a small bathhouse which had been demolished, evidently to make way for the defences of the late fort. It should be added that we still have no evidence allowing us to decide whether Lancaster was at any stage structurally equipped as a port or whether there was simply a beaching-point on the River Lune.

Further, the frequency with which coins of the third and fourth centuries have been found in the vicinity of Barrow-in-Furness suggests that there may well be an undiscovered late site in that area (see Appendix, below; also Shotter 1990; 1995; 2011). The new find of coins of Carausius and Allectus prompts the suggestion that there may also have been a late Roman site, perhaps near the coast between Carnforth and Cartmel, and that it may have been under construction, if not in use, in the last years of the third century.
The coins in the Morecambe Bay hoard

The coins were not in a particularly good state of preservation when found, and some of the identifications could not be made more precise because of the presence of heavy corrosion-products. However, the date-range of the present find certainly lies between the reigns of the rebel-Emperors, Victorinus (AD 269-71 of the Imperium Galliarum) and Allectus (AD 293-6), and the coins are distributed between issuers as shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issuer</th>
<th>No. of Coins</th>
<th>References in RIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victorinus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudius Tacitus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(inc. RIC vol. 5 (Tacitus), no. 58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(inc. RIC vol. 5 (Probus), nos 53, 104, 515, 801)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carausius</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(inc. RIC vol. 5 (Carausius), nos 33(7), 98(3), 101(2), 118(2), 161, 179, 300, 440)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carausius or Allectus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allectus</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(inc. RIC vol. 5 (Allectus), nos 20, 28/86, 35(2), 46, 55, 83, 86, 90/91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegible</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Nota: It is anticipated that these coins will be acquired by a local Museum)

Summary of finds of late Roman coins in the vicinity of Barrow-in-Furness (c. AD 250-400)

Approximately 30 Roman coins have been reported over the years from the Barrow area, of which 19 have been issues of the second half of the third and the fourth centuries. General evidence provided by coin-loss in Roman Britain suggests that issues dating from the second half of the third century could have been lost at any stage during the period in question (Shotter 1978, Caruana and Shotter 2002). The issuers of the coins recorded from Barrow are as shown in Table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>No. of Coins</th>
<th>Type of Coin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trajan Decius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Antoninianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallienus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(One radiate copy and one Alexandrian tetrachron)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudius I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(One radiate copy and two Alexandrian tetrachrons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorinus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Radiate copy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetricus I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Radiate copy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocletian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Alexandrian tetrachron)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Nummi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Nummi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantius II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Nummi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnentius</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Nummi)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The principal findspots have been Furness Abbey, Walney and Foulney Islands. Such a distribution would certainly lend support to a proposition that the area saw...
Roman naval activity at least between the mid-third and the mid-fourth centuries. The presence of coins from Alexandria further suggests that some, at least, of this activity may have been commercial, rather than military, in nature. For full details of these coin-finds from the Barrow area, see Shotter 1990, 1995, 2011, 177.

In all, therefore, there is sufficient evidence to suggest that the Roman defence of the north-west coast in the later years of occupation may have been considerably more extensive and coherent than has appeared to be the case. It may further be surmised that the purpose of such activity may not have been solely military, but may have been equally directed towards the preservation, through commerce, of a widely-accepted Romanised way of life.
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Eccles Place-Names in Cumbria

DANIEL W. ELSWORTH

The potential importance of eccles place-names as an indicator of early churches has been a source of discussion for some time (see Newman and Brennand, 2007, 85 for a recent summary), although corresponding physical evidence has generally been far from forthcoming. It has also been suggested that such names might relate to the organisation and distribution of pre-Northumbrian administrative boundaries, and are perhaps more likely to simply reflect settlements or even land connected to an early church or occupied by Christians, rather than necessarily where a church was situated (Thomas, 1981, 148; Kenyon 1991, 96). The presence of such names may also indicate attempts by the Anglian church to appropriate earlier sites or their associated properties and are thought to be connected to the later survival of British kings in certain areas (Higham, 1993, 100-101). Regardless of the exact interpretation or meaning, they are still considered significant, and have been identified as an area worth further investigation by the recent Research Agenda for North-West England (Newman and Brennand, 2007, 84-85). In northern England there are examples in the north-east (Higham, 1986, 276), and more in Lancashire (Kenyon, 1991, 95-97) and West Yorkshire (Higham, 1993, 101). No comprehensive study of eccles place-names in Cumbria has yet been carried out. It has been stated, however, that there are none in the county (Morris, 1983, 45; Cameron, 1987, 4; and more recently by Winchester, 2006, 169), but also that there are eight or nine examples (Cramp, 1983, 272).

