

In the year 1814 the reverend John Hodgson, incumbent of Jarrow (and one of the founders of the Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle-upon-Tyne), had a dispute about the collection of Easter dues at South Shields. In a rough memorandum of his case, in his own handwriting,<sup>105</sup> he notes :—‘The township of South Shields has immemorially enjoyed preveleges which the rest of the parish of Jarrow never has. It has never paid any church cess to Jarrow, and both Harton and Westoe, to the utmost extent of their boundaries, always have. They, too, have always sent churchwardens to Jarrow, which South Shields never did.’

And so it appears that the grant of land originally made to bishop Aidan, probably by king Oswin, and certainly not later than 648 A.D., has remained ever since the peculiar property of the church of St. Hild’s, with the exception of the miserable diversion to the Dean and Chapter of Durham of one-half of it in the year 1768. And thus there is more than a nominal or even traditional association, there is a definite historical link between the St. Hild’s of to-day and abbess Hilda’s first religious house in the seventh century.

---

APPENDIX.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN BERNICIA AND DEIRA.

[Read on the 25th November, 1896.]

The boundary-line between the two kingdoms, or provinces, of Bernicia and Deira, into which Northumbria was subdivided, both in early Anglo-Saxon times, and also again for a brief period under the Danes in the ninth century, has been variously placed by various writers at the Tees, the Tyne, or even the Tweed. Moreover, it is not only a case of conflict of opinion between different authorities ; but in not a few instances the same author, actually in the same work, will speak of the frontier now as at the Tyne, and now as at the Tees. Thus, for example, Camden in speaking of the Brigantes says :<sup>106</sup> ‘The

<sup>105</sup> Now preserved amongst the parish records of St. Hild’s.

<sup>106</sup> *Britannia*, ed. 1607, p. 558. ‘Saxones enim has regiones Nordanhumbrorum regnum dixerunt, et in duas partes diuiserunt : Deiram, Deir-land illa ætate uocarunt, scilicet, quæ nobis proximior cis Tinam fl. & Berniciam quæ ulterior, a Tina ad Fretum usque Scoticum pertinuit.’

Saxons called this district the kingdom of the Northumbrians, and divided it into two parts, Deira (Deir-land was their name for it), which lies nearer to us on this side of the river Tyne, and Bernicia, which is beyond, and stretched from the Tyne to the Scottish Frith ;' but when he comes to the Ottadini<sup>107</sup> he speaks of 'the kingdom of the Bernicians, whom the Britons call *Guir a Brinaich*, or mountaineers, which stretched from the Tees to the Scottish Frith.' So, too, Montalembert (iii. 311) describes the Tyne as 'a river which was then (*sc.* in 651.A.D.) the boundary-line between the two Northumbrian states of Deira and Bernicia,<sup>108</sup> and which is now one of the principal arteries of the maritime commerce of England ;' but only a few sentences later on (p. 319) he virtually places the division at the Tees : 'The first of these monasteries was built on the borders of Deira and Bernicia, on a wooded promontory where the deer then found a covert, and which has since become, under the name of Hartlepool, one of the most frequented ports on the coast.' And yet once more, in the map of 'The English kingdoms in 600' given in Green's *History of the English People*, at page 32 of vol. i., the dotted boundary line is marked at the Tyne in accordance with the description in the text (p. 37) of 'the coast district between the Forth and the Tyne which bore the name of Bernicia ;' but the lettering on the map extends the name 'Bernicians' from the Forth to the Tees.<sup>109</sup>

The difficulty has no doubt arisen mainly from the fact that there is no direct statement by a contemporary writer as to where the boundary was fixed. Bede, quite in his usual vague way, merely states<sup>110</sup> that 'the Northumbrian people was in ancient times divided into these two provinces,' of Bernicia and Deira, but he does not define their limits ; nor is there any definition of them in Nennius, or

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.* p. 674. 'Cum regnum Berniciorum, quos Britanni *Guir a Brinaich*, id est, quasi *Montanos* dicunt, constitutum esset, quod a Tesi ad Scoticum fretum pertigit,' etc.

<sup>108</sup> This was practically Montalembert's settled verdict, for again and again he repeats it ; as, *e.g.*, in his notice of Verca (iv. 152) : 'Her convent was at the mouth of the Tyne, the river which divided the two Northumbrian kingdoms, Deira and Bernicia.' See also iii. 252 (ed. Gasquet).

<sup>109</sup> To cite one more instance ; professor Mayor, in the *Onomasticon* to his edition of Bede, *s.vv.* 'Bernicii' and 'Deiri' makes the Tyne the dividing boundary ; but in his note on iii. 1, he places it at the Tees.

