

## I.—JOHN HORSLEY, SCHOLAR AND GENTLEMAN.

BEING A LECTURE DELIVERED IN NEWCASTLE ON 27TH APRIL,  
1932,<sup>1</sup> AT THE INVITATION OF THE SOCIETY OF ANTI-  
QUARIES OF NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE.

BY SIR GEORGE MACDONALD, K.C.B., D.LITT., LL.D., F.B.A.

On January 11th, 1731/2, John Horsley, Presbyterian minister and schoolmaster, died at Morpeth, and three days later he was laid to rest in the churchyard there. He was only forty-six. But he had endeavoured to combine the conscientious discharge of his everyday duties with an exhaustive and thoroughgoing study of the antiquities of Roman Britain, and the effort had worn him out prematurely. No tombstone marks his grave. The sole contemporary record is a bald entry in the parish register: "Jan. 15th—This day buried Mr. John Horsley." Little more than a week before his death he had penned the dedication of the great book which was destined to keep his memory green. It was published at the end of the following March or the beginning of the following April.<sup>2</sup>

Regarded from any point of view, the *Britannia Romana* is an astonishing achievement. In 1907, nearly

<sup>1</sup> The lecture had necessarily to be considerably abbreviated in delivery, but is here printed in full with references. I should like to take this opportunity of saying that it owes much to the generosity with which Mr. R. C. Bosanquet allowed me to draw upon his wide knowledge of Northumbrian topography and Northumbrian family history. Help received from various other friends upon specific points is acknowledged in the footnotes or in the text, and several whose names do not appear there, gave me valuable assistance of a more general character, notably Mr. John Allan of the British Museum, Mr. Parker Brewis, Mr. F. C. Nicholson of Edinburgh University Library, and Miss M. V. Taylor of Oxford.

<sup>2</sup> *Arch. Ael.* (N.S.), vi, p. 179.

two centuries after it had appeared, Haverfield could still say of it that it "was till quite lately the best and most scholarly account of any Roman province that had been written anywhere in Europe."<sup>3</sup> That is praise indeed, and the eulogy is well deserved. Horsley was a first-rate observer and a first-rate epigraphist, and he had at the same time the broad outlook of a first-rate historian. Since his day much new material has accumulated and the methods of handling it have been vastly improved. In the circumstances it is far from surprising that some of his conclusions should no longer be tenable. Nevertheless his book remains an indispensable instrument of research. It is true that the collection of inscriptions, which he regarded as the core of the whole, has been superseded by the *Berlin Corpus*. But it must not be forgotten that, so far as this country is concerned, the *Britannia Romana* provided the solid foundation on which that imposing superstructure was reared. And, apart from inscriptions, there are whole sections which are of abiding value, whether because of the accuracy of the details which they embody, or because of the soundness of the general principles which are enunciated with an altogether admirable clarity. Speaking from my own experience in Scotland, I can say that, if a student of Roman Britain chooses to ignore Horsley, he will do so at his peril.

Work of a quality so lasting could only have been produced by a very remarkable man. Yet our knowledge of Horsley as an individual is meagre in the extreme. To quote the words of John Hodgson, the historian of Northumberland, "no friend or contemporary, after his death, was found to climb high in the temple of fame, and inscribe his name there among those of the enlightened and distinguished of his time."<sup>4</sup> The first detailed sketch of his life had been contributed to the *Newcastle Magazine* for March, 1821, by the Rev. William Turner. Hodgson, after he had "enquired far and near," decided that the best he could do was to adopt Turner's sketch as the text

<sup>3</sup> *Roman Occupation of Britain*, p. 75.

<sup>4</sup> *Hist. of Northumberland*, pt. 2, vol. ii, p. 443.

of his own account, adding to it such further information as he had been able to gather.<sup>5</sup> His memoir has since been supplemented and at some points corrected by others who have pursued the quest.<sup>6</sup> Perhaps it will not be deemed inappropriate that in the bicentenary year of Horsley's death an attempt should be made to collate the results of these earlier enquiries. It is possible that in the process we may be able to pick up some stray gleanings that have inadvertently been left by the wayside. It is possible, too, that a closer scrutiny of his own writings, and incidentally of the writings of those of his contemporaries with whom he was brought into more immediate contact, may throw a little fresh light on his personality and character.

The date of his birth can be calculated roughly by deducting forty-six from the year of his death. It must have been 1685 or, less probably, 1684. Regarding his parentage genealogists are by no means agreed. In his *Materials for the History of Northumberland*<sup>7</sup> he speaks of "a relation of my own" who was familiar with the district of Glendale, if he did not actually reside there, and also mentions a "Cousin Nestbitt" whose father was said to have been 114 when he died and to have married his second wife when he was eighty, "after which he had several children"—a family tradition which Horsley treats with the scepticism proper to the scientific archæologist. Again, the memorial volume which he published on the death of his friend and co-presbyter, Dr. Jonathan Harle of Alnwick, is dedicated to the widow by her "most

<sup>5</sup> In 1831 this account was published separately in *Memoirs of the Lives of Thomas Gibson, M.D., Jonathan Harle, M.D., John Horsley, M.A., F.R.S., William Turner, M.D.* As the separate publication contains important *addenda*, I propose to refer to it throughout rather than to the *History*. It will be cited as *Mem.*

<sup>6</sup> Notably J. Hodgson Hinde in *Arch. Ael.* (N.S.), vi, pp. 174 ff.; W. H. D. Longstaffe, *ibid.*, pp. 180 ff.; and J. C. Hodgson, *op. cit.* (3rd ser.), xv, pp. 57 ff.

<sup>7</sup> This, along with other documents, was published by Mr. Hodgson Hinde in *Inedited Contributions to the History of Northumberland*, part i (Stevenson and Dryden, Newcastle. n.d.), which will be cited as *Ined. Contr.* The references here are to p. 50 and p. 22.

affectionate Kinsman and faithful Servant.”<sup>8</sup> As Mrs. Harle had been a Miss Ledgard before her marriage, this establishes some sort of connexion with a well-known Newcastle family. More definite than any of the foregoing is a casual remark in the *Britannia Romana* to the effect that it was his great-uncle who “gave name and being” to the mansion, near Wallsend, which used to be called Cosyn’s House.<sup>9</sup> Armed with these clues, three highly competent Northumbrian antiquaries—the late J. Hodgson Hinde, the late W. H. D. Longstaffe, and the late J. Crawford Hodgson—strove hard to identify Horsley’s father. They were all well equipped for an investigation of the kind, but in the end three quite different solutions emerged, none of them propounded with full confidence in its finality. There, I fear, the question must be left.

Darkness no less abysmal enshrouds the place of his birth. The earliest reference to it that I have been able to find belongs to 1808, when James Savage, in publishing an appreciative analysis of the *Britannia Romana* in a periodical called *The Librarian*, affirmed explicitly in his biographical note that the author “was a native of Northumberland.” Chalmers’s *Biographical Dictionary* (1814) hesitated a little, not venturing further than to say that Horsley “is supposed to have been a native of Northumberland.” Then came Turner’s sketch, in which we are told that “the family of Mr. Horsley were undoubtedly of Northumberland,” but that he himself “is stated to have been born at Pinkie-house, in Scotland, in 1685.” Pinkie House is in the parish of Inveresk, a few miles east of Edinburgh, and Turner’s explanation is that the Horsleys, being nonconformists, had in all likelihood been “obliged to change their residence during the severities of Charles or James the Second,” but had “returned soon after the revolution and act of toleration.”

<sup>8</sup>Besides the dedication (6 pages), the volume contains a memoir (41 pages), two sermons and some other writings by Harle himself, and the funeral sermon which was preached by Horsley.

<sup>9</sup>*Brit. Rom.*, p. 207.

Hodgson repeats the Pinkie House story without expressly questioning its authenticity, although he does observe that there was no confirmatory evidence to be found in the baptismal registers of Inveresk.<sup>10</sup> Through the publication of his *Memoirs*, in 1831, it gained wide currency. Thus, in 1835 Robert Chambers formally welcomed Horsley as a compatriot by including his name in the *Biographical Dictionary of Eminent Scotsmen*. In 1863 the compiler of Anderson's *Scottish Nation* followed suit. But Northumberland was not prepared to surrender her claim so lightly as all that. Of the three antiquaries to whose researches I have already alluded, Hodgson Hinde and Longstaffe voted for Newcastle, despite the fact that the parish records there proved to be just as silent as they had been at Inveresk. Encouraged by an entry that had been discovered elsewhere, Crawford Hodgson was disposed to go further afield. He thought it "quite possible" that the author of the *Britannia Romana* might have been "the John Horsley who was baptized at St. Hilds, South Shields, on the 20th of April, 1684, as son of Thomas Horsley." He adds that "the dates fit very well." But surely the fit is rather loose. If the identification is correct, Horsley at the time of his death was not forty-six, but well on the way to being forty-eight.

