

I.—JOHN HORSLEY AND JOHN HODGSON.

(Being the Fourth Horsley Memorial Lecture, delivered on
26 February, 1958.)

BY ERIC BIRLEY, F.S.A., PRESIDENT OF THE SOCIETY.*

*Bibliographical note: Detailed references to the papers by Sir George Macdonald and R. C. Bosanquet (AA4 X 1-57 and 58-81) are only given on occasions, since constant reference to them is presupposed; the same applies to R. G. Collingwood's paper (AA4 XV 1-42). Works which I have consulted, but not referred to except occasionally, include the following: J. Hodgson Hinde, "Notes on the Rev. John Horsley" and W. H. D. Longstaffe's "Additional remarks" (AA2 VI 174-180); J. Crawford Hodgson, "Remains of John Horsley the historian" (AA3 XV 57-79). Other references are given sparingly, but I hope sufficiently, the following abbreviations being employed:

AA1-4—*Archæologia Aeliana*, 1st-4th series.

BR—John Horsley, *Britannia Romana* (1732).

HN—John Hodgson, *History of Northumberland* (part II, volume iii, 1840, unless another volume is specified).

It. Sep.—Alexander Gordon, *Itinerarium Septentrionale* (1726/27).

Memoir—John Hodgson, *Memoirs of the Lives of Thomas Gibson, M.D., Jonathan Harle, M.D., John Horsley, M.A., F.R.S., William Turner, M.D.* (1831), pp. 21-42 and 97-144.

Raine—James Raine, *A Memoir of the Rev. John Hodgson* (two volumes, 1857).

Surtees Soc.—Publications of the Surtees Society (cited by volume number and not by title).

It is now twenty-six years since Sir George Macdonald gave the first Horsley memorial lecture, in the year which marked the bicentenary of his death (on 12 January 1732)

and of the publication of his *Britannia Romana* a few months later. Sir George reviewed the evidence for Horsley's education, for his life's work as a scholar and a scientist, as a minister of the Presbyterian church and a schoolmaster, and contrasted his achievements and his high standards with the achievements and standards of two contemporary antiquaries, Alexander Gordon and John Warburton, showing how Horsley on any count deserves to rank high above them. In the same volume of *Archæologia Aeliana* a supporting paper by our beloved and lamented late president R. C. Bosanquet, "John Horsley and his times", sketched with sure hand the setting in which Horsley lived and worked, placed his eminence as a Northumbrian scholar in perspective and illuminated the progress of his work—and its influence on later students. These two papers have profoundly affected my own study of Horsley, of the antiquarian history of the north of England and of Hadrian's Wall; and in the following pages I presuppose constant reference to them by any of my readers who may wish to look further into the theme which I have selected for discussion in this, the fourth lecture in the series which Sir George Macdonald inaugurated in April 1932.

My theme is inspired in part by Macdonald and more particularly by Bosanquet, but immediately by the second Horsley lecture which R. G. Collingwood read to us in April 1937, on "John Horsley and Hadrian's Wall". I say *inspired* of set purpose, even though the sequel will show that I disagree profoundly with much of what Collingwood wrote, regarding his main conclusions as untenable and his approach to the subject as a lesson in that propaganda which deceives even its disseminator, selecting and if need be inventing such evidence as may best lead to a conclusion already decided upon. But Collingwood—whom I am proud to remember as a teacher and a friend—had the precious gift for detecting the existence of problems, and for opening up new vistas of research; he saw that it was necessary to study Horsley's work on the Wall, he was the first scholar who

appreciated the need for studying Horsley's maps as well as his text, and above all he gave us the numerical framework into which it is now possible to fit our evidence (whether it be derived from past records or from our own researches). It was a conviction that Collingwood's conclusions were profoundly erroneous and misleading which first led me to undertake a fresh study of the subject, and an *obiter dictum* of his (suggesting that the nineteenth-century antiquaries one and all neglected Horsley) which suggested that I should incorporate in such a study an appraisal of John Hodgson, the greatest of those antiquaries—and one of the founders of our Society. I hope to show that Hodgson did more than anyone else to revive Horsley's memory and keep it green, and to study and continue the work on what he himself was the first to show convincing reasons for calling *Hadrian's Wall*. The centenary of Hodgson's death passed unnoticed by our Society in 1945; but it so happens that his first traceable study of the Wall took place in 1808 (p. 36 below), and there is thus the convenient commemoration of a hundred and fiftieth anniversary to justify—if justification were needed—linking commemoration of Hodgson with renewed commemoration of his hero Horsley.

I have learnt much, too, from Mr. C. E. Stevens's study, "The building of Hadrian's Wall", the third Horsley lecture, given to the Society in 1947; but I have thought it best to leave that sector of the field in the state to which he developed it, for I have neither the wish nor a need to review the question of centurial stones and their significance; and the sequence and timetable of the Wall's construction, which Mr. Stevens enucleated so brilliantly, is far too complicated and specialized a question to go into—even in passing—in a paper devoted primarily to a review of two men's methods and of the influence of one of them upon the other.

I.—THE COMPOSITION OF THE *Britannia Romana*.

Collingwood's lecture was a remarkable *tour de force*.

It was based on an intensive study of Horsley's three chapters on the Wall and of the set of maps which accompany them, professing to deduce the stages of Horsley's thought on the subject and the way in which he alternated between field-work and theorizing; in the event, Collingwood came to the conclusion that "Whether you look at his field-work or at his theoretical thinking, Horsley's work on the Wall is the best that has ever been done". But to reach that conclusion he had persuaded himself that Horsley was still studying the subject intensively in the last year or two of his life, and that he would have revised his text further (after yet more field-work) before sending it to press—as some person unnamed was to do after his untimely death: hence the dictum that "the *Britannia Romana* is unfinished work, the kind of thing which fools and bairns should not see". And yet Collingwood's whole thesis can be disproved, from Horsley's own writings!

Sir George Macdonald devoted some ten pages of his Horsley lecture to an analysis of the *Britannia Romana* and an appraisal of its three books, paying most attention (as Horsley himself had done) to the epigraphical hard core of the work, book II, and duly emphasizing the extent to which the progress of the project and Horsley's method of work, in co-operation with Robert Cay in Newcastle and John Ward in London, can be followed by reference to the *Britannia* itself and to the surviving letters of Horsley and his correspondents. He paid a special tribute to Cay, rightly terming him the closest personal friend among all Horsley's helpers, and mentioning his particular interest in book III (the geographical section), in cartography and in inscriptions. The progress of the project was further examined by R. C. Bosanquet, who was able to show that by the autumn of 1729 its text was so far complete that Horsley could now begin collecting materials for a history of Northumberland; he printed a letter of Horsley's to lord Oxford, dated 11 February 1731, in which early publication of the book is anticipated, explained why it was not after all published in

the spring of 1731, and concluded that Horsley's preface was probably sent to London with the dedication to Sir Richard Ellys, under date 2 January 1732; finally he quoted Ward's letter of 18 January to Roger Gale, written only six days after Horsley's sudden death:

"Everything was finished that he had to do in the present work before his death, and the whole is printed except the indexes and preface."

It might seem that these references to Macdonald and to Bosanquet should suffice to demolish Collingwood's thesis of an unfinished study. But I am apt to think (as Horsley often put it) that a more detailed examination of the evidence will serve to increase our admiration for Horsley's true quality, even if it involves taking him off the pedestal on which Collingwood's imagination set him; and it will also serve to show how closely John Hodgson must be drawn upon in any study of the *Britannia Romana*.

First, its preface. Its period of composition is clear on internal evidence: Horsley twice cites the *Daily Courant* of 23 November 1731, he takes note of Ward's "Letter to the author" (BR pp. 343-355 *bis*), dated 2 September 1731, and his "Essay on Peutinger's table" (BR pp. 505-520), on which he writes:

"I had no opportunity of seeing it before the sheets were printed off, but I have since read it carefully over."

We shall not be far wrong if we take it that the proofs of letter and essay were sent off from London early in December, and that Horsley's preface was put into final form within a few days at most of 2 January 1732, the date of his dedication to Sir Richard Ellys. It starts with a history of the project:

"It is now above four years since I was first prevailed with to compleat this work, for which time I have pursued it with the greatest care and application. The first book cost me much

labour and time in my study. . . . But I need not inform the world, that the second book was the most expensive and tedious. . . . The third book is an addition, which at first was not intended, and for that reason has occasioned a considerable delay of the publication."

There follows the author's justification for appearing in print and for dealing with his subject on scientific lines, with a brief survey of the contents and purpose of each of the three books; then, on p. v:

"But instead of enlarging further on these heads, I would rather chuse to fill up the remainder of this Preface with some additional remarks, which have occurred on the last revisal of the printed sheets sent down to me from *London*. . . ."

The extent and contents of these "additional remarks" will be sufficient to show what points were in fact still in Horsley's mind—and Collingwood's theory that he was deep in renewed study of the Wall finds nothing to support it. Book I is only accorded half a dozen pages, and the three chapters on the Wall a mere paragraph apiece, comprising the following points and no more: (a) the proper dimensions of the fort at Old Penrith, (b) further consideration of the identification of five *Notitia* stations in Cumberland, and of the possibility of a Roman fort at Brampton, (c) information from Dr. Hunter about a gateway through the Wall having been found "in the next *castellum* west from *Walwick*", (d) a footnote to p. 121, noting that a later edition of Echard's *Roman History* gives the length of the wall correctly as eighty miles, and (e) the briefest of additional notes on the "out-buildings" at Chesters and the course of the road linking it with "Carrvoran" and "Watling-street". Nothing at all about even one of the subjects which Collingwood claimed that Horsley had particularly on his mind in the last year or two of his life—the turret-system, the anatomy of the Vallum, or an intensive study of the Military Way.

