

The Roman Place-names of Derbyshire.

It is unfortunate that the ancient authorities which supply us liberally with the Roman names of towns or forts in Britain have for the most part left Derbyshire severely alone. The reason is not far to seek. The fact that none of the principal Roman roads led through the county is sufficient to explain the neglect of it in such a work as the "Itinerary of Antoninus." A traveller in search of knowledge or 'impressions' of Britain would naturally choose the more important roads, which would offer him easier and safer travelling, better accommodation, and more to see. The additional information which seemed to have come as a godsend to grateful antiquaries from the publication of the work of "Richard of Cirencester" in 1757, was shown some forty years ago to be but vanity. "Richard's" history proved to be a forgery palmed off upon the world by one Charles Bertram (1723—1765), an Englishman resident in Copenhagen, who used his ingenuity and his absence to dupe the over-credulous Dr. Stukeley and others.¹

We must be thankful for small mercies. They come in the shape of the work of the *Ravennas Anonymus*, whoever or whatever he may be. The compilation which goes under this name, first published at Paris in 1688, appears

1. There is an interesting account of Bertram and his remarkable forgeries in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. He originally called himself "Richard of Westminster." The mischief done by him still lingers on in some quarters. He has vitiated most of the maps of Roman Britain published during the last century.

to have been written in the seventh century.² It contains an unmethodical, careless, and sometimes demonstrably inaccurate list of the names of places in various parts of the Roman world. But with all its faults it is certainly "founded on fact," and cannot be neglected by the student of ancient geography. The section which is of use for the present purpose is V, 31 (Pinder and Parthey). There we find the following series of names, in the ablative case, as is usual in the itineraries:—

Nanione *or* Nauione.³

Aquis.

Arnemeza (Arnemeya, *codex Basiliensis*).

Zerdotalia.

Let us consider these names in order.

In Vol. vii. of the *Journal of the Derbyshire Archaeological and Natural History Society*, Mr. W. Thomp-son Watkin suggested that *Nauio* was the name of the Roman fort at Brough, where successful excavations have recently been conducted by Mr. Garstang. In support of his view he cited a fragmentary sepulchral inscription⁴ found at Foligno, in Italy. There we read of a *censitor* (census-officer) *Brittonum Anauion*. Watkin took the letters *Anauion* to represent a *Nauione*, *i.e.*, "from Nauio," but, as Dr. Haverfield⁵ points out, we must read *Brittonum Anauion(ensium)*, *i.e.*, "of the Anavionensian Britons."

2. Pinder and Parthey's ed. (Berlin 1860), *Praef.*

3. The alternative reading has been added in accordance with the information now to hand in Dr. F. Haverfield's very important article on "Romano-British Derbyshire," contributed to the *Victoria History* of the county. There we learn (p. 210, footnote) that Professor Phillimore reports the reading of the best MS. (Vatican Urbinas 961) to be *Nauione*. Though most of the present article was prepared before the *Victoria History* was available, I gratefully acknowledge valuable assistance derived from it.

4. *Ephemeris Epigraphica* vii, 1102.

5. *Derb. Arch. Journ.*, xxvi. (1904), to which I am indebted for most of the facts stated about (A)nauio; *Victoria Hist.*, p. 210.

In the year 1862 a Roman milestone (now in the Buxton Museum) was found near the Silverlands of Higher Buxton. It refers to some place as being distant 10 or 11⁶ miles ANAVIONE. It is impossible to tell from the inscription alone whether we are to understand ANAVIONE as one word, *i.e.*, from Anauio," or as two, *i.e.*, A NAVIONE, "from Nauio."⁷ But the Foligno inscription constitutes a strong presumption in favour of the former alternative. Two other considerations taken in connexion with the facts already stated practically settle the question of the Roman name of Brough:—

1. Assuming, as we may reasonably do, that the milestone has been found near its original site, we may conclude that it was set up in Buxton. Now the only Roman fort about 10 miles by the road from Buxton was Brough.

2. Ravennas mentions in succession two rivers named *Anaua* and *Doruantium* respectively. It is difficult to resist the conclusion that *Doruantium* is the modern Derwent, and *Anaua* the modern Noe (or Now), the stream on whose bank the remains of the Brough fort have been found. *Anauio* would then be derived from the name of the stream.

Thus we may infer that the Roman name of Brough was Anauio.⁸

6. The number is not clear. Dr. Haverfield thinks it is probably 10 (*Derb. Arch. Journ.*, loc. cit.), but possibly 11 (*Victoria Hist.*, pp. 210, 226).

7. This reminds one of a somewhat similar difficulty in Cæsar's *Gallic War*, I. xxxi. 12 quod proelium factum sit Admagetobrigae. As this use of the locative case (referring to a town at which a battle is fought) is very irregular, it has been suggested that we ought to read *ad Magetobrigam*, *i.e.* "at Magetobriga." The real name of the town is unknown.

8. Horsley's alternative theories about the *Nauione* of Ravennas (especially the second, that the word is a corruption of *Causennae*) are worthy of the age in which Voltaire defined etymology as "A science in which the vowels count for nothing and the consonants for very little."