Here again, unless and until other testimony is forthcoming, it will be prudent to refrain from any temptation to be dogmatic. For my own part, while I am not prepared to plead the cause of Inveresk with the fervour of conviction, I feel that it can hardly be put unceremoniously aside. Turner must have had some authority for the statement which he reported. The story is so intrinsically improbable that it can hardly be a pure invention. The chances are that, if it is not true, it rests on a misunderstanding. If we knew what the authority for it was, we should be in a better position to judge as to

<sup>10</sup> *Mem.*, p. 26. Mr. William Angus, curator of the Historical Department of the Register House, has been good enough to make a fresh search for me. Like that made a century ago, it was fruitless.

its value. As matters stand, we cannot even guess. It is, however, worth while pointing out that there is nothing incredible in the suggestion that Horsley's parents had to quit Northumberland temporarily, for religious reasons, not very long before he was born. The notorious Judge Jeffreys was at Newcastle on the Northern Circuit in July, 1684, and there is contemporary evidence that his visit synchronized with a great 'drive' of dissenters throughout the county, when there were "many fugitives."<sup>11</sup> On the other hand, Pinkie House would be an odd place for a nonconformist family to choose as a city of refuge. The then owner was the Earl of Dunfermline, who was outlawed and forfeited in 1690 for having taken the field with 'Bonnie Dundee' in the year immediately preceding.

When we come to Horsley's education, we get our feet upon solid ground. We know from Bourne's *History* of the town that he attended the Grammar School of Newcastle.<sup>12</sup> Thereafter he proceeded to the University of Edinburgh, a very natural choice. As a Presbyterian he would have knocked in vain at the gate of Oxford or of Cambridge, unless he had been willing to subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles; and of the four Scottish universities that of Edinburgh was easily the most convenient for Northumbrians, who seem to have resorted to it freely. Jabez Cay, the uncle of Horsley's most intimate friend, was one of the two "English Boyes" who were banished by the Scottish Privy Council on suspicion of being among the ringleaders in a notorious 'rag,' as it would nowadays be called. On Christmas Day, 1680, 'in fulfilment of a publicly advertised intention, but in deliberate defiance of orders issued by the Government, by the city magistrates, and by the university authorities, the students burned an effigy of the Pope at the Mercat Cross amid shouts of '*Pereat Papa.*' The affair created an immense sensation, especially as the Duke of York, afterwards

<sup>11</sup> *Publications of the Surtees Society*, vol. 50, p. 198.

<sup>12</sup> Bourne was his contemporary. The passage, which was written a few months after Horsley's death, is quoted in *Arch. Ael.* (N.S.), vi, p. 176.

James II, was in residence at Holyrood.<sup>13</sup> Cay, who was only fourteen when he was expelled, subsequently went to Padua, where he graduated in medicine in 1685. On his return he took up practice in Newcastle and was apparently very successful, for he purchased the property of North Charlton.<sup>14</sup> Although he died in 1703, it is more than likely that he knew Horsley as a lad. In any case we may be sure that, when the latter went to Edinburgh, he was thoroughly familiar with the tale of 'the burning of the Pope.'

On his arrival he would find the arts curriculum still hidebound with mediævalism. The instruction was in the hands of four 'Regents of Philosophy.' Every year one of the four enrolled a class of 'bajans' or fledglings (*bécs jaunes*), whom he taught for four successive sessions, presenting them at the end of the course to his three colleagues, who examined them in the works of Aristotle, the dialectics of Ramus, and astronomy. Those who survived the ordeal were 'laureated' as masters of arts. The records of the university show that Horsley's regent was William Law. They also show that, when he first came up, his proficiency in Latin and Greek was such as to secure for him exemption, not only from the preliminary discipline of the 'Regent of Humanity,' but also from the work of the 'bajan' year, a period normally devoted to drill in pure scholarship. He joined Law's class as a 'semi' or second-year man,<sup>15</sup> and was plunged at once into Aristotle. This speaks well for the standard maintained at the Grammar School of

<sup>13</sup> The University Library contains an interesting collection of contemporary documents relating to the riot, including a copy of the students' advertisement. The fullest recent account of the incident is that given by Sir Alex. Grant in his *History of the University of Edinburgh* (ii, pp. 473 ff.). The story is very vividly told in Sir John Lauder of Fountainhall's *Historical Observes* (Bannatyne Club, 1840), pp. 18 f.

<sup>14</sup> *Northumberland County History*, ii, p. 298, where, however, the scene and date of the burning are wrongly given as "before Holyrood" and November 5th, 1682. Jabez Cay signed the Edinburgh Matriculation album as a 'semi' (see *infra*) on 23rd April, 1680.

<sup>15</sup> The number of such '*supervenientes*' is surprisingly large. I am indebted to Prof. R. K. Hannay, Historiographer Royal for Scotland, for help in verifying the significance of this term.

Newcastle. Combined with the fact that he afterwards kept a school himself, it also throws some light on the ready mastery of ancient literature which is so manifest in his published writings. In the *Britannia Romana* he draws freely on the poets as well as on the historians and geographers, and he could quote Horace with playful aptness in casual correspondence.<sup>16</sup>

The date of his matriculation was March 2nd, 1699. Matriculation, however, then took place towards the end of the academic year, and not, as now, at the beginning, so that we may suppose him to have entered the university in the autumn of 1698—the very year, as it happened, of the ill-starred expedition to Darien. He cannot have been more than thirteen, a usual enough age at that time. One other fact of some significance I have discovered in the records. In his day the University Library was a reference library only, and was but little used by the students. Before obtaining access to it, they had to be personally vouched for by their regent and had to take an oath that they would not mishandle the books. In the register Horsley's signature and that of his regent, Law, are appended to the statement that he was formally admitted on May 7th, 1700. He had then just finished his third or 'bachelor' year, and was about to become a 'magistrand.' On April 29th, 1701, almost exactly twelve months later, he took his master's degree. Dr. David Laing, in a fragmentary and unpublished note preserved among his papers, suggests that, as he was intended for the church, he may have remained in Edinburgh for some time to study divinity. The suggestion is attractive,<sup>17</sup> but no register of divinity students is extant to confirm it.

It is, however, certain that the horizon of his intel-

<sup>16</sup> *Stukeley Corr.*, iii, p. 319. The abbreviation, *Stukeley Corr.*, indicates the three volumes of the *Publications of the Surtees Society* (73, 76 and 80) which contain the Stukeley papers. It will be used throughout.

<sup>17</sup> It was made independently by George Tate in the account of Horsley's life which he contributed to the *Alnwick Mercury* in 1861, and which was also issued separately.



lectual interests at Edinburgh extended beyond the Sahara of mediæval Aristotelianism. Sir John Clerk of Penicuik, writing to Roger Gale in 1729, says: "He was, it seems, well known to some of our university professors some years ago, and acquired a great reputation for the mathematics, and his knowledge in all parts of philosophy."<sup>18</sup> Mathematics, as we have seen, formed no part of the ordinary curriculum at Edinburgh. But the teaching staff of the arts faculty included, in addition to the regents, a professor of mathematics, attendance on whose lectures was voluntary. Unless Horsley had followed them, he could hardly have acquired "a great reputation." It is noteworthy, too, that the Edinburgh professors with whom we find him corresponding when the *Britannia Romana* was in progress, were Sir Robert Stewart, an older contemporary of his own, who was promoted to the chair of Natural Philosophy in 1708, when the system of regents was abolished, and the famous Colin McLaurin, a much younger man, who became professor of mathematics in 1725.<sup>19</sup> Nor did he ever lose his zest for scientific subjects. The paper entitled 'An Account of the Depth of Rain fallen from April 1st, 1722, to April 1st, 1723. Observed at Widdrington in Northumberland, . . . by the Reverend Mr. Horsley,' which was communicated to the Royal Society and published in the *Philosophical Transactions*,<sup>20</sup> is in essence a brief description of a rain-gauge he had invented. Again, in June, 1731, he sent Roger Gale a short account of one or two experiments which seemed to him to throw light on the nature of friction.<sup>21</sup> Finally, until within a week of his death he was giving courses of lectures, sometimes in Morpeth and sometimes in Newcastle, not only on Astronomy but on "the most necessary and fundamental Principles of Statics,

<sup>18</sup> *Stukeley Corr.*, iii, p. 390.

<sup>19</sup> *Brit. Rom.*, pp. vi and 361.

<sup>20</sup> Vol. xxxii, pp. 328 f. Another proof of his interest in nature is his description of the Aurora Borealis "a new phenomenon here," in *Ined. Contr.*, pp. 21 f., while among the unpublished fragments in the Blackgate is a careful and detailed account of the effect of lightning on a house near Barnard Castle, which was struck on September 19th, 1729.

<sup>21</sup> *Stukeley Corr.*, i, pp. 269 ff.

Mechanics, Hydrostatics and Pneumatics." The words just quoted are from the title of a handbook which he printed and which was pirated by a Glasgow lecturer in 1743. His collection of scientific apparatus ultimately found its way into Dr. Williams's library in London.<sup>21a</sup>

If we bear all this in mind,<sup>22</sup> it is easy to understand why the obituary notice which appeared in the *Newcastle Courant* of January 15th, 1732, should have run: "He was a great and eminent mathematician, and much esteemed by all that had the happiness of his acquaintance." On the other hand, it is a mistake to suppose, as has sometimes been done, that it was to his scientific attainments that he owed his admission to the Royal Society, of which he was elected a Fellow on May 8th, 1729. There is little or no doubt that the honour was conferred on him in recognition of his acknowledged distinction in archæology. The Royal Society had not yet surrendered that part of the field to the still youthful reincarnation of the Society of Antiquaries of London, and his correspondence with Roger Gale, who was for many years its treasurer and a man of much influence in its counsels, was almost entirely concerned with archæological matters. Latterly, at all events, he must have regarded science as mainly a bread-and-butter subject. Although the fees charged for his lectures were anything but exorbitant, his income from this source would serve as a welcome contribution towards the very large outlay entailed by his frequent journeys of exploration as well as by the printing of the *Britannia Romana* and the engraving of the plates, to say nothing of the payment of the assistant whom he employed.