Book II receives the lion's share of attention, pp. x-xxv, and book III would have had little space devoted to it, "as

this was the last, and in respect of the former but lately composed", but for its long discussion of a letter and a map recently communicated to him "from a gentleman of *Northamptonshire* . . . Mr. *Eayre*", and its two pages devoted to Ward's essay on Peutinger. Indeed, the recent composition of book III had already been stressed during Horsley's review of book I (p. vi):

"This book was not only composed, but the copy of it out of my hands a considerable time, before the third was fully resolved on."

Collingwood's theory of the timetable of Horsley's attention to the Wall, and his assumption that the three chapters were still in manuscript at his death, may thus be rejected out of hand, on the evidence of the *Britannia Romana* itself—which confirms Ward's statement to Gale, that everything Horsley had to do was finished before his death, and shows that the whole of book I, including the three chapters on the Wall, had been sent to press before a start was made at writing book III.

The full opening to the preface may now be quoted:

"It is very common for men to be drawn from slight beginnings into schemes of a vast extent, and for a large expensive fabric to arise from some originally small design. This collection, which at first I intended only for my own amusement and pleasure, now ventures to shew itself in public; and from some general and brief hints for private use has swell'd to that bulk, in which at present it appears. It is now above four years since I was first prevailed with to compleat this work, for which time I have pursued it with the greatest care and application."

Written at the end of 1731, this carries the beginning of Horsley's intensive work on the book back to 1727 at earliest, the year after Gordon's *Itinerarium Septentrionale* had been published. When we turn from the *Britannia Romana* to Horsley's letters, still greater precision is attainable. The earliest dated letter is that written to Cay on 1 June 1727, mentioned briefly, with an extract from its last paragraph,

by Hodgson in his last volume, published in 1840 (HN 279, footnote); it had evidently come to his notice too late to be used in his *Memoir* of 1831—of which, more presently. So had Judge Cay's "Observations" on the *Britannia*, cited by Hodgson more than once (HN 212, 218, 228 and 284); both had been communicated to him by John Cay of Edinburgh, to whom I suppose that he later returned them, for they are not included among the Horsley MSS. in the Black Gate library. But it does contain a volume entitled *MSS of Cay, Harle & Horsley*, in which two successive amanuenses have transcribed the text of (a) Judge Cay's observations, (b) extracts from Horsley's MS. history of Northumberland, and (c) copies of several letters—to Robert Cay from Dr. Harle of Alnwick and his son, Horsley's letter of 1 June 1727, one from Judge Cay to his brother, and finally Horsley's letter of 12 June 1731 to Gale (printed in *Surtees Soc.* vol. 73, pp. 269ff.) and Stukeley's to Gale of 4 February 1728 (*Surtees Soc.* vol. 76, p. 71). Here and there, notes have been added in Hodgson's own neat hand. I cannot be certain that the transcription of the letter is accurate in every detail (the punctuation seems unlike Horsley's), but it deserves to be printed in full, for its light on the close interest of Robert Cay in the whole project, and on the subject-matter of Horsley's thoughts that summer:

"To Mr. Robert Cay to be left at Batson's Coffee House near the Exchange London.—Morpeth 1 June 1727.—Sir,—I hope this will find you safe at London, and yt you had better way and better weather than I. If you could by any means visit Conington, which is two miles south from Stilton in your return and spend an hour or two there I believe you would be pleased yourself and it might do me a service. What at present I find I omitted when there was to take the dimensions of that side of the Altar in the Church on which is inscribed, Antonino et Geta Consulibus, together with the shape and size of the letters. I also forgot to take the dimensions of the stone above the summer House door and the diameter of the Corona in which is inscribed Cohors 4ta Gallorum and the size of the letters. The representation is exact in Cambden, and there is a stone at Durham found at Lanchester on which every thing seems to be almost

the same and in the same proportion only the inscription differs. There are two inscriptions at the door of the Royal Society's Museum but I believe (*sic*) neither of them belonging to Britain, I neglected to take them when at London and therefore wish if you have a little time that you would do it or be better assured that neither of them belong to Britain. The one seems to be upon a coarse marble and therefore cannot be British. I desire you would also examine carefully whether in the inscription found at Risingham (Mo-gont, Gad &c.) there be as Cambden has made it either Deo above or an A between the G & D and whether there be a transverse stroke in the letter A throughout the inscription. This inscription, you'll find in the Summer house at Conington. You'll please also to enquire diligently about the stones which you'll observe by the vacancies in the summer house have been removed. I begged of the people to inform themselves if they could what was become of them, and they faithfully promised they would.

"I believe you'll think it worth your while if you go to Conington to observe in the general, what inscriptions have the A with the transverse stroke and which of them have not. I am apt to think it will prove a better mark of Antiquity than at first I imagined. There is also an inscription upon a part of a rude pillar but much defaced if you have time I wish you would try what you can make of it for I have not yet found it in Cambden.

"I send this just to be a memorandum to you, and if any thing more occur I shall make bold to trouble you with it. I beg the favour of you not to take notice to any body and particularly not to Mr. Gordon of my being busy about anything of this nature. I wish you a safe return and am your very humble servant J. Horsley."

The reference to Gordon, in the last paragraph, is all that Hodgson quoted (after summarizing the rest of the letter in a sentence); he, and Sir George Macdonald after him, took it to mean that nobody was to be told about the book on which Horsley was now intensively engaged, and that the specific mention of Gordon implies something hardly to the credit of one or other of them. To Hodgson, the reason was clear enough: "He seems to have been more indebted to Gordon's descriptions than he was willing to acknowledge." Sir George Macdonald took another view, suggesting that "the indebtedness was all on the other side"; but that is not supported by an undated letter (Hodgson's *Memoir*,

no. 6, pp. 115ff.) which reads as if it was written very shortly after Horsley had obtained a copy of the *Itinerarium Septentrionale*, and thus several months earlier than that which has just been reproduced—perhaps in the second half of 1726. Its importance is cardinal for my present purpose, and I therefore quote it, too, in full (from a collation of the original MS. in the Black Gate, retaining Horsley's own spelling, punctuation and use of capitals, but expanding his habitual abbreviations—ye, yt, &c.):

“To Mr. Robert Cay, at Newbigging, to be left at Mr. Ralph Emmerson's, in the Groat Market, Newcastle.—Morpeth, Monday.—Sir,—I find Gordon does not take the least notice of a Station near Halton or Portgate. He mentions some Ruins at the Chappel Houses not far from you but does not take them to have been a Station. I wish you could view them, because the Distance from Newcastle and Rouchester will suit better there than at Benwall. And this may be suppos'd to have been abandoned after the Time of Antoninus Pius and the building Severus's wall.

“The Roman Foot I find is (according to the model to be seen in the Capitol) to the English Foot as 1306 to 1350, tho' the others will have it to be as 1334 to 1350.

“As the Line of the Wall appeard clearly to me to pass over the East or South side of Pandon Gate, I am much of the opinion that it has taken a small Turn there or at the Stock bridge, and shall take it for granted that it has done so, if that bridge and the Nether deen Bridge be found much in a Line with one another and with the other places through which we supposd the wall to have passed to the Westgate. And I am apt to think upon Enquiry, you'll find it to be so. Or perhaps the two angles have been just at the two Gates.

“I think the scheme of the Stations per Lineam Valli will certainly hold good. I have been agreeably surprizd to find, since I came Home, that Dumbrugh Castle may be provd by undoubted Inscriptions to be the antient Axelodunum. And I am amazd that the Inscriptions there and at Adon Castle (i.e. near the Station we observd) shoud never have been made use of before to determine the one to be Axelodunum, and the other *Hunnum*. I have sent you an old Copy of the Stations per Lineam Valli which I had by me. I have not Time to transcribe it—but have just added hastily what I take at present to be the places—tho' I am a little doubtful as to some of 'em. But

Tunocellum is undoubtedly Itunae Ocellum, promontorium Itunae, and a proper place for marines. The other five stations appear (by Alone) to be on the South Side, and at some small Distance from the Wall. I write in Haste and am your very Humble Servant, John Horsley."

Several points should be noted before we examine the particular case of Horsley's use of Gordon. (a) Cay has recently been in Horsley's company on a visit to the Wall, sharing in the discovery of the fort near Aydon castle now best known as Haltonchesters; and perhaps both of them had visited the western end of the Wall. (b) Drumburgh might seem to have been mentioned by a slip of the pen instead of Burgh; but I suggest that at this stage Horsley had not yet decided to treat Watchcross as a Notitia station, so that his "scheme" required Axelodunum to fall at Drumburgh, to fit its numerical position in the Notitia list—as to which it is to be noted that Horsley is not yet as confident as he later became. (c) Cay is not only Horsley's trusted correspondent, and his companion in the field, but also his agent charged with such field-work as Horsley himself was unable to undertake; this, of course, helps to explain the closeness of the partnership between the two men, to which several of the later letters bear witness. But even more important is the evidence that it was to Gordon's book that he owed his knowledge of the site at Chapelhouse, a furlong east of mile-castle 9 and about the same distance south of the Wall: Sir George Macdonald should have conceded at least one instance of Horsley owing to Gordon something which he did not acknowledge in the *Britannia Romana*. There is a good deal more, however, to be found by a careful comparison between their two books, in spite of Horsley's undertaking to Stukeley, in March 1729, that he would act "a just and generous part" to Gordon and his friend Goodman. It is fair to say that Gordon is seldom mentioned, in the three chapters on the Wall, except to call his views in question; but it can be shown that a good deal of his material has been taken over by Horsley without acknowledgment. Further

analysis shows that Horsley's attention to Gordon's text must largely have come in the study, after his return from the field, and never been checked further on the ground. Several instances might be cited, but I give the preference to the case of the Turf Wall (as we now know it, thanks to the acumen of Cadwallader Bates, and the excavations first of Haverfield and his colleagues, and later of F. G. Simpson). It will be remembered that Gordon treats Wall and Vallum as the work of Severus and Hadrian respectively, the Vallum normally appearing as *Hadrian's Wall*—though on occasions he calls it the *Vallum*, *Adrian's Wall* or the *Turff Vallum*. Westwards of Birdoswald, according to his account,

(*It. Sep.* p. 80) "the Walls separate pretty wide, and pass by a Place called the *High-house*, where they are distant 81 Paces from each other. Beyond this, *Severus's Wall* is to be seen very great and conspicuous, having about 7 or 8 regular Courses of the square Stones, facing it, still visible. In this manner, they run to a few Houses called *Wallbour*, where they touch one another, and this is the first Time, I ever observed that Circumstance. At *Wallbour* is another square Watch-Tower, 66 Foot each Way."