The aim of this short account is not to examine eccles names in Cumbria in any detail, a far larger and more complex task and one requiring considerably more understanding of the subject than the author can profess to have, but rather to note the existence and location of such names in the county, and bring some obscure, and in one case potentially significant, examples to the attention of those who might make use of such information in the future. Four easily identifiable place-names apparently incorporating the element eccle are visible on modern mapping (Figure 1), to which can be added Eaglesfield, the potential of which has already been examined (Wilson, 1978), making a total of five. An Eagle Crag in both Borrowdale and Patterdale might also be added, but perhaps with some caution.

It is necessary to examine the origins of these names, however, to identify whether they are modern creations, perhaps transported from elsewhere, or whether there is evidence for an alternative meaning. Eccle Riggs near Broughton-in-Furness, for example, clearly has early origins, and is recorded by that name from at least 1688 in the parish registers (Clark, 1950, 6). It is difficult to trace Ecclerigg at Troutbeck, on the north-east side of Windermere, in the same way, but it is clearly so named on Clark’s map of 1787 (Smith, 1967a, 190). In this case it is attached to a hall, house, and crag and is apparently not a modern invention. However, it is recorded that the farm at this site was not built until 1700 and that prior to that at least some of the land was known as ‘Langtale’ rather than Ecclerigg (Scott, 1904, 240), so it is unclear when the name was first applied. While this evidence might make the example dubious, another interesting aspect of this site is the presence of a ‘Kirk Lane’ a short distance...
Fig. 1. The location of possible *eccles* place-names given in the text

1 - Eaglesfield, near Cockermouth
2 - Eagle Crag, Borrowdale
3 - Eagle Crag, Patterdale
4 - Ecclerigg, Troutbeck
5 - Moss Eccles Tarn, High Sawrey
6 - Eccle Riggs, Broughton-in-Furness
7 - Eclishous, Millom Parish
8 - Eglisfylde, Conishead
9 - Ecclerigg, Killington
10 - Eccles Taiths, Sedbergh
to the north-east, which forms a curious loop from the main road. Although its name might suggest it, the lane does not apparently connect to any extant church.

Moss Eccles Tarn near High Sawrey is apparently first recorded on the Ordnance Survey map of 1851, and the origins of its name are uncertain. Both of the Eagle Crags are recorded in 1777 (Smith, 1967a, 225; Armstrong et al., 1950, 353), but as has been noted these should be treated with caution and probably have more obvious derivations.

The name of Ecclerigg Hall near Killington, to the east of Kendal, does appear to be later. The building is named ‘Hasteads’ on the tithe map of 1841 and there are no field names apparently incorporating eccles associated with any of the adjacent land (CRO (K) WDRC/8/232, 1841). The present name does not appear to have come into use until later in the nineteenth century; there is a small body of water a short distance to the south known as Ecclerigg Tarn, but the origins of this name are uncertain as it does not appear even on early maps and also seems to be a relatively modern creation. Confusing the matter somewhat, however, is the evidence contained in the census for the area, which lists an Acclerigg in 1851 – not the same place as ‘Hasteads’ as this is separately listed as ‘Asteads’ – and an Aikrigg (HO 107/2441/343-437, 1851).

Other references to eccles place-names are more obscure, and not shown on modern mapping. Several documents relating to Sizergh Estates in the parish of Cautley near Sedbergh mention a property called ‘Eccles or Fawcett Taiths’ and an apparently related ‘Eccle’s lands’ (CRO (K) WDPP/Box 9, n.d.; despite being undated these documents appear to belong to the eighteenth or early nineteenth century). There is no such property now evident on maps, although a Taythes and Fawcett Bank are situated c.5km north-east of Sedbergh, and these perhaps represent the same place. What is not certain in this case is whether the eccles element in fact relates to someone of that name; the latter example suggests it does, the former is less conclusive. More obscure examples are also available: there is a reference to an Eclishous somewhere in Millom parish in 1666 (Haswell, 1925, 202), but it has not been possible to discover any more information regarding this site or its location.

