

250
H. 6. 57

The Roman Wall: An attempt to substantiate the claims of Severus to the authorship of the Roman Wall. By Robert Bell.



NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE:

Imprinted by G. BOUCHIER RICHARDSON, at the Sign of the *River-god Tynes*, Clayton-street-west; Printer to the Society of Antiquaries, and to the Typographical Society, both of Newcastle-upon-Tyne. M.DCCC.LII.

IA 146
BA

1/6 fcs
209

The Roman Wall. An at-
tempt to substantiate the claims
of Severus to the authorship of
the Roman Wall. By
Robert Bell.





The Roman Wall: An attempt to substantiate the claims of Severus to the authorship of the Roman Wall. By Robert Bell.



NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE:

Imprinted by G. BOUCHIER RICHARDSON, at the Sign of the *River-god Tyme*, Clayton-street-west; Printer to the Society of Antiquaries, and to the Typographical Society, both of Newcastle-upon-Tyne. M.DCCC.LII.

MS. C. 13. 1. 1. 2

The Roman Wall.

An attempt to substantiate the claims of Severus to the authorship of the Roman Wall.

THE object of this paper is to investigate the grounds upon which the authorship of the Roman Wall, from the Tyne to the Solway, is attributed to Hadrian, by some, and by others, to Severus; and particularly to record the evidence upon which I place my conviction that the great work in question, is referrible to Lucius Septimius Severus. In support of my argument, I shall, in the first place, direct attention to a strong local proof, in the immediate neighbourhood of the Wall, viz. an inscription still remaining upon a rock, bordering on the river Gelt, commonly called the "the Written Rock of Gelt." All modern authors, who have noticed this inscribed rock, however they may differ as to the reading of it, agree on one point, viz. that Aper and Maximus were Consuls when the inscription was made; and I should imagine, few would doubt that it was cut by the Roman quarrymen, when procuring stones for the Wall. I have carefully read the inscription for myself; but before offering my own version, I shall give those of the following eminent authors, especially for the sake of quoting their opinions upon the question—Who built the Wall?

Camden, in his *Britannia*, says, "Near Brampton, runs the little river Gelt, on the banks of which, in a rock called Helbeck, is the gaping inscription, set up by an ensign of the second legion called Augusta (pos-

The Roman Wall.

sibly optio), under Agricola the Proprætor, with some others, of which time has deprived us." Then follows his copy—

VEXIL. REG. II. AVG. OPT. APR : : :
SVB. AGRICOLA. OB. YIORE

REG. I. MA. MERCAHI

NVMERCATIS. FIRMI.

Camden continues — "In the same rock we read in a more modern character, OFICIUM ROMANORUM. Here the Gelt empties itself into the Irthing," etc. Camden's copy of the inscription is very incorrect. He is also in error in his account of the locality of the rock; for, in the first place, he calls it Helbeck. Now, Helbeck discharges itself into the Gelt, a full quarter of a mile above the written rock; and, secondly, he says— "Here the Gelt empties itself into the river Irthing;"—whereas the confluence of the rivers Gelt and Irthing is at least three miles below the rock in question. It might well be supposed that Camden never saw the rock, or the inscription upon it; but even if he did, he must have contented himself with reading it from the bed of the river, not being disposed to hazard his life for the purpose of taking a correct copy. Camden declines giving his own opinion as to who built the stone Wall.

In Nicholson and Burn's History of Cumberland, their own version is not given; that of Horsley is substituted, viz. "*Vexillatio legionis secundæ Augustæ, ob virtutem appellatæ; sub Agricola optione Apro et Maximo Consulibus; ex officina Mercati, Mercatius filius Firmii.*" Then he continues—"Aper and Maximus were Consuls when Severus' Wall was built; and, from the nature of the stone, Mr. Horsley conjectures that a large quantity of the stones for the Wall, was fetched from this place; and that the ninth and tenth cohorts of the Legio secunda Augusta were employed in this quarry, and about the Wall in these parts."