This patently describes the situation immediately east of milecastle 51 (Wallbowers), where the Turf Wall and its ditch run in, as it seems to the traveller from Birdoswald—following the road which since Gordon's day has hidden the "very great and conspicuous" remains of the stone Wall—to coincide thereafter with the line of the Stone Wall and its ditch. If Horsley had been the gifted field-worker that Collingwood thought him, here was surely a case for his attention! Yet he contented himself with the following brief and (to us) unsatisfactory paragraph:

(BR p. 153) "Over against a house called *Midgham-foot* the walls are about ten chains distant. From *High-house* to *Walbours* they are very large and conspicuous; *Severus's wall* in the third or fourth degree, and the ditch in the second, and the military way very visible in the second or third degree at the least. The *vallum* looks like a military way, tho' this seems to

be occasioned by its being the publick road at present; for 'tis very broad, but low. There is a visible *castellum* here, to which *Severus's* military way (as usual) goes up; and perhaps this has led Mr. *Gordon* to say, that the 'walls touch one another'."

On Horsley's definition, "*Severus's* military way" is frequently to be equated with the north mound of the Vallum (along which, as he rightly observed, the Military Way often runs), and it is true that the Turf Wall looks not unlike one of the Vallum mounds; but it is accompanied by an unmistakable ditch, though Gordon omitted to mention it—and if Horsley had ever checked Gordon's account on the spot, after reading it, he must surely have seen the ditch. One is tempted to suspect that our undated letter was written in the summer of 1726, after Horsley's return home from an excursion along the Wall in Cay's company, to find a copy of the *Itinerarium Septentrionale* awaiting him in Morpeth. It is unfortunate that its precise date of publication has not yet been established, and that we cannot be sure how soon Horsley secured his copy. Publication certainly occurred before the end of July 1726, for the book is mentioned in a letter of 20 July from Jonathan Harle (son of the Alnwick minister) in London to Cay in Newcastle, quoted in Hodgson's *Memoir* (p. 15f., footnote):

"Mr. Gordon's book is come out, and I doubt not but hon'ble mention of you will be made in it."

But the list of subscribers shows only one in Northumberland, namely Sir John Swinburn, bart.; and we are left to speculate whether Horsley had been sent a copy by one of the other subscribers with whom he was already friendly—Ellys (undoubtedly the "Richard Ellis, *Esq.*;" of the list), Hunter or Ward—or whether he had ordered a copy through a bookseller.

If I am right, it was late in the summer of 1726 that Horsley studied Gordon's book, and much of his discussion in the three Wall chapters must have been written out, from

those "general and brief hints for private use", during the winter 1726/27, without any personal field-work to check points on which Gordon's text did not accord with his notes, or his recollection. What checking there was, Horsley left to Cay; and the three chapters, so far from representing the fruits of long years of gestation, are revealed as in substance the rapid products of that "labour and time in my study". That will explain why they do not show evidence of methodical exploitation either of Gordon or of any other earlier writer; and to me, indeed, they read far more like some paper of Collingwood's—written at high speed, by a man gifted with great vision and clarity, with minimal attention (except in the analysis of the milecastle system) to field-notes or to specific sources. We shall be seeing presently that there are in fact some later insertions in the text (none of them demonstrably later than the end of April 1728); and it seems simplest to suppose that the whole treatment of the milecastles is an addition, worked out in the study after George Mark (BR p. 121) had made the survey of the Wall "by my order": that will explain how Horsley failed to spot the surplus milecastle between Harlow Hill and Haltonchesters, and many another point on which Mark's treatment falls far short of perfection. Collingwood has already suggested that the length of the Wall, given by Horsley as "sixty-eight miles and three furlongs" (to quote his exact words) was arrived at by dint of Mark "cooking" his measurements so as to agree with Gordon's; and the map shows a great deal more indebtedness to Gordon, unnoticed in the text. Let us take the case of the turrets, where Collingwood's discussion is more than usually partisan and misleading.

In his text Horsley only mentions the sites of four turrets—one doubtful one "not very far from" milecastle 8; two in the Wall-mile 15/16; and one identifiable as turret 36a (BR pp. 138, 140 and 147). His maps however show twelve in all, only two of them mentioned in his text, whereas four certainly and probably a fifth can be equated with the five which are all that Gordon recorded. In view of Colling-

wood's claim that it was Horsley who discovered the existence of the turrets and that

"what Gordon says about turrets will, I think, convince any reader that he was looking, not very skilfully, for something he had been told to expect,"

it will be well to see what Gordon's actual words were. First,

(*It. Sep.* p. 74) "About 1329 Paces further west [sc. of Walwick], there are no less than six regular Courses of the square Stones above one another, facing the Old Wall; and here I met with a little Exploratory Turret of hewn Free-Stone joining to it, being little more than 12 Foot in Length, and something less in Breadth; and is about 5 Courses of Stone in Height. Beyond that is such another called *Tower-Tare*; the Stone Wall is here about six Courses high. A little beyond this, I met with another square Watch-Tower, projecting from the Wall about 66 Foot each Way: And still somewhat more Westerly, is another small Exploratory Turret, of the same Dimensions with the former."

Here the topographical details give us turrets 28a, 28b, mile-castle 29 and a turret beyond that but before milecastle 30; Horsley's text omits all reference to the turrets, but might well have been based on Gordon's, except for its observation about the milecastle (which could well have been inserted from Mark's report):

(BR p. 145) "Near *Towertay* there are five or six regular courses of the facing stones of the wall. And a little west from thence are large remains of a *castellum*, detached about a yard from the wall, the reason of which is not very obvious."

Next, west of Housesteads, Gordon writes:

(*It. Sep.* p. 78) "From *Craigloch*, *Severus's* Wall still keeps the high Ground, and *Hadrian's* the low, passing by a few Houses called the *Lochend-Houses*, beyond which there is another Watch-Tower; from hence the Walls reach to a place called the *Steelrig*, and are within 39¹ Paces of each other. After this I met with another Watch-Tower. Beyond this, *Hadrian's*

¹ Clearly a misprint; 700 yards would be nearer the mark.

Vallum is 772 Paces from *Severus's*. Going more Westerly I met with another exploratory Turret of hewn Stone; at which Place the Wall is eight Courses high, and beyond is another Watch Tower like those already mentioned. A little more Westerly the 2 Walls come within 27 Paces of one another; from thence pass by *Craigend* to *Hartwhistle Burn* . . .”

The topographical details give us milecastle 39 (Castlenick), milecastle 40 or 41, a turret to west of it, then milecastle 42 (Cawfields) and the convergence of Wall and Vallum as they approach Haltwhistle burn. Horsley's map marks a turret identifiable without question as 41a; in his text no particulars are given about the Wall between Steelrigg and Haltwhistle burn, except that it “runs immediately upon the precipices”, and it might seem as if in this sector Horsley had not followed its line, choosing to traverse the easier and straighter line of the Vallum, the course of which he describes with great precision as far as the length from Bradley to Twice Brewed is concerned:

(BR p. 149) “And it is remarkable, that the *vallum* to avoid a morass or peet-moss, keeps the high ground south of the moss, so as that the flat mossy ground lies between the two hills, on the brow or edge of which stand the walls.”

But westward to Haltwhistle burn all he says of the Vallum is that it is “pretty conspicuous, especially the ditch and north *agger*”—and yet the last mile of that stretch includes the most striking of all the series of gaps! I find it difficult to avoid the conclusion that Horsley never walked or rode between Steelrigg and Haltwhistle burn, and that here direct utilization of Gordon was confined to the map.

Lastly, “a little beyond” Walltown, Gordon

(*It. Sep.* p. 79) “met with another Watch Tower, the Wall continuing to have 8, 9, and 10 Courses of the square Stones above one another: And a little more Westerly, 11 and 12 Courses. Beyond this is another exploratory Turret. *Severus's* Wall then descends from the high Ridge of Rocks and Precipices. . . .”

Here we are in the Wall mile 45/46, passing along the Nine Nicks of Thirlwall towards Carvoran—and Horsley's map duly marks a turret in what must be the 45a position, for he shows milecastle 46 too far east of its correct place; his text leaves the turret unnoticed, though it gives particulars of the Wall between Walltown and Carvoran where it was

(BR p. 151) "in the greatest perfection of any now remaining in the whole track. It is about three yards high, has about fourteen regular courses, and at one part sixteen, of the facing stones entire."

To sum up the turret question: Gordon was surely recording milecastles and turrets alike as he had actually noticed them, and his complete disregard for any measurements of the intervals between them must mean that neither Horsley nor anyone else had discussed their existence, or their spacing, with him. By contrast, Horsley's map makes use of Gordon's five turrets, but his description of the Wall excludes them—as it excludes all but two of the turrets not taken over from Gordon. That must mean that Horsley wrote his text without collating his notes with Gordon's account, and before his map had been compiled; and it seems clear that his schedule and discussion of milecastles and their spacing is a later insertion, after Mark's survey but not after further field-work by Horsley himself—for it accepts implicitly all the errors of fact to which Collingwood has drawn attention (in particular, placing an extra milecastle in the sector between Rudchester and Haltonchesters), and moreover it misses milecastles that Horsley could hardly have missed if he had ever returned to the Wall to check his manuscript! According to him, milecastle 31

(BR p. 145) "has either been very near the station at *Carrowburgh*, or just fallen in with it."