<sup>110</sup> *H. E.* iii. 1. 'At interfecto in pugna Aeduino suscepit pro illo regnum Deirorum . . . Osric . . . porro regnum Berniciorum, nam in has duas prouincias gens Nordanhymbrorum antiquitus diuisa erat, suscepit . . . Eanfrid.'

in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. It is not until after the Norman Conquest that any precise description occurs. But it must be borne in mind that the chroniclers who do treat of this question had access to earlier information which is no longer directly available.

It will help to make the matter clearer if reference is first made to the opinions which have least to support them.

I.—The view that the Tweed formed the boundary between the kingdoms may be somewhat summarily dismissed. It has nothing whatever to recommend it, and it is difficult to understand how it can ever have been seriously entertained at all. Professor Mayor, in his note on the passage of Bede cited above, quotes Smith's note: 'The boundaries of the two kingdoms appear to have varied, for some authorities make Deira reach to the Tweed and Bernicia to the Frith of Forth, while others confine Deira to the south of the Tees, but make the northern kingdom extend to the Frith.'<sup>111</sup> Who Smith's 'authorities' were for the Tweed theory to whom he refers may probably be gathered from the following note in Elstob's *English-Saxon Homily*:<sup>112</sup> 'The Learned and Judicious Editor of the *Saxon Chron.* . . . carries it farther. . . . To the kingdom of *Deira* he alots all that lies between *Humber* and *Twede*, and includes by Name *Yorkshire*, *Lancashire*, *Westmorland*, *Cumberland*, *Northumberland*, and Bishoprick of *Durham*:' to the Beornicas he assigns all that lies between the *Twede* and the *Frith of Edenburrow*.' Thus Edmund Gibson<sup>113</sup> is pointed out as the original promulgator of this idea. Perhaps its conception was due to a confusion with the later divisions of the land in the tenth century, by which the country north of the Tweed came to be eventually separated from England, and assigned

<sup>111</sup> Smith's words are worth quoting for the oddity of his Latin: 'Harum tamen Prouinciarum Terminos longe aliter dederunt quidam. Deiros ad Tuedam, Bernicios ad fretum Edinburgicum extendentes: Et Bernicios quidem ad Fretum inueniamus; Deiros uero non ultra Tesam fluuium.' Dr. John Smith, who was prebend of the seventh stall in Durham cathedral, and rector of Bishopwearmouth, died in 1715. His edition of Bede, which was not completed at the time of his death, was prepared for the press and published in 1722 by his son George Smith, the nonjuror, of Burnhall, near Durham.

<sup>112</sup> *An English-Saxon Homily on the Birthday of St. Gregory*, by Elizabeth Elstob; London, 1709; p. 13. For a notice of Elizabeth Elstob, see Richardson's *Table Book*, vol. ii. p. 64 (30th May, 1756).

<sup>113</sup> *Chronicon Saxonicum*, ed. Edmund Gibson, A.B.; published at Oxford in 1692; s.vv. 'Beornicas' and 'Deerna rice' in the 'Explicatio' at the end. Gibson was afterwards bishop of London, 1723-1748.

to Scotland. Edward the Elder in 924 A.D. received the oath of fealty 'not only from the Danes of York, but also from the English kingdom of Bernicia, which had never been overrun by the Danes,<sup>114</sup> from the Welsh of Strathclyde, and even from the king of the Scots.'<sup>115</sup> So the way was prepared for Edred's organization thirty years later, when 'instead of dividing his new dominions (in Northumbria) into shires, as had been done with the southern parts of the Danelaw, the region north of the Humber was divided into two earldoms, one of which, now or a little later, was entrusted to the king of the Scots; the other, from the Tweed to the Humber, was given to Osulf, an Englishman.'<sup>116</sup> Now this division corresponds exactly with that ascribed to the earlier Anglo-Saxon Northumbria by Gibson. A century later, when Malcolm 'became king William's man' in 1072 A.D., the Scottish hold of the district north of the Tweed became finally fixed, especially through Malcolm's marriage with Margaret. 'Henceforward his English earldom of Lothian was recognized as the most important part of his dominions.'<sup>117</sup>

II.—Next, as regards the Tees as constituting the boundary between the two kingdoms. There are two champions of this view whose opinions deserve careful consideration.

The learned archbishop Ussher, in his *Britannicarum Ecclesiarum Antiquitates et Primordia*,<sup>118</sup> published in 1639 A.D., after quoting the statements of Ralph of Chester, Thomas of Malmesbury, Richard of Hexham, Humphrey Lhuyd, William Camden, John of Tynemouth, and John Fordun, of whom Richard of Hexham and Humphrey Lhuyd alone declare for the Tees as against the Tyne, proceeds to give his own judgment, after all, in favour of the Tees. Fortunately, after

<sup>114</sup> A remarkable illustration of this fact was brought forward by Mr. R. Oliver Heslop at the meeting of the Society on 25th November, 1896. He pointed out that there are practically no Danish place-names in the present county of Northumberland; and that while there are not a few instances in the south of the county of Durham (except in upper Weardale, where there is none), they become fewer and fewer towards the Tyne. See also *Arch. Ael.* vol. xiii. p. 224.

