




Historic England

## Saxon Shore Forts



On 1st April 2015 the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England changed its common name from English Heritage to Historic England. We are now re-branding all our documents.

Although this document refers to English Heritage, it is still the Commission's current advice and guidance and will in due course be re-branded as Historic England.

[Please see our website](#) for up to date contact information, and further advice.

We welcome feedback to help improve this document, which will be periodically revised. Please email comments to [guidance@HistoricEngland.org.uk](mailto:guidance@HistoricEngland.org.uk)


We are the government's expert advisory service for England's historic environment. We give constructive advice to local authorities, owners and the public. We champion historic places helping people to understand, value and care for them, now and for the future.

[HistoricEngland.org.uk/advice](http://HistoricEngland.org.uk/advice)

Introductions to  
Heritage Assets

# Saxon Shore Forts

---



May 2011



ENGLISH HERITAGE




Fig. 1. Location map of the forts of the Saxon Shore.



Fig. 2. Aerial photograph of the early fort at Reculver; showing attrition by coastal erosion.

## INTRODUCTION

The Roman forts of the Saxon Shore are a specific group of later Roman coastal defensive forts constructed to several different plans and portraying the development of Roman military architecture during the third and early fourth centuries. They seem to represent a response to the appearance of seaborne Saxon raiders from the mid 3rd century. The forts were built along the coast (Figure 1), mostly on potential points of penetration into the Roman province, such as inlets or estuaries, from the Wash and down round the east and south coast of England. The sites are: Brancaster, Caister-on-Sea, and Burgh Castle (all Norfolk), Walton Castle (Suffolk), Bradwell-on-Sea (Essex), Reculver (Figure 2), Richborough, Dover and Lympne (Kent), Pevensey (East Sussex) and Portchester (Hampshire).

The name given to this group of forts derives from the fact that nine of them are recorded by their Roman names in the late 4th-century document the *Notitia Dignitatum* (the 'Register of Dignitaries') as being under the command of an official known as the Count of the Saxon Shore (*comes litoris Saxonici*). As the most prominent and substantial of all of the surviving Roman monuments in Britain, the forts of the Saxon Shore have been the object of antiquarian and archaeological interest since the 17th century.

Several of the forts on the east coast have been subject to coastal erosion, with large parts of those at Richborough, Reculver, Burgh Castle, and Bradwell-on-Sea being lost. Walton Castle has entirely gone, and is known only from antiquarian records.

## DESCRIPTION

All of the forts are located on strategic estuaries. For instance, Richborough and Reculver guard the two ends of the Wantsum channel and Portchester castle is located at the head of Portchester harbour; while Caister and Burgh (Figure 3) castles flank the Great Estuary in the Great Yarmouth area. The meaning of the term Saxon Shore is debated, as is the function of the forts. Different arguments suggest that they were links in a logistic chain, or designed to prevent penetration into the province by seaborne raiders and pirates.

Two groups of forts can be differentiated morphologically. One group resembles most of the forts in Roman Britain, sharing their size and internal layout. The second group, however, features novel aspects of Roman fort architecture, common in examples across most of the Roman Empire, but represented uniquely in Britain on the Saxon Shore.

### 'Early' group

The early group of forts comprises the two forts on the Norfolk coast, at Brancaster and Caister, and Reculver in Kent. These three forts are virtually square with rounded corners (the so-called 'playing card shape' common in Roman military architecture). The external walls were narrow (2.4m), and backed by a substantial earthen rampart. The gates were flanked by internal square towers, and there were also internal angle- and interval-towers. It is assumed that they contained the range of buildings common to Roman auxiliary forts. At Brancaster, aerial photography shows a conventional headquarters building (*principia*) and other buildings rather irregularly disposed. A barrack is known at Caistor; while at Reculver, excavation has revealed the *principia* and barracks of a fort of conventional layout, together with an internal bath-house.



Fig. 3. Aerial photograph of the bastioned fort at Burgh Castle, showing attrition (lower right) through coastal erosion.



Fig. 4. Aerial photograph of the fort of Pevensey, showing the medieval castle (top) within the oval Roman walled circuit.

The three forts have been assumed to be early because of their conventional architecture, and excavation has confirmed this judgement. The forts were built at an early stage of coastal defence during the early 3rd century.

### Main group

The other forts named in the introduction fall into this category. The principal differences with the early group are the thickness of the walls (up to 3.5m), the variability of plan and, most importantly, the presence of semi-circular bastions on the outer faces of the fort walls.

The massive outer walls were often founded on chalk and flint rafts with the underlying ground stabilised with timber piles. Above a plinth course the walls were faced with flint or stone, including re-used materials. The wall-core comprised concrete and stone, predominantly flint, which occurs abundantly in the chalk areas in which these forts are situated. At regular intervals up the wall were bonding and levelling courses of either flat stones or ceramic tiles. The walls were built in sections, possibly by separate work-parties, and this is shown by horizontal cracks in wall faces. Although most sites were square or rectilinear, there was the potential to fit the defences to a specific site. This is particularly seen in the oval plan of Pevensey.