It is still plainly visible to-day, some hundred yards east of *Carrowburgh* fort. Then, Horsley identifies milecastle 78,

(BR p. 157) "fourteen furlongs from *Boulness*; so that there has been another between this and the station,"

and his map carefully distinguishes between the identified milecastle and the inferred; yet milecastle 79 had been seen and recorded by Gordon:

(*It. Sep.* p. 82) (Beyond Drumburgh) "the Stone-Wall appears very great, passing through *West-Kirkland*; next by *Fesa-Cross*, which is upon the Wall; beyond which the Lime and Mortar that cemented the inward Part of the Wall, appears very plain. After this I found another Watch-Tower 66 Foot square: 365 Paces beyond that, the Wall measures 8 Foot of perpendicular Height; and thus both the Wall and the Ditch, continuing distinct and plain, run a little more westerly to *Bulness*. . . ."

Horsley's field-work could hardly be shown more clearly to have been behind him when he wrote his text, and in this case neither Horsley nor Mark (nor Cay, for that matter) collated the survey with Gordon's account or inserted the proper symbol for an identified milecastle 79, between Fisher Cross and Bowness.

I have said that the schedule and discussion of milecastles and their spacing must be a later insertion in a text written out in Horsley's study during the winter 1726/27, before Mark had been sent to make the survey which yielded the map and allowed Horsley to compile the schedule. It was surely at the same stage, with Mark's notebook before him, that he formulated and inserted his theory of turret spacing (BR p. 120), which refers specifically to the measurement of one interval—which a later passage (BR p. 147), confirmed by the map, allowed Collingwood to identify as that between milecastle 36 and turret 36a, pointing out that the distance which Horsley gives as 308 yards was the result of Mark, most likely, misreading the entry 508 in his field-book and thus leading Horsley

"by generalizing from this one instance to propound a view of the turret-scheme so remote from the truth."

At whatever stage the results of Mark's survey were taken

into account and the schedules and discussions inserted in the text of the chapters on the Wall, Horsley's letters to Cay allow us to trace his final additions to those chapters and to assign them to the early summer of 1728. The first, dated 22 April 1728, contains these significant passages:

(a) "I have sent you in some more Papers by Mr. Wilson, which I hope you have receivd, and desire you woud examine them with the same Freedom with which you have done the others. I beg you woud correct the mistakes you observed in the Maps in such a manner as you yourself shall think proper, so that they may not be forgot. The 2d map or No. 2 must be corrected by No. 1, which is right. There are some other Remarks which have occurrd to me which I beg you woud insert in their properest place, if there be nothing of the same nature mentiond any where in the Papers already, which I don't remember at present."

There follows a series of notes, traceable in the printed text of the *Britannia Romana*, the most important for our present purpose being that incorporated—with only minor changes in wording—almost at the end of chapter 9:

(b) "N.B. This following passage to be just added at the End of the Present State of the Wall. Cambden, page 1017, supposes that the Wall begun *A mile beyond Boulness, as appears by the Foundations at low water*. But upon Search and Enquiry into this matter I coud not find or hear of any thing of this Nature that coud be rely'd on, and therefore am of the Opinion that it has been the Foundation of one of the small Forts or Castles which were placed along the side of the Frith that has led him into this Error."

Cay did not always think that the Wall chapters included the "properest place" for all of Horsley's remarks; thus, that which Horsley suggested inserting in chapter 8—

(c) "I find by Inscriptions that the Legio 2da Augusta in the reign of Hadrian was at Netherby and Bewcastle. Could they be posted there in these advanced stations to guard or secure the workmen that were building the Vallum? This to be added where I observe in the antient State of the Wall that the Romans

had advanced Stations when the Wall was building if not added already.”

—is placed under *legio II Augusta* in chapter 6 (BR p. 78). Finally, a link with the undated letter to which we must turn next:

(d) “I would fain have somewhat sent to London that they may make a beginning.”

This makes it clear that the first book had not yet been sent to the printers, but that it was already out of Horsley’s hands; a letter merely dated “Morpeth, Monday night” (Hodgson’s no. 3, *Memoir* pp. 101-106), by its contents evidently belongs to the same period, and specifically a few days after that of 22 April, to which it looks back in the following passage:

“I would fain as I said before have somewhat sent to London as soon as possible. And yet I believe it will be necessary to transcribe some Sheets which are not legible and to correct any word or expression that is in any way obscure or improper. This I leave entirely to your Discretion and Judgment, if you can but spare Time to run them once over again before they go away. If you take the Trouble of sending them away, please to direct them for Mr John Osburne, Bookseller at the Ship in pater noster Row.”

The beginning of this letter had renewed Horsley’s injunction to Cay to use his own judgment in dealing with the additional items:

“I have sent you some more Papers, and some other miscellaneous hasty remarks which you may consider at your Leisure. And if a proper place for inserting them occur to you, please to polish ’em a little and add them where you see fit, if you think them worthy of notice.”

The last three paragraphs of the letter are concerned with the maps for the *Britannia*, and again entrust Cay with making corrections; the final paragraph is given here (though it is not directly relevant to my purpose) because the version printed in Hodgson’s *Memoir* contains a mistake of substance in its transcription of Horsley’s MS.:

“In the Map of the military way from South Shields, the Deen burn should be added on the East side of the 3 or 4 prick Lines (which denote the greater visibility of the way) You will know best where and how to insert it. And I think there should be a Plurality of Marks where there is a village in this Map as well as those of the Wall.”

The final sentence seems to imply a large-scale map of Roman Durham, lacking from the *Britannia Romana*: but perhaps “in this Map” means in the portion of the map “from SEGEDVNVM to CONDERCVM” which marks a ROMAN WAY running to South Shields, with three extra prick-lines where it comes closest to Jarrow “slyke”; but the Deen burn, as noted by Hodgson (who however prints it “*Deen-bush*”), has not been inserted.

Horsley’s later letters to Cay are concerned with materials for books II and III and not with book I, except for the letter headed “Morpeth, Friday night” (Hodgson’s no. 7, *Memoir* p. 117f.), which includes:

“I must beg the favour of you to send me back what you have among the papers relating to the wall in Scotland.”

The letter also discusses the reading of the bilingual altar from Lanchester, C.I.L. VII 431 (Horsley’s *Durham* XXV with pp. 25f. and xi); comparison with Horsley’s letters to Gale allows us to date this one, by the stage reached in deciphering the Greek text, after that of 7 April 1729 (*Surtees Soc.* vol. 80, pp. 95ff.) and before that of 1 May (*op. cit.*, pp. 257ff.) in the same year. The Roman Wall in Scotland is dealt with in the last chapter of book I, pp. 158-175; in view of what we have seen about the progress of book I from Horsley to Cay, on its way to the printer in London, in April 1728, this letter (which we can place twelve months later) perhaps indicates the stage by which Horsley had received proofs of the book, rather than that he had kept chapter 10 back until then. Yet consideration of his overall programme might lead us to suppose that the chapter on the Antonine Wall, and Mark’s survey of it and the six maps

which that yielded, might have had to follow the rest of book I after an interval, to allow for the field-work which in this case by Horsley's own abundant testimony only came after the publication of Gordon's book. If the chapters on our Wall were safely off Horsley's hands by the end of April 1728, he might perhaps have been able to turn to writing up the Antonine Wall later that year; but his visit to Scotland for the purpose cannot yet be dated specifically—though we know that he had called on Sir John Clerk of Penicuik, Gordon's patron, not long before 15 February 1729 (Surtees Soc. vol. 80, p. 391).

· Lastly, in considering the progress of the *Britannia Romana*, I take the letter of 18 September 1729, which opens with the phrase which to Hodgson seemed so charged with foreboding for Horsley's future—and his own (*Memoir* p. 42, with the observations of Sir George Macdonald and R. C. Bosanquet, AA4 X pp. 27 and 80):

“I have sent you a paquet of maps, &c., relating to the *Britannia Romana*. I am quite wearied out with them; but I am in great hopes that if you fall fresh to the work, you will go far to complete it, upon the foundation I have laid; though in some places the foundation itself may need your helping hand a little.”

I have already mentioned that by the autumn of 1729 Horsley was beginning to collect materials for a history of Northumberland and that R. C. Bosanquet has shown that that must imply substantial completion of the project begun in 1727: the decisive evidence comes in the closing paragraph of this letter of 18 September (Hodgson's No. 11, *Memoir* pp. 124-128):

“If it falls in your way to procure me an authentic account of the quantity of coals sent from Newcastle to London yearly, or anything else that is curious and fit for a natural history, you will please to be mindful of me. I think to spend my leisure time this winter on that subject. . . .”

The last of Horsley's letters to Cay, assignable through

John Hodgson Hinde's researches to a short time before 10 May 1731 (AA2 VI 174-180, especially p. 177, on the letter printed by Hodgson without a number, *Memoir* p. 29, footnote), and his letters to Gale—seventeen of them, covering the period from 24 March 1729 to 12 June 1731, as listed in an appendix to the present paper—show that he was primarily concerned with new discoveries and the best readings to adopt for difficult inscriptions, in the period after September 1729.

* * *

This long discussion has put Collingwood's imaginative reconstruction of Horsley's methods finally out of court, I hope, and has indicated that the true merit of the chapters on the Wall is to be sought, not in the fruits of repeated field-work, but in the clarity of vision which allowed Horsley, fresh from a tour of the Wall with Cay and perhaps stung to action by noting Gordon's omission of all acknowledgment either to Cay or to himself, to construct a logical discussion of the whole subject. Where his premises were faulty, his conclusions have of course been disproved, as Collingwood demonstrated particularly neatly in his discussion of the names of the forts (AA4 XV 20-25); but the more I consider Horsley's text, the more I appreciate and wonder at his ability to point out matters of cardinal importance. Some of them, Collingwood drew attention to, but he by no means exhausted the riches of the Horsley lode! It was not merely the spacing of milecastles and turrets, but also the spacing of forts along the Wall in which Horsley was interested—though it was left to Dr. Swinbank and Mr. Spaul, in 1950, to produce the first specific analysis and discussion of the subject (AA4 XXIX 221-238). He was the first to note and to understand the evidence for the *Schwerpunkt* of military activity having been in the west, at the Cumberland end of the frontier (BR p. 103, &c.), a point that few later writers have either noted or understood; and there are still plenty of problems awaiting

attention in the field (to say nothing of excavation), arising from Horsley's record of what he or his surveyor had seen, or from his reflections on what had been seen—or sought in vain.