In addition to all of these, and perhaps the most convincing and intriguing of all, is a reference to an Eglysfylde and Eclysconflate listed amongst property situated at Conishead Priory in a post-Dissolution grant of 1547 (Anon, c1929, 6, and also Park, 1932, 31). However, Farrer and Brownbill (1914, 352n) list Eglisfield and Elstonflat, and an early eighteenth century copy of the original document seems to confirm this reading (LRO DDK 5/1, 1707). The reference to ‘Eclysconflate’ is probably something of a red herring. A later estate map does, however, show a ‘Gleaston Flat’ on the west side of the present buildings, which could either indicate a source for Elstonflat/Eclysconflate or be a later corruption of it (CRO (B) BDX/209/10/4, n.d.). While the other examples might be considered dubious on etymological grounds, or are possibly or certainly later creations, the case at Conishead seems very convincing, even though it has not been possible to identify an exact location. Conishead is in close proximity to the Roman road identified by Thomas West as coming off the sands at this point and crossing the Furness Peninsula (Elsworth, 2007); the proximity of eccles names to
Roman roads is something that has been commented on by Cameron (1987, 2), but without further research it is not possible to comment on the other sites in Cumbria. Conishead was clearly also associated with some powerful individuals from at least the early medieval period; the name means ‘king’s headland’ (Ekwall, 1922, 212) and Chapel Island was formerly ‘Harlsyde’ meaning ‘Earl’s seat’ (see Yarlside near Shap for example; Smith, 1967b, 178). The establishment of the medieval priory on such a site is perhaps far from coincidental.

More detailed future research may elucidate the history of some of these sites and reveal whether there is any evidence for an early Christian connection. In addition, the frequent correspondence between *eccle* and -rigg (presumably in all cases simply referring to a ridge or high piece of ground) is curious, and can also only be understood through further investigation. Previous research has suggested that *eccles* names form a limited number of compounds, not previously recorded as including -rigg (Gelling, 1978, 96). It is also especially noteworthy that many are *eccle* rather than *eccles*, something that may have a significant bearing on the meaning (Whaley, 2006, 106), and that none relate to major settlements. It is also evident that the distribution, particularly of those that seem etymologically sound, is generally concentrated in the southern part of the county, although this is likely to be at least partially due to biases inherent in the limited amount of information examined and the local familiarity of the author. This distribution does, however, form a convenient continuation with the examples known in Lancashire (see Figure 49 in Thomas, 1981, 269); of course, three of the Cumbrian *eccles* names were originally in Lancashire.

In conclusion, while there is every reason to expect some or most of these names to have their origin in other sources, for example in one of several personal names or *āc*, the Old English for oak (see for example Smith, 1967b, 230), This seems likely to be the case with Ecclerigg Hall in Killington based on the evidence in the census. There seems little debate about the reference at Conishead, and given this site’s history some form of earlier Christian community is perhaps not unlikely in this location. As stated at the beginning of this note, further investigation by those better qualified to do so is necessary. The intention of this brief survey is merely to describe the possible examples in the county and the available evidence for their authenticity (or otherwise). The nature of the evidence is, at present, extremely limited. In all but one case (Eaglesfield), only the place-name itself suggests any significance, but additional investigation into the context and any relevant associations would undoubtedly prove useful. The place-name *llan*, for example, has not been studied in detail in the county and the relationship between possible British religious sites and other habitational place-names would be worth further consideration. These, taken with existing work on church dedications to what are considered ‘British’ saints and church sites with early characteristics (as already covered by O’Sullivan, 1985), would hopefully provide a greater understanding of the situation. The most significant consideration in the case of Cumbria would appear to be the need to look deeper into the records, and not rely on examples shown on present mapping; the very obvious example at Conishead has been available in a well-used published form for almost 100 years and yet its significance was apparently not previously realised. Similar cases are sure to be revealed in the future.
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Results of an Archaeological Watching Brief to the Rear of 3 Castle Street, Kendal and a Consideration of the Development of Wildman Street

DANIEL W. SELWORTH, SAMUEL WHITEHEAD AND JO DAWSON

An archaeological watching brief was undertaken by Greenlane Archaeology following a planning application by Acorn Developments (Kendal) Ltd to build three houses to the rear of 3 Castle Street in north-east Kendal (see Figure 1).¹ The results of this work revealed a number of interesting finds and potentially add to the presently limited understanding of this part of Kendal, which had until this point been subject to very little archaeological investigation. Wildman Street, to the north of the site, is thought to have existed from at least the medieval period, and the associated area seems likely to have developed at the same time.² The exact extent of Wildman Street's development at that time is uncertain, however, but is evidently part of the medieval road network³ and effectively forms an extension of Stramongate, which is first recorded in 1365.⁴ The presence of the Castle Dairy, located on the north side of Wildman Street, elements of which date to the fourteenth century further demonstrates the medieval history of this part of Kendal.⁵ There is little information regarding the origins of Castle Street although it would seem an obvious link between the north of town to the castle via Stramongate Bridge, which appears to have been built, or perhaps more likely rebuilt, in 1379.⁶

It has been assumed that the plots on Wildman Street are medieval due to post-medieval title deeds that refer to them as ‘burgages’ and their presence on Speed’s map of 1611⁷ (see Fig. 2, map A). While Speed’s plan does show a row of properties along Wildman Street, the land to the rear is clearly open and undeveloped (although the degree of detail depicted on Speed’s plan leaves this open to interpretation). This appears to have still been the case until the publication of Wood’s plan in 1833 (Fig. 2, map B). Later maps show that the plots along the south-east side of Wildman Street (the rear wall of which forms the north-west edge of the development area) were subsequently altered and moved. Two schools were built on this area of previously undeveloped land during the nineteenth century: the Infants’ School and the British School.

