The Antiquaries Journal, **87**, 2007, pp 346–56

JOHN LELAND AND THE 'BRITON BRYKES'

Oliver Harris*

This paper traces the practice among early modern antiquaries of describing Roman bricks as 'British'. The term originated in the 1530s in the notes of John Leland, who based his nomenclature on material first encountered at Verulamium. He may either have regarded the settlement there as British, or have adopted a local folk-attribution. Others who followed his usage, including William Camden, recognized that the bricks were actually Roman, but the terminology was not properly discussed until the end of the seventeenth century. While Leland's designation was flawed, his identification is of significance as an exceptionally early exercise in archaeological typology.

The term 'British bricks' (or in Latin, *lateres Britannici*) is found in a number of English antiquarian texts of the early modern period, in reference to what we now know to have been Roman bricks and bonding tiles. The usage was established in the early sixteenth century by John Leland, who recorded the bricks, both in their original settings and reused in later buildings, at various locations, mainly in Kent: in the walls of the shore forts at Richborough and Lympne (Stutfall Castle); in the church of St Mary-in-Castro at Dover Castle; in the putative remains of the Saxon nunnery at Folkestone; in the Ridingate and the churches of St Pancras and St Martin at Canterbury; and in archaeological contexts at Kenchester, Herefordshire, and Bewcastle, Cumberland.[1] He also remarked on their absence from the walls of Gloucester Castle.[2] He identified them primarily by size and shape: they were 'Britons brikes, very large' at Lympne; 'greate Briton brykes' at Dover; *longissimi et latissimi later*[*es*] *more Britannico* and 'long Briton brikes' at Canterbury; 'great and long Briton brikes' at Folkestone; and *cocti later*[*es*] *maiusculi* and 'mervelus and long brykes both white and redde after the Britons fascion' at Richborough.[3] Only at Bewcastle did he find the complementary evidence of bricks bearing 'entayled [sculpted] worke and portretures'.[4]

William Camden, who drew on Leland's notes, used the term six times in the first edition of his *Britannia* (1586), in descriptions of Dover Castle, Stutfall Castle, Kenchester, Silchester (Hampshire) and Burgh Castle (Suffolk), and in a report of how Constantine first walled London.[5] William Lambarde, in the second edition of his *Perambulation of Kent* (1596), noted reused 'Brytaine bricks' in medieval buildings at Lympne, crediting his information to John Stow.[6] Stow himself, in his *Survey of London* (1598), reported the excavation in Lime Street, London, in 1576 of a hearth made of 'Britaine (or Romayne) tyle as they call it'.[7] Camden added two new references to the 1607 edition of *Britannia*, in accounts of Wroxeter (Shropshire) and Ambleside (Westmorland); and another four to the 1610 English translation, in accounts of Richborough, Folkestone, Pevensey (Sussex) and Sudbrook (Monmouthshire).[8]

* *O D Harris, 27 The Cloisters, 145 Commercial Street, London E1 6EB, UK.*
E-mail: <OliverDHarris@netscape.net>.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003581500000949 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The term continued to be used through much of the seventeenth century by such writers as John Speed, John Weever, James Howell, Samuel Clarke, William Burton (the commentator on the Antonine Itinerary), Thomas Philipot, Richard Blome, the German tourist Paul Hentzner and the anonymous editor of the 1656 edition of Lambarde's *Perambulation*; all, however, were quoting or paraphrasing either Camden or, less often, Leland.[9] William Somner employed it with a little more originality, noting bricks at several new sites in Canterbury, as well as at Dover, Lympne and Pevensey.[10] In texts derived from Camden, including Edmund Gibson's translation of *Britannia* (1695), Thomas Cox's *Magna Britannia* (1720–31), and passages in a number of local histories, 'British' bricks continued to feature until the end of the eighteenth century.[11]

Front-line antiquaries, however, had begun to accept by the mid-seventeenth century that the term was unsatisfactory, and needed expansion or clarification. Somner, regarding the bricks as 'infallible Remaines of antiquity', alluded more than once to 'British or Romane bricke'.[12] John Conyers in 1675 recorded 'tyles of the brittons Roman tyles & bricks' among his collections.[13] Sir Robert Atkyns wrote in 1712 of 'Quantities of *Roman* or *British* Brick' found at Wick, Gloucestershire, and Samuel Carte, at about the same date, referred to reused 'British or Roman bricks or tiles' in the church of St Nicholas, Leicester, and 'Roman or British tile' recovered from excavations nearby.[14]

Others were by now assigning bricks to the Romans without qualification, perhaps under the influence of travellers' reports from Italy, where even the casual tourist could appreciate that structures of 'great stones and Bricks in Square' were typical Roman work.[15] As early as 1633, Anthony Munday and Humphrey Dyson, describing the church of St Alban Wood Street, London, referred to '*Romane* bricks, here and there inlayed amongst the stones'.[16] In the early 1640s, the Leicestershire antiquary William Burton recorded 'Roman large brickes' in the Jewry Wall at Leicester.[17] Further examples were reported by William Dugdale at Alcester and Monks Kirby, Warwickshire, in 1656, and by Elias Ashmole at Cave's Inn (Roman *Tripontium*), on Watling Street, the following year.[18] At about the same date, Silas Taylor found 'Roman bricke' at Kenchester.[19] Sir Thomas Browne in 1658 noted burial urns 'closed with *Romane* bricks' from Caister-on-Sea, Norfolk, and Christopher Wren discovered a section of roadway on a foundation of '*Roman* Brick and Rubbish' beneath St Mary-le-Bow Church, London.[20] An ornamental brick excavated in Mark Lane, London, in the 1670s was also identified – in this case erroneously – as Roman.[21] Randle Holme, in 1688, reported Roman stamped tiles having often been excavated in Chester and elsewhere.[22] Thomas Machell wrote in 1692 of Roman brick observed at Watercrook, Westmorland.[23] John Aubrey, Martin Lister, Robert Plot and Edward Lhuyd, members of the new generation of empirically minded virtuosi associated with the Royal Society, are all found describing bricks and tiles as Roman.[24] Lister, writing in the Society's *Philosophical Transactions* in 1683, related the dimensions of the bricks observed in fieldwork at York, Leicester and St Albans to those described in the literary texts of Pliny and Vitruvius.[25] He was the first scholar in Britain to make these connections, though he had been preceded by the sixteenth-century Venetian, Daniel Barbaro.[26]

