



ROMAN DURHAM.



# ARCHAEOLOGIA AELIANA.

## I.—ROMAN DURHAM.\*

BY J. A. PETCH, M.A.

[Read on 30th July, 1924.]

The difference between the state of southern Britain under the Romans and that of northern Britain cannot perhaps be too often stressed. In the south—roughly south of York-Chester—for a large portion of the period we find a purely civil population in existence, troops being absent—the Roman rule there was not so much an “occupation” as a protectorate. In the north, the presence of great numbers of Roman troops caused this territory to be definitely “occupied.” Though however the contrast is great, it is not absolute. In the south there were for a comparatively long period civilians and no troops; in the north there were mainly troops, but also, as seems to be clear from the remains in Durham for example, some civilians, though probably rather uncivilised civilians. It is with a portion of this occupied and mainly military zone that this paper attempts to deal.

In the north, when we speak of the Roman occupation of Britain, consciously or unconsciously the Roman Wall tends to colour to a very large extent our conceptions of that period. Yet of late it has been realised that great as the Wall was and still is, perhaps even to the Romans themselves it was not the most important feature of the occupation. Mr. F. G. Simpson has proved<sup>1</sup> that it was in the nature of an afterthought on the part of the military engineers of the time; Mr. R. G. Collingwood has

\* For list of abbreviations used see end of this paper, p. 34.

<sup>1</sup> *Trans. Cumberland and Westmorland Antiq. and Arch. Soc. (N.S.)*, xxii, pp. 370, 393 *seq.*, etc.

discussed<sup>2</sup> the unsuitability of the Wall as a means of defence when manned by troops armed only with spear and sword. The Wall was after all more of a custom's barrier, a means of keeping closely under survey all who entered or left the province. The strength of the Roman military frontier lay behind the Wall. Unless the dispositions of troops in Durham, Yorkshire, Lancashire, Westmorland and Cumberland are taken into account, the Wall for all its grandeur and monumental impressiveness reveals the Romans as little more than merely amateur strategists with inexhaustible supplies of manual labour at their disposal. That then is the part that Durham plays in Roman times; as one of the modern six northern counties of England it helps us to see the Roman Wall as something else than merely foolishly big. It provides a sample of the Hadrianic conception of a frontier system—a deep tract of country covered by a network of roads, these roads guarded at intervals by forts garrisoned by auxiliary troops, and debouching from the legionary fortresses in the rear of the fortified zone upon the limits of the province, along which was thrown a line of forts, the outworks of the province. Of this general scheme, the elements are to be found within the area under consideration. In addition, within an area wherein Roman military operations have been carried out there are generally to be found military works of a third type—camps, *i.e.*, temporary military posts. Within these three groups: (i) roads, (ii) forts, (iii) camps, most of the facts relating to the Roman occupation of the county can be dealt with. These together form (I) The Military Side of the Occupation. The residue of facts are here dealt with in the second main section of the paper, (II) The Civil Side of the Occupation.

#### I.—THE MILITARY SIDE OF THE OCCUPATION.

(i) *Roads*.—The question of the position of Roman roads in county Durham has been greatly obscured by the Darlington antiquary, Jack Cade, and his followers. Though Hutchinson took “a pleasure in mining poor

<sup>2</sup> *Vasculum* (Reid & Co., Ltd., Newcastle-upon-Tyne); Oct., 1921.

Jack Cade's castles, and breaking up his roads" (a pleasure in truth only too easily gratifiable), the influence of Cade's writings, especially of his article in the eighth volume of *Archaeologia*, has been appallingly wide. Many of the so-called Roman roads of the county are due only to his unfortunate enthusiasm. It is, however, certain that there was a road running through the county from Piercebridge via Binchester and Lanchester to Ebchester and so to the north. The surface of this road has been uncovered at various points along the line, e.g., north of Binchester<sup>3</sup> and apparently at Willington.<sup>4</sup> That Chester-le-Street, Jarrow and South Shields, the only other known forts in the county, were connected by branch roads with this main road is probable. "Wrekin Dike," which may be Roman, though there seems to be no conclusive evidence, apparently leaves Jarrow on one side;<sup>5</sup> there is no trace of the road which probably ran from Lanchester to Chester-le-Street.

There are two other roads laid down as Roman. It has been said<sup>6</sup> that there is "little reason to doubt" that in Roman times a road entered the county at Barnard Castle, and ran through Raby Park, probably through Merrington, and then on to Ferryhill and Garmondsway. There appears to be little concrete evidence to encourage such a belief.<sup>7</sup> The road from Pountey's Bridge to somewhere west or north of Durham city<sup>8</sup> seems to be largely laid down upon a foundation of place-names, though it

<sup>3</sup> P.S.N. (3), v, p. 64, cf. also H. and S., quoted pp. 16-17.

<sup>4</sup> H. iii, p. 284. "A large column was lately dug up with an inscription thereon; but before a drawing could be obtained, it was squared down and defaced, to make the pillar of a shed for cattle." (*Ibid.*). Perhaps we may see in this "column" a Roman milestone.

<sup>5</sup> In this district Horsley thought that he found "some certain visible remains of a military way on Gateshead Fell, pointing directly towards the part where I suppose the station has been at Newcastle, and coming as I apprehend, from Chester-le-Street" (*Brit. Rom.*, p. 104). Others have found apparent traces of Roman roads hereabouts. Cf. Longstaffe; "Durham Before the Conquest"; *Memoirs communicated to the . . . Arch. Institute, Newcastle-upon-Tyne*, August, 1852, vol. i, pp. 59-60.

<sup>6</sup> Boyle, p. 66.

<sup>7</sup> Mr. Wooler has found apparent traces of a Roman road near Wackerfield. P.S.N. (3), iii, p. 220.

<sup>8</sup> Boyle, *loc. cit.* Cf. S., iii, p. 228.

is said<sup>9</sup> that "fragments of Roman brick" have been picked up near Surtees' site for that bridge. Of a third road—Cade's coast road—we can only say that there is—and was in his time—no evidence for its existence.<sup>10</sup> Finds of Roman remains along the coast are detailed in section II (ii) of this paper; here it may be said that there is no trace of such a road, and a line of Roman remains is not sufficient evidence in itself of a road. In fact, throughout the area of county Durham we can only be sure of one Roman road—Deor Street, as Symeon of Durham called it, running from Piercebridge to Ebchester, with probable, though unknown, offshoots. The other suggested lines, though they have often been accepted as certain, must be far more thoroughly explored before we can be at all sure that they are the sites of Roman roads.

(ii) *Forts*.—None of the forts in the county have been completely excavated. Most work has been done upon the South Shields site, and a certain amount of digging was carried out at Binchester round about 1878. The striking and well-preserved remains at Lanchester are virtually untouched, and form perhaps the most attractive site for excavators in the county, if not in the north. As a consequence, the following notes on the various sites are mainly compilations and criticisms of what others have said. It is however hoped that such a compilation of scattered references will be of service when further work upon the Roman remains of the county is contemplated.

*Piercebridge*, Horsley's *Magis*, can never be completely excavated unless the modern inhabitants of the site can be induced to migrate in the interests of archaeology—an all too unlikely contingency. "The station occupies a nearly level piece of ground on the north bank of the river Tees."<sup>11</sup> The N.W. corner of the rampart, which is of a coarse gritty sandstone,<sup>12</sup> together with the ditch, are in a good state of preservation.<sup>13</sup> Bruce<sup>14</sup> puts the area of the

<sup>9</sup> *J.A.A.*, xlili, p. 182, cf. *P.S.N.* (3), iv, p. 244.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Summers, *Sunderland*, p. 17.

<sup>11</sup> Bruce (2), p. 320.

<sup>12</sup> Bruce, *loc. cit.*

<sup>13</sup> *P.S.N.* (3), i, pp. 123 seq.

<sup>14</sup> Bruce (3), p. 353.

site at about  $8\frac{3}{4}$  acres, Wooler at  $10\frac{3}{4}$  (610 feet  $\times$  765 feet).<sup>15</sup> The divergence may be due to the fact that one area includes the fortifications. Even so, the area is unusually large for that of an auxiliary fort. Attempts have been made to explain this great size,<sup>15a</sup> but probably the site of the fort bath-house provides the real clue. In 1730, an "aqueduct"<sup>16</sup> was found leading to the bath-house which is situated 180 feet west of the east rampart and 225 feet north of the south. Now it is usually the case in Britain that the bath-house is outside of the fort proper but within the fortified annexe which is to be found alongside of so many Roman forts. If then Piercebridge is an ordinary site, the acreages given above may in each case include the acreage of the annexe. The confusion of the areas can easily be explained on the supposition that the dividing rampart between fort and annexe has been destroyed by the building of the village within the ramparts. If this is the case, probably the area of the annexe as apart from the fort was about  $3\frac{1}{2}$  acres, taking the larger of the two areas given above as correct.

Finds<sup>17</sup> on the site include plain and stamped Samian ware, other pottery, a bronze Mercury<sup>18</sup> about  $4\frac{1}{2}$  inches high, a small model in bronze of a ploughman with a team of oxen,<sup>19</sup> now in the British Museum, and gold rings<sup>20</sup> now lost. The coins range from Nero to Valens.<sup>21</sup> "A multitude of coins of the Lower Empire have been found here,"<sup>22</sup> but earlier coins are sufficient in number to suggest that excavation might bring to light definite evidence of a Flavian date for the foundation of the fort.

<sup>15</sup> P.S.N. (3), i, pp. 123 seq.