The earliest records for the plot of land behind 3 Castle Street are from 1830 when it was sold by Edward Baycliffe, a marble mason, formerly a worsted spinner, to the Quaker Friends Meeting in Stramongate in order to facilitate the establishment of a school.⁸ Wood’s plan shows the ‘Infant School’ situated in the south-west corner of the plot; the remainder of the area to the east apparently given over to allotments (see Fig. 2, map B). Number 3 Castle Street was originally the schoolmaster’s house for Castle Street Infants’ School, but it must have been built later as it does not feature on Wood’s plan. The Ordnance Survey map of 1861 shows the schoolmaster’s house and what appear to be gardens to the north-west, beyond the boundary of the school (Fig. 2, map C). The school was enlarged in 1899 with the addition of an upper floor, but was closed in 1968, and demolished in 1990. A detached house, called ‘School House’, was subsequently built on the site.
FIG. 1. Site location and plan of features discussed.
The building to the north and east of the site was originally the British School, built in 1835.9 with a large yard to its west (See Fig.1 and Fig. 2, map C). In 1857 this school was enlarged by the addition of new classrooms and committee rooms.10

Results

The groundworks for the development were monitored in February and March 2008, revealing the following stratigraphic sequence (Fig. 1). The earliest deposits comprised the natural boulder clay and sands laid down at the end of the last Ice Age, but evidently reworked by alluvial action. The proximity of the site to the junction of Stock Beck and the River Kent no doubt made it subject to flooding from an early date, something which is recorded historically.11 Flooding was perhaps brought under control by more recent canalisation and improved management of these two watercourses. Overlaying this a thin subsoil developed from at least the medieval period (Phase 1). Post-medieval finds were also recovered from this but these are considered intrusive from layers above (particularly from Phase 3, which was in direct contact with this deposit) or poorly located as a result of the less than ideal conditions under which they were recovered.

Subsequently (Phase 2) a series of shallow pits and ditches, the latter typically 0.5m wide and 0.3m deep, were cut into this subsoil, and in some cases through into the underlying natural. In addition, a very thin deposit of dark silt with a linear edge was also deposited, presumably against a boundary feature for which there was no surviving evidence. It was noticeable that the ditch features and this linear deposit were all approximately 5m apart and seemingly followed the alignment of extant property boundaries on Wildman Street. They all clearly continued to the north, beyond the limits of the excavation area, but extended to different lengths at their southern ends. Their fills, which contained some, presumably residual, medieval pottery suggest that they were backfilled and sealed in the seventeenth or eighteenth century. By the beginning of the nineteenth century a dumped deposit of grey-brown silty-clay was laid across the entire site (Phase 3), generally between 0.1m and 0.3m thick with frequent stone and mortar inclusions. This was presumably intended to level or raise the ground level, and may well correspond to a reorganisation of the plots along Wildman Street evident on the early nineteenth century maps of the area, and the construction of the Infants’ School in 1830. The dumped deposit partially comprised demolition rubble and even included pieces of marble, presumably from chimney-pieces and the like.

Subsequently, a deposit of mid orange-brown sandy-clay, typically 0.2m-0.4m thick, was laid across the site (Phase 4), presumably to form gardens related to the schoolmaster’s house. This was probably subsoil brought onto the site from elsewhere in Kendal as it also contained medieval pottery but stratigraphically must post-date the early nineteenth century. The following deposits (Phase 5) relate to the demolition of the school building in 1990 and the subsequent use of the site.
Finds

The most diagnostic finds of medieval date, from Phase 1 and residually occurring in Phase 4, are illustrated (Fig. 3; nos. 1 and 6 are from Phase 4). The rims of four different northern gritty ware vessels were present, dated to the late twelfth to thirteenth century (Fig. 3, nos. 1-4). Of these, numbers 2 and 3 were similar to material from kilns at Docker Moor, and number 4 was similar to material from kilns at Ellel, both of which are in Lancashire. A single rim and a base in sandy ware fabrics were also present (Fig. 3, nos. 5-6), dated to the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries, respectively. A button in the form of a sawn bone disc with a central hole, which would presumably have had textile sewn onto it, can also be ascribed a medieval date (Fig. 3, no. 7). An identical bone button was found during excavations at Black Friars Street, Carlisle, which was considered to be medieval despite being unstratified.12
Fig. 3. Medieval pottery from Phases 1 and 4 (1-4 are northern gritty ware, 5-6 are sandy ware) and a bone button from Phase 1 (7).