Whether he received his theological training at Edinburgh or not, we know that by 1709 he was settled as a "dissenting minister" at Morpeth. Dr. Edmund Calamy speaks of having had some "free conversation" with him

<sup>21a</sup> The "remnants" mentioned in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* (xxvii, 383) are now (1932) reduced to a small box into which some of the apparatus fitted.

<sup>22</sup> For particulars see *Mem.*, pp. 29 f., *Arch. Ael.* (N.S.), vi, pp. 175 ff., and *op. cit.* (3rd ser.), xv, pp. 68 f.

there in that year.<sup>23</sup> John Hodgson's theory that he was not fully ordained until 1721, having been previously merely a licentiate, became unnecessary as soon as Crawford Hodgson pointed out that the 'John Horsley of Widdrington, gent.,' appointed trustee of the chapel at Morpeth in 1721, was quite a different person—to wit, a land-agent who died four years before the author of the *Britannia Romana*.<sup>24</sup> Failure to distinguish between the land-agent and the archæologist has further been responsible, not only for the idea that the latter was engaged in business, but also for the current belief that he lived for a number of years at Widdrington. Morpeth is eight miles away, and it is almost incredible that the minister and schoolmaster should have been content to reside so far from the scene of his daily labours. It may be urged that the idea that he did so receives substantial support from the fact that it was of the rainfall at Widdrington that he kept a record in 1722-23. After all, however, if he thought Widdrington the best spot at which to set up his gauge, it would be a simple affair to ride over periodically and make the necessary observations. At a pinch the figures could be taken for him by a friend, for the great merit he claimed for his invention was the ease with which anyone could read it.

Crawford Hodgson was also the first to direct public attention to another and not less serious case of confusion.<sup>25</sup> Wood in his *Antient and Modern State of the Parish of Cramond*, published in 1794, states that Anne, third daughter of the Rev. William Hamilton, minister of the parish from 1694 until 1709, when he became Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh, "married John Horsley, F.R.S., author of that valuable work *Britannia Romana*, by whom she was mother of Samuel Horsley, the present learned Bishop of St. David's."<sup>26</sup>

<sup>23</sup> See *Arch. Ael.* (3rd ser.), xv, p. 62.

<sup>24</sup> *Mem.*, p. 27, footnote, and *Arch. Ael.* (3rd ser.), xv, pp. 76 f.

<sup>25</sup> *Arch. Ael.*, l.c., p. 75.

<sup>26</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 81. Anne had two sisters, both of whom found husbands in Edinburgh: see Scott, *Fasti Ecclesiæ Scoticanæ* (Rev. ed.), i, p. 146.

In point of fact, Hamilton's son-in-law was another Edinburgh graduate of the same name, the Rev. John Horsley, at one time clerk of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, London, and afterwards rector of Newington Butts in Surrey. But Wood's mistake was repeated by Turner and after him by John Hodgson and others, confirmation being found in a letter of November 15th, 1727, where Horsley speaks of being visited by "professor Hamilton and the principal of St. Andrew's."<sup>27</sup> There is no justification for seeing in this a proof of the supposed relationship. The real significance of the incident lies elsewhere. The identity of the second visitor is doubtful, as there were at this time three colleges in St. Andrew's, two of them ruled by principals, both clergymen, and one by a provost.<sup>28</sup> On the whole, the probabilities are in favour of the Rev. James Hadow, principal of St. Mary's, a noted man in his day. In any event, that Horsley should have been on such friendly terms with high dignitaries of the Church of Scotland is a clear indication of the esteem in which he was held by his fellow-Presbyterians north of the Border. It accords perfectly with a note, in his own diary, regarding a journey to Edinburgh: "Wednesday night I lodg'd at Kelso being detained by y<sup>e</sup> ministers of y<sup>e</sup> synod who hap'ned to be met there."<sup>29</sup>

As to the lady whom Horsley actually married, there is nothing to be said. We do not even know her maiden name. But the family tree,<sup>30</sup> compiled from the Morpeth register, makes it certain that the wedding must have taken place not later than 1710 or, in other words, only a year or two after he was settled in his charge. He was probably already an author. As his earliest literary venture has hitherto escaped notice, an account of it may be of interest. In 1708 the Rev. Thomas Bennet, rector of St. James's in Colchester, whom Crawford Hodgson

<sup>27</sup> *Mem.*, p. 19.

<sup>28</sup> I have to thank Mr. Andrew Bennett, secretary of the University Court, for information upon this point.

<sup>29</sup> *Arch. Ael.* (3rd ser.), xv, p. 66.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 68.

calls "a man as wickedly narrow-minded as he was vociferous,"<sup>31</sup> had published a book treating of set forms of prayer, which was anything but palatable to Presbyterians. Horsley, although he was only twenty-three, accepted the challenge immediately. His answer took the form of an anonymous tract entitled:

' A | BRIEF REPLY | TO THE | *Scriptural* and *Argumentative Part* | OF | MR. BENNET'S | BRIEF HISTORY | OF THE | JOINT USE OF | Precomposed Set Forms of Prayer | LONDON | Printed for *Whattoff Boulter*, at the *Angel, Bible, and Crown* in the *Poultry*, 1708.'  
12mo. pp. ii—59.

Bennet himself does not seem to have continued the controversy. But Horsley's *brochure* was bitterly attacked by a nameless scribe in the *Censura Temporum* for March, 1709, whereupon he entered the lists once more, this time with *A Direct and Full Reply* (1710), which stands at the head of Crawford Hodgson's catalogue.<sup>32</sup> It appeared under his own name, and the preface of 24 pages, in which he acknowledges the authorship of the *Brief Reply*, bears witness to the keenness of the resentment which he felt at the tone of the criticism to which his original effort had been subjected. Two quotations will show that, if he had chosen, he might have developed a vituperative style worthy of the best (or worst) eighteenth-century tradition. On p. iv he says of the publication in which the criticism has found a place:

" If these Pamphlets are valued by any, it must be purely for the Scurrilous Language and Abusive Expressions, of which they are as full as they are empty of true Reason and Learning."

And again on p. xxiv we read:

" But as for such Unfair, Abusive Writers as this, I hope I know better how to dispose both of my Money and Time than to spend the one in Buying such Books, or the other in Confuting the same."

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 70, footnote.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 69 ff. I owe my own first acquaintance with the *Brief Reply* to David Laing's unpublished note, already mentioned. There is a copy in the British Museum, where it is catalogued under Bennet's name. The fact that the Museum has no copy of the *Direct and Full Reply* doubtless explains the failure to identify the author of the earlier work.

To most of us it will, I think, seem a matter for thankfulness that he preferred the serener atmosphere of Roman Britain.

Having added something to Crawford Hodgson's 'Bibliography of John Horsley,' I now propose to redress the balance by subtraction. One of the items it contains is *An Inquiry into the Force of the Objections made against the Resurrection of Christ*, published in London in 1730. No author's name is attached to this book, but in Halkett and Laing's *Dictionary of Anonymous and Pseudonymous Literature* it is said to be by the 'Rev. John Horsley, M.A.,' without any further mark of identification. In the catalogue of the Advocates' Library, however, which was compiled by Halkett, it is expressly attributed to the rector of Newington Butts, and a cursory glance at its contents is sufficient to prove that it cannot possibly have been written by a dweller in Northumberland. Such a sentence as "To clear this matter a little, let us suppose a Criminal executed here in London" is conclusive.<sup>33</sup> Only one other modification of the 'Bibliography' is required, and it is trifling. The sermon preached at Alnwick on the occasion of the death of Dr. Harle, besides being included in the memorial volume of 1730, was also issued separately under the title, *The Vanity of Man and this World*. There is a copy in the British Museum.<sup>34</sup>

That he was a good pastor might almost be inferred from the title of a little book which he published in 1729, at the very time when he was busy seeing the *Britannia Romana* through the press. It runs—"Vows in Trouble, Or a Plain and Practical Discourse concerning the Nature of Vows made in Trouble; and the Reasonableness and Necessity of a faithful Performance of them." His care of his flock is made abundantly clear by such a sentence as the following, which occurs in the Introduction:

<sup>33</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 7.

<sup>34</sup> The various items of the memorial volume are separately paged.

“ I have oft had Occasion, and wish'd for some little Book on this Subject, to put at a proper Time into the Hands of some People, who needed such a Monitor, and to whom, by a divine Blessing, it might have been very useful.”

Again, we seem to get a glimpse of an actual pastoral visit in an unpublished fragment of which I shall have more to say presently :

“ On Thursday, 20th February, 1728/9, I had occasion to call at a cottage nam'd *Hole i' th' hill* which stands on Benridge Moor about two miles or more norwesterly from Morpeth.”