<sup>15a</sup> e.g., Wooler; *Roman Fort at Piercebridge* (Butler & Tanner, 1917), p. 47, where it is suggested that the proximity of the strong native position of Stanwick called for extra Roman forces. The weakness of this suggestion lies in the fact that it is unknown whether Stanwick was occupied in Roman times.

<sup>16</sup> P.S.N., *loc. cit.*; "a yard wide and a yard and a quarter deep."

<sup>17</sup> Cf. P.S.N., *loc. cit.*

<sup>18</sup> A.J., xviii, p. 90. Illustrated in Wooler, *op. cit.*, opp. p. 120.

<sup>19</sup> *Brit. Mus. Guide to . . . R. Britain*, p. 90. For illust. see Wooler, *op. cit.*, opp. p. 148.

<sup>20</sup> A.J., vii, p. 191.

<sup>21</sup> P.S.N., *loc. cit.*

<sup>22</sup> H., iii, p. 262.

A tombstone was found south of the river in 1844, and to the inscriptions that have been found near or on the site are to be added the stones discovered during the restoration of Gainford church in 1864,<sup>23</sup> now in the Cathedral Library, Durham. If there are, as there are said to be,<sup>24</sup> "Roman broached stones" in the chancel wall of Winston church, once again Piercebridge has been the quarry. The various inscriptions found at Piercebridge are as follows:—

*Military*: (see note 23 *infra* (b)).

*Altars*: D. M. CONDATI (C. 420); see note 23 *infra* (a).

*Funerary*: C. 421; see note 23 *infra* (c).

*Fragment*: C. 419; for BELLINV stone, see p. 9, note 41.

*Binchester (Vinovia)*, "stands upon a bold promontory formed by the curious windings of the river Wear."<sup>25</sup> The foundations of the ramparts are about 100 feet above the bed of the river.<sup>26</sup> The outline of the fort has not been fully traced.<sup>27</sup> On the east side the wall at the level of the footing course is 8 feet 7 inches thick, above that 8 feet.<sup>28</sup> No gates were found when the excavations of 1879 were carried out. In fact, the slight excavation then carried out did not shed much light upon the history and form of the fort. The great Binchester hypocaust is the crux. Of this striking place of work, there are 88 pillars of brick still standing, carrying an "arcade" of three arches.<sup>29</sup> Flues were found in the wall, held by metal "T" hold-fasts, and covered with coloured plaster. The chamber above was 22 feet by 16 feet. What was this hypocaust?

<sup>23</sup> *P.S.N.* (3), ii, p. 344. The suggestion that these stones came from a villa at this place belonging to the commandant of the fort is, to say the least, highly improbable. Cf. *Ibid.*, iii, p. 378; *Catal. of ... Stones ... in the Cath. Library, Durham*, pp. 5-7. The stones are:—

(a) An altar to Jupiter Dolychenus. (C. 422.)

(b) A fragment. LEG VI V (C. 1344a).

(c) A fragment of (?) a funeral relief—a man, holding a (?) rabbit by its hind legs.

<sup>24</sup> *P.S.N.* (3), ii, p. 385.

<sup>25</sup> *Bruce* (2), p. 320.

<sup>26</sup> Hooppell; *Vinovia* (Whiting & Co., London, 1891), p. 3.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5. Much of the site has fallen away down the hillside.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 14-16.



Hooppell<sup>30</sup> saw in it originally the *praetorium*, and argued that it had later been turned into public baths. It is very doubtful whether his arguments hold good. The addition of two drains, the wearing down of the threshold, and the finding of many small late coins do not seem to argue so great a transformation. It is far more likely that this building was a bath-house from its inception, if it ever was a bath-house at all. That it was so is by no means certain, and the uncertainty is increased when it is recalled that the excavations brought to light a circular chamber with heating arrangements in the portion of the site on the other side of the southern rampart.<sup>31</sup> From this chamber when cleared came a bronze strigil. It is then possible that this was a portion of a bath-house.<sup>32</sup> On the other hand, if it is the bath-house it is probably outside the fort proper and within the annexe. Yet the buildings brought to light in the area of the *canabae* and along the edge of "Watling Street" closely resemble barrack buildings such as have been found, *e.g.*, at Housesteads. Were the excavators then totally wrong? Is what they called the annexe really the fort and what they called the fort really only the annexe? If this inversion is correct, the large hypocaust may be viewed as part of the baths, the small circular chamber as connected probably with the house of the commandant. If the identification of the excavators is correct and the suggested inversion wrong, the large hypocaust will form part of the commandant's house, the circular chamber part of the bath-house outside the fort.<sup>33</sup>

In the present state of our knowledge it is impossible to say which view is correct. The same doubt must con-

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 17-18.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 19.

<sup>32</sup> This building had certainly been modified, according to the report, a wall having been driven across it. Is it possible that Hooppell was right, that the hypocaust was first the *praetorium*, later the baths, and that the circular chamber was the original baths, later some other type of building? If so the sites of the fort proper and the annexe seem to have been reversed at some time. This seems a drastic change, almost too drastic. Perhaps Binchester will prove an English Inchtuthill or Camelon, and some of these buildings parallel to the Agricolan buildings at those sites. (*J.R.S.*, ix, pp. 113 *seq.*).

<sup>33</sup> But see note 32.

tinue as to the nature of the square building found 20 feet outside the eastern rampart.<sup>34</sup> We can only say that arguments based on the view that once the fort ditch was a wet ditch, will not, like the ditch of any Roman fort, hold water; moreover the transformation from a Mithraeum to a kiln is as unlikely as the suggestion is refreshing in its enterprise.<sup>35</sup>

The excavators have however fully atoned for any mistakes by doing a thing which was little to be expected in an age when for the most part pottery was thrown away without regard or record. It is indeed a thing for which we must be very grateful that they have preserved to us a record of the potters' stamps on the Samian ware which came to light.<sup>36</sup> That they did not read all the stamps correctly is only to be expected; that they endeavoured to read and record them at all is a matter for congratulation. Among the stamps recorded are two<sup>37</sup> which definitely assign to Binchester a Flavian origin. Here it may perhaps be allowed to comment on the fact that no one has apparently cared to examine the record of the pottery or the pottery itself now in the Durham University Museum, and this seems to be the first notice of this Flavian pottery from Binchester.

The coins found range from Claudius to Gratian,<sup>38</sup> and though the excavators reported<sup>39</sup> that there were signs of three periods of occupation of the site, the evidence is too scanty to assign dates to these periods. Extensive further work must be done before the history of the fort, founded in Flavian times, and apparently lasting on well into the second half of the fourth century, can be ascertained.

<sup>34</sup> Hooppell; *op. cit.*, p. 8.

<sup>35</sup> What the writer wished to find was evidence of Christianity. This he thought to find in quite impossible ways (*e.g.*, *op. cit.*, pp. 12, 38).

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 50-52.

<sup>37</sup> (i) **MERCAT O** on a fragment "on which are a bird and a dog in separate compartments." (The stamp was read wrongly as **MERCVTO**: I have seen the piece at Durham.) (ii) On a fragment of plain Samian ware, **OF CELSI**. Mr. Donald Atkinson has helped me in the matter of the pottery from Binchester.

<sup>38</sup> Hooppell; *op. cit.*, pp. 42-47.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11.

The inscriptions from the fort are as follows:—

*Military*: Tiles: C. 1234, a. and b.; *Eph.* VII, 1135.

*Altars*: FORTUNAE SANCTAE (C. 423); MATRIB. OLLOTOTIS, (C. 424);<sup>40</sup> GENIO LOCI (?), (C. 425); MATRIBUS, (C. 426); . . . . . EX C. FRIS. VINOVIE, (C. 427); ?, (C. 428) (AESC)VLAPIO (ET) SALUTI, (*Eph.* VII, 979); ? MATR. TRAMAR, (*Eph.* VII, 980).

*Funerary*: C. 429.

*Fragments*: BELLINV (C. 430);<sup>41</sup> ?, *Eph.* VII, 1146.

In addition the ancient church of Escombe seems to contain many Roman worked stones. Baldwin Brown<sup>42</sup> considered that the chancel arch had been removed bodily from the fort, and that other architectural peculiarities were due to the use of Roman material. A stone recording work by men of the Sixth Legion was built into the wall upside down.<sup>43</sup> A statue of Priapus is mentioned by Hutchinson<sup>44</sup> as coming from Binchester—it was long used by a farmer's wife as a cheese press until it spoilt her cheese and was discharged from these menial duties. This seems to be the basis for Cade's amusing suggested Greek derivation for Binchester, placing there a centre of Bacchic orgies.<sup>45</sup>

Lanchester (*Longovicus* ?), "occupies a lofty brow to the west of the village, on a tongue of land formed by the junction of two small streams. On three sides the ground falls away from the camp; on the west only it is commanded by a high moorland hill . . . and on this side, the fosse has been peculiarly bold. The station is one of the largest of its class, containing an area of about seven acres."<sup>46</sup> Elsewhere,<sup>47</sup> Bruce puts the area at six acres, and the dimensions given by Wooler<sup>48</sup> imply an area of

<sup>40</sup> Cf. *P.S.N.* (2), v, pp. 143 seq.; *Arch. Ael.* (2), xv, pp. 225-7.

<sup>41</sup> So Hübner, but Hooppell (*op. cit.*) does not mention this fragment, whereas Wooler (*op. cit.*, p. 132) ascribes an exactly similar stone to Piercebridge, as does *Arch. Ael.* (3), xvii, p. 104, no. 192.

<sup>42</sup> *P.S.N.* (3), i, p. 266.

<sup>43</sup> *Arch. Ael.* (New), viii, p. 285.

<sup>44</sup> *H.*, iii, pp. 426 seq.