Fig. 4. Selection of Phase 2 artefacts (8 copper alloy, 9-11 red earthenware, 12 buff-coloured earthenware).
A selection of post-medieval finds from Phases 2 and 3 are also illustrated (Fig. 4 and 5). Domestic assemblages in Cumbria, including those from Kendal, have not been widely published or illustrated and suitable examples are included here partly to redress this balance. All the post-medieval pottery is illustrated by context phase, since the coarse red earthenware vessels change little compared with the fine tablewares they are associated with. The numbers are too small to draw any conclusions about differences in the styles of coarse red earthenware vessels at different dates, but as more of these types are illustrated from other sites, with their associated finewares, statistically significant results will be obtainable.
A copper alloy button was present in Phase 2 (Fig. 4, no. 8), as were the bases of two red earthenware hollowware vessels (Fig 4, nos. 9 and 10), and the rim of a much larger red earthenware crock (Fig 4, no. 11). One fine ware vessel is illustrated from this phase – part of a black-glazed buff-coloured earthenware candlestick base (Fig 4, no. 12), dated to the late seventeenth to early eighteenth century. In addition, what was apparently a piece of sandstone with vitrified surfaces was recovered from a small pit belonging to this phase. The cause of the vitrification is uncertain – it had clearly been subject to extreme heat and one possibility is that it had been exposed to glazes used during the manufacture of pottery. There is no confirmed pottery-making site in Kendal at present, although an attempt was apparently made to introduce factory-scale production in the post-medieval period.14

Nine coarse red earthenware vessels are illustrated from Phase 3 – pancheon-type vessels (Fig 5, no. 15, 17-20), and crock-type vessels (Fig 5, no. 16, 23-25). Three of the pancheons are very similar in style, with a simple rim with an unglazed white slip stripe along the top (Fig 5, nos. 18-20). The finewares associated with these coarsewares – pearlware, one with an early blue transfer-printed chinoiserie design (Fig 5, no. 21), and another with a relief-moulded garland motif border with a blue painted stripe (Fig 5, no. 22) – indicate a date of late eighteenth to early nineteenth century. The glass bottles (Fig 5, nos. 13-14) confirm this date.

Conclusions

The various maps of the site are particularly useful in understanding its development, and show the horticultural nature of the land to the south-east of Wildman Street until at least 1833 (Fig 2), without the typically long burgage plots depicted elsewhere in Kendal. The absence during the groundworks of plot boundary ditches, and to a lesser extent pits, of medieval date is also an indication that this area was not developed, at least not to the same extent, as other parts of the town during that period.

A good quantity of medieval pottery (69 fragments in total, the vast majority from Phase 1) was recovered during the watching brief, demonstrating that there was activity in this part of Kendal at that time. However, the assemblage largely comprises wares of the twelfth to thirteenth centuries with very few later types. The clearly post-medieval dating of the majority of the deposits casts doubt on the suggestion that Wildman Street was occupied by developed medieval burgage plots. In particular the series of features from Phase 2 suggest that the area was only beginning to be developed after the medieval period.

An understanding of the medieval history of the site is perhaps best seen in relation to the Castle Dairy which is thought to have its origins in the fourteenth century.15 It may have formed part of a grange belonging to the castle mentioned in documentary sources in 1331, and said to be situated on the east side of the River Kent.16 This reference makes it apparent, however, that it must have existed prior to this date. This property is recorded as also containing a forge and other buildings before becoming a private house in the late 1550s following the loss of estates belonging to the Marquess of Northampton in 1553.17 It seems unlikely that the area of land primarily occupied by a grange would have contained developed burgage plots until after it had ceased.
to serve this function. This provides a convenient explanation for the archaeological evidence for the development of the site only in the post-medieval period; the medieval finds are likely to have been deposited in fields belonging to the grange, which were subsequently developed into ‘burgage’ plots from the sixteenth century onwards, hence the depiction of properties on Speed’s plan of 1611. These were then reorganised in the nineteenth century, at which time the original boundaries must have partially gone out of use and become buried by re-deposited material. Based on the archaeological evidence, therefore, use of the term ‘burgage’ and the depiction of properties on Speed’s plan might not always be an indication of medieval origin.
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Tree-ring Dating of Buildings on the Solway Plain
NINA JENNINGS AND PETER MESSENGER