Let me take, as an illustration, the thickness of the Wall, his attention to which was noticed in passing by Sir George Macdonald (AA4 X 19) and in rather greater detail by Collingwood (AA4 XV 4), referring to the paragraph devoted to that subject in chapter 8 (BR p. 122). Two other passages, both in chapter 9, still await proper attention—though there is reason to think that they will have received it, through the good offices of the ancient monuments department of the Ministry of Works, by the time this study appears in print:

(BR p. 147) (a) (Between Sewingshields and Housesteads) “As such steep rocks are a sufficient fence of themselves, I am inclined to think the wall has not in these parts had either strength or thickness, equal to what it has had in other parts. For the remains here are not so considerable, tho' it seems very improbable that any of the stones, especially in some places, could have been removed. In the hollows between the rocks, besides the addition of the ditch and a *castellum* here and there, the wall itself seems to have been stronger and thicker.”

(b) (Between Walltown and Carvoran, immediately after the passage quoted at p. 17 above) “The reason of its being so well preserved at this part is, that the wall is here backed up with earth and rocks on the south, or inner side; so that tho' it be three yards high on the north or outward side, yet within it is not much above the level of the ground. For a considerable space the wall seems to have been faced up against the ground or rocks, and only to have been raised so far above the inner ground, as to serve for a parapet. . . .”

It is customary nowadays to generalize about the height of the Wall, the most usual figure being fifteen Roman feet to the walk, or twenty feet if we include the parapet (though not every writer gives credit to F. G. Simpson for working out this figure from surviving structural evidence at mile-castles 37 and 48); Parker Brewis in 1926 arrived at the same

total by a different calculation, his figures being sixteen and four feet respectively (AA4 IV 115f.). But in each case the basis of calculation was the Broad Wall; and nobody has yet considered in print the possibility, here hinted at by Horsley, that the Narrow Wall—or the still narrower Wall which one meets with on long stretches of the central sector, between milecastles 34 and 46—may have been designed to stand to a reduced height in calculable relationship to their reduced thickness.

None of us can claim, any more than Collingwood might seem to have claimed, to have paid completely adequate attention to Horsley's observations on the Wall. But the superficiality of Collingwood's study is emphasized, not merely by the revelation of its failure to study more than Horsley's three chapters on the Wall and the accompanying plates, but in a casual reference thrown out by him in discussing the diversion of the Vallum which Horsley's map shows at Rudchester. He notes that Haverfield, who observed the diversion on the ground in 1897, stated in his report that it seemed "not to have been noticed before", and comments that Haverfield

"here as elsewhere followed the lead of the nineteenth-century antiquaries in neglecting Horsley."

Yet a case can be made out, I think, for claiming that nobody has given such long and careful attention to Horsley, and to continuing and doing honour to his work, as the greatest of all the nineteenth-century antiquaries, John Hodgson. To him I devote the next part of my paper.

II.—JOHN HODGSON ON HORSLEY.

Once the *Britannia Romana* had been published, it set a standard (to quote R. C. Bosanquet's informed opinion) "of sober and methodical investigation whose influence is still unspent". No reputable antiquary could think of study-

ing Roman inscriptions, or the Wall, without paying large tribute to Horsley, often making his text the main dish and noting later discoveries—or the writer's own observations—as mere trimmings; so it was with our local topographers and historians, Wallis, Hutchinson and Brand, so too (as Bosanquet pointed out) with Bishop Pococke and with Lingard; and it may be remembered that Gough, in his two editions of Camden's *Britannia* (1789 and 1806), contented himself with lengthy quotations from Horsley when it came to providing a new chapter of additions to supplement Camden's brief account of the Wall. Even John Warburton's scissors-and-paste pirating of Horsley in the *Vallum Romanum* (1753) tells the same story, doing credit to his judgment of Horsley's achievement—in that respect at least Hutton was shrewder than he perhaps realized when he honoured Warburton with the epithet *judicious* (AA4 X 79).

But the passage of time inevitably led to Horsley's work receding into the background as new discoveries were made, up and down the country—and as the study of Roman history came increasingly to be continued within the restricted framework of county history, in which the Roman period inevitably accounts for only a fraction of the whole. Witness the Cumberland volume of the Lysons brothers' *Magna Britannia*, published in 1816, in which the account of "British and Roman Roads and Stations, and the Roman Wall", pp. cxxix-cxlviii, contributed by the bishop of Cloyne, though it makes good use of Horsley, attempts a fresh synthesis of the evidence and gives more emphasis to later discoveries and to the writer's own examination of the Roman sites: nowhere is this more apparent than in the case of Moresby (p. cxliv),

"one of the few instances in which the accuracy of Horsley has failed him; for though he allowed the inscriptions found here to be Roman, he has too hastily observed that there are hardly any marks of the station itself; other antiquaries have been more fortunate in discovering it; the site is in a field, on the side of the village, towards Barton, called the Crofts, and the church

stands (as is often the case) within its area. It is a square of 400 feet, on an elevation, overlooking several creeks still frequented by small craft, and shews that one reason of its being placed here was to protect the coast against the invasions of the northern and western pirates. The west Agger is perfectly plain, and the stones of the south wall still appear through the turf that covers them."

The Lysons brothers themselves described the Roman altars and inscriptions of Cumberland, pp. cxlix-clxxxix (the last few pages also dealing with miscellaneous Roman antiquities), and while they paid a deserved tribute to Horsley's "excellent work on the Roman antiquities of Britain", they noted that the 75 items in his collection of Cumberland stones had now been increased, by later discoveries, to a grand total of more than 140.

Yet long before the publication in 1840 of his "Roman Wall and South Tynedale", occupying much of part II, volume iii, of his *History of Northumberland*, the rev. John Hodgson had shown that it was possible to combine original research with methodical attention to the *Britannia Romana*, and had appreciated the need to discover more about Horsley's life and methods if full justice were to be done to him. I shall be coming presently to consider how Hodgson's interest in Horsley reveals itself in his mature treatment of the Wall, which Collingwood was not the first or the last scholar to neglect; but first let me remind you of the main facts of John Hodgson's life, and of the debt which our Society above all owes to him.

The facts are set forth, at almost overpowering length, in James Raine's two-volume *Memoir* of Hodgson, published in 1857. Raine was able to draw on the historian's voluminous notebooks and diaries and a large series of letters (written by Hodgson to his wife, or by various correspondents to Hodgson), most of which are now preserved in the Black Gate library; and he included lengthy appreciations of most of Hodgson's published writings, besides recording the researches which formed the basis for them. For my present

purpose, it will suffice to refer generally to Raine, and to select the points which bear most closely on Horsley and on the Wall.

Hodgson was born at Swindale in Westmorland in 1779, educated at Bampton grammar school, and after experience as a schoolmaster at Matterdale, Stainton near Dacre, and Sedgfield, in 1804 became curate of Esh and Satley and schoolmaster at Lanchester; in 1806 he moved to a curacy in Gateshead, and in 1808 he was presented to the living of Jarrow with Heworth; thence he was preferred to Kirkwhelpington in 1823, and finally to Hartburn in 1833. He fell ill shortly before the printing of his last volume had been completed, so that Raine had to supervise its final stages and to furnish it with a preface, and he died in 1845.

His interest in antiquity can be shown to have begun early; for example, his 1840 volume happens to record notes made on a visit to Castle Crag in Borrowdale in 1797 (HN, p. 224). But his first appearance in print as an antiquary—and as a poet—was in 1807, when he published a modest duodecimo, *Poems written at Lanchester*; one of them “Longovicus, a vision”, was furnished with copious foot-notes on the evidence for the fort’s Roman name and place in the road-system of Britain, its antiquarian history and present appearance, with a description of the aqueducts leading to it; accounts of its inscribed and sculptured stones and of its coin-series; an essay on the transition from Roman Britain to Saxon England, and the continued use of the Roman road-system into medieval times; a section on Lanchester church; and a discussion of the evidence for Roman mining in the Lanchester district and elsewhere. It reveals close attention to Horsley, but also an independence of judgment such as Horsley would have been the first to appreciate; and its quality was no doubt what soon brought Hodgson commissions to write the volumes on Northumberland and on Westmorland for the *Beauties of England and Wales* series (n.d. [1812] and [1813]) and the new edition of the *Picture of Newcastle* (1812), all of which contain evidence of

his special interest in Roman remains, though all involved attention to a far wider canvas as well—and restricted him to what we should now call a streamlined discussion of the subject which most concerns us at present. The narrative volumes of his *History of Northumberland*, published in 1827, 1832 and 1840, allow us to follow the growth in his stature as a historian, and in his mastery of the archæological material; but there is even more striking evidence to be found in the publications of our Society. Hodgson was one of its original members and became joint secretary at its inaugural meeting on 6 February 1813; next month, he read the first paper to it, an essay “On the study of Antiquities” which occupies just over ten closely printed pages (pp. ix-xix) in volume i of the first series of *Archæologia Aeliana*, while 211 out of the 320 pages of its main text come from his pen, including the long report on his excavation of the Housesteads Mithraeum in 1822, and ranging in period from discussions of cairn-burial and of “the Aera when Brass was used in purposes to which Iron is now applied” to studies in seventeenth-century history. The second volume was not completed until 1832, when he was already deeply committed to his *History*, and only 99 of its 420 pages were contributed by him; after that there are only ten pages in volume three (1844), and a brief preface, with an index and synopsis of its contents, attached to the transcription of the musters for Northumberland in 1538, communicated in 1835, which ultimately appeared in the fourth volume of the series (1855) at pp. 157-206.

This is not the place for a full assessment of Hodgson’s work for the Society or for Roman archæology. But we may note that his paper to us in March 1813 observed that

(AA1 I xviii) “The remains of the Roman Wall, though largely described about the middle of the last century, by the accurate and judicious Horsley, are still but slightly investigated; and the received opinions respecting the constructors of the several parts of it, seem to be founded on very inaccurate criticism.”