<sup>45</sup> So Conyers Surtees: *Hist. of Byers Green.*

<sup>46</sup> *Bruce* (2), p. 318.

<sup>47</sup> *Bruce* (3), p. 347.

<sup>48</sup> *P.S.N.* (3), ii, p. 406. 188 yards (E-W) × 166.

not quite six and a half. On the other hand Surtees<sup>49</sup> gives figures that make the area five and a half acres, though he states that the acreage is eight. The walls, though to a great extent stripped of the facing stones, are in places still six feet above the present level, and it is said that traces have been noted of round corner turrets.<sup>50</sup> The site is virtually untouched by the excavator. When a boy, the late Canon Greenwell lighted in the course of play with his brothers upon what appears to have been a drain, which he traversed for a distance of forty or fifty yards.<sup>51</sup> Years later the same archaeologist partly dug out three semi-circular bays near the centre of the fort, facing to the east, "and apparently part of the Praetorium."<sup>52</sup> In 1905<sup>53</sup> these bays were found to rest upon pillars, and a stone sill of a door through the wall to the north of the bays was then found *in situ*. There are also records of buildings found without the walls. "On the slope of the hill, leading from the station to the village, are the remains of what must have been an important range of buildings."<sup>54</sup> Horsley saw what he took, probably correctly, to be the baths near the south-east corner of the vallum. "The floor was supported by pillars, about a yard distant from each other, and resting on a surface apparently metallic. The angles of four square stones met upon each of the pillars and had their upper surface plastered to the depth of 4 inches with a mixture of lime, limestone, pebbles, and fragments of brick . . . Beneath these pillars a second range was found resting on blue stiff clay with the space betwixt them filled with rubbish. Every trace of the bath is now [*i.e.*, in Surtees's day] obliterated, except some large masses of its flooring, built up in the neighbouring fences."<sup>55</sup> Two aqueducts<sup>56</sup> have

<sup>49</sup> S., ii, p. 303 *seq.* 183 yards (N-S) × 143.

<sup>50</sup> T.D.N.S., iii (1882), p. L.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, v, p. xlvi. Perhaps allowances must be made for the effect on a boy's imagination of such an escapade, and the consequent exaggeration of distances.

<sup>52</sup> P.S.N. (3), ii, p. 406.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>54</sup> Bruce (3), p. 349.

<sup>55</sup> S., ii, pp. 303 *seq.* From this building has come an altar to Fortune (C. 433; *vide infra*).

<sup>56</sup> *Arch. Ael.* (Quarto), i, opp. p. 112. S., *loc. cit.*

been traced "each at least two miles long" which seem to have fed the baths.

The lack of knowledge gained from excavation on this most promising site, "perhaps the boldest and proudest monument of Roman arms in the north,"<sup>57</sup> is to be the more deplored because of several intriguing phenomena recorded by various writers. Thus, "in draining the valley to the north of the station, in the year 1840, numerous fragments of Roman sandals, mingled with human bones, were found deeply embedded in the bog. In one case, a sandal, nearly perfect, invested the undisturbed remains of a human foot. It would almost appear as if some bloody skirmish had taken place here, and that the bodies of the slain had been interred as they fell."<sup>58</sup> It is perhaps more likely that this is the site of the cemetery attached to the fort. Again, Lanchester has been several times connected with the working of minerals. "The surrounding moor abounds in ironstone. Of this the Romans appear to have availed themselves, for enormous heaps of slag, of ancient production, have been found in the neighbourhood."<sup>59</sup> As Hutchinson long ago pointed out,<sup>60</sup> "we should be glad to know how a proper distinction can be made, by which to determine what is British, Roman, or Saxon work [and we may add mediæval and later work], without some instruments were found in the working to denote the people." Apparently no steps have ever been taken to analyse some of these scoriae, to see whether they are from lead or from iron workings. Bruce indeed records<sup>61</sup> that "in the neighbourhood of one of these heaps of scoriae the iron tongs represented in Plate XVII, Fig. 8, so much resembling those at present used by blacksmiths, was ploughed up."<sup>62</sup> The tongs resemble the modern instrument to such a

<sup>57</sup> *S.*, ii, p. 304.

<sup>58</sup> *Bruce* (2), p. 319.

<sup>59</sup> *Bruce* (3) p. 353.

<sup>60</sup> *H.*, iii, p. 604.

<sup>61</sup> *Bruce* (2), p. 433.

<sup>62</sup> A piece of buff-coloured coarse ware has come, apparently from Chester-le-Street, with "a short-handed axe with a hammer-head at the back, a pair of large closed pincers . . ." and a ? quadrant or an ? anvil, in appliqué. (*P.S.N.* (3), x, pp. 19 *seq.*, with illustration of the fragment and of the Colchester "Blacksmith's Vase." There is a similar fragment in the museum at Wroxeter.)

degree that it is difficult to say whether they are really ancient, *i.e.*, Roman, or not. As to the "Roman blast furnace" which the same great archaeologist describes<sup>63</sup> as being found near Lanchester, it in no way differs from furnaces described by Louis<sup>64</sup> and ascribed to mediæval and later times.<sup>65</sup> In this connection we have also the statement of Surtees<sup>66</sup> that "from the number of hearths, similar to those of our smitheries, which were found in clearing away the ruins from the interior of the station, the workmen supposed that the Romans had been a tribe of smiths." All these statements, though it is difficult to see how they can be explained, make the excavation of this site all the more desirable.

As to small finds in the fort itself, there seems to be no record of Samian ware found. In fact the only mention of pottery from this site that the writer has seen is the statement by Hutchinson<sup>67</sup> that "the cup used at divine offices in the church [*i.e.*, at Lanchester] has a cover, which was found in this station, a date on it, 1571, presumed to be the date of finding. It is a Roman patera, and is also represented in the cut." As to the coins, "a large proportion of the coins found are of the higher empire, though the series extends down to Valentinian."<sup>68</sup> Surtees<sup>69</sup> gives details, as does Bruce.<sup>70</sup>

The inscriptions from the site are as follows:—

*Military*: LEG. XX V. V. (C. 447); COH I (C. 448); C. 449 (Centurial Stone).

*Building Inscriptions*. IMP. CAES. M. ANT. GORDIANUS P. F. AVG. BALNEVM CVM BASILICA A (SO)LO INSTRVXIT PER EGN. LVGILIANVM LEG. AVG PR. PR. CVRANTE M. AVR. QVIRINO PREF. COH. I L(INGONVM) GOR. (C. 445).

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>64</sup> Louis; *Chemistry and Industry*, March 16th and 23rd, 1923, p. 286.

<sup>65</sup> Charles I made a grant to George, Duke of Buckingham, "of the mines of silver, or of lead mixed with silver, in or near Muggleswicke, alias Mugglesley, in the county palatine of the bishopric of Duresme . . . for twenty-one years."

<sup>66</sup> *S.*, ii, p. 304 note.

<sup>67</sup> *H.*, ii, p. 465.

<sup>68</sup> *Bruce* (2), p. 318.

<sup>69</sup> *S.*, ii, p. 305.

<sup>70</sup> *Bruce* (3), p. 349.

IMP. CAESAR M. ANTONIVS GORDIANVS P. F. AVG. PRINCIPIA ET ARMAMENTARIA CONLAPSA RESTITVIT PER MAECILIVM FVSCVM LEG. AVG. PR. PR. CVRANTE M. AVR. QVIRINO PR. COH. I L(INGONVM) GOR. (C. 446).

*Altars* : to Aesculapius (bilingual : C. 431); FORTVNAE AVG. (C. 433); DEO (C. 434); I.O.M. . . . COH. VARDVLLOR . . (C. 435); DEO MARTI (C. 437); id. ? C. 438; MARTI (C. 439); NVM. AVG. ET GEN. COH. I VARDVLLORVM (C. 440); SILVANO (C. 441); DEO VIT . . (C. 442); D. VICTORIE (C. 443); ?C. 444; DEO (*Eph.* IV, 676); DEAE GARMANGABI (*Arch. Ael.* (2), XVI, pp. 321-7).

*Miscellaneous* : a gold plate with raised letters, MARTI AVG. (C. 436); a base, ? for a statuette, inscribed GENIO PRAETORI CL. EPAPHRODITVS CLAVDIANVS TRIBVNVS CHO. I LING. V.L.P.M. (C. 432).

From this site have also come, a fragment of a figure of Fortune with her wheel, now headless (*L.S.* 707), and a head of Mercury (*L.S.* 706).

From the inscriptions recording building work we learn that reconstruction in the fort was carried out at the beginning of the third century. Several observers have noted signs of a conflagration; Surtees for instance suggested<sup>71</sup> that the fort had come to a violent end. But of the history of this promising site this is all that can at present be said.

*Chèster-le-Street* (R. name unknown). Surtees was uncertain<sup>72</sup> as to both the site and the name of the Roman fort at this place. Most probably Featherstonehaugh has delimited the area correctly, giving the acreage as about six, *i.e.*, 180 paces (N. to S.) by 170.<sup>73</sup> In 1856, a hypocaust was uncovered, "closely contiguous and parallel to the supposed southern rampart of the Roman *castrum*."<sup>74</sup>

<sup>71</sup> *S.*, ii, p. 304.

<sup>72</sup> *S.*, ii, p. 136.

<sup>73</sup> *Arch. Ael.* (Quarto), iv, pp. 289 *seq.* The ancient church apparently stands within or near the site.

<sup>74</sup> *P.S.N.*, vol. i (1855-7), p. 109.

A "barrel drain"<sup>75</sup> had been found fourteen years previously, and though Bruce called these the remains of a "villa,"<sup>76</sup> as was then the custom with such structures, we cannot doubt that this was the bath-house of the fort. This is the only building which has come to light, and is outside the area of the fort proper.