'British' and 'Roman' bricks now enjoyed a parallel existence, but it was only in the 1690s, and specifically in the spurt of collaborative antiquarian activity that accompanied preparations for the 1695 *Britannia*, that the terminology became a matter for explicit consideration or discussion. Plot, collecting material for a projected survey of Kent, was puzzled by Camden's references to 'British' bricks at Dover and Stutfall Castles, and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003581500000949 Published online by Cambridge University Press

wrote a memorandum to himself to 'Search carefully for them, & remark what they be'; but when he and his companion, Thomas Browne, visited Stutfall and Richborough in the summer of 1693, they identified the bricks at both sites as 'Roman'.[27] Later the same year, John Woodward insisted to Edward Lhuyd that the pre-Roman Britons had been a 'very Simple, & Rude people', lacking in advanced technical skills. 'All ye Buildings, fortifications & other works that are called British: all ye Coines, Bricks, tyles, Pavements &c that some fancyfull men call British, are all later then ye Roman descent, & either actualy ye works of ye Romans, or imitations of them.'[28] In 1694, Ralph Thoresby, having discovered what he judged to be 'British or Roman bricks' at Kirkstall Abbey, West Yorkshire, raised the matter with Gibson, who likewise expressed the view that the Britons' only knowledge of bricks had been acquired from the Romans, so that '[t]hose who would have the Roman and British different, are certainly in an error'.[29] Thoresby took the point, and his subsequent published writings refer only to Roman bricks.[30] Gibson accepted that after the Roman settlement the Britons had followed Roman practices, and indeed that bricks were made by British slave-labour to enforced Roman standards (hence the high quality of the product, 'much firmer than our modern ones'): he may have been implying that the attribution arose from these circumstances.[31] In preparing his edition of *Britannia*, he took issue with Camden's report of 'British' bricks at Burgh Castle: 'Yet the brick being nigh a foot & a half in length, and at most a foot in breadth, agree rather with ye account of Roman bricks given by Vitruvius & after him by Plinie'.[32] In the volume as published, Gibson and his collaborators consistently referred to 'Roman' bricks in their annotations and additions, although Camden's 'British' designation was adhered to in the translation.[33]

John Batteley, writing probably in the late 1690s, similarly accepted the Roman attribution, albeit with a little less confidence: he referred to bricks 'of that kind which we call Roman', and addressed the possibility of reuse, acknowledging that even if the bricks themselves were Roman, the structures in which they were found might not be.[34] Elsewhere, fewer doubts were expressed: John Woodward in 1707 could readily distinguish Roman from medieval among the bricks in the city wall of London, and by this period the great majority of informed antiquaries, including Abraham de la Pryme, John Lyster, Thomas and Roger Gale, John Bagford, William Stukeley, John Horsley and Sir Hans Sloane, were describing bricks as Roman without further comment.[35] Thomas Hearne, in 1712, was initially reluctant to accept the mosaic pavement uncovered at Stonesfield, Oxfordshire, as Roman, because he 'could find no Roman Brick, or hear of any that had been found': once he learned, however, that bricks from the site were of suitably Vitruvian dimensions he was persuaded that the attribution was sound.[36] The 'British' label, despite its survival in derivative texts, was by now thoroughly discredited among serious antiquaries. Woodward argued that the Britons had been entirely ignorant of building technology prior to the Roman settlement, so that there was 'not one Stone upon another; nor so much as a Brick, in all the whole Island'; and he expressed himself 'somewhat surprized to find a Gentleman of the Diligence and Ingenuity of Mr Somner taking the Roman Bricks, that he observed in the Walls of Canterbury, for *British Bricks*'.[37] John Harris in 1719 could similarly 'scarce comprehend' Lambarde's 1656 editor designating bricks 'the markes of British building'.[38]

The truth is, however, that most of the earlier adherents of the 'British' label had fully accepted that the bricks were actually Roman. Camden's reference to 'such as we call Britaine-bricks' shows that he used the term as conventional shorthand rather than literal description: he in fact regarded the bricks as 'most certaine arguments' for