Lysons, in his History of Cumberland, says, speaking of the written rock, "an imperfect copy of it was first published by Mr. Camden, in the year 1607, in the enlarged edition of his Britannia; it was afterwards more

The Roman Wall.

correctly given in the appendix to Gordon's Itinerary, and by Horsley, who appears to have taken great pains in the investigation of it." Then he quotes Horsley's version of it as given above. Lysons goes on to say, "The Vexillatio, mentioned in this inscription, had no doubt been employed in procuring stone from these rocks, for the Wall of Severus; Aper and Maximus were Consuls A.D. 207, in the reign of the Emperor, in which year the Wall was begun," etc.

Hutchinson, in his History of Cumberland, gives it thus:—

VEXX. IIG. II. AVG. OB. VAPP. APRO. E. MAXIMO

CONSVKIBVS

SVB. AGRICOKA. OPTIO. OFICINA. MERCATI

MERCATIVS. FIRMI

Hutchinson says—"The face of the rock, on which the inscription is cut, is inaccessible, and only to be read by the assistance of a ladder or glass, and that not very correctly." In another place, he observes—"His fellow-traveller took notice of the resemblance there seemed to be both as to the nature and colour, between the stone of this quarry, and that with which the Roman Wall, in a great part of Cumberland, appears to have been built; from which he concluded the stones must have been fetched from this place; which remark I have since taken notice of in Camden, though at that time I did not remember it; and this looks the more probable from the scarcity of stones and quarries thereabout; so that the people often expressed their wonder from whence the Romans got their stones with which they built the Wall, in that part; and this may be further added, that the inhabitants near the place continue to call this the old quarry."

When the Rev. J. C. Bruce was engaged with his interesting and valuable work, on the Roman Wall, he requested me to assist the talented artist who illustrated his book, Mr. John Storey, jun., of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, to take an accurate copy of the inscription. We set off on the 8th of March, 1850, accompanied by two of my friends from Brampton, Mr. John Bell, solicitor, and Dr. Graham, with two or three other gentlemen. The day was

The Roman Wall.

exceedingly fine, and we were well prepared with every apparatus for taking, if possible, an exact copy. There is no difficulty or danger in getting to the commencement of the inscription, as there is a ledge of rock projecting eighteen inches or two feet, immediately below it; but the ledge does not extend very far, perhaps about two thirds of the distance. Fortunately some one had placed a piece of larch timber, from the end of this ledge, to a tree growing out of the rock, at the farther end of the inscription. This timber had rather an unsound appearance; but after having tried it as well as I could, I ventured along it, and reached the tree in safety. To that tree I made fast a cart-rope, and there being another tree, at the other end, conveniently situated, we stretched the rope backwards and forwards, very tightly, from tree to tree; so that we had an excellent and strong handrail, as a security against tumbling over the precipice into the river, a height, I should think, of from thirty to forty feet. With a similar rope, we contrived, by winding it from one great ivy branch to another, above the inscription, to have a secure hold for our hands, in whatever direction we wished. We had then every opportunity to examine the whole thoroughly, and with perfect safety. We first washed the inscription well, with water, which brought it out very clearly, and enabled Mr. Storey to take a true copy; and whilst scrambling about the rock, we discovered another portion of the inscription, not before noticed by any historian; for the simple reason that no one, I suppose, had thought proper to run the risk of examining the rock, in the same manner; and it is impossible to see the part we discovered, from the bed of the river. The following is our reading of it, as taken by Mr. Storey:—



The Roman Wall.

The above copies of the Gelt rock inscription are sufficient to prove that this quarry had been worked in the consulate of Aper and Maximus, by a company of the second legion, and consequently in the reign of the Emperor Severus. By reference to the *Fasti Consulares*, it will be perceived that Aper and Maximus were Consuls A.D. 207. Severus commenced his reign A.D. 193, and died at York, in 211.