Surtees records<sup>77</sup> the finding of a gold coin of Galba "a little to the west of Chester," and "believed" that "other scattered Roman coins of less consequence have occurred here from time to time." Featherstonehaugh<sup>78</sup> says of the coins found that they are "very numerous," and notes examples ranging from Hadrian to Gratian. In 1920,<sup>79</sup> ten coins were found during the rebuilding of the bridge across the Cong or Chester burn in the bed of the stream, and two others in the deanery field south-east of the parish church, that is close to Featherstonehaugh's site for the fort. These coins range from Domitian to Tetricus the younger. Other coins have since been found,<sup>80</sup> the latest in date being "a very small brass" of Helena, wife of Constantine the Great.<sup>81</sup> Pottery also has been found. In 1912, there was exhibited to this Society a "red earthenware bottle of Roman shape, about six inches high, and the handle and the base of another cream-coloured jar, with traces of a red glaze, said to have been found at Chester-le-Street about three years ago on the site of the deanery, during excavations for the Board schools. The exhibitor said that with them were found several Roman coins, one an *aureus* of Vespasian, which he had sold."<sup>82</sup> Samian ware has been found and the potters' stamps recorded.<sup>83</sup> One fragment, "part of a small plain

<sup>75</sup> Bruce (3), p. 312.

<sup>76</sup> Bruce (2), pp. 311-2. He states that the wall was 5 feet thick, and six courses high. 30 hypocaust pillars, many covered with soot, were found *in situ* on a concrete floor.

<sup>77</sup> S., *loc. cit.*

<sup>78</sup> Arch. Ael., *loc. cit.*

<sup>79</sup> P.S.N. (3), ix, p. 126.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, ix, p. 30; x, p. 41.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, x, p. 112.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, v, p. 223.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, iii, p. 299: HABILIS M; MARTIIO; LVCINA. *Ibid.*, x, pp. 18 *seq.*:—MOM; MARTIIO; LVCINA; . . . TIAN. Of the pottery bearing these last three stamps, and other pottery recorded *loc. cit.*, it is stated: "The series shows that the sherds are selected pieces saved and put on one side owing to their special attraction and interest, and it is



vase, with complete base 2 inches in diameter. Dragen-dorff, form 27. Slightly blurred potter's stamp on the interior **MOM**,<sup>84</sup> would point to a Flavian origin for the fort, save that it is not absolutely certain that it came from Chester-le-Street (see note 83, p. 14).

Minor finds include<sup>85</sup> two pieces of chain-armour "corroded into lumps," iron nails, a fibula of bronze enamelled in blue, a fragment of an enamelled lock plate, the end of a key or a stylus, glass, etc. The inscriptions recorded are as follows:—

*Military*: **LEG. II AVG.** (C. 455).

*Building*: (**AQVAM**) **INDVXIT** (*Eph.* VII, 986).

*Altars*: **DEO APOL(L)INI** (C. 452); ? C. 453; **DEABVS VITBVS** (C. 454); **DEO MART. CONDATIV** (*Eph.* VII, 984); **DEO VITIRI** (*Eph.* VII, 985).

*Funerary*: C. 456.

*Ebchester* (*Vindomora*), stands "at the foot of a long descent yet on the edge of a still deeper declivity."<sup>86</sup> "All the ramparts of the station may be traced. The parish church built of Roman stones, stands within it, near the south-west corner. The north wall of the station has stood upon a bold escarpment, at the bottom of which the river Derwent flows. At a short distance from its western rampart, is a valley, permeated by a streamlet, which would, in this direction, add materially to the strength of the encampment. The Roman road has gone along this side of the station."<sup>87</sup> Bruce puts the area at four acres. "The vallum and agger are most perfect on the north, where they stretch along the very edge of the hill towards the river for 160 paces. The north-west angle is perfect, and parts of the western agger, though cut through by roads and foot-paths. On the south, also, the

probable that the collection originally came from the Roman station at Chester-le-Street." The italics are mine. The pottery was exhibited to the Newcastle Society by Lt.-Col. Spain, "By the courtesy of the Rev. A. D. E. Titcombe, of Chester-le-Street."

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, x, p. 18.

<sup>85</sup> *P.S.N.*, vol. i (1855-7), p. 155; *Arch. Ael.* (Quarto), iv, pp. 289 *seq.*

<sup>86</sup> *S.*, ii, p. 299.

<sup>87</sup> *Bruce* (2), p. 316.

vallum is extremely distinguishable, just within the south wall of the church-yard, part of which at least seems built out of the ruins of the Roman ramparts, and the moss-grown crumbling walls of some neighbouring cottages on the west betray a similar origin."<sup>88</sup> Pottery and coins have been found on the site,<sup>89</sup> but the only find recorded in detail seems to be that of "a Roman circular brooch of bronze in very fine condition with pin complete, and boss of glass or spar-like material in the centre. It is said to have been found at Ebchester."<sup>90</sup> This apparently is all that can at present be said about this fort, from which have come the following inscriptions:—

*Military*: C. 460; 461; 462-8 (no unit is named); tiles,  
**LEG. VI V.** (*Eph.* VII, 1122a); . . . **H. I BR** (C. 1229).

*Altars*: **DEO MARTI** (C. 457); (? **MINER**)**VAE . . .**  
**ACTAR(IVS) COH. IIII BR . . .** (C. 458); **DEO**  
**VITIRI** (C. 459); **DEO VITIR** (*Eph.* IV, 677);  
**I:O.M.** (*Eph.* VII, 981); ? *Eph.* 982 and 983.

*Funerary*: ? Finial from monument, **HAVE** (C. 470).

*Fragment*: C. 469.

It may not seem irrelevant to add here a note by Hutchinson<sup>91</sup> on the appearance of Deor Street near Ebchester. "We paid attention to the great Roman road which leads to this place from the southward, and found it remarkably perfect where the new enclosures of common lands had not taken place. We traced it for a considerable distance, so as to enable us strictly to ascertain the dimensions; it is formed in three distinct parts, with four ditches; a centre road, probably made for carriages and cavalry, forty-two feet in width, with a narrow road on each side for foot-passengers, twelve feet wide." Elsewhere<sup>92</sup> the same writer says that "at a Roman mile and a half to the south, some years ago was discovered, the foundation of a square

<sup>88</sup> *S.*, *loc. cit.*

<sup>89</sup> *P.S.N.* (New), iii, pp. 55-8. *Ibid.*, iv, p. 186, records a fragment of a *mortarium* with **EXON** on the edge.

<sup>90</sup> *P.S.N.* (New), viii, p. 269.

<sup>91</sup> *H.*, ii, pp. 544 *seq.*

<sup>92</sup> *H.*, ii, p. 549 note.

watch tower, about six or eight yards on the west side of the military way; the stones were cemented with lime." With this may be compared Surtees' description<sup>93</sup> of the road and a tower near Lanchester. "In some places it" (the road) "is paved; in others formed by a high ridge of earth covered with gravel; in general, it has a ditch on either side. On the edge of this road, about a mile north of the station, near a farm called Low Woodside, the foundations of a small circular building were discovered by the plough, about forty years since. In it are a great number of hollow-headed copper nails; a clawed hammer of rude workmanship; and several other antiques were found buried in the ashes resembling those of a smith's furnace." It is doubtful to what period these two buildings should be ascribed.

The only other known Roman forts in the county—Jarrow and South Shields—are rather related to the Roman Wall than to the road system of the area discussed. Both on the south bank of the Tyne, parallels for them are to be found in the forts supporting the western flank of the Wall in Cumberland. South Shields guards the river entrance<sup>94</sup>—there is no evidence for a fort at Tyne-mouth on the north bank—Jarrow the immediate eastern end of the Wall, which terminates at Wallsend directly across the river.

*Jarrow.*—"At Jarrow an oblong square of about three acres, with its corners rounded off, overlooking the estuary of Jarrow Slake, and fronting on the south the bank of the navigable stream called the Don, is, on good grounds, supposed to have been the site of a station . . . of the Romans. Underground foundations of a wall of strong masonry mark out its area on every side, and include within them the site of the present church and church-yard. . . . In digging up part of the remains of these walls in 1812, a silver *denarius* of Aulus Vitellius was found embedded in mortar in the heart of the wall; and when the road was formed past Jarrow Row, in 1803,

<sup>93</sup> S., ii, p. 303.

<sup>94</sup> For S. Shields as a port see *Arch. Ael.* (3), xx, pp. 61-2.

two square pavements of Roman brick were discovered."<sup>95</sup> Surtees states<sup>96</sup> that a line of wall which was traced east and west parallel to the south wall of the church-yard, was found to end in the site of a round tower, near the south-west angle of the cemetery, and that it was here that the coin of Vitellius was found. Recently an *as* of Nero (Lugdunum, *ca.* A.D. 66) has been found on waste land "near Bede's Monastery."<sup>97</sup> Though this evidence, even with that of the inscriptions recorded below, is slight, yet it is sufficient fully to justify Surtees' exclamation: "Friendly reader, if thou dost not believe, *ex imo corde*, that a Roman fort, on the line or within the pale of Agricola's Wall [*sic*], existed at Jarrow, I do in very sober sadness call thee Giaour."

The inscriptions are:—C. 498 (a) and (b).

(a) DIFFVSI  
PROVINC  
BRITANNIA AD  
VTRVMQVE O  
EXERCITVS

.....  
(b) OMNIVM FIL  
HADR  
. A NECESSITAT  
VATIS.. NORP  
.. F..... INC  
.....