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003581500000949 Published online by Cambridge University Press

construction 'by the Romans, who used such in their great buildings'.[39] (Uncertainty admittedly crept in at Pevensey, where he noted 'great bricks, such as the Britans used'.[40]) Stow similarly appreciated that the term was potentially misleading, writing of 'Britaine (or Romayne) tyle as they call it', and later revising the phrase to 'Britain, or rather Roman Tile': elsewhere he highlighted the gap in skills between the technically advanced Romans, who walled their towns 'with stone, and baked brickes, or tyles', and the more primitive Britons, who did not.[41] Somner cross-referred the user of his index from '*British*-Bricks' to '*Roman*-Bricks'; described the walls of Stutfall Castle as being 'of the Roman mode and make, full of British bricks'; alluded at Reculver to 'Roman tile or brick' without mentioning Britons; and at Dover Castle argued cogently that whereas the keep was shown to be of post-Roman date by the fact that 'no jot of Roman or British tile or brick' was to be seen in it, the tower of St Mary-in-Castro was demonstrably Roman because it had brick visible in 'great abundance'.[42] Cox, conflating Camden's description with Gibson's commentary, observed that the dimensions of the 'British' bricks at Burgh Castle 'agree pretty exactly with the Account of *Roman* Brick, given by *Vetruvius* and *Pliny*'.[43]

Leland – the source of the term – is a different matter, however. He referred to 'Briton brykes' entirely literally, attributing the bricks to the indigenous British. Despite abundant finds of Roman coins at Richborough, Lympne and Kenchester, he regarded the Richborough bricks as made 'after the Britons fascion', and Stutfall Castle as 'the ruines of a stronge fortresse of the Britons'.[44] The clearest insight into his views occurs in notes made at Canterbury. Here, in the library of St Augustine's Abbey, he encountered a copy of the eleventh-century life of St Augustine by Goscelin, and in it the claim that St Martin's Church in Canterbury, used for Christian worship before Augustine's arrival by the Frankish-born Queen Bertha and her chaplain, Bishop Liudhard, had originally been built by Roman Christians.[45] Paraphrasing this passage, Leland added the gloss 'or rather by Britons', and the further comment, 'It still exists, built from very long and very broad bricks in the British manner, such as may readily be seen in the ruins of Verulamium' (*in ruinis Verolamiensibus*).[46]

Thus Leland reveals the source of his attribution, and provides the basis for an approximate chronology. He seems to have visited Verulamium, and have become aware of the distinctive bricks, in about 1535.[47] He recognized them again soon afterwards in Canterbury and elsewhere in Kent; recorded the fragments at Kenchester and looked for occurrences at Gloucester on a tour made in about 1537; and noted the examples at Bewcastle in either 1538 or 1539.[48] And from his notes – particularly by way of Camden – his terminology entered the common vocabulary of late sixteenth-century antiquarianism, and survived largely unchallenged until the end of the seventeenth century.

But why should Leland have thought of the bricks as British? The only earlier writers in Britain to have noticed Roman bricks had been 'Nennius', the early ninth-century author of the *Historia Britonum*, who characterized Britain as possessing 'innumerable forts built of stone and brick', but did not venture a specific attribution, and Giraldus Cambrensis in the late twelfth century, who described as having brick walls (*coctilibus muris*) both Caerleon, which he knew to be a Roman town, and Carmarthen, which he associated with Merlin, and so presumably regarded as British.[49] Leland was familiar with both texts, but they do not seem to have influenced his thinking on the matter at hand.[50] Instead, it is clear that his ideas emerged from what he had seen at Verulamium. So does this mean that he regarded the settlement there as British?

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003581500000949 Published online by Cambridge University Press

His surviving notes on Verulamium are brief, but confirm that he had examined its remains closely. He reports (presumably at second hand) the robbing out of a length of Watling Street in 1531; notes his own discovery nearby of what he took to be rounded aqueduct pipes (perhaps actually roof-tiles); and suggests a site for the town's '*palatium*'.[51] He further appreciated that 'very broad bricks' from the Verulamium ruins had been used to build St Albans Abbey church.[52] With regard to the site's historical context, he tells us that his visit was prompted by curiosity 'to inspect the ruins of the old Roman *municipium*', a status which he knew from reading Tacitus that Verulamium had possessed.[53] However, he also knew from Ptolemy that it had been the 'ancient town of the Catuvellauni' (*Catieuchlanorum*); he believed that Uther Pendragon, father of King Arthur, had died there; and he was familiar too with Matthew Paris's story of how, in the late tenth or early eleventh century, a manuscript life of St Alban had been found in the ruins, written in 'the language used at that time by the ancient Britons'.[54] It does seem possible, then, that he thought of the town and its remains as primarily British rather than Roman. Alternatively, he may have adopted a local St Albans term: we know that, a generation later, reused brick and tile in the abbey church was known as 'Jewe's Tyle', presumably on account of its evidently ancient but mysterious origins: 'Briton bricks' may simply have been a variant folk-attribution.[55]

Leland was a patriot, and a staunch defender of the traditions of Geoffrey of Monmouth and his *Historia Regum Britanniae* (purportedly translated from a 'British', that is Welsh, original), which he made every effort to reconcile with the testimony of the classical authorities.[56] He appreciated that there were difficulties in the story of Brutus and the Trojan settlement of Britain, but he accepted its essential truth, along with the historicity of such later figures as Bladud, founder of Bath, the legislator Dunwallo Molmutius, Lucius who converted the island to Christianity and, above all, Arthur.[57] He conceded that the Britons had at one time lived in a primitive and uncultured state, but argued that the same could be said of virtually all peoples, even the Greeks and Italians.[58] He believed that the education of the pre-Roman Britons had lain in manual and military skills rather than letters, and that artistic and literary learning, along with spiritual authority, had been the monopoly of an elite hierarchy of druids, bards, *vates*, flamens and archflamens.[59] He knew from Caesar that British coinage had existed, and attributed the paucity of its survival (he had never seen any examples) to its probable suppression by the Romans.[60] He had little of the later commentators' sense of British technological backwardness, and accepted that Britons had built the great roads that crossed the country.[61] He would have had no reason, therefore, to question their ability to build with brick. His curiosity about the possible survival of bricks at Gloucester probably reflected his interest in the city's origins, and in its putative ancient name, *Claudia*: he believed that this name commemorated not the Emperor Claudius, but some later (British?) Claudius, and he may have hoped for physical evidence to support his case.[62] His designation of bricks as British therefore reversed the more usual tendency of scholars in the humanist tradition to assume that technically sophisticated but enigmatic remains, ranging from burial urns to Stonehenge, were most likely to be Roman. (Leland did, however, succumb to this temptation on at least one occasion, assigning to the Romans the megaliths known as the 'Devil's Arrows', at Boroughbridge, North Yorkshire.[63])