All the while the demands of the pulpit had to be satisfied, and there is every reason to believe that they were fully met. Thus, on June 26th, 1728, he wrote from Morpeth to a friend: “ I am to preach on Friday afternoon, but shall be at liberty about 3 o' th' clock.”<sup>35</sup> So, too, on Wednesday, 5th February, 1728-9, “ I preached at Birdhope Craig.”<sup>36</sup> Once more, on the Saturday of Easter week, 1731, he rode all the way from Edinburgh to Mindrum, doubtless (as Mr. Bosanquet has suggested to me) in order that he might be in time to conduct the Sunday service there.<sup>37</sup> And his popularity with his own congregation is convincingly attested by the fact that a new chapel was built for him in 1721, the Presbyterians of Morpeth having up till then had no fixed meeting-house.<sup>38</sup>

Of his activities as a schoolmaster we hear practically nothing. According to Spearman,<sup>39</sup> he “ kept an academy in Morpeth,” and this is borne out by Sir John Clerk's statement that he “ taught there in a private academy, with the benefitt of a meeting-house for his support.”<sup>40</sup> Perhaps we may guess where he found his *clientèle*. Mr. Bosanquet has pointed out to me that there is abundant evidence in the fragments of his diaries and elsewhere that he was on a footing of friendship with

<sup>35</sup> *Mem.*, p. 118.

<sup>36</sup> *Arch. Ael.* (3rd ser.), xv, p. 63.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 66.

<sup>38</sup> Hodgson, *Hist. of Northumberland*, pt. 2, vol. ii, p. 441.

<sup>39</sup> Quoted in *Arch. Ael.* (N.S.), vi, p. 177.

<sup>40</sup> *Stukeley Corr.*, iii, p. 391.

various families of substance, particularly in Redesdale—the Halls of Otterburn, the Andersons of Birdhope Craig, and others—and it is not unnatural to think that some of them would send their sons to be educated under his care. The “Master Hall,” who accompanied him in one of his journeys to the south-west of England and London,<sup>41</sup> may well have been a pupil—possibly Gabriel Hall, who was called to the Inner Temple in 1734—while in his comment upon Gallow Hill we can almost catch the echo of a ‘leaving report.’ It is “the seat of Mark Aynesly, Esq., a promising young gentleman, si vitam viresque dederit deus.”<sup>42</sup> In the unpublished Edinburgh fragment to which I have referred, we find him dining with Aynesly at Gallow Hill in June, 1728. The mansion was about seven miles south-west of Morpeth. But, wherever his pupils may have come from, the school must have prospered,<sup>43</sup> for he had undoubtedly a much more comfortable income than his ministerial stipend could have furnished. Had it not been so, it would have been impossible for him to travel as freely as he did in pursuit of Roman remains or to produce the *Britannia Romana*.

That the fire of his enthusiasm for Roman Britain was first kindled by Hadrian’s Wall is hardly open to question. It is not unlikely that he saw something of it as a boy. But the earliest quite certain point of contact is *circa* 1712 to 1716, when he encountered John Warburton, then busy with his Map of Northumberland. By this time, if we can believe Warburton, Horsley was looked upon as something of an authority. By 1725 his reputation was firmly established, at all events locally. In that year Stukeley, then at the zenith of his fame as an omniscient antiquary, paid a visit to the Wall. On July 1st

<sup>41</sup> *Mem.*, pp. 122, 124.

<sup>42</sup> *Ined. Contr.*, p. 47.

<sup>43</sup> Spearman, as quoted in *Arch. Ael.* (N.S.), vi, p. 177, says that the Rev. Newton Ogle, afterwards Dean of Winchester, was a pupil. Mr. Bosanquet, however, notes: “This must be a mistake. Newton Ogle was baptized in October, 1726, and matriculated at Lincoln College, Oxford, in 1743. But his elder brother Nathaniel would fit; he was baptized in 1715 and matriculated at Balliol in 1731.” The Ogles, it may be added, were at one time nonconformists.



'J.H[arley]' wrote from London to his father, Dr. Harley of Alnwick, to make sure that the great man received proper attention, and in the course of his letter he says :

" I thought it needless to write to Mr. Cay, as not knowing whether he can be at leisure; but, having some business with Mr. Horsley, have hinted it to him."<sup>44</sup>

For some reason or other nothing came of the hint. Horsley did not meet Stukeley until three or four years later. But the allusion is interesting, for the *Britannia Romana* must have been already in embryo in the form of the "general and brief hints for private use . . . intended only for my own amusement and pleasure."<sup>45</sup> We may go further and say that the idea of expanding them into a comprehensive work on Roman Britain was gradually shaping itself in his mind. By 1727 he had resolved to undertake the task, and thenceforward he "pursued it with the greatest care and application."<sup>46</sup>

His intention soon became generally known. As to that I may quote the testimony of Robert Ainsworth, whose Latin lexicon many of our grandfathers assiduously thumbed. Ainsworth compiled the latter part of the catalogue of the collections of Dr. John Woodward, which were auctioned in London in November, 1728, the sale of the books alone occupying twenty-eight days.<sup>47</sup> One of the lots—knocked down, I may say, for ten shillings—was the slab from Benwell (CIL. vii, 513), bearing a dedication to Victory by Alfenus Senecio. In describing the stone, which had been presented to Woodward by Dr. Cay, Ainsworth stresses its importance as proving Benwell to be Condercum, the station assigned in the *Notitia* to the *Ala I Asturum*, whose name occurs in the inscription. He explains in a footnote that he owes this information to Horsley, "a scholar and a profound student of British antiquities," who was preparing a complete *corpus* of the

<sup>44</sup> Nichols, *Lit. Illustr.*, ii, p. 798.

<sup>45</sup> *Brit. Rom.*, p. i.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>47</sup> See Nichols, *Lit. Anecdotes*, v, p. 249, footnote.

Roman inscriptions of Britain.<sup>48</sup> As I shall have occasion to return to the note, it will be convenient to reproduce it here in full. It is as follows :

“ *Hujus rei notitiam, ut ingenuè fatear, mecum communicavit vir eruditus, et Antiquitatum Britannarum studiosissimus, Dominus Horsley, qui cum in stationis hujus vicinià habitet, non solum omnia diligenter examinavit, sed etiam accuratam ejus delineationem dedit. Cujus operà et industrià universam Inscriptionum omnium Romanarum, quae in hac insulà reperiuntur, συλλογήν expectare licet. Subiit sanè mirari viri vel sagacitatem vel felicitatem quem certò scio, ante visum hunc lapidem, in loco supra memorato stationem hanc posuisse.*”

The *Britannia Romana*, whose appearance was thus heralded, is divided, like all Gaul, into three parts. Book I, which “ cost me much labour and time in my study,”<sup>49</sup> consists mainly of a judicious and masterly review of the literary evidence from Julius Cæsar downwards. But there is a section of it which represents the fruit of a great deal of excellent field-work. The identification of the *stationes per lineam valli* leads up to an account of ‘The antient state of *Hadrian’s vallum*, and the Wall of *Severus*,’ and this in turn to a similar account of what was still to be seen on the ground. As an *addendum*, there is a chapter on ‘The antient and present state of the *Roman wall in Scotland*, and the forts upon it,’ and with that Book I concludes. Every page of these chapters bears the stamp of close and accurate personal observation. Even on the northern isthmus, where he was a comparative stranger, he very rarely goes astray. Between Tyne and Solway, where the ground was much more familiar, he remarks upon features which none of his predecessors had noticed and which his successors have sometimes allowed to fall into oblivion, leaving them to be rediscovered nearly two centuries after his death.

<sup>48</sup> *Museum Woodwardianum*, pp. 261 f. Its proper title is: *A Catalogue of the Library, Antiquities etc. of the Late Learned Dr. Woodward*. . . . By Mr. Christopher Bateman, bookseller, and Mr. John Cooper. One of the three copies in the Bodleian is priced.

<sup>49</sup> *Brit. Rom.*, p. i.

Thus, he was the first to point out that the Vallum was appreciably shorter than the Wall, owing to its being truncated at the ends, and he was fully alive to the existence of the 'gaps,' which gave rise to so much discussion when they were observed again a few years ago. He was familiar, too, with the difference between the broad and the narrow Wall, and he paid particular attention to the course of the Military Way. Moreover, he had a thorough grasp of the system of mile-castles, knowing that there had been eighty-one of them in all, inclusive of the very few cases where coincidence of site had led to the place of a mile-castle being occupied by a fort. He was mistaken, it is true, about the turrets, calculating that there must have been four between each pair of mile-castles, instead of only two as was actually the case. But he will hardly be criticized for this, if it be remembered that there had been no such clearing with the spade as was afterwards carried out by John Clayton, and that the examples which could be recognized without excavation were few and far between. Indeed, the words in which he refers to them are eloquent of the care he took to ascertain the facts:

"The smaller turrets (in Latin *turres*) have been more generally and intirely ruined than the *castella*; so that 'tis hard to find three of them any where together with certainty. The distance between two where it was thought to be surest, was measured and found to be near fourteen chains or three hundred and eight yards."<sup>50</sup>

The measurement was probably taken in the course of the special geometrical survey which he arranged to have made. The surveyor was doubtless George Mark, who was in all likelihood (as Crawford Hodgson has suggested)<sup>51</sup> his assistant in the school at Morpeth. We can gather from Horsley's letters that he regularly employed Mark on work of the kind, sometimes as far afield as Wales,<sup>52</sup> and after Horsley's own death Mark, who had become a schoolmaster at Dunbar, played an active part

<sup>50</sup> *Brit. Rom.*, p. 120.

<sup>51</sup> *Arch. Ael.* (3rd ser.), xv, p. 77.