Moreover, Bruce describes<sup>98</sup> a stone from Jarrow, 1 foot 9 inches by 1 foot, representing a hunter shooting at a stag.

*South Shields.*—The Roman fort on High Lawe is the only Roman site in the area under discussion which has been satisfactorily excavated.<sup>99</sup> Even so, the existence of modern buildings has prevented the opening up of the

<sup>95</sup> Bruce (2), p. 293, quoting Hodgson; *Hist. of Northumberland* (1820-58); III, ii, p. 230.

<sup>96</sup> *S., Gateshead Section*, p. 20.      <sup>97</sup> *P.S.N.* (4), i., p. 286.

<sup>98</sup> Bruce (3), p. 310. For illust. see *Arch. Ael.* (3), xvii, p. 123, no. 242.

<sup>99</sup> *Arch. Ael.* (New), x, pp. 223 *seq.* Cf. Hooppell; *Nat. Hist. Trans. of Northumberland, Durham, and Newcastle*; vol. vii, pp. 144, 167.

complete area of the fort. There have been laid bare remains of granaries, whose floors were originally supported on sleeper-walls running the length of the buildings, a hypocaust of whinstone,<sup>1</sup> probably part of the the commandant's quarters, and the paved area of the *principia*, with a *sacellum* chamber behind, whose lower courses are excellently preserved, giving visible evidence of the use of metal to cramp the stones together; the stone flight of steps leading down into this underground chamber is also well preserved at the foot. The remains are instructive rather than imposing; thus the broken paving of the *principia* court still has a gutter running round it, this showing that the court was not completely roofed over, but surrounded by a colonnade or cloister. In 1875, a portion of this building was found covered by "a fallen but unbroken wall of a building which was to the north of it, and of which the lower courses were standing; between the fallen wall and the pavement earth had accumulated."<sup>2</sup>

From time to time in the course of local building operations the cemetery has been hit upon,<sup>3</sup> and to this Society was presented in 1911 the "skull of a Roman-Briton,"<sup>4</sup> from a grave formed of stone slabs, in the graveyard about three hundred yards to the south-west of the camp. The skull was found "about forty years ago," *i.e.*, about 1870.

Pottery has been recorded of various types, and the coins from the site range through practically the whole period<sup>5</sup> of the Roman occupation of Britain. Small finds have been very common indeed, and include a bronze lamp,<sup>6</sup> a dragon fibula,<sup>7</sup> a piece of bronze,<sup>8</sup> perhaps the handle of a small vessel, with **UTERE FELIX** incised thereon, the letters perhaps having been filled with enamel, intaglios of red jasper,<sup>9</sup> many curious inscribed pewter

<sup>1</sup> Discovered in 1798. *S.*, *Gateshead Section*, p. 12.

<sup>2</sup> *P.S.N.* (3), i, p. 94. <sup>3</sup> *J.A.A.*, xxxvi, p. 113. <sup>4</sup> *P.S.N.* (3), v, p. 137.

<sup>5</sup> The latest appears to be an *Ae.* 3 of Theodosius. *P.S.N.* (3), v, p. 66.

<sup>6</sup> *P.S.L.* (2), xxi, p. 135. <sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, xxii, p. 62. <sup>8</sup> *J.A.A.*, xxxvi, p. 237.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 113. For a ring of jet, inscribed **C P S**, see *Eph.* vii, 1176.

seals,<sup>10</sup> a clasp knife,<sup>11</sup> a bronze figure of Jupiter wielding a thunderbolt in his right hand,<sup>12</sup> toilet articles in abundance,<sup>13</sup> in short a very generous collection of the articles usually to be found on any permanently inhabited Roman site.

The inscriptions are as follows:—

*Military*: tiles, **COH. V G** (*Eph.* III, 122a; *cf.* IV, 696; VII, 1003); ? *Eph.* III, 1226; *Eph.* IV, 704, *cf.* VII, 1144; **LE. VI V** (*Eph.* VII, 1122b).

*Building Inscription*: **IMP. CAES. DIVI SEVERI NEPOS  
DIVI MAGNI ANTONINI FIL. M. AVREL.  
SEVERVS /// /// PIVS FELIX AVG. PONTIF. M.  
TRIB. POT. PP. COS. AQVAM VSIBVS MIL. COH.  
V GALLO. INDVXIT CVRA . MARIO VALERIANO  
LEG. EIVS PR. PR.** (*Arch. Ael.* (2), XVI, pp. 157-61)<sup>14</sup>

*Altars*: . . . **CONSERVATORIB** (So Collingwood, *Arch. Ael.* (3), XX, p. 58; *cf.* C. 496); ? C. 497a; **DESCVLAP** (*Eph.* VII, 998); **MART** (*Eph.* VII, 999); **BRIGANTIAE** (*Antiquary*, XVII, July '95) **IVLIVS VERAX C. LEG. V[I]** (*Antiquary*, Feb. '98. *Cf.* *Arch. Ael.* (2), XIX, p. 275).

*Dedication*: . . . **SANCTE ET NVMINI . . . . .  
DOMITIVS EPICTET . . . . . COMMILITONIBVS  
TEMPLV** (*Eph.* VII, 1000).

*Funerary*: *Eph.* IV, 678; IV, 718a (**BARATES PALM-YRENVS**); VII, 1001 and 1002.

*Fragments*: C. 497; *Eph.* III, 97 and 98; IV, 679; VII, 1004-5-6.

Roman forts have been placed in some other localities throughout the county. Of Gateshead, Bruce says:<sup>15</sup> "the strength of the position, on the south bank of the Tyne, is such as to induce us to suppose that the Romans

<sup>10</sup> *Arch. Ael.* (New), viii, pp. 57 *seq.* *Cf.* *Eph.* iii, 202, iv, 706.

<sup>11</sup> *Illust. Arch. Ael.* (New), x, opp. p. 115.

<sup>12</sup> *P.S.N.* (3), iii, p. 116.

<sup>13</sup> See the collection in S. Shields Museum. *Cf.* *J.A.A.*, xxxiv, pp. 233, 255, 373, 378.

<sup>14</sup> The name erased is **ALEXANDER** (*Arch. Ael.*, *loc. cit.*).

<sup>15</sup> *Bruce* (2), p. 296.

would not neglect to occupy it as a fort auxiliary to the great station of Pons Aelii. The bridge of Hadrian would otherwise have been insecure. The number of coins and other Roman antiquities which have been found on the brow of the hill occupied by the modern Gateshead, give countenance to this conjecture." In criticism it can only be said, that no traces of such a fort have been found, save small objects of Roman date which may just as well be evidence of a purely civil settlement at the bridgehead. The strategical argument is a matter of opinion, the more difficult to determine as it is propounded to and by moderns. The same writer states<sup>16</sup> without quoting any evidence that there is "a small fort" at Stanley, near Lanchester. The earthwork at Wardley,<sup>17</sup> in the parish of Jarrow, is almost certainly the remains of the *camera* which the priors and monks of Durham had at this place. The claims of Maiden Castle<sup>18</sup> to be a Roman fort or a Roman camp rest upon a few squared stones and one which, in Surtees' opinion, "could scarcely be taken for anything else than a rude and defaced Roman altar." Cade imagined that Hartlepool had been "a Roman harbour, and that a Roman road once passed in this direction. These conjectures, however, are warranted neither by historical records, nor by any visible remains of Roman art in the neighbourhood."<sup>19</sup> It is to be feared that Cade was as near to probability as that Mr. Cooke who proved—to his own satisfaction—that, an oriental colony having settled in very early times in Britain, Hartlepool is a "manifest corruption of Heracleopolis."<sup>20</sup> A Roman fort has been suggested<sup>21</sup> for Barnard Castle on the slight evidence of a few coins from Startforth, and the case made out for a Roman fort or camp at Sadberge<sup>22</sup> is lamentably

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 298. S., ii, p. 230, records a square entrenchment and "several Roman coins."

<sup>17</sup> *Arch. Ael.* (Quarto), i, pp. 112 seq. Cf. *H.*, ii, p. 604, note; *Bruce* (2), p. 296.

<sup>18</sup> *H.*, ii, p. 394, note, p. 395. S., iv, pp. 90-91.

<sup>19</sup> See Sharp; *History of Hartlepool* (1851), p. 15.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 1.

<sup>21</sup> Hooppell; *Vinovia*; map opp. p. 2.

<sup>22</sup> Taylor; *History of Sadberge* (1919), pp. 8 seq. Cf. *J.A.A.*, xliii, p. 161.

weak. Finds of the Roman period are there none, and the argument that Sadberge was so important a place in Saxon times that it must have been important in Roman times is unhistorical. In fact this argument rather tends to lead to exactly the opposite conclusion; for the Saxons, so far as our very scanty knowledge goes, seem to have avoided, at least not occupied, Roman sites. To sum up, there is no satisfactory evidence that any of these places go back to Roman times. There is weak evidence in the case for Gateshead. All the others are in the nature of vain imaginings.

(iii) *Camps*.—Remains of camps, or temporarily occupied military positions, are curiously lacking in county Durham. This might seem to point, not merely to little actual campaigning within the county, but also, and this would be perhaps more striking, to little passing up and down by road of large bodies of troops. But it is to be remembered that this lack may be due simply to our ignorance, and that the camps may be there, though they have not yet been discovered and recorded, or else that they may have been destroyed by agricultural processes.