WITH the the aid of a generous grant from English Heritage, the following buildings have been cored by the Nottingham Dendrochronology Laboratory:

NY 229 570 Barn, Lilac House, Kirkbride 1574
NY 325 591 Fauld Farm, Burgh-by-Sands 1591-1610
NY 084 456 Salta Cottage, Salta 1606, with a rather low probability
NY 306 564 Old Post Office, Kirkbampton 1629
NY 265 597 Barn, Stonehouse Farm, Drumburgh 1601-26, 1638
NY 334 563 Barn, Lea End, Castletown 1632-57
NY 328 544 Beech House, Great Orton 1658-83

Reused timbers were also sampled, in the hope of finding a cruck pair predating the earliest so far found, ie those at the Royal Oak Inn, Moorhouse.¹

NY 410 582 Barn, Tarraby Farm, Tarraby 1509
NY 325 591 Fauld Farm, Burgh-by-Sands 1463-68
NY 306 564 Old Post Office, Kirkbampton 1604, 1595-1610

The following gave good samples but these did not match existing records:
NY 253 507 Tony Cottage, Orton
NY 292 591 Barn, Bousted Hill

Part of the grant was used to provide training in the repair of clay dabbins. Three one week, practical courses were held at Ash Gill Farm, Threapland, near Aspatria for eight working builders. In addition, the 1910 Land Tax Records for the Solway Plain were copied in the National Archives at Kew, and desposited in Carlisle County Record Office. These records give a detailed description of every building in the country at that time and will be useful to other researchers.

Reference
¹ Nina Jennings, ‘Tree-ring dating of buildings on the Solway Plain’ CW3, i, 205-7
READER response and my own continuing research have indicated aspects of my paper in CW3, x, that require clarification,¹ and have directed me towards future lines of enquiry which may shed light on the exercise of a web of patronage that enabled eighteenth-century Cumbrians to flourish in London and further afield.

The Post Office connection

I relied on the Victorian family biographer of the Robinsons in stating that Thomas and Hugh Robinson, older brothers of John Robinson’s father Charles, were educated at Westminster School and Trinity, Cambridge.² The archives of the school and the college, however, indicate that this is only true of Hugh: he was sent to Westminster in 1717,³ in 1722 was enrolled at Trinity, where he became a fellow, and was ordained priest in 1731 before returning north in 1738 to be rector of Lowther and chaplain to Viscount Lonsdale. Hugh’s brother Thomas was later confused with a different Thomas Robinson (1695-1770) from North Yorkshire, who went to Westminster and Trinity before serving as a diplomat, being ennobled as first Baron Grantham and holding various offices; his last appointment was Postmaster-General in 1765-66.⁴

The career of his Appleby namesake was not without distinction, however. Born in 1697, Thomas Robinson probably attended the Grammar School, went to London, perhaps when Hugh was still at Westminster, and obtained a position in the Post Office. His abilities were evidently exceptional: in February 1737 he was appointed Secretary to the General Post Office, a position equivalent to a modern chief executive; but only eighteen months later he died at Scarborough after taking the waters. There were no children, but he had evidently opened doors for his brothers. Some forty years before John Robinson entered Parliament his uncle Jeremiah, born in 1704, became a Post Office Surveyor – what would later be called an accountant – in the Northern Division, dying at Richmond, Yorkshire, in 1742; Christopher Robinson (1712-1762), a barrister, was Resident Surveyor at the General Post Office; Atkinson Robinson, the youngest of John’s uncles, followed Christopher in the same office and died at Hampstead in 1771.⁵

None of these men left sons, but the family foothold in the Post Office was sustained in 1771 when the position of Deputy Solicitor went to their 25 year-old nephew, John’s cousin Antony Parkin of Appleby.⁶ The Post Office Secretary was Anthony Todd of Upper Weardale, who had married Christopher Robinson’s daughter Ann, Parkin’s aunt and another cousin of John Robinson, who had just been appointed Treasury Secretary. Robinson and Todd, two upwardly mobile Northerners, were kindred spirits. Neither had a son, but their daughters married into the aristocracy. In August 1782 Robinson was witness to the marriage between Eleanor Todd and James Maitland, later eighth Earl of Lauderdale. The marriage settlement was £30,000, £5,000 more than Robinson paid in 1781 when his daughter Mary married Henry Nevill, the future second Earl of Abergavenny.⁷ Both men doubtless regarded it as money well spent.
The East India connection