That the stone Wall, for some miles, in our neighbourhood, was built by the second legion, there are many stones, found on the line of Wall, to prove. At Oldwall, Irthington, there is one walled in an old building, standing on the line of Wall, bearing the following inscription—*LEG II AVG > IVLI TERTVLLIA*—This is a common walling stone, of about ten inches by eight, which has evidently come out of the Wall. I have one in my own possession, a much nicer stone; upon it is the following inscription—*LEG II AVG FECIT*. This I got from Newtown, of Irthington, having discovered it in the wall of a very ancient dwelling house, situate exactly on the site of the Wall. I gave the old man, to whom the house belonged, a peck of potatoes for it, and had it taken out, and the place walled up again. A few years ago, I saw two stones worked in the same manner, one of them having a similar inscription, the other was a little defaced. I neglected looking after them at that time, and they are now gone; doubtless they have been taken away by some *knowing one*, as they were on the public road-side, in a stone fence on the line of Wall. There is one yet remaining, in a stone wall, near to the station of *AMBOGLANNA*; but it is illegible from having been so much exposed to the weather. From the foregoing observations, it may reasonably be admitted that the second legion was quartered in Cumberland, in the reign of Severus, as proved by the inscription on Gelt rock; and that the Wall, in this neighbourhood, was constructed by that legion, is equally clear from the above mentioned stones found in this locality. The *Hadrianites* endeavour to evade this powerful proof that the Wall was built by Severus, by the supposition that the inscription, on the Gelt rock, was made when the Wall was only repaired by Severus, in the year 207. But it must be observed that the inscription is nearly at the top of the rock, and the quarry has been worked to an enormous extent, down to the bed of the river, a depth of at least fifty feet. If Severus only re-

The Roman Wall.

paired the stone Wall, previously built by Hadrian, the Picts, not being satisfied with breaking it down, must have carried the materials with them into Caledonia; otherwise it could never have cost Severus the enormous labour and expense of merely repairing a few breaches in the Wall. It has not been doubted that a large portion of the Wall, in Cumberland, was built by the second legion; but it is again argued that the character of many inscriptions of this legion found on the Wall, betoken them to have been made earlier than the time of Severus—strange discovery!! I have seen the slab at Netherby, inscribed to Severus. I have not seen any one to Hadrian; but only copies. I possess coins of Hadrian, as well as of his Empress Sabina; of Severus, and of his Empress, Julia; of his sons Caracalla and Geta; nearly every one of them found on, or near the line of Wall; so that I know they are no counterfeits: but, for my part, I cannot perceive any especial difference of character between the reign of Hadrian and that of Severus. The second legion had a great deal to do with the building of the wall of Antoninus, between the Frith of Forth and the Clyde, as appears from slabs found on the said line of wall.—*vide* Stuart's 'Caledonia Romana,' General Roy's 'Military Antiquities,' etc. But whether or not this legion was quartered in Cumberland, and in this immediate neighbourhood, in the reign of Hadrian, remains to be proved. It is also observed that there are more inscriptions to Hadrian, and to Hadrian's officers, along the line of Wall, than to Severus, though in the time of the latter Emperor, inscriptions were more in fashion; and that it is further remarkable how few there are to Severus, in comparison with those found on the Scotch wall, to Antoninus Pius.

So far as Northumberland is concerned, I am not in possession of any local knowledge; but as to Cumberland, I would ask—where are all these inscriptions to Hadrian? I have seen a great many of the slabs and altars found in Cumberland; but, as I have already mentioned, not one with the name of Hadrian upon it; although I am informed that, on digging for the foundations of the new parish church, at Moresby, a slab was found bearing the following inscription—IMP. CAES. TRAIAN. HADRIANI. AVG. P. P. LEG. XX. VV. Camden also makes mention of one at Netherby, which Gordon says he could not find there. From my own knowledge, I can testify

The Roman Wall.