The only well-attested camp is near the fort of Lan-chester. "In a field, to the south-west of the station, are the remains of what appears to be a large temporary camp. The lines of the south and west ramparts are well marked, and the curve of the south-west angle is clearly defined. This camp, if such it be, has occupied the whole summit of the knoll on which the station stands, and would embrace an area of twenty acres."<sup>23</sup> McLaughlan<sup>24</sup> placed a Roman camp at Rowley, but this work may be the remains of a castle built by a de Esh against the Scots. Surtees thought to find a camp between Thorp and Whitton.<sup>25</sup> Of the numerous sites designated as Roman by Cade it is not worth while to mention one. They are all imaginary.

## II.—THE CIVIL SIDE OF THE OCCUPATION.

Though in the main the Roman occupation of the area in question was naturally military in character, there are

<sup>23</sup> *Bruce* (2), p. 319.

<sup>24</sup> So *Boyle*, pp. 480-1.

<sup>25</sup> See p. 33 (f).



what can only be traces of a contemporary civilian population also. From Mesolithic times<sup>26</sup> there was occupation of this part of Britain, and the Romans did not find and would not make an uninhabited desert in this region. Roman objects are found widely, though scantily, scattered over the area of the present county; and though in the past antiquaries may have been only too prone to make a single Roman coin the foundation-stone of a Roman fort or camp, there can be little doubt that most if not all of such finds represent the slight Romanization of the native population. From most of the finds there is little conclusion to be drawn, but it is perhaps possible from their distribution to attempt to give at least a partial answer to two questions that have at various times been raised concerning Roman Durham. The first is an old problem, so old that by now an affirmative answer is almost always given or taken for granted<sup>27</sup>—Did the Romans work the mines of Weardale? The second problem has been raised more recently by the discovery of a system of coastal stations in Yorkshire.<sup>28</sup> As known at present this system has both its flanks in the air, and an examination of Roman finds made hitherto on the Durham coast may help towards the ultimate discovery of the continuation northwards of the Filey-Saltburn line. Hence for the present purpose, small finds of Roman objects in Durham have been divided into three groups:—

- (i) Finds in Weardale.
- (ii) Finds on the coast.
- (iii) Miscellaneous finds.

(i) *The Romans in Weardale*.—The mines of Weardale were worked as long ago as the reign of Stephen.<sup>29</sup> Beyond that date it is difficult to go, though it may be significant that Heathery-burn cave<sup>30</sup> is in Weardale, and that at the beginning of the last century a founder's hoard

<sup>26</sup> *Ant. J.*, iii, p. 262.

<sup>27</sup> Louis; *Chemistry and Industry*, March 16th and 23rd, 1923, simply says that there is no evidence (p. 287).

<sup>28</sup> *J.R.S.*, ii (1912), pp. 201-14. Cf. *J.R.S.*, xii (1922), pp. 79-81.

<sup>29</sup> *Surtees Society Publications*, no. xi (1839), Appendix, p. xxxiii.

<sup>30</sup> *V.C.H.*, i, pp. 202 seq. Cf. *Archaeologia*, liv, pp. 87 seq.

of the Bronze Age was discovered on the south side of the river Wear near Hag-gate farm-house, Stanhope.<sup>31</sup> Pre-Roman objects are comparatively numerous in this area.<sup>32</sup>

That during the occupation the Romans were acquainted with Weardale is proved. From the neighbourhood of Stanhope comes an altar to *Silvanus*,<sup>33</sup> commemorating the exploit of a sportsman Roman officer *C. Tetius Veturius Micianus*; and from Eastgate, a little higher up the dale, has come a second altar to that deity, set up by one *Aurelius Quirinus*.<sup>34</sup> These altars, however, of themselves prove nothing more than occasional Roman presence in the country-side which was in later times hunted over by the mediæval bishops of Durham.<sup>35</sup> Finds which might go to prove more permanent occupation are as follows:—

- (a) A "small bronze double-handed amphora-shaped jar, apparently of Roman date," 1 $\frac{7}{8}$ " high, and patinated green, has been found "in Stanhope district."<sup>36</sup>
- (b) Two skillets of Italian manufacture (*Cipius Polybius*) and a ladle were found in August, 1913, in a peat bog "in Weardale."<sup>37</sup>
- (c) "In 1870 a number of Roman coins were found at Westgate-in-Weardale, and the inscriptions and dates on these silver *denarii* covered a period from A.D. 81 to A.D. 161."<sup>38</sup>

All of these finds may quite well represent merely the adoption by natives of Roman usages, even merely the

<sup>31</sup> *Arch. Ael.* (Quarto), i, pp. 13 *seq.* This hoard was styled Roman at the time of discovery, but the plates accompanying the description of the find show that the implements were typically Bronze Age. Cf. *V.C.H.*, i, p. 201.

<sup>32</sup> More have come to light since the *V.C.H.* was published (1907).

<sup>33</sup> *C.* 451. Found 1747. This altar is an interesting anticipation of the legend of the Brancepeth boar, which in later times made its lair on Brandon Hill, till at length, near Cleeves-cross, it fell to the might of Hodge of Ferry.

<sup>34</sup> *C.* 450. Found 1869 (or 1870). Cf. *C.* 445-6.

<sup>35</sup> "The Bishop of Duresme hath a praty square pile on the north syde of Were ryver, caullid the Westgate, and thereby is a parke, rudely enclosid with stone, of a twelve or fourteen miles in cumpace." Leland, *ap. H.*, iii, p. 345.

<sup>36</sup> *P.S.N.* (3), viii, p. 167. <sup>37</sup> *P.S.N.* (3), vii, p. 9. <sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, iv, p. 283.

occasional presence of Romans in the dale. The circumstances of the find (b) may suggest that the objects were in the possession not of a resident but of someone passing through the district. As to (c), the date may be significant, as coinciding roughly with the period of disturbance in northern England and southern Scotland in the governorship of Julius Verus.<sup>39</sup> No lead pigs have as yet come to light in the area, and on this lamentably scanty evidence it is quite impossible to say definitely that there was any Roman working of the local veins of lead or iron. In this connection, however, attention may again be called to the facts relative to the fort of Lanchester recorded on p. 12. It remains true, however, that at present there is nothing at all to be said definitely on this question. Those who have dogmatically stated that the Romans did work the mineral wealth of Weardale have rather gone beyond the available evidence, which is conclusive neither way.<sup>39a</sup>

(ii) *The Romans on the Coast of Durham*.—On the coast there has been occupation at various times from Upper Palæolithic days onward. Whitburn, near Sunderland, has produced a Mas d'Azil harpoon;<sup>40</sup> on Black Fell, about seven miles west of Sunderland, have been found Mas d'Azil-Tardenois pygmy flints;<sup>41</sup> and Horden in particular has been prolific in flints.<sup>42</sup> The presence of Roman remains along the coast has long been noted,<sup>43</sup> but the various finds have apparently never been catalogued. The following list is an attempt towards a complete enumeration of the various finds.

(a) *Carr House, Seaton Carew*.<sup>44</sup>—In the Blackgate, Newcastle, are remains from this site. They comprise the

<sup>39</sup> *Proc. Soc. of Antiquaries of Scotland*, xxxviii, pp. 454-9.

<sup>39a</sup> Since the above was written and in print, I have read Mr. Wooler's *Roman Lead-mining in Weardale* (*Yorks. Archaeological Journal*, pt. 109 (vol. xxviii), pp. 93-100), in which he ascribes a bronze ladle to a Roman origin, and sees in the "Castles," near Wolsingham (*cf. H.*, iii, p. 374), a "Roman penal settlement." I regret to have to confess that I see no reason to modify the above conclusion.

<sup>40</sup> *Brit. Mus. Guide to the . . . Stone Age*, p. 73.

<sup>41</sup> *Ant. J.*, iii, p. 262.

<sup>42</sup> *P.S.N.* (3), i, p. 272.

<sup>43</sup> *e.g.*, *S.*, iii, p. 402.

<sup>44</sup> For details of discovery, etc., *vide Arch. Ael.* (Quarto), ii, p. 110; *idem* (New), x, pp. 103 *seq.*; *P.S.N.* (3), vi, p. 170; *Ibid.*, i, p. 356.

base of a Samian bowl, with the stamp **JULIUS F**,<sup>45</sup> fragments of Upchurch ware, implements of bone, fibulæ, and coins ranging from Claudius and Titus to Valens and Gratian. Mediæval coins were also found. The only thing which might even by a flight of fancy be styled an architectural remnant was found in 1816, being "two flat stones in an upright position, and a third lying near them." Haverfield<sup>46</sup> thought that this was possibly the site of a coastal station such as those on the Yorkshire coast; but if this is so, the pottery and coin evidence show that the site was occupied before such a late fourth-century post was erected.

(b) At *Shotton*<sup>47</sup> a Roman altar was "found in a field among a heap of stones a little to the south of Shotton." The inscription is identical with that of an altar found at *Carvoran*<sup>48</sup> and subsequently lost. Probably this is the lost altar, but there is no indication as to how it got to this destination.

At this same place was found in 1881 an armlet of gold,<sup>49</sup> made up of two portions of differing styles. One portion was a rope twist of good craftsmanship, the other was of thicker gold wire, roughly angular, and rudely bent into semi-circular form. The armlet weighed almost 2 ozs., and no other object was found in association with it. Franks judged it to be Roman, and a parallel was found at *New Grange*, Ireland, in association with a coin of Geta. On the other hand the *Shotton* armlet has elsewhere<sup>50</sup> been ascribed to the time of probably Henry I.

(c) *Seaton*.—"At another *Seaton* (in the parish of *Seaham*) a small vessel of earthenware was found several years ago, half filled with Roman third brass, chiefly *Claudius Gothicus*, *Tetricus*, *Victorinus*, etc., in miserable preservation."<sup>51</sup>

<sup>45</sup> Late second century German.