He was our leader in excavation—at Housesteads in 1822, 1830, 1831 and 1832—in close harmony with his friend the rev. Anthony Hedley; and he set an outstanding example of prompt and full publication of the results of excavation.

It was in May 1819 that Hodgson published his proposals for a history of Northumberland, and in August 1820 that he addressed the following letter to the editor of the *Newcastle Magazine*:

“Sir,—You will oblige me by allowing me, through the medium of your Magazine, to solicit information amongst your numerous subscribers on the following points, viz:—Where Mr. Horsley, author of the *Britannia Romana*, was born? Whether he left any unpublished papers or correspondence on antiquarian or topographical subjects? And if so—Are they now existing; and in whose possession? I am, Sir, your’s, &c. John Hodgson. Upper Heworth, near Gateshead, Aug. 1820.”

The first response came in March 1821, when the rev. William Turner (1761-1859), another of our original members, contributed a memoir of Horsley to the same magazine—including a note of the tradition (from what source, he omitted to say) that Horsley had been born at Pinkie House, in Scotland, in 1685; Turner believed that Horsley’s death had occurred in December 1731, and it is demonstrably from these two dates that the calculation of his age at death, forty-six, was derived (though no subsequent writer seems to have appreciated the point). For a long time, nothing more came to hand, and when Hodgson was preparing the Morpeth volume of his *History*, he decided to reprint Turner’s memoir in it, with a few additional notes of his own; but just as he was on the point of sending it to the printers, he had the good fortune to be put in touch (through W. C. Trevelyan of Wallington, one of the most generous and constant patrons and forwarders of his work) with John Cay of Edinburgh, a great-grandson of Robert Cay, who placed at his disposal

“12 long and interesting letters by Horsley, to . . . Robert Cay, esq., of Newcastle upon Tyne, on subjects connected with

the compilation, correction, and getting-up of the *Britannia Romana*; one letter from Dr. Harle; another from Mr. George Mark to the same gentleman; and part of a letter to Horsley himself, from John Cay, esq., brother of Robt. Cay. . . .”

With the letters came the folio MS. in which Horsley had written out some of his materials for the history of Northumberland on which, as we have seen, he began to work in the autumn of 1729. Hodgson promptly included extracts from letters and history in footnotes to Turner's memoir, together with additional notes based on his own researches, and the resulting text duly appeared at pp. 443-448 of the Morpeth volume, in 1832; but it had already been published separately in 1831, with lives of three other Morpeth worthies—Thomas Gibson, Jonathan Harle and William Turner the sixteenth-century botanist—in a little octavo volume of 147 pages with a dedication dated “Whelpington, Aug. 5, 1831” to his friend Anthony Hedley “of Chesterholm, in the County of Northumberland”. Pp. 9-86 are overprinted from the Morpeth volume, while pp. 87-144 consist of *Addenda* which

“it is supposed, will not be unacceptable to the bibliomanists who may be disposed to have a copy of this tract.”

This is the work which Sir George Macdonald cites regularly, as I have done in the previous section of this paper, as the *Memoir*—and which, as Bosanquet pointed out, is now very rare: my wife and I owe it to the kindness of Mr. C. E. Stevens that we have possessed a copy of it since 5 April 1934. The *Addenda* are basic for our knowledge of Horsley, for they include full texts of eleven of the twelve letters to Cay (one had already been quoted as a footnote to p. 29 = HN II ii 444f.), with a number of useful footnotes from Hodgson's pen (pp. 97-128), some extracts from the MS. history (pp. 129-142), and finally an extract from the Morpeth register which shows the date of Horsley's burial, 15 January 1732 (given in HN II ii 522), and Hodgson's reflections on Horsley's learning and scientific knowledge,

concluding that "his name shines with bright and unsullied lustre in the temple of Fame". The later studies of Horsley—by Hodgson Hinde, Longstaffe, and Crawford Hodgson, Sir George Macdonald's Horsley lecture and Bosanquet's delightful paper on "John Horsley and his times", all derive essential material from Hodgson's *Memoir*. Yet, but for Hodgson's patient enquiries—and W. C. Trevelyan's interest—the Cay MSS. might still have been awaiting discovery now; and it would have been necessary to base our study of Horsley's work on the evidence of the *Britannia Romana* itself and on the letters to Stukeley and Roger Gale, a schedule of which I give as an appendix to this paper. My own debt to Hodgson will be apparent already; the letters to Robert Cay provide the clearest indication of Horsley's methods, the timetable of his work, and the extent to which his text and his maps alike were committed to Cay's judgment for emendation or improvement before they were sent up to London. Raine remarks of Anthony Hedley that he was

"probably for several years the only one of Hodgson's correspondents to whom he wrote with freedom and ease, not merely on topographical pursuits, to which the former was passionately devoted, but on the ordinary topics of the day" (Raine, vol. i, p. 73).

One might almost claim as much for the correspondence between Horsley and Cay, even though a mere fourteen of Horsley's letters, and none of Cay's, survive.

It should be noted that the MSS. which Hodgson had used for his *Memoir* were presented to our Society by Mr. Cay of Edinburgh in 1869, through the good offices of John Hodgson Hinde (AA3 XV 66, footnote 9, and 71, footnote 16), who printed a fuller version of Horsley's history as *Inedited Contributions to the History of Northumberland* (Newcastle, William H. Robinson, bookseller, n.d.), in fact at his own expense, and they are now safely preserved in the Black Gate, bound up in a volume in the manuscript case; I

have collated the texts of several of the letters to which it has seemed useful to refer in the preceding section of this paper.

But Hodgson did not merely keep Horsley's memory green, and assist later students, by publication of the *Memoir*; his whole work on the Wall was conditioned and inspired by Horsley's example. Indeed, it would not be unfair to turn Collingwood's dictum upside down and to claim that Hodgson gave a clear lead to the nineteenth-century antiquaries in his study of Horsley. Bosanquet was well aware of the fact, and of its influence on John Clayton (AA4 X 81), whose tributes to Horsley he quotes; and even the ambitious and self-seeking Dr. Bruce (as one feels bound to describe him) paid handsome lip-service to "the elaborate productions of Horsley and Hodgson" in the preface to his *Roman Wall*.

Bruce made abundant and most skilful use of Hodgson's 1840 monograph in his own compilation, including in it brief tributes of respect to Horsley, Hedley and Hodgson himself, closing with an unequivocal affirmation:

"It is perhaps enough for the present author to say, that had not Horsley and Hodgson cleared the way before him, he would never have ventured to write a book upon the Barrier of the Lower Isthmus. Though he cannot be a Horsley or a Hodgson, he hopes he will never prove a Warburton."

James Raine was not so sure about this last point; witness his observations in the second volume of his *Memoir of Hodgson*, pp. 400-407. But here it will be sufficient for me to quote a prophecy of Raine's (*ibid.*, p. 397) which, despite Bruce—and Collingwood—deserves to be fulfilled:

"Henceforward Hadrian and Hodgson may well be spoken of together in connection with the Wall—the one as its builder, the other as the restorer to him of the mural crown which had fallen from his head, and had been for many centuries worn by one who had no just claim to the distinction."

III.—JOHN HODGSON ON HADRIAN'S WALL.

Hodgson's monograph on the Wall found its way almost by chance into the volume eventually published in 1840. He printed his account of Carvoran (HN 135-143) before he had "thought of the plan of giving a History of the Roman Wall in the contiguous township of Thirlwall" (HN 204), and that history, ultimately extending to more than 170 pages, much of them in small type and including what is probably the longest footnote in English literature, was sent to the printers in instalments at irregular intervals; no wonder that Bruce professed to justify his own book by claiming that Hodgson

"has failed to present his ample materials to the reader in that condensed and well-arranged form which distinguishes his previous volumes, and without which a book on antiquities will not arrest the attention of the general reader."

But as Raine justly observed, in a first appreciation of Hodgson's study of the Wall, "In this work coadjutor he had none, and posterity will do justice to his labour."

Hodgson's account of *The Roman Wall* (HN 149-322) contains copious notes on all other ancient walls known to him, accompanied by five views of the Chinese Wall; then comes a survey of the literary evidence, these two sections together accounting for the first 19 pages, mainly in small type. He devotes over seventy pages (HN 167-243) to the Wall forts and other Notitia stations, and another ten to Corstopitum, Papcastle, Moresby, Netherby and Birrens, with brief notes on Risingham and High Rochester (with which he had dealt at considerable length in his 1827 volume, HN II i 175-186 and 138-149 respectively). Next come an account of Agricola's movements and works, sections on "Forts of Glota and Bodotria" and "The Vallum, or Praetenturae of Hadrian", and an extended account of "The

Wall of Antoninus Pius" (HN 254-272); all this was in type, as far as p. 270, before he continued his studies (HN 271). But the most important section is the next one, "On the Murus or Wall of Stone attributed to Severus" (HN 272-304), followed—after brief notes on the Fail Dyke and the "Murus attributed to the reign of Valentinian III"—by "Conclusions and Inferences from the preceding account of the British long fortifications" (HN 305-316). The whole account closes with a section on "Baths", with special reference to those at Haltonchesters, contributed by Dobson the architect, an alphabetical index of the deities occurring in the inscriptions listed under the different stations, and some additional observations on the masonry of Wall and forts and on some traditions recorded by Camden (HN 316-322).