<sup>115</sup> Ransome's *Advanced History of England*, 1895, vol. i. p. 63.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.* p. 65. This southern earldom was again subdivided during Edgar's reign (959-975 A.D.) 'Commissa prouincia Osulfo comiti: qui regnante postmodum Eadgaro, socium accepit Oslacum; deinde Osulfus ad Aquilonalem plagam Tinæ, Oslac uero super Eboracum et eius fines curas administrabat.' *Chronica Rogeri de Hoveden*, Rolls series, vol. i. p. 57.

<sup>117</sup> Ransome, *l.c.* p. 96.

<sup>118</sup> Ed. Ebrington, 1847, vol. v. c. xii. pp. 452-453.

his careful wont, he states his reason. Finding the secondary authorities not agreed, he goes back past them, as a true historian, to Bede as a primary informant. But in Bede, of course, he can find no categorical statement; he can only trace an inference. And the inference is this: when, according to Bede, the episcopal see of the Northumbrians was divided into two in 678 A.D. Bosa became bishop of the Deirans at York, and Eata bishop of the Bernicians at Hexham or at Lindisfarne.<sup>119</sup> But as Hexham is on the south side of the Tyne, Ussher argues that the debatable territory between the Tyne and the Tees must therefore have been part of Bernicia. That is all he has to urge for it; and it cannot be said to amount to much. For, to argue as to the limits of an earlier subdivision of a kingdom from a later arrangement of a diocese, a generation after that kingdom had been finally welded into one, falls very far short of proof, or even probability. The subordinate kingdoms of Northumbria were permanently united after Oswin's death in 651 A.D.: the see of Northumbria was first subdivided in 678 A.D. Twenty-seven years of a single secular government had thus intervened before the ecclesiastical rearrangement took place. Moreover, the original bishopric of Lindisfarne, out of which the two new dioceses were taken, was never merely the see of the Bernicians, but had the episcopal control of Northumbria as a whole. For forty-three years the bishops had spiritually supervised the whole kingdom, whether as separated into Bernicia and Deira, or as united under one king; their jurisdiction was entirely independent of the secular subdivision. When Chad was consecrated bishop in 665 A.D. it was as bishop of York, but he took over the whole diocese of Lindisfarne, or Northumbria; and after his brief tenure of the see his successor, Wilfrid, 'administered the diocese of the whole province of the Northumbrians.'<sup>120</sup> An ecclesiastical division, therefore, of this great unity would be obviously independent of obsolete civil areas of administration. And further, Ussher's argu-

<sup>119</sup> Bede, *H. E.* iv. 12. 'Quo etiam anno orta inter ipsum regem Ecgridum et reuerentissimum antistitem Vilfridum dissensione, pulsus est idem antistes a sede sui episcopatus et duo in locum eius substituti episcopi, qui Nordanhymbrorum genti praeessent, Bosa uidelicet qui Derorum et Eata qui Berniciorum prouinciam gubernaret: hic in ciuitate Eboraci, ille in Hagustaldensi siue in Lindisfarnensi ecclesia cathedram habens episcopalem.'

<sup>120</sup> 'Totius Northanhymbrorum prouinciæ pontificatum non paruo tempore administrauit.' *Sym. Dun.* i. 9.

ment has a further defect, in that it rests on the assumption that if the Tyne was the boundary it must have been so along its whole course. But at the present time, and ever since Durham has been a separate county, the south side of the Tyne west of the parish of Ryton<sup>121</sup> belongs to Northumberland; yet no one would maintain on that account that the Tyne, generally speaking, is not the division between the counties of Northumberland and Durham, or between the dioceses of Newcastle and Durham. The inference drawn by Ussher from this single circumstance is altogether too precarious and vague to be admitted even as evidence.

But in addition to archbishop Ussher there is another supporter of the Tees theory, whose words carry peculiar weight from his special knowledge of northern antiquities. Mr. Longstaffe in his paper on *Durham before the Conquest*, contributed to the Newcastle meeting of the Archaeological Institute in August, 1852,<sup>122</sup> pronounces for the Tees boundary practically on two grounds: partly on account of the territory of the Hexham bishopric, both on the occasion of its severance under Bosa from York, and also with special reference to the subsequent subdivision of the northern diocese between Lindisfarne and Hexham in 681 A.D.;<sup>123</sup> (but this line of argument has already been shown to be quite inconclusive); and partly on the ground that in the time of the later division of the earldom of Northumberland three hundred years later, 'in 969, by means of the Tees, it is remarked by Wallingford<sup>124</sup> that the two kingdoms

<sup>121</sup> The river Derwent for some twenty miles forms the boundary of the county, and would naturally form the division to its junction with the Tyne. The only part of the county to the west of it is the original parish of Ryton. The rev. C. E. Adamson suggests that this is included as being one of the ancient manors of the bishop of Durham. These were all regarded formerly as parts of Durham, e.g. Bedlingtonshire, which was counted as part of the Chester Ward of the county of Durham (Mackenzie, *Northumberland*, ed. 1825, i. 344) until it was annexed to Northumberland in 1845 by Act of Parliament (7 & 8 Vict. cap. 61). But Ryton, as being actually contiguous to the county of Durham, remained undisturbed as part of it.