<sup>52</sup> *Mem.*, p. 120.

in the completion of his unfinished Map of Northumberland, which was published by Robert Cay in 1753.<sup>53</sup> For reasons which will be apparent by and by, it is desirable to cite at full length the sentences in which Horsley tells of his survey :

“ The length of *Severus's* wall is certainly known, it having been twice measured of late, once by Mr. *Gordon*, and a second time by my order; and as there is little difference between the two measures, 'tis a proof there is no material mistake in either. . . . The number of stations (or places of observation) upon the same principal stationary line, in the survey I ordered to be made, were an hundred and sixty-four; the length of the wall sixty-eight miles and three furlongs, including the length of the stations at each end.”<sup>54</sup>

This survey was the basis of the series of illustrative maps of Wall, Vallum and Military Way, which are inserted in the *Britannia Romana*. Judged by modern standards, they are far from perfect. On the other hand, they are very much better than anything in Gordon's *Itinerarium Septentrionale*, published five or six years before.<sup>55</sup> The same remarks apply to the maps of the Scottish Wall, where also “ a survey was taken by my order,”<sup>56</sup> and where again we need hardly hesitate to conclude that Mark was the surveyor. We may, I think, assume that the two had gone over the Forth and Clyde isthmus together, for there are many points on the line where Mark would certainly require guidance. In both cases the forts would seem to have been looked upon as of secondary importance, and there is consequently little to be learned from the plans that are provided. Perhaps this is scarcely to be wondered at. It was not until soldiers like Melville and Roy began to interest themselves in Roman remains that antiquaries took to thinking seriously about the details of ‘castrametation.’ Gordon is possibly the one exception.<sup>57</sup>

<sup>53</sup> *Arch. Ael.*, l.c., p. 79.

<sup>54</sup> *Brit. Rom.*, p. 121.

<sup>55</sup> The map in Gordon's book is signed by John Mackay.

<sup>56</sup> *Brit. Rom.*, p. 160.

<sup>57</sup> See, for example, *Itin. Sept.*, pp. 16 f.

The weakness just mentioned betrays itself in other illustrations. Whitley Castle, for instance, is given a perfectly regular shape in that facing p. 113. But the most serious mistake of the kind, or indeed of any kind, in the *Britannia Romana* is in the plate which faces p. 44. There, as will be immediately evident from a comparison with Roy's plan or even with that of Gordon, the entrenchments at Dealgin Ross, besides being given a name that really belongs to a quite different fort a good many miles away, are distorted into a wholly impossible form. On reflection I am inclined to lay the responsibility for the distortion on the engraver, who has telescoped the smaller camp into the larger one, in order that he might fit both into the page without reducing the scale. The text leaves it a little doubtful whether Horsley had visited the spot in person, although the criticism he makes upon Gordon's plan in the text rather implies that he had done so. But in any event it seems strange that he should have allowed so misleading a representation to appear. It can only mean that his main concern with sites was to connect them with names that occur in the *Notitia* or the Antonine Itinerary.

The contrast with the epigraphical section, which constitutes Book II, is remarkable. That section was, in his own words, "the most expensive and tedious" portion of the whole. "Several thousand miles were travelled on this account, to visit antient monuments, and re-examine them, where there was any doubt or difficulty."<sup>58</sup> Well might he flatter himself that his collection of inscriptions would "not be judg'd trifling or useless."<sup>59</sup> It included about 340, of which more than 140 were new, while a considerable number of the others were "as good as new, tho' extant before, because not published in an intelligible manner."<sup>60</sup> Continental scholars were slow to recognize its merits. But, when recognition did come, it was generous. The editor of

<sup>58</sup> *Brit. Rom.*, p. i.

<sup>59</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. iii.

<sup>60</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 178.

vol. vii of the Berlin *Corpus* expresses his amazement that earlier epigraphists should have ignored what he very justly calls "*opus primum de titulis Britannicis neque in Britannia solum sed inter omnium aetatum syllogas epigraphicas summa laude dignum.*"<sup>61</sup> Horsley himself attached so much importance to it that he thought of giving it precedence over Book I and placing it at the beginning of the volume. "This seems the most natural," he argues, "because it is the foundation upon which, in a great measure, the other is built."<sup>62</sup> Ultimately he set the idea aside, possibly in deference to the opinion of his friend Robert Cay, upon whose advice he began Book I with the historical summary rather than with the account of the two walls, to which he was originally disposed to give the preference.<sup>63</sup>

It cannot be said that the illustrations to Book II rank high as works of art. A few of them are good—the large relief from Cumberland (N. 53), which was supplied by Stukeley; the Bath head (N. 72), which had been drawn by George Vertue, then official engraver to the Society of Antiquaries;<sup>64</sup> the Rudge cup (N. 74) and the Kent Janus (N. 76), both of which seem to be from the hand of his own engraver, Mynde; the Oxfordshire inscription (N. 76), which was drawn for him by Professor Ward; and the dedication from Chichester (N. 76), which was copied from Stukeley's *Itinerarium Curiosum*. For the rest, there is only too much ground for the severe criticism to which they were subjected by Stukeley, himself a very competent draughtsman, in the second edition of his *Itinerarium* (ii, p. 61), where he says:

"When I returned home from this journey, and compared my drawings of the antiquities here exhibited, taken from the things themselves, with those that have been published before or since, by Mr. Alexander Gordon or Mr. Horsley; it grieved me that, for want of a tolerable skill in design, they have given us such poor and

<sup>61</sup> CIL, vii, p. 8.

<sup>62</sup> *Mem.*, p. 113.

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

<sup>64</sup> *Stukeley Corr.*, ii, p. 137. The plate is signed by Mynde. The references to the other drawings will be easily found in *Brit. Rom.*

wretched pictures of these elegant antiquities; so that the reader may not wonder when he views them both together: and indeed it gives foreigners a mean idea of the Roman works in our island; but very injuriously. I have therefore caused a good many of these to be engraven, to show the just difference."

The truth is that Horsley cared little about the trimmings. He would hardly have taken exception to Haverfield's remark that the copies of inscriptions and sculptures are characterized by "remarkable accuracy and no less remarkable clumsiness."<sup>65</sup> For him the one thing that mattered was the lettering, and over this he took immense pains.<sup>66</sup> Nearly everything is drawn to the uniform scale of an eighth, meticulously measured, and, in the very few instances where that was not practicable, "notice is given of it in the observations."<sup>67</sup> From references in the text and in the few private letters that have survived, we can gather what all this passion for accuracy involved. His custom was to travel on horseback, and he never shirked a journey long or short. His description of a slab from the Antonine Wall, which had drifted as far north as Marischal College, leaves no doubt that he had ridden all the way to Aberdeen to examine it, and he took Mark with him to Bath and South Wales to help him to make a record of his observations. In his repeated excursions to London he was constantly varying his route, in order to tread as closely as possible in the footsteps of the Romans. The "several thousand miles"

<sup>65</sup> *Roman Occupation of Britain*, p. 75.

<sup>66</sup> In a letter of May 18th, 1731, printed in *Stukeley Corr.*, ii, p. 76, Mr. R. Patten (cf. *Proc. Soc. Ant. Newc.*, 3rd ser., viii, p. 169; ix, p. 48) remarks upon the casual manner in which an inscription, recently discovered at Plumpton Wall, had been examined by "a Presbyterian Minister." In an editorial note it is stated that the Presbyterian minister was Horsley. This is a mistake. By May 3rd Horsley had had two copies sent him (*ibid.*, p. 75), and had divined the correct reading. He was satisfied that a letter, which both of his correspondents had assumed to be a C, was really a G, and he asked one of them to look at the stone again. It turned out that he was right (*op. cit.*, i, p. 269). The *Britannia Romana* was then passing through the press, and in the preface (p. xx) he says explicitly, with reference to this inscription, "I could not have an opportunity of examining it myself, but an ingenious friend in that neighbourhood has at my request re-examined the original."

<sup>67</sup> *Brit. Rom.*, p. 178.

of which he speaks is certainly not an over-statement. These wanderings must obviously have been undertaken during his vacations, for there is nothing whatever to indicate that he neglected his work as minister and school-master. They may have covered a period of not less than twenty years.

Although he was always glad to have independent copies of difficult inscriptions by friends on whom he could rely, this was only that he might have an opportunity of checking his own reading, and in the last resort it was to his own judgement that he trusted. At the same time he was willing, and even anxious, to discuss puzzling questions of interpretation with anyone who had a right to an opinion, and in such discussions he kept a perfectly open mind, never hesitating to abandon his own solution in the very rare cases where a better one was offered him. A typical example is his long-drawn-out argument with Roger Gale about the word *CONSECRANEIS* on a tablet from Bremenium. Here is a characteristic extract :

“ I confesse your letter has shockt my assurance, though I still hope my conjecture will not be quite overthrown . . . but I onely send this to begg excuse for the delay till I return home, when I shall re-examine the Riechester stone.”<sup>68</sup>

As a result of the re-examination, he accepted Gale's view.