What is of greater interest than his flawed attribution is his successful classification of the bricks in the first place. Among his many eclectic interests, Leland was intrigued by building materials. He frequently noted 'squarid stone' (or, *lapides quadratos*) as evidence of the relatively high status of structures, both standing and demolished.[64] He thought

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003581500000949 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the reported use of Caen stone at Bristol Castle and Tewkesbury Abbey worth recording, and he examined closely the composition of the mortar, 'made of se sand and smaul peble', at both Richborough and Stutfall Castle.[65] Similarly, he often recorded the use of brick, both in contemporary buildings (such as Chenies, Buckinghamshire, and Tong Castle, Shropshire) and in those of the previous century (including the town gates of Beverley, East Yorkshire, Someries Castle, Bedfordshire, and New Place, Stratford-upon-Avon, Warwickshire).[66] He gave particular attention to its widespread use at Hull, East Yorkshire, and appreciated at Greys Court, Oxfordshire, that the courtyard buildings, timber-framed and 'spacyd withe bricke', were more recent work than the stone-built towers.[67]

His identification of 'Briton brykes', however, takes his observations to a higher level of analysis. Early modern antiquarianism brought to the study of the past an increasingly critical approach to texts, allied to a new interest in material evidence. But while antiquaries recognized in principle the evidential value of archaeological remains, and undertook commendable programmes of recording and collection, their interpretive techniques, based as they were on the tying of physical relics to received text-based narratives, were rather less innovative. What Stuart Piggott calls 'the liberation of archaeological studies from a dependence on literary sources' is therefore usually dated to the late seventeenth century, when scholars trained in Baconian empirical principles came to the realization that, by means of what John Aubrey dubbed 'comparative antiquitie', monuments and artefacts could be made to speak for themselves.[68] Michael Hunter nonetheless rightly warns against 'rash claims about "beginnings"', and isolated instances of comparative or stylistic interpretation can be found on occasion at earlier dates, in relation to materials as diverse as seals, handwriting, armour, funeral monuments and buildings.[69] However, these early attempts were inevitably rudimentary and impressionistic. Not untypical are Leland's own assessments that Leicester Castle, being 'a thing of smaul estimation', with 'no apparaunce other of high waulles or dikes', must in its present form be later than the Barons' Wars; that, although Ripon Minster was a Saxon foundation, 'the hole chirch that now standith indubitately was made sins the Conquest'; and that the body of Carlisle Cathedral was older than its choir.[70] Against such a background of hazily informed guesswork, his designation of 'Briton brykes', although mistaken in its associations, stands out for the relative precision with which he noted the bricks' characteristics, his ability to distinguish them from their more modern counterparts, and above all his consistent recognition of them at geographically scattered sites. Subsequent generations of antiquaries and archaeologists have long acknowledged the debt they owe to Leland for his recording of field monuments, but here we also find him demonstrating, at a remarkably early date, an archaeological astuteness well ahead of its time, and a fundamentally sound procedure of typological classification.

NOTES

1. Toulmin Smith 1906–10, III, 103; IV, 50, 61, 64–6, 69; V, 55; Leland 1774, IV, 8; Leland 1543, sig G2r.
2. Toulmin Smith 1906–10, III, 100.
3. Leland also noted 'greate brykes', at Caerwent, without specifically identifying them as British: ibid, III, 43.
4. More generally in Cumberland, he noted the ploughing up of bricks 'conteyninge the prints of antique works': ibid, V, 53.
5. Camden 1586, 135, 182, 184, 229, 260, 350. The claim that Constantine walled London, at the request of his mother Helena, is a variation on the more usual

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003581500000949 Published online by Cambridge University Press

story that Helena alone was responsible: Henry of Huntingdon 1996, 62–3. For the circulation of Leland's notes, see Harris 2005.

