

ART. XX. — *An attempt at a Survey of Roman Cumberland and Westmorland, continued.* By R. S. FERGUSON, F.S.A.

Read at Furness Abbey, August, 16th, 1877.

IT will probably be expected that I should take some notice of a paper read at our Gilsland meeting under the title of "The Romans in Westmorland; a rejoinder to Mr. R. S. Ferguson,"—and I cannot help regretting that its author has, by imputing to me predeterminations, and motives, and pets, existing only in his own mind, lowered the discussion below the tone that should be observed in the Transactions of a Society such as this, and below the calmness with which the allocation of Roman stations might well be considered.

The writer of that paper correctly says that I join issue with him on three questions of interest, viz. —

1. As to the line of the Tenth Iter of Antoninus.
2. As to the route of Agricola's march northwards in A.D. 79.
3. As to the name of the Roman station at Kendal.

I will deal with the last question first. My opponent says that Watercrook, near Kendal, is Concangium.

Now all that we know about Concangium is, that it is one of the miscellaneous stations of the Notitia; these stations have been fully discussed in a paper entitled "An Examination of Horsley's Allocations of the Miscellaneous Notitia Stations in the North of England," by the late John Hodgson Hinde, published in the fourth volume of the *Archæologia Æliana*, old series. In this paper I read (and I had not seen this paper until after my paper, the subject of this attack, was in print), "The services of Horsley, in ascertaining the true order of the 'Stationes per

Dictis, and Concangium must be looked for in Yorkshire, between Doncaster and Bowes; Mr. Hodgson Hinde comes to a similar conclusion. He adds, writing of the Watercrock-Concangium theory, "but it must be conceded that this last allocation (*i.e.* Concangium at Watercrock) was made originally by Camden,* and was probably the cause of Horsley's placing the other two stations on this side (the east) of the island. Camden's sole inducement was a fancied construction of the name of the river on which Kendal stands, the Kent, or as he writes it, the Can, in Concangium, a piece of etymological evidence, which might be received in corroboration of a conclusion otherwise probable, but totally inadequate as independent testimony."†

I must now deal with my opponent's arguments in favour of Watercrock being Concangium, for to do him justice he has, after following blindly "the reputed antiquaries" who tell him Watercrock is Concangium, an argument in favour of that theory which I am sure is all his own; indeed, he claims it as his own, (*Annals of Kendal*, p. 16,) and expresses his surprise that no one of the reputed antiquaries had thought of it. It is this:—

Somewhere in a writer called Baxter he finds a statement that "the Cangi were not a distinct nation seated in one place, but such of the different nations as were employed in pasturage, in feeding the flocks, and herds of the respective tribes." Where did Baxter get this state-

* Camden recanted his opinion. In Gibson's edition of his works, 1722, Camden himself says, "Once, indeed, I was of opinion that it, Watercrock, was the old Roman station Concangium, but time has informed me better," and Bishop Gibson, his editor, thinks, taking the *Notitia* as his authority, and Concangii being mentioned therein next before Lavatær, or Bowes, "it is most probable to be sought for nearer the wall."

† There is in the case of Watercrock no independent testimony; the inscribed stones found there tell us nothing as to its Roman name.

The late Mr. Phillips, the eminent geologist, in his history of Yorkshire, by a precisely similar train of reasoning to that adopted by Mr. Hinde, places Concangium in Yorkshire. See also Hodgson's *Northumberland* Pt. II., Vol. III. p. 126, where Hodgson suggest that Horsley's allocations are wrong, as they do not follow some consecutive order.