In a Horsley lecture it would be inappropriate to enlarge unduly on the details of a study which led its author ultimately to reject Horsley's views and to assign the whole series of works to Hadrian. But it is right to stress that Hodgson throughout pays the most careful attention to Horsley's book—and that he is scrupulous to give full credit to Horsley, as indeed to all his sources, living or dead: there is no trace of the self-aggrandisement which one can trace so often in the writings of Bruce. In his section on the forts it will be sufficient to stress that he regularly cites Horsley's descriptions of their remains and his readings of their inscriptions, following Horsley's meticulous example in recording the findspots and present whereabouts of every stone for which those details could be given: Mr. Stevens did well to observe, in this connection, that "Hodgson, as might be expected, comes up to Horsley's standard" (AA4 XXVI 36, note 6). But it will be best to take most of my instances from the long section which Hodgson devotes to the Wall itself, premising only that his punctilious citation of the year in which he noted this or that item enables us to plot the incidence of his study of the subject, with peaks in 1810 (when he was touring Northumberland, collecting materials for his volume in the Beauties series), 1817, 1822 (the year of his

first Housesteads excavation), 1831-33 and 1837; for the record, the first copy of an inscription from the Wall was made in 1808 (HN 282), the year in which he became perpetual curate of Jarrow with Heworth. Many of the notes which he made in those years of special activity may be consulted still in the MSS. which he bound up and indexed from time to time, towards the end of his life, and which are now amongst our treasures in the Black Gate library—particularly “MS. Materials Q” for 1810, and “MS. Materials Z” for 1832 and 1833. Raine has placed on record the precise timetable of Hodgson’s writing (Raine, vol. ii, p. 404):

“It appears from his Journal that he began to write his History of the Wall on the 27th of July, 1836; from which date the progress of his pen on the subject may be traced almost daily until the 22nd of May, 1838. . . . It may be worth while to note, in passing along (so minute are his Journals in the information they afford), that the precise intermediate period between 1836 and 1838, in which he was beginning to arrive at the conclusion which will hand his name down to posterity, I mean that Hadrian was the constructor of the Wall, was on the 29th and 30th of November, 1837.”

One quotation, on Housesteads, is too delightful to omit—even if it were not so good an indication of Hodgson’s constant attention to the *Britannia Romana*:

“Horsley, too, whose clear and simple style never kindles on his pages into poetic warmth, speaks of ‘the vast ruins of this place as truly wonderful. . . .’”

But we must turn to the section on the Wall. It opens with a review of the literary sources for the campaign of Severus, but manages to insert in a footnote the text of the letter from Sir Christopher Ridley to Mr. William Claxton *circa* 1572, which in fact seems to contain the earliest reference to turrets and their spacing—which Collingwood claimed Horsley to have discovered:

“at every mylis end theyr hath been a great bildyng or castle

. . . and at every half myles end is theyr a tower. . . ." (HN 273, footnote).

Then come subsections on the "Greater Military Way", as described by Horsley—and by Sir Christopher Ridley, with notes based on Hodgson's own field-work (especially HN 275), and a first hint that it must be considered as "one member of the grand military plan, which included all the works attributed to Hadrian and Severus", duly noting that Horsley had considered that possibility only to reject it. Next comes a paragraph on the "Smaller Military Way", derived expressly from Horsley (BR p. 121), and a longer one on the Wall ditch, based in part on Gordon (who was more interested in it than Horsley), in part on his own observations. That brings Hodgson to the Wall proper, with special attention to its thickness and method of construction, and to the relationship between forts and Wall. It is easy to be wise after the event; but it was not until F. G. Simpson's work in 1945 had proved the point at Housesteads (and at Chesters and Birdoswald) that the justice of Hodgson's observation could be appreciated, that

"Borcovicus and Aesica, I would say, are manifestly coeval with the murus" (HN 278).

On the milecastles he rightly takes Horsley's discussion as his basis, noting however that Gordon had been the first to give their dimensions, Horsley adopting Gordon's figures, and

"I have depended so implicitly on Horsley's measures of all these works as strictly accurate, as to have neglected many opportunities of taking their real dimensions myself."

But he gives measurements taken by himself at milecastles 29, 36, 37, 38 and 39 (HN 279).

As to the turrets, Hodgson cites Gordon's records of five of them, and Horsley's calculation that there had been four in each Wall-mile. He himself found one "about 300 yards west of Burdoswald" in 1833 (turret 49b), and on another

page he quotes, from Brand, Shaftoe's record of the turret (6b) found in 1751 "about 14 chains west of the station" at Benwell. It may be suggested that these distances were what caused him to accept Horsley's theory that there had been four turrets to the mile, with "near 14 chains or 308 yards" the standard interval: though admittedly he had not studied what Horsley's map has to tell us on the question.

Then comes Hodgson's lengthy study of "Inscriptions belonging to the Murus and Castella, and Notices respecting the Murus and Vallum from station to station" (HN 279-304), constantly referring to Horsley—and to the records of other visitors—as well as to his own field-notes; I select a few points for special notice. (a) On the thickness of the Wall, he records the alternation between six feet and ten, between Haltonchesters and Chesters (compare Lingard's observations in 1807, AA4 VI 146); a 6 ft. 2 in. measurement some 80 yards east of milecastle 37; 7 ft. 7 in. on the Walltown Crag (that is, close to milecastle 45); and 6 ft. 7 in. at the Wall's western junction with Birdoswald fort (HN 283, 288, 294 and 296). (b) He devotes careful attention to its structure, already described in general (HN 276f.): note in particular the detailed observations made on Sewing-shields Crag (Wall-mile 35/36, HN 287), west of Housesteads (37/38, HN 288), on the Walltown Crag (HN 293f., with views and detailed drawings), and at Birdoswald (HN 296), and finally his summing-up—with a footnote referring his readers back to more than a dozen previous pages—at the very end, on "the MASONRY of the Murus and Stations" (HN 322). (c) Like Horsley, he refrains from estimating the height of the Wall; and though he does not specifically mention Horsley's view (quoted above, p. 24) that it was less on the crags than elsewhere, he clearly has it in mind in his note on the Wall between Housesteads fort and milecastle 37, where he found it still standing 5 ft. 5 in. high in thirteen courses, four of them below the ground:

"Here the masonry and mortar were solid; and from the

great quantity of rubbish that laid close to its north side, it is plain that the original height of the murus must have been very considerable. . . . Great quantities of the facing stones, indeed, lie below, among 'the glidders', or fallen masses of basalt. . . ." (HN 288)

(d) This last extract brings me to the point which perhaps links Hodgson most closely with our own age, namely his appreciation that the spade could help to solve questions which field-work had raised. His own excavations at Housesteads and Hedley's at Chesterholm had shown the way, and he displays constant awareness of the profit to be derived from observing casual digging for other purposes—as in Newcastle when the Shire Hall was abuilding, in 1810/12, or at Wallsend in 1814 (HN 173, 171): witness his records of the quarry close to milecastle 31 (HN 286) and of the Wall just west of Birdoswald fort (HN 296). Still more striking, however, and prophetic, is the note on Greatchesters (HN 292):

"I may mention that in 1837, I endeavoured to ascertain how its east and west walls were connected with the murus; but having neither men nor tools to assist me, I could only find that the west wall turned off circularly to the murus, like that of Amboglanna [*Birdoswald*]. A little digging would, however, ascertain how the two works were joined."

It was left to this Society to make the trial, in 1895 (Sir William Crossman supervising the work, and J. P. Gibson reporting on it and providing two outstandingly good photographs of it—AA2 XXIV 34-37 with plates iii and iv), and to F. G. Simpson to return to the charge in 1925, in the Durham University Excavation Committee's first season (see Mr. M. R. Hull's report, AA4 II 197-202); and it was Simpson, more than anyone else, who did most to illuminate the problems which Hodgson left to his successors in his final reflections (HN 322):

"Some more accurate investigations than I have had opportunity to make, are wanting to ascertain how the murus, and the

walls of its stations, castles, and towers are joined into each other."

(e) Finally, another link backward to Horsley and forward to the present day: Hodgson quotes Horsley's account of the Dere Street gateway through the Wall, in the Wall-mile 22/23 (HN 283), following Horsley in using the term *castellum* for that structure as well as for *milecastle* (a word first introduced by Robert Smith in 1708, but only given general currency by John Clayton in 1848 and by Bruce thereafter, as Bosanquet pointed out in a posthumous paper, recently printed in the Cumberland & Westmorland Society's *Transactions*, N.S., LV 169ff.); in passing, he observes that

"The castellum next east of Aesica has certainly, I think, stood partly within and partly without the murus."

Hodgson takes up the point more fully in his topographical account, a few pages later (HN 291):

"Half-way between the farm-house called the Burn-head and the station of Aesica, are the remains of a castellum which has apparently stood half on one side and half on the other, of the murus. The fosse passes close under the north wall of this castellum, and leaves here, as in the ascent to Teppermoor, a broad space between it and the murus to the station one way, and the Burn-head the other."

It is instructive to see how this observation has fared in Bruce's hands. His first edition takes it over, without acknowledgment and with marked loss of clarity (RW1, 254):

"Westward of Burn-head farm-house, the fosse is boldly developed, but the Wall is traceable only in the ruins of its foundation. As we proceed onwards to Great Chesters, the foundations of a mile-castle, which has stood half to the north of the Wall, and half within it, may be, though not without careful scrutiny, observed. The tower which formerly stood at Portgate is the only other known example of a similar arrangement."

In his third edition he quotes from Mac Lauchlan's *Memoir*,

adding two brief sentences of his own (RW3, 232 = folio ed., 183):

“About mid-way between the water and the station of AESICA are traces of a building about the size of the mile-castles, but unlike them, being partly within and partly without the Wall. Its distance from the last is only about four furlongs.’ Hence it remains a question whether it be a mile-castle or not. It is in a ruinous condition.”

The reference to the Dere Street gateway has been omitted—yet it should surely have suggested that this was a comparable extra gateway through the Wall, unlike that in the Knag Burn defile east of Housesteads (AA4 XIV 172-177) only in the fact of its projection beyond the Wall. This structure should certainly be tested by the spade (as there is now reason to believe that we shall soon have an opportunity for testing Horsley’s Portgate “castellum”); so, perhaps, should one which Christopher Hunter saw near Chesters and mentioned to Horsley, though Horsley’s account of it (in his preface, pp. ixf.) takes it to be milecastle 29:

“I have taken notice, that I had not been able to discover any passes through the wall at the milliary *castella*, though this was what I expected. Dr. *Hunter* has since told me, that in the next *castellum* west from *Walwick*, there was a gate through the wall, and that some of the iron belonging to it was found by Mr. *Wilson* of *Walwick*: but this did not occur to me. I take the *castellum* intended, to be that which is a little disjoined from the wall; though not so much as to leave a sufficient passage for a single man.” (This milecastle is identifiable as no. 29 from Horsley’s brief description on BR p. 145.)