<sup>122</sup> *Proceedings of the Archaeological Institute, Newcastle*, vol. i. [London, 1858] pp. 42, 43.

<sup>123</sup> See Bede, *H. E.* iv. 12. 'Qui etiam post tres abscissionis Vilfridi annos, horum numero duos addidit antistites, Tunbertum ad ecclesiam Hagustaldensem, remanente Eata ad Lindisfarnensem, et Truiniuni ad provinciam Pictorum, quæ tunc temporis Anglorum erat imperio subiecta.'

<sup>124</sup> *Chronica Joannis Wallingford*, in *Gale's Script.* XV. But see Wright's *Biographia Britannica Literaria*, vol. ii. p. 471. 'John de Wallingford, abbot of St. Alban's [A.D. 1199] is described by Matthew Paris as a man of learning :

became two earldoms or counties ; and during the Danish division and a temporary division by the Tyne of the earldom, the historians describe the northern portion as "beyond Tyne," not as "of the Bernicians." But surely the mere fact that the old name of the seventh century province of 'Bernicia' is not applied in the tenth century to the portion of it lying between the Tyne and the Tweed, under completely altered conditions of government, can have no bearing whatever on the exact southern boundary of the ancient division. Indeed, if there was any definite reason for avoiding the name of 'Bernicia,' it was on account of the narrowing of its northern, not of its southern, extent. In the very passage of 'Wallingford' to which Mr. Longstaffe refers, the district north of the Tweed is referred to as 'Louthion.' Moreover, the text of the reference, as printed by Gale, is obviously corrupt ; but if it proves anything, it seems to show that the writer actually applied the title of Deira to the territory north of the Tees, and so far to tell against Mr. Longstaffe's position. The words are : 'From the Humber to the Tees he assigned to Oslach. . . but from the Tees to Mireforth, that is the seaside part of Deira, to Eadulf, surnamed Ewelthild.'<sup>125</sup>

Of other scattered writers who allege that the Tees was the boundary of Bernicia and Deira no serious notice need be taken. For example, William Somner in his *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*<sup>126</sup> so states it on the

but that historian does not ascribe to him any writings, and it is more than probable that the Chronicle printed under his name by Gale, and other works which go under the same name, were the composition of a monkish writer who lived at a later period.' And compare Hardy, *Descriptive Catalogue of Materials*, etc., No. 1229, p. 625. 'The author seems frequently desirous of examining and comparing authorities, and yet the result is only error and absurdity, as he confounds persons and places, and sets chronology at defiance.' The only known MS. of the work is Cott. Julius, D. vii. 6.

<sup>125</sup> Gale, vol. iii. p. 544. 'At rex Eadgarus sub eodem tempore [sc. the time of Dunstan's appointment to the archbishopric of Canterbury in 960 A.D.] Barones Northumbrenses in consilium conuocans apud Eboracum, capitula multa ad regni negotia spectantia bene ordinauit. Inter quæ etiam Osulfi comitatum, quem auunculus eius Eadredus toti Northimbriæ sub nomine comitis præfecerat, in duos diuisit comitatus. Ipso Osulfo iam mortuo, noluit sub nomine hæreditatis rex eam partem terræ alicui prouenire soli, ne ad antiquam libertatem aspirantes (?) Northimbriæ, hoc est ab Humbria usque ad Theisam Oslach, et comitis gladio eum cinxit. A Theisa uero usque ad Mireforth sub nomine etiam comitatus, partem uidelicet maritimam Deiræ dedit Eadulf cognomento Ewelthild. Sicque duo regna ad duos comitatus deuenerunt, permanseruntque omni tempore regum Anglorum sub ditione et donatione eorumdem.'

<sup>126</sup> *Dictionarium Saxonico-Latino-Anglicum*, Oxonii, MDCLIX.

authority of Camden 'in Ottadinis;' but if he had referred to the same author 'in Brigantibus' he might on the same authority have adopted the Tyne.

The originator of all the confusion about the Tees is Richard of Hexham, who was prior there in 1143 A.D. He writes, in his *History of the Church of Hexham*: 'The territory of the Northumbrians in the time of the kings included under one general title all the tract from the river Humber to another river which was called the Tweed. But this was subdivided into two provinces, namely, Deira, which, beginning at the Humber, was bounded by the river Tees, and Bernicia, which extended from the Tees to the Tweed.'<sup>127</sup> Here he betrays himself as resting on a wrong basis for Anglo-Saxon times by placing the northern limit of Bernicia at the Tweed, instead of the Forth (as has been shown above in the case of Gibson and of Smith). Perhaps it may be urged in his excuse that the unity of the church administration of the one mighty palatinate bishopric on both sides of the Tyne in his own time, and the marked separation between that territory and Yorkshire, might easily mislead him into supposing that that division was a fundamental and an ancient one.