I briefly discussed the way in which John Robinson’s influence within the East India Company, which he sustained after leaving government office in 1782, furnished jobs for various Wordsworths and Myers. This seems to have been but the tip of an iceberg of Cumbrian patronage that dwarfs the Post Office connection. Certainly deserving of attention is Richard Atkinson, who as a recently-elected Director of the East India Company, worked closely with Robinson in the overthrow of the Fox-North Coalition in 1783-4, but of whom I made no mention, considering this an issue of high politics beyond the scope of a paper focusing on Robinson’s Appleby links. Atkinson was a native of Temple Sowerby, the younger son of a tanner. When he came to London to seek his fortune as a counting-house clerk, he may indeed have been ‘a mere adventurer unsustained by any inheritance’ with no more attributes than ‘common penmanship and arithmetic’; but by 1772, aged 33, he was partner in a London-based West Indian trading company, as well as the owner of a three-decked vessel contracted to the East India Company. It is hard to imagine that his rise did not owe much to John Robinson, whose uncle, the Rev. Carleton Atkinson, Rector of Kirkby Thore, was Richard Atkinson’s parish priest. It was Robinson who in 1775 introduced Richard to Lord North, paving the way for the lucrative but highly controversial contract to supply British forces in America with rum. By the time of his death in 1785, Richard Atkinson was an MP and London alderman with £300,000, most of which – not without subsequent dispute – was bequeathed to his relatives.

The muster of beneficiaries of Robinson’s influence may also include Thomas Bowser, who died in 1833 a Lieutenant-General and a KCB after a lifetime of distinguished soldiering for the Company. Born in 1748, he is believed to have been the son of John Bowser, churchwarden at Kirkby Thore, and to have attended Appleby Grammar School. He too came to London and worked in a ‘merchant’s counting house’ before taking up his military career in India in 1773. There is also John Bellas, born in Long Marton in 1745, who died a Colonel of Artillery in Bombay in 1808, and George Bowness of Bolton. Robinson’s extensive correspondence, which includes many letters from Atkinson, may shed further light on these intriguing Eden-born Anglo-Indians.

The Church connection

Though neither John Robinson nor any of his brothers went into the Church, three uncles and a brother-in-law were clergymen. In his capacity of MP for Harwich, he was able to offer the curacy of Ramsey and Dovercourt to William Wordsworth in 1791. The incumbent, who had fled his creditors but not resigned the living, had also been a Robinson appointment. He was William Cowper (1744-1809) of Penrith, former curate of Dacre, and grammar school master, first at Blencow, then at Houghton-le-Spring. His wife was Ann, daughter of the late Rector of Kirkby Thore, Carleton Atkinson, and a cousin of John Robinson. This connection was probably the reason why Cowper got the Harwich living in 1786; it was strengthened in 1788 when Cowper’s sister Dorothy, younger by ten years, married William Cookson, brother-in-law of Robinson’s cousin John Wordsworth.
In 1790 Cowper was sued for debt, and fled, perhaps to Holland; ‘it is impossible he can ever return to Harwich’, Dorothy Wordsworth noted. Whether or not he received any assistance from John Robinson, in circumstances as yet unclear he and his wife found their way to Mrs Cowper’s roots in Appleby; their later days may have been ‘clouded by indigence and distress’. What is certain is that the parish register of St. Michael’s, Bongate, records in May 1809 the burial of Ann, wife of William Cowper aged 60, and in November of William, ‘Vicar of Harwich’. No age is stated, but he was probably 65.

‘As quick as you can say Jack Robinson’

My claim, based on the record of the debate of 1 March 1784 in Cobbett’s Parliamentary History, that Sheridan’s celebrated House of Commons quip was a myth prompted one reader to point out that the contemporary reports of Debrett were more comprehensive. But on inspection, it was evident from Debrett too that Sheridan did not speak in the debate. However, a more startling story concerning the Robinson simile surfaced in a 1980 press report occasioned by John Robinson’s only extant portrait being put up for sale. It claimed that he ‘fell out with the eminent Massachusetts politician James Otis, and in a Boston Coffee House one day they had a violent quarrel. The Englishman struck Otis such a savage blow with his cutlass that the American never properly recovered and his career was finished.’ A 2002 art dealer’s catalogue went further: ‘his temper was so volatile that swords would flash before anyone could say “Jack Robinson”.’

John Robinson was a militia colonel and could presumably wield a sword. But his disposition was hardly quarrelsome, and there is no evidence of his ever fighting a duel: indeed, he declined a challenge from Sir James Lowther. Even more compelling proof that he had no part in this 1769 Boston brawl is that his correspondence shows he did not leave England in that or any other year. He has been confused with a bellicose customs collector of the same name posted to America. John Robinson of Appleby was a man of many parts, but this was not one of them.