it is not there now ; but that it was there in the time of Camden, I dare not dispute. The reading of it is thus—IMP. CÆS. HADRIANO. AVG. LEG. II. AVG. F. But does it follow from that inscription, or from a thousand more of the same sort, that Hadrian built a wall or vallum at all? If the slabs or altars to Severus, be scarce on the line of Wall, what can be said for those of Hadrian? It is generally admitted that Hadrian constructed a wall ; then might it not reasonably be expected of him, as well as of Severus, that some inscription stating the fact, would have been discovered? Such is not the case with regard to Hadrian. Gordon, in his Itinerary, says, “Mr. Camden, in the additions to his work, gives the following inscription on a slab to Severus, viz.—SEPT. SEVERO. IMP. QVI. MVRVM. HVNC CONDIDIT.”—and again adds, “This inscription is not now to be found.”—Possibly not! But is authority so high, as that of Camden, to be slighted on that account? The slab or altar might fall into the hands of some one, who, ignorant of its value to posterity, broke it into walling stones for building purposes, or even for a stone fence ; no uncommon circumstance in the time of Camden. Even within my own recollection, it was a custom of the superstitious on the line of Wall, in our neighbourhood, either to pound the slabs or altars, bearing inscriptions, into sand for their kitchens, or to place them in the foundations of houses, or stone walls, because they considered them unlucky ; calling them witch-stones, or stones of bad omen, and consequently took good care they should never again make their appearance. Some of the old women, whilst churning, might perhaps not get butter so soon as they expected ; then down went a Roman slab or altar, if there were any in the immediate neighbourhood, a guiltless sacrifice to ignorance and superstition.

There is another and a very powerful reason why so many of these fine relics of antiquity are lost to the world, viz. that they are most commonly found by farmers or their servants, when draining, fencing, or carting away soil. The owners of the property have perhaps no interest in such things ; the great bulk of the farmers know nothing at all about them ; they are valueless to them, so far as antiquity goes ; but they may be useful as covers for a conduit, or for some other purpose about the farm premises. Some of them may be preserved by a mere casualty, or possibly laid care-

The Roman Wall.

lessly aside, till they are perhaps either broken or defaced. This is not the case with all the farmers or yeomen on the line of the Wall. Some are very careful of all the Roman relics they can procure. They are diligent collectors, and, while they live, feel great interest in these remains of a by-gone age. Their successors however, may be persons of very different tastes. The admirers of antiquity knowing where such things are collected, go to inspect them, and purchase for a trifle, or, more commonly, beg any thing they wish especially to have; this is taken away, and by a few similar repetitions the whole collection is gradually dispersed. I do not advance these remarks from hearsay; they are to me well known facts. I was born within half a mile of the Wall, and, except when at school, have lived there all my life. The search after Roman antiquities was always one of my *hobbies*; and I have succeeded in collecting many coins found on and near the line of Wall, as well as some slabs, and other less important Roman relics, found at AMBOGLANNA, PETRIANA, and the neighbourhood. My little unpretending collection may, after my time, fall into the hands of some one who cannot appreciate its value. In such case what is to be expected? In every probability it may be squandered abroad, in the same manner.

I shall next refer to the testimony of ancient authors. Spartian, *in Severo*, says—“*Britanniam quod maximum ejus imperii decus est, muro per transversam insulam ducto utrimque ad finem oceani munivit; unde etiam Britannici nomen accepit.*” Spartian dedicated his work on the Roman Emperors, from Hadrian to Caracalla and Geta, to the Emperor Dioclesian. Dioclesian abdicated A.D. 304. Admitting that Spartian dedicated his book to this Emperor, in the very last year of his reign, it then follows, he wrote only ninety-seven years after the Wall was commenced, viz. in the consulate of Aper and Maximus. Even in this extreme case, is it possible that Spartian could be mistaken as to the Emperor by whom the Wall was built? Dioclesian reigned twenty-one years before he abdicated. Spartian's work may have been published in the early part of the reign of Dioclesian, for any proof to the contrary. In such case his work may have been written within eighty years after the building of the Wall. It could not be thought very unreasonable further to suppose that Spartian might be thirty or forty years old, or perhaps more, when he published his work;

The Roman Wall.