In addition to Richard of Hexham, Ussher also quotes Humphrey Lhuyd in support of the Tees boundary. This writer seems to have been a native of Denbigh,<sup>128</sup> who wrote in Latin a *Britanniae Descriptio*, which was published at Cologne in 1572, a few years before Camden's *Britannia*. His statement is: 'The kingdom of Deira embraced the whole district from the Humber and the Trent to the river Tees; and Bernicia from the Tees to the Scottish sea, which now they call Fyrthe. . . . That tideway now called Forthe used to be called the Pictish, and afterwards the Scottish sea. Moreover, the kingdom of the Northumbrians extended as far as this.'<sup>129</sup> This indeed appears to be the only account which, while it covers rightly

<sup>127</sup> Printed in Twysden's *Historiae Anglicanae Scriptores* X. 1652, fol. 285 a. 'Generali nomine regio Northanhymbrorum tempore regum uocabatur, quicquid erat ab Humbra flumine usque ad alium fluuium qui uocabatur Tweda. Hæc autem subdivisa erat in duas provincias scilicet in Deiram quæ ab Humbra incipiens ad Tesam fluuium terminabatur; et in Berniciam quæ a Tesa usque ad Twedam protendebatur.'

<sup>128</sup> Watts, s.n. in *Bibliotheca Britannica*.

<sup>129</sup> Fol. 24. 'Deeræ regnum continebat totam regionem a Humbro et Trenta ad Tyssam flumen, Bernicia uero a Tyssa ad mare Scoticum, quod nunc Fyrthe uocant.' Fol. 40. 'Aestus ille nunc Forthea dictus mare Picticum et postea Scoticum dicebatur. Et huc usque Northumbrorum regnum extendebatur.'



the whole extent of Anglo-Saxon Northumbria, yet places the boundary between the two sub-kingdoms at the Tees. But its late date and obscure origin deprive it of any weight as an original authority.

III.—There remains, therefore, to be considered only the case for the Tyne as having formed the dividing frontier; and here the evidence rests on a surer basis, both of direct statement and of inference from known facts.

The *Vita S. Oswaldi*, by one of the Reginalds of Durham, which is printed (for the first time) in the appendix to the first volume of Arnold's edition of Symeon of Durham in the Rolls series, was written, as chapter lv. shows, in 1165 A.D.<sup>130</sup> In this work, when speaking of king Ida and his successors, the writer says: 'The kingdom of the Deirans was in ancient times from the river Humber to the bed of the beginning (? mouth) of the Tyne; while that of the Bernicians extended its bounds and circuit from the opening of the Tyne as far as Scotwad, which in the Scottish tongue is called Forth.'<sup>131</sup> This description is afterwards adopted and transcribed, with a simplification of its turgid Latinity, by John of Tynemouth (about 1336 A.D.);<sup>132</sup> and is again appropriated, according to Ussher, a few years later by John of Fordun, in his *Scotichronicon*.<sup>133</sup>

<sup>130</sup> 'Anno quidem instanti millesimus centesimus sexagesimus quintus ab incarnationis tempore est.'

<sup>131</sup> c.i. 'Regnum Deirorum antiquitus erat de flumine Humbre usque Tinæ principii alueum; Berniciorum autem de Tinæ exordio usque in Scotwad [?Scoticum uadum], quod in Scottorum lingua Forth nominatur, dilatabat simul terminum et ambitum.'

<sup>132</sup> 'Regnum Deirorum a flumine Humbriæ usque ad Tynam fluium quondam se extendit. Regnum uero Berniciorum a flumine Tyne usque ad mare Scoticum, quod Scotorum lingua Forth nominatur, porrigebatur,' in *Regis Oswaldi Vita* (quoted by Ussher, *l.c.*). That he copied from Reginald of Durham is shown by the next sentence, in which he describes the district between Tyne and Tees as having been a wilderness, and the haunt of wild beasts, at that time. This passage is all but a word for word transcription, with a few slight modifications.