ment

ment from? Not from Tacitus certainly; and until I am furnished with a better authority than Baxter, I shall be bold enough to take Tacitus as my guide, and not Baxter. The words of Tacitus are (Ann. xii., 32) "Ductus in Cangos exercitus," or, as some read them, "Ductus inde Cangos exercitus." He speaks of them as of any other nation, and it is clear from his text that the Cangi were a nation situated next to the Ordovices. Camden (in an earlier edition), Gibson, Gough, and the author of the index to the Monum. Hist. Brit. place the Cangi in Somersetshire, but Camden (in a subsequent edition), Latham (in Smith's Dict. Gr. and Rom. Geo.), J. G. Oreillius, the learned editor of Tacitus, and Dr. MacCaul, in his "Britanno-Roman Inscriptions," all consider the Cangi as a distinct nation, and place them in North Wales, *i.e.*, Flintshire, Cheshire, and Denbighshire, well known lead-producing districts. The Cangi are same as the Ceangi; whose name appear on certain pigs of lead, for which see MacCaul's "Britanno-Roman Inscriptions," pp. 32-36, and "Hubner's Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum," vol. VII., p. 222.

However, my opponent, having found his herdsmen, (in Baxter and not in Tacitus,) proceeds to locate them in the "fertile vale of Kent;" he says, "they were the heads or chief cattle retainers of the western Brigantes. Con and can, I say, are pleonasms, both alike signifying *chief*, ergo, the Con-cangii were the principal herdsmen in this part of the country. *Con* is the original of the river Kent, the *chief* of the rivers Kent, Mint, and Sprint." I have no doubt this is all my opponent's own argument, and I make him a present of it, and also of his funny notion that Agricola tried to please the natives by calling a camp Concangium. I may add that it is very improbable that the same root from the same dialect, or language, should be repeated twice in the same word.

To sum up, I conceive I have shewn (see pp. 93-94) that
Concangium

Concangium must be in Yorkshire, and that, therefore, Watercrock in Westmorland cannot be Concangium. Mr. Hodgson Hinde and Mr. Phillips have both proved the same in a manner beyond my abilities. I conceive that I have also, by reference to Tacitus in preference to Baxter, destroyed the notion of the Cangi being herdsmen, and shewn them to be a distinct nation, settled in a particular place. In short, I have left my opponent nothing to go on but the jingle between Kendal and Concangium. If Mr. Nicholson likes to call that jingle etymology, I would remind him that his friends the Messrs. Lysons, say, "etymology is the weakest ground on which a theorist can stand."—Lysons' *Cumberland*, p. 130.

2. With regard to Agricola's march, I need not repeat my observations; they are to be found in the current volume of our Transactions, but I would call to my opponent's notice the able article of Mr. Jackson, printed on p. 9 of our current volume. I have, however, a few words to say in reply to my opponent's remarks on my paper under this head. I never said a word as to Agricola's marching round by Morecambe Bay and the shores of the Solway to be "conducted to Old Carlisle," and the words "conducted to old Carlisle" which my opponent puts in inverted commas as a quotation from my paper, apply not to Agricola's line of march, but to a subsequent deviation from his line of march. Nor have I omitted to acknowledge my obligations to Rauthmel, (see p. 74,) but I consulted Tacitus, (not Baxter,) before I consulted Rauthmel, and my views of the question of whether Agricola had with him a fleet or not are stated in my paper, (p. 67,) and on that very important point I differ from Rauthmel, and so can hardly be said to follow him as a shadow; nor do I omit the Lune, as my opponent charges me with doing. I mention the Morecambe estuary, and I imagine the Lune discharges its waters into that estuary, somewhere between Fleetwood and Walney, between which points runs also the
great

great river Kent, Can, or Con, the chief of the rivers Kent, Mint, and Sprint, to all which noble streams I will apologise, if my opponent wishes, for omitting their names. Nor did I ever suggest that Agricola's or his army crossed these mighty streams or any estuaries by "swimming," as my opponent says I do.

Had he read me with any care he would have seen that I speak of marching across at low tide (p. 73). I have a little right to complain that in these cases my opponent has consulted his imagination, or Baxter, for what I wrote, and has not consulted my paper.