therefore it is probable that the Wall was built only forty or fifty years before his own time, and perhaps even less than that. Had Spartian's statement been incorrect, it would have been contradicted by men, then living, who had themselves witnessed the building of the Wall. In my own native village, an old gentleman (an excellent specimen of a Cumberland yeoman, and a near neighbour of mine) lived to the patriarchal age of 119 years. He died in 1823. His memory was excellent even up to the time of his death, and many times have I, with great delight, sat and listened to him telling the tales of his youth. I was most especially interested in his account of the Scotch Rebellions. He had the curiosity, when a boy of from 10 to 11 years old, to go from his own home, a considerable distance, to see the rebels pass, on their way south, in 1715; and his description of them, more particularly of the Highlanders, was amusing in the extreme. He served in the militia, at Carlisle, when the city was besieged in 1745; but he did not at all like his new occupation as a soldier; for said he, "The cannon balls were coming rattling into the town from Stanwix-bank, like hail; and besides we were starving of hunger. For my part, I had nothing but a basin of broth during three days; so in the night I scrambled over the city wall, and cut off for home." We have another old man, in the immediate neighbourhood, in his ninety-ninth year, whose memory is equally good; and I should think it will scarcely be doubted, that men were quite as likely to live to as great an age, in the same locality, in those days, as now. Spartian's work is not called in question, as to the fact that Severus built the Wall. On the contrary, Aurelius Victor, *in Severo*, says, "*Britanniam quæ ad ea utilis, pulsus hostibus, muro munivit per transversam insulam ducto, utrimque ad finem oceani.*" Victor wrote, in the reign of Constantius, a history of the Roman Emperors, from Augustus to his own time, A.D. 360. Victor was honoured with the consulship, and was, consequently, a man of respectability. He follows Spartian, at a distance of not more than fifty-six years, and verifies, to all intents and purposes, the assertions of that author. Had Spartian been in error, as to the Emperor who built the stone Wall, Victor would have confuted him. But could Victor himself be so ignorant, as not to know who constructed a work so vast and stupendous as the Roman Wall, especially since it was built so shortly before his own time?

The Roman Wall.

Eutropius, contemporary with Victor, wrote in the reign of Julian the Apostate, who died A.D. 363. Eutropius, for his excellent qualities, was called *clarissimus*. He wrote an epitome of the history of Rome, from Romulus, to the reign of Valens, to whom he dedicated his work. He says, speaking of Severus—“*Novissimum bellum in Britannia habuit, utque receptas provincias omni securitate muniret Vallum per cxxxii passuum millia a mari ad mare deduxit.*”

Cassiodorus, who died A.D. 562, at the age of a hundred years, expresses himself thus; “*Severus in Britannos bellum movit, ubi receptas provincias ab incursione barbará faceret securiores, murum per cxxxii millia passuum a mari ad mare duxit.*”

Paulus Diaconus, who flourished in the middle of the eighth century, observes—“*Novissimum bellum in Britannia habuit Severus, utque receptas provincias omni securitate muniret, vallum per xxxv millia passuum a mari ad mare deduxit.*”*

It will here be perceived that the cxxxii of Eutropius and of Cassiodorus, and the xxxv of Diaconus, do not correspond with the length of the Wall. These I consider mere mistakes of modern printers. If we substitute L for c, in Eutropius, and Cassiodorus; and place an L before the xxxv, of Diaconus; we have the length of the Wall very nearly.

I cannot but think it rather an unwarrantable liberty to assume, that all these eminent authors were in error, as to the Emperor who built the stone Wall, especially since most of them lived and wrote so shortly after the time. It may as well be supposed, that it will not be known eighty or ninety years hence, who built that magnificent structure, the Crystal Palace, of 1851, in Hyde Park, London: a splendid work, certainly; but infinitely inferior in magnitude to the Roman Wall.

A cavil has been set up about the terms murus and vallum; but I should suspect few will contend, that they are not synonymous terms. A murus is a vallum, and a vallum a murus. A murus may be of sods and stakes, like the Wall of Hadrian; or it may be of stones, like that of Severus. It may be of bricks, or of any other material; so also may a vallum.—“A comparison of the several passages respecting the Walls of Hadrian and

* Paulus Diaconus, *lib.* 8. as cited by Gordon, in his *Itin. Sept. Lond.* 1727.