<sup>133</sup> Ussher, *l.c.* 'Quod ipsum etiam in Johannis Fordoni Scotichronico similiter annotatum inuenimus.' This reference seems to be a confused memory of three passages in the *Scotichronicon*: (i) 'Huius autem Albania regionis provincias, quæcunque fuerint, quæ sunt inter *Humbrum* & mare *Scoticum*, olim *Britones* dominio tantum, & nihil unquam possessionis in *Albione* uersus Boream, habuerunt,' ii. 6. (ii) '*Scotia* quidem a *Scotorum* gentibus quibus incolitur appellatur. Ad fretum quoque *Scoticum* *Scotia* prius initium sumpsit, ab Austro deinde quidem ad *Humbri* flumen. a quo cæpit exordium *Albania*. Postmodum uero iuxta murum inceptit *Thirlwal*, quem *Seuerus* extruxerat ad amnem *Tynam*,' ii. 7. (iii) 'Igitur irruptiones *Fulgentii* crebras grauiter fereps Imperator, fieri iussit uallum inter *Deiram* & *Albaniam*, ut eius impetum propius accedere prohiberet,' ii. 34. Printed in Gale, vol. i. pp. 590, 606.

Moreover, other chroniclers of the fourteenth century agree in this view. Thus, for example, Ralph Higden of Chester (1342 A.D.) writes in his *Polychronicon*: 'This kingdom of the Northumbrians was originally divided into two provinces, Deira to the south and Bernicia to the north; and these two kingdoms the river Tyne divided at that time. For the kingdom of the Deirans extended from the river Humber as far as the river Tyne; and the kingdom of the Bernicians stretched from the river Tyne as far as the aforementioned Scottish sea;'<sup>134</sup> and he refers to Alfred of Beverley as his authority.<sup>135</sup> And similarly Thomas of Malmesbury, in his *Eulogium Historiarum* (about 1370 A.D.): 'The kingdom of the Deirans extended from the river Humber to the river Tyne, and the kingdom of the Bernicians from the river Tyne to the Scottish sea, where the town of St. John's now is.'<sup>136</sup>

Again, Leland, in his *Collectanea*, gives some excerpts from the work of an anonymous author, *De Episcopis Lindisfarnensibus*; and these include the statement that 'Northumbria was divided into the kingdom of the Deirans and (the kingdom) of the Bernicians. The limit of the Deirans was from the Humber to the Tyne; that of the Bernicians from the Tyne to the Scottish sea.'<sup>137</sup> Again, he quotes later from the chronicle of another anonymous author which he found at Whitby: 'The kingdom of the Deirans from Humber to Tyne. The kingdom of the Bernicians from Tyne to the Scottish sea, where the town of St. John's is.'<sup>138</sup>

<sup>134</sup> 'Hoc autem regnum Northimbrorum primitus diuisum fuit in duas prouincias; in Deiram ad austrum, et in Berniciam ad aquilonem, quæ duo regna flumen Tyne tunc temporis diuiserat. Nam regnum Deirorum a fluuio Humbriæ usque ad flumen Tyne extendebatur; regnum uero Berniciorum a flumine Tyne usque ad mare Scoticum prædictum porrigebatur,' lib. i. c. 51.

<sup>135</sup> 'The fifty-first chapter, on the succession of kingdoms in Britain, is taken, according to most MSS., from Alfred of Beverley. . . . Both versions, however, as well as MS. B., omit the reference. The words do not occur, I believe, in Alfred.' Prof. Churchill Babington, Introduction to Higden's *Polychronicon*, Rolls series, vol. ii. p. xiv.

<sup>136</sup> 'Nam regnum Deirorum a fluuio Humbre usque ad flumen Tyne se extendebat; regnum uero Berniciorum a flumine Tyne usque ad mare Scoticum, ubi nunc est uilla Sancti Johannis porrigebatur; totum enim intermedium ad regnum Berniciorum pertinebat.' Vol. ii. p. 165, Rolls series. The description seems to be borrowed from Ralph Higden, or from the same source as that from which he derived it.

<sup>137</sup> 'Northumbria diuisa in regnum Deirorum & Berniciorum. Deirorum limes ab Humbro ad Tinam. Berniciorum limes a Tina ad mare Scoticum.' Vol. ii. (i.) p. 366.

<sup>138</sup> 'Northumbria olim continebat totam terram quæ est inter Humbrum & Tuedam fluuios. . . . Regnum Deirorum a Humbro ad Tinam. Regnum

The witness of the monastic chroniclers is strongly in favour of the Tyne boundary. And it is in their writings that the primary sources lie for all subsequent utterances on the subject ; it is to them mainly that recourse must be had for information and guidance about the 'old times before them.' For they had access to many records which have since perished, and they were in touch with many local traditions which still lived on when they wrote.

In modern times Dr. Lappenberg says : 'The country to the north of the Humber had suffered the most severely from the inroads of the Picts and Scots. It became at an early period separated into two British states, the names of which were retained for some centuries, viz., Deifyr (Deora rice), afterwards Latinized into Deira, extending from the Humber to the Tyne, and Berneich (Beorna rice), afterwards Bernicia, from the Tyne to the Clyde.'<sup>139</sup> But it would be as useless as it would be tedious to enumerate lists of modern writers who have declared for the Tees or for the Tyne as the Bernicia-Deiran boundary. While their opinions are interesting, and in some cases valuable on account of the critical judgment of the authors, they really add nothing to the actual evidence on the point, for they do not adduce the arguments on which they base their opinions, nor do they quote any references from early authorities.