6. Lambarde 1596, 184.
7. Stow 1598, 123.
8. Camden 1607, 449, 624; Camden 1610, 315, 342, 349, 634, with the references from the earlier editions at 271, 344, 349, 423, 468, 593, 618, 760. The 1607 Wroxeter entry refers merely to walls constructed *Britannicorum ordine*, but bricks are probably implied: the 1610 translation refers explicitly to 'British brickes'. The respective contributions of Camden and Philemon Holland to the 1610 translation remain debatable, but it is likely that Camden added the substantive new entries.
9. Speed 1611–12, 29, 85; Weever 1631, 264, 767; Howell 1657, 4; Clarke 1657, 92; Burton 1658, 27, 187, 193, 254; Philipot 1659, 53; Blome 1673, 236; Hentzner 1612, 161; Lambarde 1656, 112, 178, 194. Hentzner's narrative records a visit made to England in 1598, but his note of British bricks at Dover must be a later interpolation, as it is taken from Camden 1607.
10. Somner 1640, 6, 19, 21, 30, 62, 65; Somner 1693, 91–2, 100, 105; and quotations from Leland and Camden (1610) at 89, 93.
11. Camden 1695, 126, 201n, 205, 209n, 210, 312, 376, 544, 575, 597n, 806; Cox 1720–31, II, 868, 926, 1150, 1164, 1179, 1183; III, 71, 92; V, 229; VI, 2; Stell 1794, 81; Hasted 1797–1801, VIII, 301.
12. Somner 1640, 19, 62, 65; Somner 1693, 91–2, 105.
13. Burnby 1984, 77.
14. Atkyns 1712, 202; Nichols 1795–1811, I/1, 5, 11.
15. Raymond 1648, 121, 147.
16. Stow 1633, 308.
17. SRO, D649/4/1, fol 154. Burton's note, intended for the unpublished second edition of his *Leicester Shire* (the first edition had appeared in 1622), was probably written not long before his death in 1645.
18. Dugdale 1656, 50, 568; Hamper 1827, 324–5.
19. BL, Harleian 6726, fol 205v.
20. Browne 1658, 32: Browne's informant may have been the landowner, Thomas Wood; Wren 1750, 265.
21. Stow 1720, II, Appendix, 23; Bagford 1774, lxx–lxxi; Massing 1990. The brick was 16th-century Dutch, but was still recorded as Roman as late as 1928: RCHME 1928, 132.
22. Holme 1688, bk 3, 343.
23. Ewbank 1963, 11–13.
24. Aubrey 1980–2, I, 452–509; Lister 1683; Plot 1686, 401; Gunther 1945, 260; Camden 1695, 591, 604, 607 (contributions by Lhuyd).
25. Lister 1683.
26. Vitruvius 1567, 74–6. The observations of Pliny (1938–63, IX, 384–9: bk 35, ch 49) and Vitruvius (1999, 36: bk 2, ch 3) subsequently became standard points of reference in discussions of Roman bricks: for example, Camden 1695, 380; Battely 1711, 37; Woodward 1713, 12–13; Battely 1774, 56; Hearne 1768–70, VIII, xii–xiii.
27. Bodleian, Hearne's Diaries 159, p 284: Thomas Hearne's transcript of Plot's *Analecta* (citing Camden 1587); Bodleian, Rawl D 390, fol 95v, published as Plot 1714, 45; Browne 1835, 461. For Plot's Kent project, see Greenslade 1982, 65; Gunther 1939, 360, 396–7; Harris 1719, Preface (p ii) and p 363.
28. Bodleian, Ashmole 1817b, fol 365: Woodward to Lhuyd, 12 Dec 1693. Woodward similarly maintained that Stonehenge and other megalithic monuments must be post-Roman, developing his arguments in a subsequent letter: Bodleian, Ashmole 1817b, fols 367–368: Woodward to Lhuyd, 23 Jan 1693/4.
29. Hunter 1830, I, 287–8; [Hunter] 1832, I, 194–5.
30. Thoresby 1696; Thoresby 1697; Thoresby 1715, 140, 561.
31. [Hunter] 1832, I, 194–5. Aubrey (1980–2, I, 458–9) had similar views on the superiority of slave-made bricks.
32. Bodleian, Eng b 2043, fol 311v. The note was published without the direct allusion to British bricks: Camden 1695, 380.
33. Camden 1695, 306, 357–8, 380, 511, 513, 591, 604, 607.
34. Battely 1711, 17, 36–8; abridged translation at Battely 1774, 23, 55–7. Batteley's brother, Nicholas, refers to Roman bricks at Dover: BL, Add 22665, fol 3.
35. Woodward 1713, iv, ix, 10–16; De la Pryme 1700; Lyster 1706; Gale 1709, 65, 81, 89, 100; Gale 1769, 127; Bagford 1774, lxxi–lxxii; Bodleian, Rawl D 400, art 128: Bagford to Thomas Hearne, *c* 1716; Lukis 1882–7, I, 68; II, 145, 163, 187, 224, 245, 255, 291, 316, 323; III, 9, 27, 31, 200–1, 271,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003581500000949 Published online by Cambridge University Press