The Roman Wall.

Severus, in the works of Spartian, Eutropius, Aurelius Victor, and Orosius, will clearly show that the agger of earth, with its ditches, etc., was the work of Hadrian; and that the stone Wall was erected by Severus, though the terms murus and vallum are indifferently applied to both. It is perfectly clear, that two lines of fortification were formed by two Emperors, from sea to sea; and it would be absurd to suppose that the bank of earth should have been formed forty years after the Wall of stone."

It seems not sufficient for the supporters of Hadrian, to suppose that he constructed both the walls. They even assert, that, from evidence which may be obtained by traversing the line of the Wall, it is perceptible, that not only were both the walls, with their fosses or ditches, but also all the stations, outposts, etc., but so many parts of one grand whole, the work of one mighty engineer, and that engineer, Hadrian. *Mirabile dictu!!* It would have been only a very slight stretch further, and supported by authority equally as good, to have supposed that every other Roman work, in Britain, was by the same great master mind!

In confutation of the above hypothesis, I shall, in the first place, refer to that eminent author Tacitus. He informs us that Agricola, his father-in-law, constructed two chains of forts in Britain. The first was built in the first year of his administration; and there is little reason to doubt, as will be hereafter seen, that it was between the Tyne and the Solway Frith, at Wallsend. The exact locality is not so clearly defined, as that of the other one. Speaking of the first chain of forts, he says (Section 20 of his Agricola)—"*Quibus rebus multæ civitates, quæ in illum diem ex æquo egerant, datis obsidiis, iram posuere, et præsiidiis castellisque circumdatæ, tanta ratione curaque, ut nulla ante Britannia nova pars inaccessita transierit.*" Here Tacitus pointedly declares, that along the frontier of the several districts which had submitted, a chain of forts was established, with so much care and judgment, that no part of the country, even where the Roman arms had never penetrated, could think itself secure from the energy of Agricola. In the second year of Agricola's administration, the Roman arms appear to have made no further progress; for he seems to have devoted his whole attention to introduce new and wise regulations, education, and Roman arts and habits, amongst the already conquered natives,

The Roman Wall.

in which, there is reason to think, he was very successful. In his third year, he laid waste the country to the north, as far as the Frith of Tay; and, so far as the Romans advanced, the country was secured by forts and garrisons. And it is allowed by men of first-rate military science, that no officer of the Romans knew better than Agricola, how to seize, on a sudden view, the most advantageous situation; and, consequently, not one of his stations was taken by storm, or reduced to capitulate. At every post, a year's provisions was laid up in store, to enable the garrison to stand a siege.

In the fourth year of his administration, he made it his business to secure the country overrun, not conquered, by a chain of forts between the Frith of Forth and the Clyde.—“*Nam Clota et Bodotria, diversi maris aestibus per immensum revectæ angusto terrarum spatio dirimuntur, quod tum præsidiis firmabatur,*” etc.

Had Agricola connected either of these chains of forts with a wall, it would have been mentioned by Tacitus; therefore it may reasonably be concluded, that none of the walls were constructed by him. It is perfectly clear, that the first chain of forts built by Agricola, in the first and second years of his administration of affairs in Britain, was between the Solway Frith and the German Ocean, at Tynemouth. There is no merit due to Hadrian, for selecting a tract for his Wall; it was already selected for him, by one much more skilled in military affairs than he, especially in British warfare. Agricola was well acquainted with the manners and national character of the Britons; for his first rudiments of military knowledge were acquired in Britain, under the conduct of Suetonius Paulinus, long before he himself undertook the administration of British affairs. Lollius Urbicus, in the reign of Antoninus Pius, took the same advantage of Agricola's line of forts, between the Frith of Forth and the Clyde, as Hadrian did on the English Isthmus. Then how did it happen that Lollius Urbicus did not construct two walls, running nearly parallel to each other, having before his eyes the example of the redoubtable Hadrian on the English Isthmus? Tacitus says, the country, as far as the Romans advanced, was secured by forts and garrisons, for the purpose of keeping in check the already conquered provinces. It therefore appears that L. Urbicus did not see the use of two walls; probably concluding that, if he could not be supported by these