But there are other indications which tend to support the testimony of the monastic chroniclers in favour of the Tyne ; especially two, which may be cited,—one from before, and the other from after, the time of the Anglo-Saxon dynasty of Northumbria.

(i.) When this dynasty was founded by Ida in 547 A.D.,<sup>140</sup> it was little more than a century since the Roman garrisons had been

Berniciorum a Tina ad mare Scoticum, ubi oppidum S. Joannis est.' Vol. iv. (iii.) p. 40. Mr. Longstaffe cites (*l.c.* p. 42) three references from Leland in support of 'the statement that the land between the Tyne and the Tees composed part of Bernicia.' Of these, however, two are, to say the least, inconclusive. Leland's actual words are : (1) 'In Bernicia est Hexham, Richemont, Carlel, & Copland'—*Coll.* vol. iv. (iii.) p. 99—where Hexham proves nothing, and Richmond proves too much ; and (2) 'Regnum Deirorum ab Humbro ad Thesim Beverle olim dicebatur,'—*Itin.* vol. vii. p. 68 (from Stowe's transcript, the original being lost),—where again the allusion seems to be only to part of Deira. The third reference is remarkable as being the one instance where Leland speaks on his own authority only, and not on the evidence of any earlier writer : 'Deiri. Incolebant latam regionem ab Abri flu. ripis ad ripas Tyssæ. Bernicii uero sedes habuerunt a Tyssa ad Tuesim flu. & ultra.' *Comment. in Cygneam Cantionem*, printed in *Itin.* vol. ix. p. 54.

<sup>139</sup> *History of England under the Anglo-Saxon Kings*, tr. by Benj. Thorpe, London, 1845, vol. i. p. 117.

<sup>140</sup> Bede, *H. E.* v. 24.

finally withdrawn from Britain. But the marks of their organization and administration were deeply stamped on the country. Now the district north of the Humber formed under the Romans two administrative provinces, divided by the Great Wall; Maxima Caesariensis on the south, with its capital at York, and Valentia between the two Walls of the Tyne and the Forth.<sup>141</sup> Of these two provinces Maxima Caesariensis was held in a much firmer grasp than Valentia.<sup>142</sup> Ida fixed his royal residence and base of operations at Bamborough in the centre of Valentia; while Aelli reigned at York over the southern province. But the tract between the Tyne and the Tees, which is the debatable region as between Bernicia and Deira, was part of the earlier Maxima Caesariensis, and was by all association of the past connected with it in every way, and not with the district north of the Wall. The Roman roads connected the Wall, and the stations on the Wall, with the south by a close and well ordered network of ways. Although there were, of course, the three main roads running north through Valentia from the Wall, two of these were to the west of the Bernician territory; so that in the Anglo-Saxon times there was only one main artery between the north and the south of the Tyne in the kingdom of Northumbria. But to the south of the river there were several roads, all linking that riverside and its neighbourhood with Deira. The great Rykniold way, after traversing almost the whole island, ended at the mouth of the Tyne;<sup>143</sup> another branch led direct to Pons Aelii; and further west there was the great Watling street. Moreover, south of the wall the camps clustered comparatively thickly, as Mr. Longstaffe himself points out: 'The Romans erected some of their finest northern fortresses between the Tees and the Tyne';<sup>144</sup> at Caer Urfe, Chester-le-Street, Lanchester, Binchester, and Piercebridge, at Wearmouth and Seaton Carew, were posts which were all in touch with the south of the Tees, but not with the north of the Tyne. The

<sup>141</sup> 'Maxima ab extremis Flaviae finibus oritur, pertinet ad inferiorem partem Muri, qui totam ex transverso percurrit insulam, spectatque in septemtriones. Spatium inter ambos, hunc et alium qui ab imperatore Antonino Pio inter Bdoram et Clyddam extructus est Murum, occupat Valentia.' Richard of Cirencester's *De Situ Britanniae*, c. vi. § 2 (ed. Giles, 1841).

<sup>142</sup> See Burton, *History of Scotland*, vol. i. p. 60:—'The book known as the *Itinerary of Antoninus*, the most distinct topography of the empire which we have from a contemporary source, brings up the roads, towns, and stations to the southern rampart from the Solway to the Tyne, and stops there as abruptly as any modern map does at the boundary of the territory to which it applies.'

<sup>143</sup> See p. 69, n. 84.