The transition from the epigraphy of Roman Britain to its geography came about very easily. I hope to show presently that, although he is not usually given credit for it, it was he who first used the remains to identify the stations *per lineam valli*. Starting from that, he applied the same principle in the case of other names occurring in the *Notitia*. Once the hunt was fairly up, he was bound to go on to the Antonine Itinerary. Here the help to be got from inscriptions was negligible. The Itinerary, of course, gives no names of garrisons. Instead, it records the number of miles from one place to another along the route that is being described. Horsley took advantage of this clue to add to his pursuit of inscriptions an endeavour

<sup>68</sup> *Stukeley Corr.*, ii, p. 138.



to follow the Roman roads and fix the position of the posting-stations. He saw that the place-names, of which others had made much use, were too often no better than a will-o'-the-wisp. Thus he writes to Stukeley :

“ I like an etymology when it is easy and natural (as in *Itun-ocelum*); but, I own, I pay a much greater regard to remains and proper distances, which are certain matters of fact.”<sup>69</sup>

And again he tells Roger Gale :

“ This was the method I took in the northern countys; first, to be well assured from ocular demonstration where there were any visible remains or certain proofs of Roman settlements, and then to compare this account with that in the Itinerary, and *Notitia Imperii*.”<sup>70</sup>

The ultimate outcome was Book III of the *Britannia Romana*. This was, he explains in his preface, “ an addition, which was not at first intended, and for that reason has occasioned a considerable delay of the publication.” In it are reprinted the originals of Ptolemy, the Antonine Itinerary, the *Notitia Imperii*, the Ravenna Geographer, and the Peutinger Table, so far as they concern Britain, and each of them is accompanied by an explanatory chapter. The last of these chapters is contributed by Professor Ward. The others are by Horsley himself, the most important being that on the Antonine Itinerary, which is a valuable compendium of conclusions reached by an uncommonly keen observer. It is clear from his letters that the illustrative maps gave him no little trouble and anxiety. In their preparation, as in the whole business of passing the volume through the press, he had to have recourse to the assistance of friends. Residence in Morpeth made the procedure cumbrous. Papers were usually sent first by carrier to Newcastle, whence they were forwarded to London by his trusted helper, Robert Cay.<sup>71</sup>

<sup>69</sup> Nichols, *Lit. Illustrations*, ii, p. 803.

<sup>70</sup> *Stukeley Corr.*, iii, p. 94.

<sup>71</sup> *Mem.*, pp. 97 ff. *passim*. Sometimes, however, they were sent direct, although apparently not until after Cay had seen them. Thus in an unpublished letter, now in the University Library at Edinburgh (Laing, ii, 387), Horsley writes: “ 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.”

Once in London, they were taken in charge by Professor Ward of Gresham College, in whom Horsley had such complete confidence that he allowed him to make corrections and additions at discretion.<sup>72</sup> He did not, for example, see the chapter on the Peutinger Table until after the sheets had been printed off, while by his own express desire the Appendix took the form of a "Letter to the Author" by Ward, covering more than a dozen pages.<sup>73</sup> In the circumstances it is remarkable that misprints and inconsistencies should be so few and far between.

The book concludes with a chronological table<sup>74</sup> and a series of indexes, modelled on those attached to the great collections of inscriptions which had been published on the continent, notably Gruter's *Corpus*, a revised edition of which had appeared in 1707. The author's additions and corrections are embodied in the preface, which must have been written about the turn of the year 1731/2, only two or three weeks before he was carried off by an apoplectic stroke. Progress had been slow. Printing apparently began in 1728,<sup>75</sup> and in April of the following year Gale had written to Stukeley that "Mr. Horseley's performance was in good forwardnesse, above half the plates being engraved."<sup>76</sup> No doubt the afterthought represented by Book III was to some extent responsible, but the delay was in part due also to the high ideal of perfection at which he aimed. Thus, speaking of the inscriptions, he says:

"Several of these have been discovered since this work was

<sup>72</sup> *Brit. Rom.*, pp. 193 and 201, footnote L.

<sup>73</sup> See the letter to Roger Gale, printed in Hutchinson's *View of Northumberland*, i, p. 205.

<sup>74</sup> In my own copy of the *Britannia Romana* (which was formerly in the Duke of Grafton's library) an eighteenth-century hand has written at the top of the Chronological Table (p. 522): "*Æra U.C. a capite ad Calcem cum Christi Annis malè composita decurrit: sed Additione Unius Annis. (U.C.) singulis, hoc medendum erit,*" and has made consequential changes at several points in the Table itself. If the writer had read footnote c on p. 9, he would have realized that his correction was unnecessary.

<sup>75</sup> *Mem.*, p. 105.

<sup>76</sup> *Stukeley Corr.*, iii, p. 256.

begun, and several after the plates were engraven where they should of course have been inserted. However, I chose to engrave new plates on purpose, and make such alterations in those which were engraven, as I found necessary, rather than to throw any of these new inscriptions into an appendix."<sup>77</sup>

No wonder that, before the end was reached, he should complain to Robert Cay of being "quite wearied out."<sup>78</sup> And the process must have been costly as well as cumbersome. From the preface we learn that "the expenses of the bookseller, and my own time and labour, are fully triple our first computation." These words set one speculating as to how the publication was financed. There is no list of subscribers, such as that by which eighteenth-century books are so often ushered in, and one can only surmise that it was a venture of Horsley's own. As we have seen, he had a good income and, after all, it was a sounder investment than, say, South Sea stock would have been. That he expected it to bring him in some reward is certain. On February 15th, 1728/9, Sir John Clerk from his comfortable chair at Penicuik wrote, a little patronizingly, to Gale that "the poor man writes for bread."<sup>79</sup> Nor was it only in cash down that a return might have been looked for. In a letter to Dr. Cary, Bishop of Clonfert, dated April 24th, 1732, Professor Ward mentions that the author of the *Britannia Romana* had died before its publication, just at the moment "when it was hoped that the credit of this book might have been of some service to him and his large family."<sup>80</sup> With that we may connect a sentence that occurs three years later in another communication from Clerk to Gale. In a letter of date 30th June, 1735, the writer says, referring to Lord Hlay: "He had a particular regard for Mr. Horseley, who printed the *Britannia Romana*, and was positively resolved to have done him service about the

<sup>77</sup> *Brit. Rom.*, p. 193.

<sup>78</sup> *Mem.*, p. 124. I think, however, that Hodgson reads too much into this passage when he interprets it as applying to the *Britannia Romana* as a whole (*Mem.*, p. 42). The context makes it clear that the reference is merely to a particular "pacquet of papers."

<sup>79</sup> *Stukeley Corr.*, iii, p. 391.

<sup>80</sup> Printed in *Arch. Ael.* (3rd ser.), xv, p. 67.

time when he died."<sup>81</sup> Directly, and also indirectly through his brother (the Duke of Argyle who befriended Jeanie Deans), Lord Ilay had great influence in Scottish administrative affairs. It is not unreasonable to think that, if Horsley had lived, the Crown would have appointed him to a high position in one of the four universities. It is quite conceivable that in 1732 he might have succeeded Hamilton as Principal and Professor of Divinity at Edinburgh.<sup>82</sup>

Harassing as was the task of seeing the book through the press, it did not absorb the whole of the intellectual energy which had to find an outlet in such leisure as he could command. As the *Materials* published by Hodgson Hinde in *Ined. Contr.* show, he contemplated writing a history of Northumberland. These reveal all the wide range of interest that such an enterprise would have called for. The jottings touch on natural features, archæological phenomena, historical associations, antiquities, place-names, country houses, family history and the like, while in September, 1729, he went down a coal-pit "in company with Mr. Peck, to see somewhat curious about the foul air."<sup>83</sup> I am able to supplement the fragments already printed by a reference to another. In the Laing collection, now in the University Library at Edinburgh, is a manuscript of some 30 folio pages, which was long in the possession of the Cay family. The title reads "An Essay on Barrows and other Tumuli," while beneath this and over the signature "John Hodgson 31 Oct. 1833" are the words "by the Revd. John Horsley author of the *Britannia Romana* and in his own handwriting excepting some translations from Homer etc." Beneath Hodgson's note, in a different hand, is "Query—Is this

<sup>81</sup> *Stukeley Corr.*, iii, p. 105.

<sup>82</sup> Hamilton, who died in 1732, became Principal in 1730, not in the year of his death, as stated in *Arch. Ael.* (3rd ser.), xv, p. 61.

<sup>83</sup> This was Richard Peck, who "stood at the head of his profession as a mining engineer or coal viewer," and who "resided at Newbiggin, in the parish of Newburn." Cf. J. Crawford Hodgson in *Proc. Soc. Ant. Newc.* (3rd ser.), viii (1918), pp. 151 ff. For the outcome of the visit see *Ined. Contr.*, pp. 16-18.

by Horsley? John Cay." The date indicates that Hodgson did not see the manuscript until after his account of Horsley's life had been published, and thus explains why he did not mention it there. John Cay is the sheriff of Linlithgowshire, who is known from *The Life of Sir Walter Scott*<sup>84</sup> to have been a friend of Lockhart's. The doubt voiced in his query is unfounded. Comparison with an autograph letter in the Laing collection confirms Hodgson's opinion as to the handwriting, and the contents speak for themselves, for the essay is an expanded version of Chapter II, iii, of the *Materials*, the chief difference being that in the Edinburgh fragment a great deal of space is devoted to demonstrating that standing stones, whether isolated or in circles, are "at least frequently of y<sup>e</sup> funeral kind"—a doctrine that would hardly have commended itself to Druidical enthusiasts like Stukeley. It must have been in connexion with the projected history that he first thought of producing the Map of Northumberland, which was not published until more than twenty years after his death.