The external bastions are the signature feature of these forts. Most of these were solid masonry 'drums' as at Burgh Castle, Bradwell-on-Sea, Pevensey (Figure 4) and Lympne, though hollow bastions appear at Portchester (Figure 5 and 6). Bastions in late Roman military architecture were provided to give the fort (or town wall) a defensive capability. They allowed attackers to be subjected to enfilading fire along the faces of the walls from the bastions. In some Saxon Shore forts (like Burgh Castle) the bastions are too far apart to enable such fire, suggesting that the builders did not fully understand the function of the bastions.

The layouts of the internal areas of the forts are little known. A grid of roads, wells and pits was found at Portchester, but little convincing evidence for internal structures. Traces of buildings have been found at Burgh Castle. Because of incomplete survival, long histories of later disturbance and adverse ground conditions, geophysics and other remote sensing techniques have not been able to elucidate these issues.

## CHRONOLOGY

The early group, as already noted, were constructed in the early-mid 3rd century. The later group were constructed in the final quarter of the 2nd century. Dates of desertion vary. There is evidence that occupation in most of the forts continued into the 5th century, though Lympne (Figure 7), Reculver, Caistor and Burgh Castle seem to have been deserted at sometime in the years 360-380. Excavations at Portchester revealed occupation in a more 'disorderly' manner in the early 5th century. Saxon occupation has been discerned at least at Portchester and Richborough, while Pevensey, Portchester and Burgh Castle later housed medieval castles. Portchester also contained an Augustinian priory, which was related to the castle. The massive nature of the forts made them suitable for later re-use in some cases: Portchester was used in the early 19th century as a Napoleonic Prisoner of War camp, while at Pevensey pill boxes were built in flint within the ruins as camouflaged defences during World War II (Figure 8).

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE ASSET TYPE AS REVEALED BY INVESTIGATION

The exploration of these sites has largely been through excavation. As noted above, some of the early group, notably Brancaster and Caister, reveal internal arrangements through geophysical survey. Excavations of the interior of the forts have largely been small in scale, and only the work at Portchester has revealed good information on the layout of the interior.

## ASSOCIATIONS

Some of the Shore Forts had civilian settlements or *vici*, though little is known of these parts of the sites. In military architecture, the early group of forts are associated with the auxiliary forts that are widespread in the Roman military north. The character of the bastioned defences relate to the bastioned late Roman town defences such as Chichester and London.




Fig. 5. Plan of the Saxon Shore fort of Portchester.



Fig. 6. Stone and tile bastions on the south wall of Portchester Castle.

The forts of Dover and Richborough certainly dominated Roman harbours, and given the location of most of these forts in sheltered places, it is probable that most of the forts were associated with harbours. The Dover fort was associated with a lighthouse of Roman date, while the amphitheatre at Richborough might conceivably have been contemporary with the fort (Figures 9 and 10).

The re-use of several fort enclosures as the outer baileys of medieval castles has been noted above.

## FURTHER READING

Two major overviews have been published in the last thirty years. These are S Johnson, *The Roman Forts of the Saxon Shore* (1976), and A Pearson, *The Roman Shore Forts* (2002). Two volumes of edited papers have appeared during the same period, D Johnston (ed), *The Saxon Shore* (1977), and V A Maxfield (ed), *The Saxon Shore: A Handbook* (1989).

There are also a number of excavation reports relating to the forts, the most important of which are: B W Cunliffe, *Fifth Report on the Excavations of the Roman Fort at Richborough, Kent* (1968); B W Cunliffe, *Excavations at Portchester Castle I: Roman* (1975); M J Darling and D Gurney, *Caister-on-Sea: Excavations by Charles Green 1951-55* (1993); S Johnson, *Burgh Castle: Excavations by Charles Green 1958-61* (1983); B J Philp, *The Excavation of the Roman Fort at Reculver* (2005).

## CREDITS

Author: Tony Wilmott  
 Cover: As Figure 10  
 Figures 1-6, 9: © English Heritage  
 Figures 7-8, 10: © Tony Wilmott

If you would like this document in a different format, please contact our Customer Services department:

**Telephone:** 0870 333 1181

**Fax:** 01793 414926

**Textphone:** 01793 414878

**E-mail:** [customers@english-heritage.org.uk](mailto:customers@english-heritage.org.uk)



Fig 7. Tumbled bastion of the fort at Lympe.



Fig 8. Bastion of the Saxon Shore fort of Pevensey. The upper part of the tower is a concealed Second World War pillbox. Note the slit for a machine gun.




Fig 9. Plan of the complex Roman site of Richborough, showing the walls of the rectilinear Saxon Shore fort.



Fig 10. Wall and bastions on the north side of the Saxon Shore fort at Richborough.