<sup>144</sup> *I.e.*, p. 51.

presumption is very strong therefore that the boundary-line between the two Anglo-Saxon kingdoms in the sixth century would naturally, and even inevitably, follow the previous and long-established boundary between the Roman provinces of Valentia and Maxima Caesariensis.<sup>145</sup>

And this probability is incidentally supported by two statements in Bede which are apparently contradictory to each other, but which on this supposition become easily intelligible. In the second chapter of his third book he writes with reference to the church built hard by the spot where Oswald raised the cross before the battle of Heavenfield : 'No sign of the Christian faith, as we have ascertained, no church, no altar was erected among the whole people of Bernicia, before the new leader of the army, at the suggestion of a devout faith, planted this standard of the holy cross, when preparing to fight against a cruel foe ;'<sup>146</sup> but only two chapters later he describes Whithern in Galloway as belonging to the province of Bernicia, and as commonly called, 'Ad Candidam Casam' because of the stone church which Ninian had built there.<sup>147</sup> Now the Roman provinces penetrated from the east to the west coast, so that Whithern would be in Valentia, which Bernicia roughly represented ; but the Anglo-Saxon Northumbria did not touch the western sea, at least so far north as this, but was shut off from it by the great Strathclyde. It therefore is possible that there might be no church in Bernicia as it actually ranged in the Northumbrian kingdom ; and yet that Whithern might be regarded as belonging to that province as in some sense the representative of Valentia.

(ii.) In the ninth century, when Guthred was raised to the throne from slavery, and made in gratitude his great gift of the Werhale to St. Cuthbert, under the sanction of his suzerain and with the concurrence of his subjects, it is clear that this was part of his own kingdom. But the Melrose chronicle states that<sup>148</sup> Guthred's authority extended

<sup>145</sup> As Montalembert perceived : 'The wall anciently raised by the emperor Severus from the mouth of the Solway to that of the Tyne, to check the Caledonian incursions, was their boundary.' iii. 252.

<sup>146</sup> 'Nullum, ut comperimus, fidei Christianæ signum, nulla ecclesia, nullum altare in tota Berniciorum gente erectum est, priusquam hoc sacræ crucis nexillum nouis militiæ ductor, dictante fidei deuotione, contra hostem immanissimum pugnaturus statueret.'

<sup>147</sup> 'Qui locus, ad prouinciam Berniciorum pertinens, uulgo uocatur Ad Candidam Casam, eo quod ibi ecclesiam de lapide, insolito Brettonibus more, fecerit.'

<sup>148</sup> 'Regnauit super Eboracum ; Egbertus uero ultra Tinam. *Chronica de Mailros, s.a. DCCCLXXXIII.* (Edinb. Bannatyne Club Publ. 1835).

only to the Tyne, while Bernicia was assigned to Egbert.<sup>149</sup> Therefore the district south of the Tyne, when a division was to be made in the ninth century under the Danes, was regarded as belonging to the southern, not to the northern, part of the whole; and so far this affords an inferential suggestion of a similar association in the Anglo-Saxon past.

Thus, while there is little or nothing in the nature of evidence to support the view that the Tees separated Bernicia from Deira, beyond Richard of Hexham's statement, which has been shown to be faulty in fact in other respects, and probably a mistaken assumption from a later ecclesiastical organization, everything of moment tends to confirm the supposition that the Tyne was the actual meeting line of the two kingdoms. It is difficult to resist the impression that many modern writers have been unconsciously misled in their support of the Tees theory by the association in their mind of the medieval and modern diocese of Durham, as separated from Scotland by the Tweed, and from Yorkshire by the Tees.

<sup>149</sup> This division of territory is quite distinct from that of Edgar's reign mentioned above (p. 78, n. 116).

#### ADDITIONAL NOTES to pp. 65 and 69.

<sup>150</sup> Mr. R. Blair points out an interesting reference to St. Hild's, which well illustrates both the use of this name as the regular title of the place and also the vague description of its situation given by Bede. In the second volume of *Bishop Cosin's Correspondence* (Surtees Soc. Publ. vol. 55, p. 134) part of a letter from the rev. George Davenport, bishop Cosin's resident chaplain at Auckland castle, to dean Sancroft of St. Paul's, is given (from Tanner MSS. xlv. 22), in which he writes, 14 August, 1665: 'The sickness hath been a fortnight at St. Hild's (commonly called Sheelds), which is a town belonging to the Dean and Chapter betwixt Gateside and the sea mouth.'

<sup>151</sup> The small islet shown on the map at page 68 as dividing the two mouths of the Tyne, is taken by Mr. Longstaffe (*Durham before the Conquest*, p. 46) and by Dr. Bruce (*The Roman Camp on the Lawe*, p. 5) to represent the Shields Heugh, and the river current to the south of it the second river bed from the Mill Dam to the Herd Sand. On the original map it is certainly coloured as land. And if, taken by itself, it does not afford very conclusive evidence, it should be borne in mind that the proof of the existence of this southern mouth of the Tyne by no means depends alone, or even mainly, on the witness of this map; but there are some strong natural indications that the river formerly had an outlet through this depression to the sea. Even as late as in 1855 A.D. the ordnance map shows a watercourse extending from the site of the old Mill Dam lake as far as to the edge of the sands.