<sup>46</sup> *J.R.S.*, ii, pp. 201-14.

<sup>47</sup> *P.S.N.* (New), i, p. 45.

<sup>48</sup> *C.* 764; **DEO VITIRI MENI DADA V.S.L.M.**

<sup>49</sup> *Arch. Ael.* (New), x, p. 189.

<sup>50</sup> *P.S.N.* (New), i, p. 337.

<sup>51</sup> *S.*, iii, p. 402.

(d) *Seaham*.—It has been several times stated<sup>52</sup> that there are diamond-broached stones in the north face of the tower of the ancient church of Seaham Harbour. These supposed Roman stones have been plastered over. A "Roman quern" was found during the carrying out of trenching for the extensions of the cemetery, and a coin of Severus and one of Constantine during excavations for houses.<sup>52a</sup>

(e) *The Mouth of the Wear*.—Round the mouth of the river Wear there is a group of small Roman finds, as follows: (i) found "near Sunderland," a spoon<sup>53</sup> with a very short hooked handle, inscribed inside the bowl, which was broken, JNE VIVAS. (ii) in a brickyard near Sunderland there was found in 1861 an *Ae.* 1 of Nero;<sup>54</sup> (iii) about the year 1820, coins of Constantine the Great were found during excavations for building near the south end of Villiers Street, Sunderland;<sup>55</sup> (iv) in January, 1849, at the north-east corner of the Town Moor, Sunderland, "remains of what was supposed to have been the site of a Roman pottery were brought to light."<sup>56</sup> The Sunderland Museum possesses a bottle-shaped vase of coarse red clay which came from this site, and neither shape, colour, nor fabric give the slightest support to the suggestion that it is Roman;<sup>57</sup> (v) On the north side of the river a "coin of the Constantine period (Trier mint) was discovered about 25 years ago"<sup>58</sup> during the restoration of the ancient church of St. Peter, Monkwearmouth. (vi) In 1759, Roman coins were found at Fulwell Hills,<sup>59</sup> but the accompanying phenomena are somewhat strange. It is stated that during quarrying, a long mound twenty-five yards from east to west, one and a half yards high, and six yards wide

<sup>52</sup> e.g., *P.S.N.* (2), x, p. 19; (3), x, p. 344. The conjunction of coins and possible masonry remains suggests that the neighbourhood of Seaham Harbour is a likely locality for a link in the coastal-station system.

<sup>52a</sup> *Newcastle Chronicle*, 6:3:07.

<sup>53</sup> *Arch. J.*, xxvi, p. 76. Cf. *Ant. J.*, ii, p. 89.

<sup>54</sup> *Arch. Ael.* (New), vii, p. 89. <sup>55</sup> *Gent. Mag.*, xci, p. 367.

<sup>56</sup> Summers; *Hist. of Sunderland* (1858), i, p. 12.

<sup>57</sup> It is no longer labelled "Roman" in the Museum.

<sup>58</sup> *P.S.N.* (New), viii, p. 110.

<sup>59</sup> *S.*, *Sunderland Sec.*, p. 75, quoting *Gent. Mag.*, Oct. 1763.

at the top, was found and in the middle of the bank was discovered a human skeleton nine feet six inches long, with a shinbone of two feet three inches from knee to ankle. The body was covered with four large flat stones, and near the right hand of the body, the head of which lay to the west, were "two Roman coins." (vii) "In the month of December, 1820, immediately above the excavation of the limestone at Carley Hill quarry [between Fulwell and Southwick] . . . . . whilst removing the surplus soil, Thomas Dobson, quarryman, found a Roman figure, which appeared to be a Lar."<sup>60</sup> This figure, of bronze, is now in the Blackgate, Newcastle. It is about four or five inches high, flattish in section and slightly concave. The figure wears boots, a kind of kilt, and shawl thrown over the shoulder, while the hands are pierced as though each had held a staff, the left hand being thrown forward. The figure is similar in one or two respects to the bronze from Piercebridge (p. 5), but there does not seem to be much reason for attributing to this Fulwell figure a Roman origin. (viii) The late Robert Blair in 1891 saw coins "said to have been found recently at Fulwell."<sup>61</sup> They were small brass, four of Victorinus, one of Claudius Gothicus.

(f) *Whitburn*.—"I was with the ingenious Doctor Smart at Brigg; and having asked him several questions about antiquity and old coins, he says that, when he was a boy about 16 years old, as he and some more of his companions were playing and casting handfuls of sand one at another, some of them grasped three or four old coins amongst the sand, and, looking further they found a peckful hid in the sand-hill. They were all Roman emperors, and as fresh as if they were new coined, being all of brass or mixt metal, and about the bigness of half-crowns. The town's name, where they were found, is Whitburn, a fisher town by the sea-side, and betwixt

<sup>60</sup> Summers; *op. cit.*, pp. 16-7 (with a poor woodcut). Cf. *Arch. Ael.* (Quarto), i, Catalogue, p. 13.

<sup>61</sup> *P.S.N.* (New), v, p. 76.

Sunderland and Shields."<sup>62</sup> These are probably the coins referred to by Hutchinson.<sup>63</sup> If so, "one of them was Maxentius. . . . There were also one or two of Licinius and as many of Maximianus." In 1889, a first brass of Trajan and a similar coin of Hadrian were "found amongst some gravel taken from the harbour quarry top at Whitburn."<sup>64</sup>

(g) *Marsden-Harton*.—"Coarse, dark ware, the brown or yellow, and the red lustrous"<sup>65</sup> (fragments) were found in a cutting during the making of a road from Marsden to Harton. The finder also reported "traces of fire," bones and teeth of an ox or a sheep, shells, and "part of a bronze nail of characteristic Roman workmanship." From the same cutting came a "human skeleton of extraordinary size."<sup>66</sup>

(h) *Herd Sands, South Shields*.—From this beach<sup>67</sup> and from the neighbouring Trow Rocks<sup>68</sup> have been recovered Roman and mediæval coins in great numbers. The simplest explanation is that these coins were contained in material dredged from the Tyne near Newcastle Swing Bridge and deposited off and along this piece of coast.<sup>69</sup> This may also be the explanation of the finding of a bronze *patera* at low-water mark on Herd Sands.<sup>70</sup> The *patera* was inscribed **APOLLINI ANEXTLOMARO M.A. SAB.**<sup>71</sup> From the same spot has been recovered the base and portions of the sides of a Roman bronze skillet.<sup>72</sup>

<sup>62</sup> *Diary of Abraham de la Prynne (Surtees Soc. Publications, liv, p. 112).*

<sup>63</sup> *H.*, ii, p. 628 note.

<sup>64</sup> *P.S.N. (New)*, iv, p. 114.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, i, p. 92.

<sup>66</sup> *Id.* (3), v, p. 18 notes the exhibition of "the skull discovered at the north end of Marsden Bay," found with 105 other bones about 6 feet from high-water mark. The age to which this belongs seems to be unknown.

<sup>67</sup> *P.S.N. (3)*, iii, p. 193; iv, pp. 83, 124, 288; v, pp. 3, 161, 188; vii, pp. 6, 83, 213; i, 273.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, i, pp. 94, 102, 118; ii, 189; iii, 193.

<sup>69</sup> *P.S.N. (3)*, iv, p. 222.

<sup>70</sup> *Id. (New)*, iii, pp. 173 *seq.*

<sup>71</sup> or ANEXTIO MARO. For discussion as to the reading, *vide P.S.N. (New)*, iv, p. 273; v, p. 186.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, iv, p. 11. At the same time and place was found an *Ae.* 2 of Faustina Junior.

Although a pre-Roman cist burial<sup>73</sup> has been found at Trow Rocks, it seems best to accept all these objects as having originally fallen or been thrown into the Tyne at the site of the bridge of Hadrian. Apparently all the finds have been made below high-water mark and generally after heavy seas.<sup>74</sup>

This for the moment completes the record of Roman objects which have occurred along the coast of Durham. In the case of the mouth of the Wear a few additional facts may be noted. The river was known to Ptolemy, who mentions it and not the Tyne. In later times the harbour is spoken of by William of Malmesbury. A little further up the river, in the parish of Ford, Hylton, there has been found a milestone of Gordianus.<sup>75</sup> It is difficult to see how this milestone and the road upon which it stood—if it really stood here—fit into the scheme of forts as we know them at present. There is no satisfactory evidence in favour of Hooppell's claim that he had found traces of a Roman bridge at Hylton.<sup>76</sup> Even a Roman road in this locality is, in the present state of our knowledge, a little disconcerting. It cannot however be doubted that during the period of the Roman occupation there was some kind of settlement at some portion of that period at least at the mouth of the Wear. Was this population native or are these the traces of a Roman station of some description? It is to be noted that there is a grouping of pre-Roman remains in this district. Interments have come to light at Ryhope,<sup>77</sup> Tunstall Hill,<sup>78</sup> Humbledon Hill,<sup>79</sup> Grindon Hill,<sup>80</sup> Hastings Hill,<sup>81</sup> etc., stone celts have come from the bed of the Wear and Millfield,<sup>82</sup> and doubtful implements from Building Hill (Sunderland).<sup>83</sup> It is at least

<sup>73</sup> *V.C.H.*, i, p. 208.

<sup>74</sup> *e.g.*, *P.S.N.* (3), iii, p. 193.

<sup>75</sup> *C.* 1184 JN IMP. M. ANT. GORDIANO PIO FELICI AVG.

<sup>76</sup> *P.S.N.* (New), i, pp. 19, 24, 134; iv, pp. 230 *seq.*

<sup>77</sup> *Id.* (3), v, p. 242.