Notes

2 Some Account of the family of Robinson of the White House, Appleby, Westmorland (London, 1874), 22. This was published anonymously, but it can be inferred from the text that it was by the Rev. Charles Best Robinson, a descendant of Admiral Hugh Robinson (1735-1802). He subsequently changed his surname to Norcliffe, his mother’s maiden name.
3 In Westminster’s records he appears as having been admitted in November 1717, aged 14. In fact Hugh Robinson turned 16 that month.
5 Details in Robinson Family 25-28 are confirmed, in the cases of Thomas, Christopher and Atkinson, by notices of their deaths in contemporary issues of the Gentleman’s Magazine.
6 CRO(K) JAC 1717, St Lawrence’s, Appleby Registers show him as christened ‘Antony’ on 6 March 1746, but he is always named ‘Anthony’ in correspondence. For a brief obituary, see Gentleman’s Magazine, 97 pt 2 (1827), 380
7 Ellis, Post Office, 96-7
NOTES 251

8 Connell, CW3 x, 228
9 CRO(K) WPR 22. A succession of Atkinson marriages and burials can be followed in the registers of St. James's, Temple Sowerby, transcribed by Vivienne Gate. They also show that, in New Style dating, Atkinson was born in March 1739, not 1738, as stated in the entries on him in ODNB and History of Parliament.
10 Gentleman's Magazine xlv (1785), 407, notice of Atkinson’s death; 570, obituary
11 East India Company Ships website, ID 851. The ship was the Earl of Bessborough.
12 Robinson Family, 85-6. St Peter’s, Temple Sowerby, was a chapelry of Kirkby Thore. Carleton Atkinson (not related to Richard) was Rector from 1722-62. See CRO(K) JAC 1281, microfilm of the registers of St Michael’s, Kirkby Thore. Carleton’s brother John was incumbent at Kirkby Stephen.
13 Horne Tooke, Facts Addressed to the Landholders (London, 1780), Foxite propaganda, claims that North agreed with Atkinson a price double the going rate.
14 Gentleman’s Magazine and private information. See CRO(K) WP 22: in 1786 ‘Matthew Atkinson, tanner’ becomes ‘Matthew Atkinson, Gentleman’
15 G. Atkinson, ‘John Robinson’ in Worthies of Westmorland, or Notable Persons born in that County since the Reformation, ii, (London, 1851), 229-252. Many of the details are confirmed in the entry in C. E. Buckland, Dictionary of Indian Biography (London, 1906), 50, which appears not to derive from Atkinson. But although CRO(K) JAC 1281 and the Bishop’s Transcripts show John Bowser’s marriage in 1743 and the christening of his first child Margaret, Thomas is yet to be traced.
16 Atkinson, Worthies, 251-2 mentions Bellas and Bowness, both of whose christenings are recorded
17 Henry Chaytor, of Croft-on-Tees, near Darlington, like his brother William was sent to Appleby Grammar School. He married Nancy Robinson, one of John’s sisters; both Chaytors held land in Appleby, and served as Mayor. Henry’s benefice until his death in 1789 was St. Peter’s, Croft-on-Tees. Croft and Chaytor records, including correspondence between William, who was an MP, and his mentor Robinson are in the North Yorkshire CRO at Northallerton.
18 CRO(K) JAC 1281 She was christened by her father at Kirkby Thore on 13 Oct 1748. In CW3 x, 228 I erroneously stated that Cowper was a cousin of Mrs Robinson; in fact Robinson was a cousin of Mrs Cowper.
19 J. Barker, Wordsworth, A Life (London, 2000) 825 n. 41. In 1802 John’s son William, the poet, married Mary Hutchinson, whom he had known since childhood, and who was living on a farm near Stockton-on-Tees owned by her brother; he had been taught by Cowper at Houghton-le-Spring G.S.
21 CRO(K), Appleby Bongate Parish register, compiled by R. G. Thwaites et al.
22 Connell, CW3 x, 230
23 Debrett’s Parliamentary Register, xiii, 230-252
24 Daily Telegraph 24 January 1980
25 Bonham’s 2002 Catalogue, Lot 106
26 In contemporary correspondence he is sometimes referred to as ‘Col/Coll Robinson’, e.g. letters from William Senhouse to his father in 1770, quoted in E. Hughes, North Country Life in the Eighteenth Century (London, 1965), 247-8
27 Connell, CW3 x, 222
28 J. E. D. Binney British Public Finance and Administration (Oxford, 1958) 25, conflated the two Robinsons, but did not mention the coffee house brawl. It can be found in I. R. Christie and B. W. Labaree, Empire or Independence 1760-1776 (Oxford, 1976), 132, but there it is quite clear which John Robinson was which.