293; Stukeley 1776; Horsley 1732; MacGregor 1994, 189–90.
36. Doble *et al* 1885–1921, III, 395–7, 400–3. Cf Levine 1987, 107–22.
37. Woodward 1713, 19–20.
38. Harris 1719, 374, commenting on Lambarde 1656, 178.
39. Camden 1610, 271, 344, 634, 760.
40. Ibid, 315. It is possible that Camden is here paraphrasing a lost description of the fort by Leland.
41. Stow 1908, I, 4–5, 160. As examples of Roman walled sites, Stow lists Richborough, Sandwich, Verulamium, Silchester, Wroxeter, Kenchester, Ribchester and Aldborough.
42. Somner 1640, [518]; Somner 1693, 78, 91–2, 100. On the last point Somner was wrong, as the church's central tower, to which he refers, contains reused Roman material but is of late Saxon construction. He overlooked the adjacent bell-tower, the authentically Roman *pharos*.
43. Cox 1720–31, V, 229, drawing on Camden 1695, 376, 380.
44. Toulmin Smith 1906–10, III, 103; IV, 61–2, 65–6. Leland was, however, inclined to identify the site at Richborough with the *Rutupiae* of the literary sources, although some authorities thought that this name signified either Dover or Sandwich: Toulmin Smith 1906–10, IV, 62; Leland 1774, I, 257; III, 425–6, 428; IV, 11.
45. Goscelin 1688, 376, 383. Goscelin draws heavily on Bede (Colgrave and Mynors 1969, 76–7).
46. Leland 1774, IV, 8.
47. Apparently writing in the mid-1540s, Leland claims to have visited Verulamium (by implication for the first time) 'about ten years ago': Hall 1709, II, 317. He was certainly there well before the suppression of St Albans Abbey in 1539.
48. Most of Leland's Kent notes were made before the suppression of St Radegund's Abbey, near Dover, and St Gregory's Priory, Canterbury (both 1536). His observations at Kenchester and Gloucester are among notes made after the suppression of St Oswald's Priory, Gloucester (1536), but before that of the Bristol friaries (1538). For the dating of his north-western tour to 1538–9, see Chandler 1998, xxix. His itineraries of the 1540s do not mention British bricks.
49. Morris 1980, 18, 59 (ch 7); Dimock 1868, 55, 80.
50. For Leland's access to both works, see Brett 1990; Leland 1774, III, 90, 93.
51. Leland 1774, IV, 168.
52. Leland 1545, 'Commentarii', sig O3v.
53. Hall 1709, II, 317; Leland 1545, 'Commentarii', sig O3r. Leland also quotes Tacitus in his unpublished 'Antiquitates Britanniae': BL, Cotton Julius Cvi, fol 32. The reference is to the *Annals*, bk 14 ch 33 (Tacitus 1925–37, IV, 162–3). A generation later, William Harrison, drawing in part on Leland's notes, made much of Verulamium's status as a *municipium*: Harrison 1577, 81v; expanded in Harrison 1587, 191.
54. Leland 1544, 2–2v, 30; Leland 1545, 'Commentarii', sig O3r; Leland 1774, IV, 166–7. Cf Riley 1867–9, I, 26–7, and Niblett and Thompson 2005, 364–5. Further on in Paris's text, the language becomes the 'old English, or rather British language'.
55. Lambarde 1730, 5: written *c* 1567–70. Cf Harris forthcoming. Leland's guide to the abbey library, and possibly a source of other local information, was a monk (later prior) named Thomas Kyngesburye, 'a man most studious of all antiquity': Hall 1709, II, 317; Hunt 1978, 268n.
56. For Leland's general account of the Britons, see Leland 1545, 'Commentarii', sigs Cr–[D4]v, and for his account of Geoffrey of Monmouth, Hall 1709, I, 189–91. For the wider context, see Kendrick 1950, 78–133; Carley 1996.
57. Hall 1709, I, 8–13, 18–19; Leland 1544.
58. Leland 1545, 'Commentarii', sigs D2r–D2v.
59. Ibid, sig [C4]v; Hall 1709, I, 1–7.
60. Leland 1545, 'Commentarii', sigs [C4]v–Dr.
61. Toulmin Smith 1906–10, III, 102. For the underlying tradition, see Wright 1985, 26 (§ 39); Henry of Huntingdon 1996, 22–5; Babington and Lumby 1865–86, II, 42–7.
62. Leland 1543, sig Fr.
63. Toulmin Smith 1906–10, I, 84–5; Leland 1543, sig G4v. Cf Ashbee 1988, 9.
64. Toulmin Smith 1906–10, I, 1, 3, 7, 27, 34, 80–1, 135, 318–19; II, 21, 49, 54; III, 68, 100, 105; IV, 6; V, 46–7, 53, 60, 105.
65. Ibid, IV, 61, 66, 139.
66. Ibid, I, 47, 105; II, 49; IV, 121; V, 16.
67. Ibid, I, 48–50; V, 72; Leland 1545, 'Commentarii', sigs [M4]v–Nr.
68. Piggott 1976, 20–1; Aubrey 1980–2, I, 25–6; Hunter 1995; Hunter 1975, 148–208;

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003581500000949 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Piggott 1989, 117–22; Schnapp 1996, 188–96; Haycock 2002, 126–32. These efforts were by no means always successful: the criteria by which Plot and Aubrey tried to use shape to classify and attribute 'camps' (hillforts) were entirely spurious, and Aubrey believed that castles such as Chepstow and Caerphilly were Roman.

69. Hunter 1995, 190.
70. Toulmin Smith 1906–10, I, 15, 81; V, 53.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations

Bodleian	Bodleian Library, Oxford
BL	British Library, London
SRO	Staffordshire Record Office, Stafford

Manuscript sources

Bodleian, Ashmole 1817b
Bodleian, Eng b 2043
Bodleian, Hearne's Diaries 159
Bodleian, Rawl D 390
Bodleian, Rawl D 400
BL, Add 22665
BL, Cotton Julius Cvi
BL, Harleian 6726
SRO, D649/4/1

Published sources

Ashbee, P 1988. 'The pursuit of prehistory into the Yorkshire dimension', in *Archaeology in Eastern Yorkshire: essays in honour of T C M Brewster* (ed T G Manby), 4–11, Sheffield

Atkyns, R 1712. *The Ancient and Present State of Glostershire*, London

Aubrey, J 1980–2. *Monumenta Britannica* (eds J Fowles and R Legg), 2 vols, Sherborne

Babington, C and Lumby, J R (eds) 1865–86. *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden, monachi Cestrensis*, 9 vols, Rolls Series, London

Bagford, J 1774. 'A letter to the publisher ... in which are many curious remarks relating to the City of London', in Leland 1774, I, lviii–lxxxvi