Robert Cay, who edited the map, seems to have been the closest personal friend among all his helpers. He was about ten years his junior, and lived in Newcastle; where he "conducted a large business in manufacturing salt on the Northumberland coast and at South Shields."<sup>85</sup> He was clearly a man of intelligence and education, nor should it be forgotten that it is to him that we owe the first description of the Corbridge lanx<sup>86</sup> and possibly its preservation from the melting-pot. His great-granddaughter, a sister of the sheriff of Linlithgowshire, was the mother of Clerk-Maxwell, the physicist.<sup>87</sup> John Cay, Robert's younger brother, was also useful as an intermediary, for he lived in London, where he was a barrister. He was appointed Judge of the Marshalsea in 1750.

<sup>84</sup> Ed. 1837, vi, p. 144.

<sup>85</sup> *Proc. Berw. Nat. Club.*, xiii (1891), p. 273.

<sup>86</sup> *Stukeley Corr.*, iii, pp. 118 ff.

<sup>87</sup> It is an interesting coincidence that Clerk-Maxwell's father should have been a direct descendant of Sir John Clerk of Penicuik.

After Horsley died, the two Cays appear to have been active in looking after the interests of his widow and children.<sup>88</sup> A number of letters, which he had written to Robert, were fortunately kept by the Cay family. There is one of them, not yet published, in the Laing collection at Edinburgh. The rest, which were printed by Hodgson in his *Memoir*, are now in the Blackgate, along with one or two fragments of a diary.<sup>89</sup> These letters, upon which I have already had occasion to draw freely, indicate that the portion of the *Britannia Romana* in which Cay took the warmest interest was Book III, the geographical section. Horsley valued his opinion on matters of cartography, and it may very well be that from the outset something like collaboration on the Map of Northumberland was intended.<sup>90</sup> But, cartography apart, Cay must have been a capable draughtsman. We find Horsley asking him to take the dimensions and draught of a sculptured relief, and also consulting him about inscriptions.<sup>91</sup> In view of all that he did for the *Britannia Romana*, it seems odd that there should be no acknowledgment of his services. We may conclude that the two friends were on terms so intimate that nothing of the kind appeared to either to be required. It is even possible that Cay, who was well off, may have advanced some of the necessary capital.

Like so many of Horsley's Northumbrian friends, the Cays were Presbyterians. Similarly, Sir Richard Ellys, to whom the *Britannia Romana* is dedicated, was a staunch

<sup>88</sup> Cf. the advertisement reprinted in *Arch. Ael.* (N.S.), xv, p. 67. See also *Mem.*, p. 35.

<sup>89</sup> Cf. *Arch. Ael.* (N.S.), vii, pp. 237 f.

<sup>90</sup> Gough (*Brit. Topogr.*, ed. 1780, ii, p. 68) says so quite explicitly. He adds "Mr. Cay caused it to be engraved in two sheets at Edinburgh, for cheapness, for the benefit of Mr. Horsley's numerous family, which occasioned its being executed so very incorrectly that an index was printed to rectify the mistakes." Mr. Bosanquet (rightly, I think) questions the soundness of this explanation of the index, pointing out that an index was a very usual concomitant of a map. One was issued with Armstrong's map, and Speed also printed one.

<sup>91</sup> *Mem.*, p. 122. In the unpublished letter in the University Library at Edinburgh, Horsley says: "I find Mr. Mark's copy of ye Riechester Inscription is as you took it."

Calvinist.<sup>92</sup> Ward, who had so much to do with the printing of it, was a nonconformist. So, too, was Mr. Gilpin of Scaleby Castle, who furnished information about Cumberland inscriptions. But there was no lack of friends in the opposite camp. What could be more charming than the complimentary allusion to Archdeacon Sharpe in the *Materials*? Horsley's comment upon Rothbury is:

“ The living is reckoned one of the best in the county, and if it were much better than it is, it would still be inferior to the merit of the Rev. Dr. Sharpe, who at present enjoys it.”<sup>93</sup>

And there were others, such as his “ good friend Mr. Collingwood,” Recorder and afterwards Mayor of Newcastle, to whose help he looked forward in dealing with “ the baronies and law affairs ” in the History,<sup>94</sup> and Dr. Christopher Hunter of Durham, with whom the *Britannia Romana* shows him to have been in frequent correspondence. Altogether, there need be no hesitation in endorsing Hodgson Hinde's view that Horsley “ enjoyed a good social position ” in the north of England.<sup>95</sup>

Nor was it only locally that he was held in high esteem by churchmen as well as by nonconformists like Ward. We do not know how he made Roger Gale's acquaintance, but it was probably through his London friends, nor how he first came into contact with Sir John Clerk, whom he visited at Penicuik.<sup>96</sup> It was, however, with an introduction from Gale that he called upon Stukeley at Grantham in January or February, 1728/9. His host had read Ainsworth's note in the *Museum Woodwardianum*, and he received a warm welcome. “ We had a world of discourse about his design.”<sup>97</sup> To judge from the letters

<sup>92</sup> It has been suggested to me that Ellys may have helped to finance the publication of the book. This is quite possible. Among the Cay papers there is a note of a ‘ present ’ of thirty guineas made by him after Horsley's death. (*Mem.*, p. 35.)

<sup>93</sup> *Ined. Contr.*, p. 51.

<sup>94</sup> *Mem.*, p. 128. For a sketch of Collingwood's life see Welford, *Men of Mark*, i, pp. 617 ff.

<sup>95</sup> *Arch. Ael.* (N.S.), vi, p. 179.

<sup>96</sup> *Stukeley Corr.*, iii, p. 390.

<sup>97</sup> *Stukeley Corr.*, ii, p. 71.

that subsequently passed between them, he had a considerable respect for Stukeley, though he had hardly the same regard for his opinion as he had for Roger Gale's. And indeed the former was not quite such an egregious person as his connexion with the spurious treatise of Richard of Cirencester might lead one to suppose. It should at least be imputed to him for righteousness by Northumbrians that he made a strenuous effort to stay the hand of the destroyer in 1754, when the Newcastle-Carlisle road was under construction. History repeats itself and, with the agitation of 1930 fresh in our minds, it is not irrelevant to recall how Stukeley waited on the Princess of Wales when she was at dinner, presented her with "Warburton's book on the Picts' wall, and a letter magnificently bound in gilt paper, acquainting Her Royal Highness with the havoc made of it by the surveyors of the new road." He obtained a promise that she would use "her interest to stop it."<sup>98</sup>

There were two of his other contemporaries with whom Horsley's relations were much less satisfactory, and at whose hands his memory has suffered somewhat seriously. These were Alexander Gordon, immortalized by Scott in *The Antiquary* as the author of the *Itinerarium Septentrionale*, and John Warburton, whose book Stukeley presented to the Princess. It will be necessary to examine the career and character of each of them at some length, if we are to recover for Horsley the full meed of honour to which he is entitled. The process, I ought to say frankly, will involve some disregard of the time-honoured maxim *De mortuis nil nisi bonum*. But in justice to their victim, that cannot be allowed to act as a deterrent.

I will begin with Gordon, the outline of whose chequered life is fairly well ascertained.<sup>99</sup> A native of the

<sup>98</sup> *Stukeley Corr.*, iii, p. 143. The letter itself is printed pp. 141 ff. The presentation copy of Warburton's book is in the British Museum.

<sup>99</sup> The fullest and most authoritative account is that by Sir Daniel Wilson and Dr. David Laing, which appeared in *Proc. Soc. Ant. Scot.*, x, pp. 363 ff. Any statements made here, and not otherwise vouched for, will be found either there or in the more popular article which Wilson published in the *Canadian Journal of Science, Literature, and History*, xiv, N.S. (1873), pp. 9-37, also issued separately.



north-east of Scotland, born perhaps a little later than Horsley, he was a graduate of one or other of the two colleges that then flourished in Aberdeen. Although not a scholar in any real sense of the word, he possessed accomplishments which Horsley lacked. He was, for instance, very musical, and, after taking his degree, he spent some time in Italy, studying singing. He must also have been able to handle pencil and brush more deftly than one would suppose from the illustrations to the *Itinerarium*, for one of the legacies disposed of in his will was his portrait, painted by himself. There are grounds for thinking that his first ambition was to shine on the operatic stage.<sup>100</sup> Disappointed in this, he set himself, on his return to Scotland, to eke out a livelihood by teaching. According to the tradition of the Penicuik household, he was for some time a tutor in Sir John Clerk's family, the younger members of which nicknamed him 'Galgacus.' This must have been round about 1723 and 1724, for in each of these years we find him accompanying his patron on what he calls a "virtuoso tuer." On these and similar expeditions, covering three seasons in all, he collected materials for his *Itinerarium Septentrionale* (1726), the first of a series of books on various subjects, which he published, or promised to publish, usually by subscription. The most notable were his *Lives of Pope Alexander VI and his son Cæsar Borgia* (1729) and his *Complete History of the Antient Amphitheatres* (1730), the latter a translation from the Italian of the Marquis Scipio Maffei.

Authorship, however, was not the only means by which he tried to raise the wind. In the summer of 1726 he figures as the 'projector' of a scheme for a canal across the Forth and Clyde isthmus,<sup>101</sup> an idea that was destined to be realized half a century or so later. Although he met with scanty encouragement in Scotland, he was slow to

<sup>100</sup> *Stukeley Corr.*, i, p. 68. Wodrow in the MS. Index to his correspondence (now in the National Library of Scotland) describes him as "Mr. Gordon, the singer."