The name *Aquae* was given by the Romans to several watering-places more or less famous for their baths or medicinal springs. Thus *Aquae Sulis* is the modern Bath, *Aquae Aureliae* is Baden-Baden, and *Aquae Mattiacae* is Wiesbaden. The warm springs and baths of Buxton were known to the Romans, as the remains of a bath-house which have been discovered are sufficient to show. It was only natural—one may say it was inevitable—that the name *Aquae* should be applied to such a place, and it is unreasonable to doubt that the fort of that name mentioned by Ravennas after *Anauio* is that of Buxton. Whether any epithet was added to distinguish this *Aquae* from others we cannot tell, but it is very probable. If one may claim the antiquaries' privilege of making rash guesses, it might be suggested that *Arnemeza*, the next name given in Ravennas, a name about which nothing is known, did not designate another place, but was separated from *Aquis* by a natural and common mistake. We should then read *Aquis Arnemezae*. *Arnemeza* may represent the name of a deity associated with the springs or with the district; we may compare *Aquae Apollinares* ("Apollo's springs; *Phoebi uada*, Martial, vi. 42, 7) in Etruria.

But the suggestion at the end of the last paragraph may justly seem to be "a wild and uncritical guess." These are the words used by Dr. Haverfield of a conjecture made by Mr. Watkin as to the ancient name of the fort now known as Melandra Castle.⁹ Mr. Watkin identified this place with the *Zerdotalia* mentioned by Ravennas next to *Arnemeza*. He also thought "that, like numerous other misspellings in the work, *Zerdotalia* should be *Zedrotalia*, and that the name of the station was preserved in the river which flows beneath it, the Edrow, as it was styled to the

9. *Derb. Arch. Journ.*, vii., pp. 86-7; also Watkin's *Roman Cheshire*, p. 24.

beginning of this (i.e., the nineteenth) century, now softened into *Etherow*.”¹⁰ This conjecture is ingenious, and one would fain accept it; it would give an interesting parallel to the naming of the fort *Anauio* from the river *Anaua*, which has been already mentioned, and as to the exact form of the word, whether *Zerdotalia* or *Zedrotalia*, the authority of the MSS. of Ravennas is certainly not great. But it is sadly to be feared that the Z at the beginning of the word is an insuperable objection to the theory, and it must be considered very doubtful if there is any connexion between the names *Etherow* and *Zerdotalia* (*Zedrotalia*). As to the origin of *Zerdotalia*, *Arnemeza*, and *Melandra*, nothing certain can be said. The name *Melandra Castle*, commonly applied at the present day to the fort near Glossop, has not been traced further back than the year 1772. In that year the Rev. Mr. Watson read before the Society of Antiquaries a paper which was subsequently published in *Archæologia*, Vol. iii. (1775), paper xxvi.¹¹ There he says: “The people call it *Melandra Castle*; the area of it is called the *Castle-yard*, and eleven fields adjoining to it are named in old deeds the *Castle Carrs*.” The word *Melandra* has a curiously Greek appearance, and looks like the creation of a pedant.

Somewhat earlier in the same section of Ravennas in which we find the five names which have just been dealt with, there occur two other names which must be mentioned, namely, *Lutudaron* (other readings *Lutudaton* and *Lutudarum*) and *Derbentione*.

Several lead pigs which have been discovered in the

10. *Roman Cheshire*, loc. cit.

11. *An Account of an undescribed Roman Station in Derbyshire*. By the Reverend Mr. Watson; in a Letter to the Reverend Mr. Norris, Secretary. Read at the SOCIETY OF ANTIQUARIES, Dec. 10, 1772.

eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in various parts of England bear the letters LVT, LVTVD, or LVTVDARES. The last of these abbreviations¹² stands for *Lutudarensis*, which doubtless means "Of Lutudarum." The correct reading in the Ravennas citation is most probably *Lutudaro*. In the inscription last mentioned the adjective *Lutudarensis* is applied to a mine (*Métallum Lutudarense*). The fact that far more pigs bearing the name of Lutudarum have been found in the neighbourhood of Matlock than in any other place is some reason for supposing that the name was applied to that district or to some part of it. If the ordinary view as to the identity of the place mentioned next in Ravennas be correct, the locality of Lutudarum may be regarded as being fixed with fair accuracy.¹³

It is now a very long time since *Deruentio* was first identified with Little Chester. "There is good ground," says Lysons (V., p. ccxv.), "to suppose it (Little Chester) was called *Deruentio*, from the neighbouring river (the Derwent), though there were at least two other towns of the same name in the island; one near York, and a second in Cumberland. The many roads bearing in every direction to the station, the numerous remains dug up on the spot, and the exact distance from *ad Trivonam* and *Etocetum*, which Richard states *Deruentio* to be in his 18th iter, put this subject out of all reasonable doubt." We now know the value of "Richard" and his statements, but the other reasons here assigned all hold good. Little Chester was in Roman times a place of considerable importance, partly because it was the meeting-point of a

12. Found on Tansley Moor, about two miles north-east of Matlock, in 1894. Dr. Haverfield (*Proc. Soc. Antiq.* xv. 188; *Vict. Hist.* p. 232) and several others have written on the subject.

13. Lysons (*Magna Britannia*, V., p. ccvii.) says "there is great reason to suppose" that Lutudarum "was the present town of Chesterfield." The reasons which he adduces in support of this idea (*ib.* p. ccxi.) are quite inconclusive.

number of roads. The neighbouring town of Derby used to be identified with *Deruentio* (*Derbentio*), but besides the fact that the etymology of *Derby* is very uncertain, it may be safely asserted that if *Deruentio* was in that district it must have been the important station of Little Chester. The variant *Derbentio* need, of course, cause no surprise, as *b* was often written for consonantal *u* in later Latin.¹⁴

Such is the meagre information which we possess on the subject of this paper. For further knowledge we must wait till the discovery of another inscription or of some long-lost work comes to reward our patience.

W. B. ANDERSON.

14. This was due to changes in the pronunciation.