Battely, J 1711. *Antiquitates Rutupinae* (ed T Terry), Oxford

Battely, [J] 1774. *The Antiquities of Richborough and Reculver* (ed J Duncombe), London

Blome, R 1673. *Britannia*, London

Brett, C 1990. 'John Leland, Wales, and early British history', *Welsh Hist Rev*, **15**, 169–82

Browne, T 1658. *Hydriotaphia, Urne Buriall*, London

Browne, T 1835. 'Dr Thomas Browne's journey with Dr Plot', in *Sir Thomas Browne's Works* (ed S Wilkin), IV, 457–62, London

Burnby, J 1984. 'John Conyers, London's first archaeologist', *Trans London Middlesex Archaeol Soc*, **35**, 63–80

Burton, W 1658. *A Commentary on Antoninus his Itinerary, or Journies of the Romane Empire, so far as it concerneth Britain*, London

Camden, W 1586. *Britannia*, London

Camden, W 1587. *Britannia*, London

Camden, W 1607. *Britannia*, London

Camden, W 1610. *Britain* (trans P Holland), London

Camden, W 1695. *Britannia* (ed E Gibson), London

Carley, J P 1996. 'Polydore Vergil and John Leland on King Arthur: the battle of the books', in *King Arthur: a casebook* (ed E D Kennedy), 185–204, New York

Chandler, J (ed) 1998. *John Leland's Itinerary: travels in Tudor England*, 2nd edn, Stroud

Clarke, S 1657. *A Geographicall Description of all the Countries in the Known World*, London

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003581500000949 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Colgrave, B and Mynors, R A B (eds) 1969. *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, Oxford

Cox, T 1720–31. *Magna Britannia et Hibernia, Antiqua & Nova*, 6 vols, London

De la Pryme, A 1700. 'A letter ... concerning some Roman antiquities in Lincolnshire', *Phil Trans*, **22**, 561–7

Dimock, J F (ed) 1868. *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera. Vol VI: Itinerarium Kambriae et Descriptio Kambriae*, Rolls Series, London

Doble, C E *et al* (eds) 1885–1921. *Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne*, 11 vols, Oxford

Dugdale, W 1656. *The Antiquities of Warwickshire*, London

Ewbank, J M (ed) 1963. *Antiquary on Horseback: the collections of the Rev. Thos. Machell*, Cumberland Westmorland Archaeol Antiq Soc, extra ser, **19**, Kendal

Gale, R 1769. 'An essay towards the recovery of the courses of the four great Roman ways', in Hearne (ed) 1768–70, VI, 116–50

Gale, T 1709. *Antonini Iter Britanniarum Commentariis Illustratum* (ed R Gale), London

Goscelin 1688. 'Vita S Augustini', in *Acta Sanctorum* (eds J Bollandus *et al*), *Maii*, **6**, 375–95, Antwerp

Greenslade, M W 1982. *The Staffordshire Historians*, Staffordshire Rec Soc, Collections for a History of Staffordshire, 4th ser, **11**, Stoke-on-Trent

Gunther, R T 1939. *Early Science in Oxford. Vol XII: Dr Plot and the Correspondence of the Philosophical Society of Oxford*, Oxford

Gunther, R T 1945. *Early Science in Oxford. Vol XIV: Life and Letters of Edward Lhwyd*, Oxford

Hall, A (ed) 1709. *Commentarii de Scriptoribus Britannicis, auctore Joanne Lelando Londinate*, 2 vols, Oxford

Hamper, W (ed) 1827. *The Life, Diary and Correspondence of Sir William Dugdale*, London

Harris, J 1719. *A History of Kent*, London

Harris, O 2005. '"Motheaten, mouldye, and rotten": the early custodial history and dissemination of John Leland's manuscript remains', *Bodleian Library Rec*, **18**, 460–501

Harris, O forthcoming. 'Jews, jurats and the Jewry Wall: a name in context', *Trans Leicestershire Archaeol Hist Soc*

Harrison, W 1577. 'An historicall description of the islande of Britayne', in *The Chronicles of England, Scotlande, and Irelande* (R Holinshed), 2 vols, London

Harrison, W 1587. 'An historicall description of the iland of Britaine', in *The First and Second Volumes of Chronicles* (R Holinshed), 2nd edn, 3 vols, London

Hasted, E 1797–1801. *The History and Topographical Survey of the County of Kent*, 12 vols, Canterbury

Haycock, D B 2002. *William Stukeley: science, religion and archaeology in eighteenth-century England*, Woodbridge

Hearne, T (ed) 1768–70. *The Itinerary of John Leland the Antiquary*, 3rd edn, 9 vols, Oxford

Henry of Huntingdon 1996. *Historia Anglorum: the history of the English people* (ed D Greenway), Oxford

Hentzner, P 1612. *Itinerarium Germaniae; Galliae; Angliae; Italiae*, Nuremburg

Holme, R 1688. *The Academy of Armory*, Chester

Horsley, J 1732. *Britannia Romana*, London

Howell, J 1657. *Londinopolis: an Historicall Discourse or Perlustration of the City of London*, London

Hunt, R W 1978. 'The library of the abbey of St Albans', in *Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts and Libraries: essays presented to N. R. Ker* (eds M B Parkes and A G Watson), 251–77, London

Hunter, J (ed) 1830. *The Diary of Ralph Thoresby, FRS*, 2 vols, London

[Hunter, J] (ed) 1832. *Letters of Eminent Men, Addressed to Ralph Thoresby, FRS*, 2 vols, London