But the rev. John Rogan’s paper on Hunter in a recent volume of *Archæologia Aeliana* includes an extract (AA4 XXXII 123) from an unpublished note, made by Hunter in the course of his visit to the Wall in 1702:

“Lower down towards *Walwick* I saw two Towers which stood so as the wall past as it were through the midst of them; whereas the rest [*sc. of the milecastles*] were set on the inside.”

This reads like nothing so much as another structure of the Dere Street type; it would be good to see it, too, searched for and, if possible, examined by the spade.

* * *

I have said enough, I think, to show how Hodgson's study of Hadrian's Wall was conditioned and inspired by Horsley's example—and that we might properly say, to adapt Sir George Macdonald's reference to Horsley in the light of his own experience in Scotland, that if a student of our Wall chooses to ignore Horsley *and Hodgson*, he will do so at his peril.

CONCLUSION.

I conclude with a brief comparison between the two giants to whom this paper has been devoted; if an apology for its length were needed, I might perhaps be allowed to borrow a sentence from the beginning of Hodgson's "Conclusions and Inferences" (HN 305):

"Much curious material, and many views and illustrations of the subject that were presented to my mind during the many months that it has occupied my attention, have been suppressed."

Horsley's claims to be remembered by all students of the Wall are manifold: he was the first to introduce system into its study, and to deduce system in its planning and construction; on milecastles and turrets, on the structure of the curtain, the course of Wall or Vallum or Military Way, on the relationship between forts and Wall, and on the military implications of the spacing and siting of the forts, he blazed a trail which has yet to be followed to its ultimate goal. But it was the "sheer scientific quality of his thought", as Collingwood aptly put it, rather than his personal field-work, which enabled him to blaze that trail; and the torch

which he had lit in the *Britannia Romana* was carried further by Hodgson than by any other man until the days of F. G. Simpson, for whom (as his friends and pupils well remember) Horsley was a constant source of inspiration and of strength.

Neither Horsley nor Hodgson could devote more than a fraction of his time or of his thought to the Wall; but only those of us who have been concerned with its investigation for thirty years and more can realize to the full how far our own abilities and vision fall short of theirs. And in the further researches to which our Society and the University of Durham are both committed, it will time and again be to Horsley and Hodgson that we shall have to turn for guidance or a starting-point. Let us hope to be able to match Horsley in our clarity and objectivity, Hodgson in our punctilious citation of our debt to predecessors or colleagues—and in methodical exploitation of printed and manuscript sources, as well as in repeated field-work and then excavation at selected points. One day, I hope, this last point will be developed further in a Simpson memorial lecture!

APPENDIX I: SCHEDULE OF HORSLEY'S LETTERS TO ROBERT CAY.

(a) Dated:

1. 1 June 1727: text reproduced, from John Hodgson's transcription in the Black Gate library, p. 8f. above (an extract only given in HN 279).
2. 15 November 1727: Hodgson's no. 1 (*Memoir* 97ff.).
3. 9 February 1728: Hodgson's no. 2 (*Memoir* 99ff.).
4. 22 April 1728: Hodgson's no. 4 (*Memoir* 106-113); extracts given, collated with the MS. in the Black Gate, p. 19f. above.
5. 26 June 1728: Hodgson's no. 8 (*Memoir* 118f.).
6. 20 July 1728: Hodgson's no. 9 (*Memoir* 119-122).
7. 30 July 1728: Hodgson's no. 10 (*Memoir* 122ff.).
8. 18 September 1729: Hodgson's no. 11 (*Memoir* 124-128).

(b) *Undated:*

1. Hodgson's no. 6 (*Memoir* 115ff.): reproduced from the Black Gate MS., p. 10f. above. (1726?)
2. Hodgson's no. 5 (*Memoir* 113ff.). (April 1728?)
3. Hodgson's no. 3 (*Memoir* 101-106); discussed, with extracts from the Black Gate MS., p. 20f. above. (Shortly after 22 April 1728)
4. Hodgson's no. 7 (*Memoir* 117f.); its dating considered p. 21 above. (Late April 1729)
5. Hodgson's *Memoir* 29=HN II ii 444f.; mentioned p. 23 above. (Shortly before 10 May 1731)
6. Edinburgh University Library, Laing ii 587: cited by Sir George Macdonald, who gives two brief extracts from it, AA4 X 25 n. 71, 29 and 30 n. 91. Mr. Iain MacIvor has kindly provided the following transcription of it:

“To Mr. Robert Cay—Newcastle.—Newbiggin Monday Morning.—Sr—I have light on and sent you inclosd your Brother's Bill for ye two Guineas.—If you can conveniently send ye Introduction to ye Collection of Inscriptions, I desire you would, because I must send it up to London as soon as I can. If you can give it to Bates ye Morpeth Carrier (at Ralph Emmerson's or next door to him) and desire them to take a particular care of it, it will come very safe to me. I find Mr Mark's copy of ye Riechester Inscription is as you took it.—I should be glad to spend two or three Days with you at Christmas, if I can get over.—I think by ye series & order in ye Notitia Piercebridge must be *Braboniacum*, and ye first in a new Set, wch seems to take a compass as ye preceding one, i.e. ye more northerly one has done.—I see some MSS read XVII from Calcaria to Cambiodunum, others XX: What if ye true Reading be XXVII. This will set all exactly right as far as I am able to judge at ye first view.—Ilkley has certainly been another Notitia Station by ye large Remains both of ye Station & Military way (wch seems to be of ye later sort.) This way joins ye other Itinerary way (if I may so call it) at Riponden where Dr Stukeley places that station and not at Aldmonbury. It is certain by ye Inscriptions, Roman Bricks, Coins &c. that have been found at Gretland and thereabout, yt there must have been a station some where in that Neighbourhood, about six or seven miles south west from Hallifax.—My service attends Mrs Cay. I am—yr very humble servt—John Horsley—I fancy ye vicinal way joining ye two grand military ways has gone off near Pomphret. The Military way from Ilkley points directly towards Riponden. The vicinal ways are generally lost and ruin'd. I suppose they have not been made so large or lasting as ye other.”

(Comparison with *Memoir* 34=HN II ii 446, John Cay's letter to Horsley enclosing a draught dated 2 July 1730, for two guineas, gives us a *terminus ante quem* if it represents his reaction to the rendering of Horsley's bill, mentioned in the present letter. The *terminus post quem* is no doubt late April 1728, when the MSS. of book I had not yet left for London; the autumn of 1729 seems to be the likeliest period.)

APPENDIX 2: SCHEDULE OF HORSLEY'S LETTERS TO STUKELEY AND GALE.

(a) To Stukeley:

1. 22 January 1729: Nichols, *Illustrations of Literary History* ii (1817), 801f.
2. 15 March 1729: *Op. cit.*, 803f.—including: "As for Mr. Gordon and his friend Mr. Goodman, I shall act a just and generous part to them; but I know them both too well to suffer myself to be insulted or bullied by either. The work is going on as fast as it can; and I have let my Bookseller know how to send any of the proofs of the Plates to you, as soon as they are wrought off. . . ."

Note: Cf. Stukeley to Gale, 22 April 1729 (Surtees Soc. 76, 263): "I have had 2 or 3 letters from him (*sc. Horsley*), he seems to be zealously bent." Some of Horsley's views cited in this letter do not appear in either of the two printed by Nichols.

(b) To Gale:

1. 24 March 1729: Surtees Soc. 80, 94f.
2. 7 April 1729: *Ibid.*, 95ff.
3. 11 April 1729: *Ibid.*, 97.

Note: Cf. Gale to Stukeley, 19 April 1729 (*ibid.*, 256): "I . . . am very impatient to see Mr. Horseley's performance, which I hear is in good forwardnesse, above half the plates being engraved."

4. 1 May, 1729: *Ibid.*, 257ff.
5. 13 June 1729: *Ibid.*, 99f. (by a misprint, given as 1727).
6. 19 June 1729: *Ibid.*, 261f.

7. 23 June 1729: *Ibid.*, 100-103 (including, as an annexure, a list of "Stations ad Lineam Valli" with their modern names and an indication of those confirmed or proved by inscriptions).
8. 21 July 1729: *Ibid.*, 103f.
9. 1 November 1729: *Ibid.*, 319f.
10. 13 December 1729: *Ibid.*, 115f.
11. 21 February 1730: *Ibid.*, 104f. (part only printed).
12. 10 December 1730: Surtees Soc. 76, 134f.

Note: Gale's reply, dated 21 December 1730 (*ibid.*, 135ff.), includes the following: "I enquir'd t'other day of Mr. Ward after your Britannia Romana, and am glad to hear it is in such forwardness as you confirm it to be in your letter." This clearly refers to a recent letter from Horsley, which has not been preserved.

13. 1 January 1731: *Ibid.*, 138.
14. 22 January 1731: Surtees Soc. 80, 116ff.
15. Undated: Surtees Soc. 76, 74f. (by its contents, assignable to this place in the list).
16. 3 May 1731: *Ibid.*, 75f.
17. 12 June 1731: Surtees Soc. 73, 269ff.

Note: Hutchinson's *Northumberland i* (1778) prints several of the above letters, or gives extracts from them, with changes in spelling, punctuation and sometimes in wording, as follows: 1, p. 40; 2, p. 162f.; 3, p. 202; 5, p. 202; 7, p. 41f.; 8, p. 17f.; 10, p. 196; 12, p. 202; 13, p. 204; 14, p. 205f.; 15, p. 206.

It is a pleasant duty to record my indebtedness to the Society's honorary librarian, Mr. T. Arthur Lewis, and to Mr. Iain MacIvor, for their help in studying Horsley's surviving letters to Robert Cay.