I do claim my opponent as the advocate of my views of the dangers of the Tebay gorge: he expatiates on the dangers of the sea route, with an avalanche of Brigantes on the heights above, ready to drop on the Romans. A small sum in multiplication will shew the dangers of the Tebay gorge to be just twice those of the sea coast route. There would, in the Tebay gorge, be two avalanches of Brigantes, one on either side, ready to drop on the Romans. "The easy, pleasant, sheltered, and rectilinear road," spoken of by Whittaker, was not then made, nor could it be made until the Brigantes, right and left, were subdued.*

One word more, and I dismiss this branch of the subject. My opponent says the words "*æstuaria ac silvas ipse pretentare*," may apply to the Solway, the Clyde, the Forth, or the Tay. If he refers to Tacitus he will find these words apply to the second year's campaign,—that of A.D. 79. "*Tertius expeditionum annus novas gentes aperuit*," thus limiting the former phrase to the Brigantes, who did not dwell near either the Clyde, Forth or Tay, but south of the Solway.

Lastly, with regard to the much vexed question of the Tenth Iter.

* On the Tebay Gorge, and its dangers, see Mr. Jackson, p. 11 of this volume.

On it I have referred to the Annals of Kendal, and I find on p. 384, the author of that book says, "I shall take no notice of Antonine's table of distances from one station to another, and on p. 384 he says "I presume only to transpose Galacum and Alone." Having disregarded both the distances between the stations, and the sequence in which they come, I do not see what Mr. Nicholson has left to guide him but his free fancy. One cannot put much faith in a theory which is founded on the throwing overboard of all the facts. One difficulty Mr. Nicholson does not attempt to grapple with. He puts Galava at Whitley Castle, and then puts the next station Glanoventa, vaguely, "on the wall." This alone is fatal to his theory; the stations on the Wall in that vicinity are all well known, and their names ascertained from inscriptions, and not one of them is "Glanoventa."

I think I may now retaliate my opponent's remarks about a "pet station." Borough Bridge seems his. In order to find it a name he transposes the order of the stations, as given in the Itinerary, and he next fits it with a garrison of some 2800 men!! The area of the Borough Bridge station is about $3\frac{1}{2}$ acres; I take the data from the Annals of Kendal. Segedunum on the Roman Wall is about the same size; I take the data from the Duke's Survey. The Notitia tells us the size of the garrison at Segedunum; it was a cohort, or about 480 men; that would be the garrison of Borough Bridge.

My opponent, rightly enough, puts down Borough Bridge as a stationary camp, but he then proceeds to calculate its garrison on the rules for camps occupied only for a night or two, where the men were packed close and marched off before they had thoroughly soiled the ground.

My opponent, besides the existence of his own theory, has an objection to my theory as to the 10th Iter. To that objection I answer that it does not follow that there is no Roman road between Ambleside and Keswick, because my opponent has been unable to find it.

The

The fact of there having been a Roman camp at each of those places makes it certain there would be a road connecting them. In the last century a regular survey was made of the Roman roads in the vicinity of Keswick, and one was found connecting that place with Ambleside (see West's Guide to the Lakes, 8th edition, p. 147). Dr. Bruce entertains no doubt as to its existence, and marks it on the map given in the *Lapidarium Septentrionale*. Professor Hubner has no doubt of it, and marks it on the map given with the seventh volume of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. However, evidence of the kind asked for by my opponent, is I am told, not wanting; and my informant will at no distant date communicate it to this Society.

The question has been put to me; as you say Watercrook is not *Concangium*, what do you say it is? I say it is one or other of the stations on the Tenth Iter. I have suggested it is *Galacum*, so does Professor Hubner; and so does Mr. Wright in his "The Celt, the Roman, and the Saxon," and the late Mr. Godwin, in his *Archæological Handbook*. My readers must recollect that my original paper was headed "An attempt at a Survey of Roman Cumberland and Westmorland." In it I endeavoured to avoid being dogmatic, and, as to many things therein, time will perhaps teach me better,—but hardly that Watercrook is *Concangium*.