<sup>78</sup> *S.*, *Sunderland Section*, p. 53. *Cf.* *V.C.H.*, i, p. 208.

<sup>79</sup> *P.S.L.* (2), vi, p. 178; *V.C.H.*, i, p. 208.

<sup>80</sup> *P.S.N.* (3), ii, pp. 197-9.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, v, p. 139.

<sup>82</sup> Summers; *Sunderland*; i, p. 12. Evans; *Ancient Stone Implements* (2); pp. 193-4. *V.C.H.*, i, p. 200.

<sup>83</sup> Summers, *op. cit.*, i, p. 14.





probable that the successors of the peoples represented by these pre-Roman finds would continue to live on in the same locality under the Roman domination. On the other hand there is no single piece of evidence to prove the existence of a Roman fort, camp, or coast-guard station. The cumulative weight of such scraps of evidence as there are, together with *a priori* inferences from the modern conception of the probabilities of Roman strategy, hardly suffice for this absence.<sup>83a</sup>

This is indeed the conclusion to be reached on the general question of Roman coastal stations in Durham. It is highly probable, in fact *a priori* almost certain, that there were such. Where the sites were it is at present impossible to determine. A survey of a good portion of the coast has produced no likely site, and it is very doubtful whether a fuller examination would produce results more satisfactory. There has been a certain amount of coastal erosion. Moreover, if there ever was a site at the mouth of the Wear, it is now almost certainly covered by the town of Sunderland. The growth of this town has largely altered the local topography, *e.g.*, a dene has been completely levelled up and where ships could lie at anchor in 1350 (according to *H.*, II, p. 647), is now a densely inhabited district.

(iii) *Miscellaneous Finds.*—Under this heading are grouped finds of Roman objects which do not seem to be connected with any actually known Roman site. Possibly the further examination of the districts concerned might show that some of these finds are indications of actual Roman occupation of the locality. That they all do not show this is clear; if they did Durham would be set thick with Roman camps or forts.

<sup>83a</sup> Since this was written, I have seen a photograph of an inscribed stone found in 1903, built into a wall near Bishopwearmouth tithe barn, Sunderland. (*Sunderland Post*, 15:10:03; *cf. Times* of same day.) The stone reads V.S.L.M., within a scroll. It has been connected with foundations found in Castle Street about 1870. (*Cf. P.S.N.* (3), I, p. 99). On the whole, this would add to the possibility of a Roman station at the mouth of the Wear, but on the south side, which is somewhat unexpected. (*Note*: the Ford milestone was found on the *south* bank of the river. C.) I have not been able to trace the stone itself. The photograph is in the Haverfield Library, Oxford.

(a) *Hurworth*.<sup>84</sup>—While excavations for foundations were being made an *Ae.* 3 of Constantine the Great, struck at Trier, is said to have been found, and was exhibited to this Society in 1909.

(b) *Middleton St. George*.<sup>85</sup>—During excavations for the cellars of "The Friary," Ponteyes Lane, two lamps "typical of the third and fourth centuries," were found about six feet below the surface.

(c) *Darlington*.—Cade, writing to Gough (1790), says: "a most valuable collection of Roman silver coins, has, this year, been taken up out of the bed of the river Tees, near Darlington. I had about a dozen sent me for inspection; some of Trajan, Gordianus, Hadrian, Severus, Antoninus, Carausius and others. Those that I saw were as perfect as if almost taken from the mint, but the treasure dispersed into divers hands."<sup>86</sup> "In later times a vast quantity of Roman third brass coins have been discovered in the Cockerbeck, between Mowden Bridge and Darlington, and in Baydalebeck, near the same bridge. . . . They were in the most perfect preservation, and are all of the Constantine family."<sup>87</sup>

In 1908, an *Ae.* 3 of Quintillus is said to have been found in a garden in Cobden Street.<sup>88</sup> Later a *sestertius* of Faustina Senior was found in a field to the south of the Cleveland Bridge Co.'s works.<sup>89</sup>

(d) *Newton Ketton*.—A coin of Severus is recorded<sup>90</sup> as having occurred here. This locality has been very prolific in flint implements.<sup>91</sup>

(e) *Great Stainton*, or Stainton-le-Street, is said to have occasionally produced Roman coins. In 1901 a "small bronze Constantine II" was found.<sup>92</sup>

<sup>84</sup> *P.S.N.* (3), iv, p. 18.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.* (4), i, pp. 198-9.

<sup>86</sup> Quoted in Longstaffe; *History . . . of Darlington* (1854); p. 187.

<sup>87</sup> Longstaffe, *loc. cit.* A note adds that the writer had seen coins of Helena, Flavia, Maxima Fausta, Constantine I and II, and Crispus.

<sup>88</sup> *P.S.N.* (3), iii, p. 238.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*, x, p. 348.

<sup>90</sup> *Arch. Ael.* (New), vii, p. 89.

<sup>91</sup> "Hundreds of flint implements, arrow-heads, scrapers, knives and flakes have been found in association with beads of amber and jet, and of white and deep blue glass." Boyle, *Intod.*, p. 63. Cf. Longstaffe, *op. cit.*, p. 349, note. Evans; *Anc. Stone Impl.* (2); p. 378.

<sup>92</sup> *P.S.N.* (New), x, p. 111.

(f) *Whitton*.—"There are evident remains of entrenchments in a field betwixt Thorpe and Whitton, about half a mile to the south-west of Thorpe. Mr. Hutchinson found, some years ago, a coin of Severus Alexander on the right bank of the brook."<sup>93</sup>

(g) *Stockton*.—A coin of Nero was found "in digging the foundation of a quay, near a granary in the part where the Castle wall joined the river."<sup>94</sup> Surtees<sup>95</sup> records the finding of "a Roman coin" in Finkle Street.

(h) *Gilligate Moor, Durham*.—A gold coin of Nero.<sup>96</sup>

(i) *Sacriston*.—Ae. 2 of Maximianus, "in pulling down a chapel, erected towards the end of the last century."<sup>97</sup>

(j) *River Deerness*.—"At the crossing of Watling Street,"<sup>98</sup> i.e., Deor Street, an altar.

(k) *Brockley Whins*.—It is extremely doubtful whether this find ought to be included in a list of finds of Roman date. The object<sup>99</sup> is a "deerhorn knife-handle," with tapering blade "riveted at the bottom of the handle," five and one quarter inches long, one inch broad at the handle, which was four and one half inches long and stained deep blue. The knife is said to be somewhat similar to a knife from Deepdale, Buxton, recorded in *The Reliquary*, 1897. The notice of the Brockley Whins find says that the object "has a very Roman look."

(l) *Ryton*.—An Ae. 2 of Constans has been found here.<sup>100</sup>

(m) *Houghton-le-Spring*.—It has been stated<sup>101</sup> that Roman objects (? coins) have been found here.

#### SUMMARY.

Deor Street, leading from Piercebridge to Ebchester, is the only well-attested Roman road in the area of county

<sup>93</sup> S., iii, p. 84, note.

<sup>94</sup> Brewster; *History of Stockton*; p. 5 (1st Edit.).

<sup>95</sup> S., iii, p. 402.

<sup>96</sup> *Arch. Ael. (New)*, vii, p. 89.

<sup>97</sup> *P.S.N. (3)*, x, p. 311.

<sup>98</sup> *P.S.N. (New)*, iv, p. 51. *L.S.*, 663: DEO VERNOSTONO COCID. Q. VIRILI CERVSIO.

<sup>99</sup> *P.S.N. (New)*, viii, p. 18.

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*, iii, p. 186.

<sup>101</sup> *Arch. Ael. (New)*, x, p. 112.

Durham. Binchester on that road is a Flavian foundation, and so possibly is Chester-le-Street, but the history of the county's seven Roman forts is generally unknown. Recorded examples of camps are peculiarly rare. Scanty traces occur of Roman usages away from the sites known to have been actually occupied by Roman troops. Of these scattered finds of Roman objects, none prove that Weardale was ever exploited by the Romans, some may later prove to be evidence for links in a chain of late coastal stations, most must be taken as pointing towards a gradual and slight Romanization of a scanty native population. At present the annexes and the immediate surroundings of the forts, in which places best proof is to be expected of the influence of Roman customs and Roman control upon the natives, are, like the forts themselves for the most part, totally unexcavated.

---

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.

- A.J. ... *The Archaeological Journal.*  
 Ant. J. ... *The Antiquaries Journal.*  
 Arch. Ael. ... *Archaeologia Aeliana.*  
 Boyle ... Boyle; *County Durham (References to "Large Paper" Edit.).*  
 Bruce ... Bruce; *The Roman Wall. (2) and (3) distinguish the second and third edition respectively.*  
 C. ... ... *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, Vol. VII.*  
 Eph. ... *Ephemeris Epigraphica.*  
 Gent. Mag. ... *The Gentleman's Magazine.*  
 H. ... ... *Hutchinson; History of Durham (1823), 3 vols.*  
 J.A.A. ... *The Journal of the Archaeological Association.*  
 J.R.S. ... *The Journal of Roman Studies.*  
 L.S. ... ... *Lapidarium Septentrionale.*  
 P.S.L. ... *The Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of London.*  
 P.S.N. ... *The Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle-upon-Tyne.*  
 S. ... ... *Surtees, R.; History of the County of Durham (1816-40), 4 vols.*  
 (The sections of this work referring to Gateshead and to Sunderland have been recently republished by Hills & Co. of Sunderland, and are occasionally referred to).  
 T.D.N.S. ... *Transactions of the Durham and Northumberland Architectural and Archaeological Society.*  
 V.C.H. ... *The Victoria County History of Durham, Vol. I.*