The Roman Wall.

performed by one individual?—No such notice is taken by any one of them, so far as Hadrian is concerned. And it is equally strange that there is not a single inscription on any quarry, from one end of the line of Wall to the other, bearing the name of Hadrian; neither is there one to mark out any consulate during his reign. Neither altar nor slab was ever heard of, to state the fact that he had any thing to do with building a wall of any kind.

The inscription on the Gelt Rock, having been made A.D. 207, it is therefore objected that the Wall could not have been built by Severus; since he did not arrive in Britain, till the year following. Granted he did not! But why could not the great work be commenced and carried on by the Roman engineers and legions, by order of the Emperor, as well in his absence, as if he had been in Britain to superintend? It is well known that Severus, in those days, was a great martyr to the gout; and consequently not always able to follow his army. Was Domitian in Britain, when Agricola made these chains of forts? or was Antoninus Pius in Britain when his legate, Lollius Urbicus connected the chain of forts, between the Frith of Forth and the Clyde, with a wall? They may have been; but I can find no proof that such was the case; neither can I conceive that their presence was necessary.

As I have already mentioned, the route across the island was previously marked out by Agricola; and if Hadrian judged it expedient to connect the stations by a barrier running into each of them, in a range with the south or Decuman end; and Severus thought proper to run his Wall into the north or Prætorian end, it may reasonably be supposed, that Severus had only one object in view, and that was, to take every possible advantage of the barrier previously constructed by Hadrian.

General Roy, in his *Military Antiquities*, gives his opinion very pointedly with reference to the walls. Yet, although a military man of great skill and experience, he does not notice the advantage of having the Roman army confined in so narrow limits, as that between the two walls in England. He says, "Julius Agricola built two chains of forts in Britain, along its narrowest Isthmuses; the first between Tyne and Solway, and the second between Forth and Clyde. The first wall was raised by the Emperor Hadrian, along the line of the nearest chain of forts, in the year 120, thirty five years after

The Roman Wall.

forts and garrisons, against revolt in his rear, without the further defence of a rampart, that he was a "little too far north." It would scarcely be considered that the Roman army, cooped up in limits so narrow, as that between the two ramparts, with a fierce enemy in front and rear, were in a desirable situation. The same be said of the English Isthmus.

Besides the stations, on the line of Wall, there are at least eight stations, in Cumberland, supporting the barrier, viz. Ellenborough, Moresby, Old Carlisle, Plumpton, Grinsdale, Watchcross, Castlesteads, and BREMENTVRACVM. In Northumberland, four, viz. Chesterholm, Old Town, Whitley Castle, Corbridge. In Durham, three, viz. Ebchester, Lanchester, and Binchester.

There are a great many stations scattered over the whole country so far as the Romans penetrated; but by far the most on the south of the two chains of forts; and it can scarcely be doubted that the greater number, if not the whole of them, was constructed by Agricola, in defence of the chain of forts on the frontier. If the two walls were constructed by one Emperor, it is more probable that they were the work of Severus. But that both the walls, forts, outposts etc., were one grand design, and built by one Emperor, may clearly be disproved by existing evidence, independently of reference to authors. I would recommend any one, who entertains that opinion, to visit the station of AMBOGLANNA, and carefully examine for himself the north west corner of the station, the Wall of which, at that place, is standing in good repair, and I should think, in nearly its original height. The Wall runs up to the corner of the station, and abuts against it; not walled into it; clearly proving that the station was built before the Wall. The workmanship of the two is also very dissimilar; the station wall is composed of stones much smaller, and more nearly square; and the work altogether, is not so well executed as that of the Wall. This is quite as strong a proof that the stone Wall and the stations were made at different periods, as the "Written Rock" is, that the Gelt quarry had been worked in the reign of L. S. Severus. Had both the walls, as well as the stations and outposts, been built by one Emperor, is it to be supposed that a work so Herculean would not have been especially noticed by every historian of the age, and handed down to posterity as one of the greatest achievements ever

The Roman Wall.