Hunter, M 1975. *John Aubrey and the Realm of Learning*, London

Hunter, M 1995. 'The Royal Society and the origins of British archaeology', in *Science and the Shape of Orthodoxy: intellectual change in late seventeenth-century Britain*, 181–200, Woodbridge

Kendrick, T D 1950. *British Antiquity*, London

Lambarde, W 1596. *A Perambulation of Kent*, London

Lambarde, W 1656. *A Perambulation of Kent*, London

Lambarde, W 1730. *Dictionarium Angliae Topographicum & Historicum: an alphabetical description of the chief places in England and Wales*, London

Leland, J 1543. *Genethliacon Illustrissimi Eaduerdi Principis Cambriae*, London

Leland, J 1544. *Assertio Inclytissimi Arturii*, London

Leland, J 1545. *Κυκνειον ασμα: Cygnea Cantio*, London

Leland, J 1774. *De Rebus Britannicis Collectanea* (ed T Hearne), 3rd edn, 6 vols, London

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003581500000949 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Levine, J M 1987. *Humanism in History: origins of modern English historiography*, Ithaca, NY

Lister, M 1683. 'Some observations upon the ruins of a Roman wall and multangular-tower at York', *Phil Trans*, **13**, 238–42

Lukis, W C (ed) 1882–7. *The Family Memoirs of the Rev William Stukeley, MD*, 3 vols, Surtees Soc, **73**, **76**, **80**, Durham

Lyster, J 1706. 'A description of a Roman sudatory, or hypocaustum, found at Wroxeter in Shropshire, anno 1701', *Phil Trans*, **25**, 2226–7

MacGregor, A 1994. 'Prehistoric and Romano-British antiquities', in *Sir Hans Sloane: collector, scientist, antiquary: founding father of the British Museum* (ed A MacGregor), 180–97, London

Massing, J M 1990. 'Veleda, Susanna, Boadicea or Dorothy: antiquarian discussions on some sixteenth-century ornamental bricks', in *England and the Continental Renaissance: essays in honour of J B Trapp* (eds E Chaney and P Mack), 282–94, Woodbridge

Morris, J (ed and trans) 1980. *Nennius, British History and the Welsh Annals*, London and Chichester

Niblett, R and Thompson, I 2005. *Alban's Buried Towns: an assessment of St Albans' archaeology up to AD 1600*, Oxford

Nichols, J 1795–1811. *The History and Antiquities of the County of Leicester*, 4 vols in 8, London

Philipot, T 1659. *Villare Cantianum: or Kent Surveyed and Illustrated*, London

Piggott, S 1976. *Ruins in a Landscape: essays in antiquarianism*, Edinburgh

Piggott, S 1989. *Ancient Britons and the Antiquarian Imagination*, London

Pliny 1938–63. *Natural History* (trans H Rackham, W H S Jones and D E Eichholz), 10 vols, London

Plot, R 1686. *The Natural History of Staffordshire*, Oxford

Plot, R 1714. 'A copy of a letter from Robert Plott, LLD ... design'd to be sent to the Royal Society in London', in *Miscellanies on Several Curious Subjects* (ed R Rawlinson), 43–6, London

Raymond, J 1648. *An Itinerary Contayning a Voyage made through Italy, in the yeare 1646, and 1647*, London

Riley, H T (ed) 1867–9. *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani a Thoma Walsingham*, 3 vols, Rolls Series, London

RCHME 1928. *An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in London. Vol 3: Roman London*, Roy Comm Hist Monuments Engl Inventories, London

Schnapp, A 1996. *The Discovery of the Past*, London

Somner, W 1640. *The Antiquities of Canterbury*, London

Somner, W 1693. *A Treatise of the Roman Ports and Forts in Kent*, Oxford

Speed, J 1611–12. *The Theatre of the Empire of Great Britaine*, London

Stell, J 1794. *The Hasting's Guide*, London

Stow, J 1598. *A Survay of London*, London

Stow, J 1633. *A Survey of London* (eds A Munday and H Dyson), London

Stow, J 1720. *A Survey of the Cities of London and Westminster* (ed J Strype), 2 vols, London

Stow, J 1908. *A Survey of London* (ed C L Kingsford), 2 vols, Oxford

Stukeley, W 1776. *Itinerarium Curiosum*, 2nd edn, 2 vols, London

Tacitus 1925–37. *The Histories and the Annals* (trans C H Moore and J Jackson), 4 vols, London

Thoresby, R 1696. 'A letter from Mr Ralph Thoresby, to Dr Martin Lister ... giving an account of a Roman pottery, near Leeds in Yorkshire', *Phil Trans*, **19**, 319–20

Thoresby, R 1697. 'Part of two letters of Mr Thoresby ... about some Roman antiquities found in Yorkshire', *Phil Trans*, **19**, 738–40

Thoresby, R 1715. *Ducatus Leodiensis*, London

Toulmin Smith, L (ed) 1906–10. *The Itinerary of John Leland*, 5 vols, London

Vitruvius 1567. *I Dieci Libri dell'Architettura* (trans and ed D Barbaro), Venice

Vitruvius 1999. *Ten Books on Architecture* (trans I D Rowland), Cambridge

Weever, J 1631. *Ancient Funerall Monuments*, London

Woodward, J 1713. *An Account of some Roman Urns, and other Antiquities, lately Digg'd up near Bishops-Gate*, London

Wren, S 1750. *Parentalia*, London

Wright, N (ed) 1985. *The Historia Regum Britannie of Geoffrey of Monmouth. I: Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS 568*, Cambridge

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003581500000949 Published online by Cambridge University Press