Agricola's recall by Domitian. The second was executed by Lollius Urbicus, in the reign of Antoninus Pius, along the farthest chain of forts, in the year 140, twenty years after the first. And the third Wall was built by Severus, on his return from the expedition against the Caledonians, about the year 208, sixty-eight years after the date of the second, and one hundred and three from the time when Hadrian raised his, running along the same neck of land, and standing nearly on the same ground." He then states that "Hadrian in his useful and necessary progress through the Roman dominions visited Britain, and there, according to Spartian, first raised a wall, eighty miles in length, to separate the Romans from the barbarians. From the length of the wall here expressed, antiquaries have almost unanimously agreed, that the earthen rampart yet existing between the Tyne and Solway, running along what we have supposed to be the first, or hithermost chain of Agricola's forts, was the vallum raised by Hadrian, on this occasion."

Julius Capitolinus, in his account of the military transactions of Antoninus Pius, says, that "this Emperor carried on many wars by his legates; among the rest, Lollius Urbicus, having subdued the Britons, likewise removed the barbarians farther off, by means of another wall of turf, drawn across the island. This passage, being the only one which occurs in the Roman historians concerning the wall of Antoninus, is of singular use; for it clearly implies, not only that this wall was farther advanced into the island than the first that had been executed, but also that it was of the same nature with the first; both must therefore have been cespititious, or formed of the materials taken promiscuously from the ditch."

After quoting the authority of Spartian, Aurelius Victor, Eutropius, Orosius, and Cassiodorus, General Roy continues—"Hence it is plain, that Severus did run a wall across Britain, from one sea to the other, which, by some of the above-mentioned historians, is termed vallum, and by others murus; though they disagree with regard to its length, and take no notice of the particular places where it began or ended; yet, as it is nowhere said to be cespititious, or of turf only, in which manner it is evident the first two were constructed; therefore it is natural to conclude, that the stone

The Roman Wall.

Wall, whose vestiges remain so conspicuous along the isthmus, between Tyne and Solway, was that built by Severus." That there have been two lines of wall made across the English isthmus, is an intuitive certainty; and that they were both constructed by the Romans is not questioned. That there are no traces of workings in the quarries of this neighbourhood at all commensurate with the quantity necessarily wanted for a work so stupendous, without including the powerful aid of Gelt, may, by inspection of the neighbourhood, be ascertained. That Gelt quarry has been worked very extensively by the second legion, in the consulate of Aper and Maximus, is proved by the "gaping inscription" of Camden. It is gaping there still, and will continue to gape for as many years to come, if no rude hand deface it. That the stone Wall, in our immediate neighbourhood, was made by the second legion, is proved by stones, found on the line of Wall, recording the fact. These stones have invariably the verb *fecit* upon them; the verb *reparavit*, or any other word bearing that meaning, has not yet been discovered. Last, not least, in the connecting link between the quarry of the written rock and the Roman Wall, is the fact, that all the stone-masons in the neighbourhood agree in opinion, that the great bulk of the stone, of which the Wall is constructed, is Gelt stone, and, of all the quarries of Gelt, that of the written rock is nearest to the Wall. To the testimony of ancient authors, the decided opinion of the most eminent of the modern, with the local evidence already advanced, may be added the powerful support of universally received tradition.

The Ancient Britons called the stone Wall *Mursever*, *Gualsever*, or *Gal-sever*, which words can only admit of one meaning. The inhabitants on or near the line of Wall, invariably hold the opinion, even at this day, that the sod wall was the work of Hadrian, and that of stone the work of Severus; and whatever arguments may be advanced now, in modern days, in contradiction to the generally received tradition, unless founded upon something tangible, will never be credited.

Nook, Irthington, July, 1852.



NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE:
PRINTED BY G. BOUCHIER RICHARDSON, CLAYTON-STREET-WEST.