<sup>101</sup> Nichols, *Lit. Anecdotes*, v, p. 330.

let his enthusiasm be damped. By this time he had made London his headquarters, and a year after Gale and "my Lord Isla" had frowned upon it,<sup>102</sup> he was showing the Society of Antiquaries there a "large plan" of the proposed waterway, "surveyed by himself 1726."<sup>103</sup> A bookselling adventure came to nothing, and he seems to have found it difficult to get into smooth financial waters. But he evidently had friends who believed in him. In February, 1724/5, he was elected a fellow of the Society of Antiquaries, and in May, 1735, he succeeded Stukeley as its secretary, his remuneration to be five shillings a meeting.<sup>104</sup> A more lucrative post was the secretaryship of the newly constituted Society for the Encouragement of Learning, which carried an annual salary of £50, and which he held from 1735 to 1739. He continued to act as secretary to the Society of Antiquaries until August, 1741, when he went to South Carolina as secretary to the Governor. There he appears to have made good, dying in comparative affluence in 1754 or 1755.<sup>105</sup>

Reading between the lines of this bald summary, one might guess that he must have had his failings. Even his patron, Sir John Clerk, who had something of an affection for him as "a great lover of Antiquities,"<sup>106</sup> deploras "our friend Sandy Gordon's weakness and want of judgement."<sup>107</sup> But it is to be feared there was more in it than that. Here is John Whiston's estimate :

"He was but in narrow circumstances. For some time he was in partnership with Mr. John Wilcox, bookseller in the Strand. But his education, temper, and manners, did not suit him for a trade. He was afterwards Secretary to the Society for promoting Learning; but, not giving a satisfactory account to the Society of the money

<sup>102</sup> *Stukeley Corr.*, iii, p. 94.

<sup>103</sup> *Gough's British Topography* (ed. 1780), ii, p. 66r.

<sup>104</sup> I have to thank Mr. H. S. Kingsford for the figure.

<sup>105</sup> According to the legal documents recovered by Sir Daniel Wilson, the *terminus ante quem* is 23rd July, 1755. On the other hand, in Stukeley's diaries it is stated that "a long letter from my old friend Alexander Gordon, Secretary to Governor Glyn in S. Carolina," was read at a meeting of the Royal Society on 25th May, 1758. (*Stukeley Corr.*, iii, p. 476.)

<sup>106</sup> *Clerk of Penicuik's Memoirs* (Scottish Hist. Soc.), p. 117.

<sup>107</sup> *Stukeley Corr.*, i, p. 269.

he was entrusted with, he was dismissed, and his effects seized on. . . . He had some learning, some ingenuity, much pride, much deceit, and very little honesty, as everyone who knew him, believed. Poverty tempted him to dishonesty; his national character and constitution to pride and ingenuity; and his dependence on the Great to flattery and deceit."<sup>108</sup>

It is not easy to reconcile this merciless censure with his election as an Honorary Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries on his departure for America. Clerk, too, continued to correspond with him long after he went abroad.<sup>109</sup> Nevertheless, on the charge of dishonesty at least, there is no escape from a verdict of guilty. I have found in the Laing collection an unprinted letter, written in 1730 to Charles Mackie, Professor of History in the University of Edinburgh. In it Gordon acknowledges receipt of a subscription for a book on the lives of the Popes Julius II and Leo X, to the composition of which he is devoting himself with "the utmost assiduity" and which will be ready for the printer shortly. After expressing his gratitude, he goes on to complain of "the diffidence your Edinburgians have about me." Others whom he approached had fought shy of subscribing, because they were doubtful whether they would ever receive any return for their money, and this is how he defends himself:

"As for People's not receiving the books they may have subscribed for 'tis their own faults if they do not since publick advertisement is given and has been to take them but if they by absence neglect to call for them or leave no orders for their correspondants to pay y<sup>e</sup> 2d. moitie that is not myne but their own fault."

*Qui s'excuse, s'accuse*, and besides there is the damning fact that the book for which Mackie had been induced to pay was never finished. I do not feel sure that it was ever begun. Nor was it the only plan of the kind that suffered shipwreck. In 1732 it was announced that a Latin edition of the *Itinerarium* was "now printing" in

<sup>108</sup> Nichols, *Lit. Anecdotes*, v, p. 699.

<sup>109</sup> *Stukeley Corr.*, i, p. 439 (1748) and iii, p. 434 (1753).

Holland, but nothing more is ever heard of it.<sup>110</sup> Much more ambitious was the preliminary advertisement on p. 188 of the *Itinerarium* itself:

“ The Author of this Work designs, in a few Days, to publish PROPOSALS for Engraving, by Subscription, *A Compleat View of the Roman Walls in Britain*, viz. Those of the Emperors *Hadrian* and *Severus*, in *Cumberland*, and *Northumberland*, in a large Map, near 14 Foot in Length, and 6 in Breadth: and that of *Antoninus Pius* in *Scotland*, in another Map of about 6 Foot in Length, and 4 in Breadth.

“ The chief Design of this Undertaking, is to present the Publick with such Draughts of these stupendous Works, as may hand down to Posterity their true Image and Representation, as taken by an actual Geometrical Survey of both, last Summer, with great Labour, and Expence.

“ The Whole will be adorned with exact Draughts of all the Inscriptions, and Altars, ever found upon these Walls: . . . their whole Number will be again delineated from their Originals, according to exact Mensuration, with a Scale, and Correction of former Publications: To all which, at the Foot of each Map, will be engrav'd a large Dissertation in *English*, and in *Latin*, for the Use of Foreigners; containing, not only an Abstract of their History, but also an Explanation of all the Inscriptions ever found upon them, compared with the Accounts already given, by those who have treated concerning them.”

That was in 1726. The proposals were never issued. But, to judge from his treatment of Mackie, Gordon would have no scruples about conducting a private canvass. In fact, more than two years later, on August 1st, 1728, Samuel Gale writes to Stukeley, over the signature ‘Cunobelin,’ that

“ GORDONIUS, the Caledonian, is going to give to the Litterati a noble prospect of the Roman Walls, *inter Scoticas Prunas*.”<sup>111</sup>

The important point for us, however, at the moment is not whether Gordon was honest or dishonest, but whether all this does not supply a key to his relations with Horsley.

<sup>110</sup> The announcement is made in the preface to the *Additions and Corrections, by way of Supplement, to the Itinerarium Septentrionale* (1732), p. iii. According to Nichols (*Lit. Anecdotes*, v, p. 336, footnote), the Latin edition was actually printed in 1731. David Laing, however, says (*Proc. Soc. Ant. Scot.*, x, p. 382): “I do not recollect ever having seen the book, nor does the title appear in the catalogues of various libraries where such a book was most likely to have been found.”

<sup>111</sup> Nichols, *Lit. Illustrations*, iv, p. 497.

His decision to include Hadrian's Wall in the *Itinerarium Septentrionale*, which was originally designed to deal with Scotland only, must date from 1724, when he saw it "for the first time," in Sir John Clerk's company.<sup>112</sup> It is, I think, quite certain that he met Horsley when he returned to survey it in 1725. That Robert Cay gave him very substantial assistance then is plain from a postscript to a letter which Dr. Jonathan Harle wrote to Cay in 1726:

"P.S.—Mr. Gordon's book is come out, and I doubt not but hon'ble mention of you will be made in it."<sup>113</sup>

And, if Robert Cay was in such close touch with him, we may be sure that Cay's friend, Horsley, was not left out. He had been working on the Wall for many years, although he had not yet actually resolved to write about it.

Despite Harle's anticipation, the *Itinerarium* contains no reference either to Cay or to Horsley, unless indeed they are the anonymous persons, cryptically alluded to in the preface, "who have grounded a Diffidence as to my Ability in performing this Work to any purpose, because I never appeared to the Publick in this Way before." Horsley may well have told Gordon frankly that it would be foolish for him to rush in where he himself was still hesitating to tread. That there had been an acute difference of opinion between them about some question of publication is obvious from a letter of June 1st, 1727, quoted by Hodgson in his *History of Northumberland*.<sup>114</sup> Writing to his friend Cay, who was then in London, Horsley begs the favour that he "would take no notice to anybody, and particularly to Mr. Gordon, of my being busy with anything of the nature" of the *Britannia Romana*. Hodgson infers that Horsley "seems to have been more indebted to Gordon's descriptions than he was willing to acknowledge." The inference is, I venture to think, a mistaken one. We shall see presently that the

<sup>112</sup> *Itin. Sept.*, p. 77, and *Clerk of Penicuik's Memoirs*, p. 117.

<sup>113</sup> *Mem.*, p. 16.

<sup>114</sup> Pt. 2, vol. iii, p. 279, footnote.

indebtedness was all on the other side. What Horsley apprehended was that Gordon might become troublesome if he heard of an enterprise that was calculated to damage the chances of his own grandiose "Proposals," which he was still endeavouring to launch. And Horsley was right. Gordon did try to put a spoke in the wheel of the *Britannia Romana*, apparently with the help of Richard Goodman of Carlisle, who had assisted him in the survey.<sup>115</sup> On March 15th, 1728/9, Horsley wrote to Stukeley :

"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."<sup>116</sup>

That Horsley kept his promise of being just to Gordon will be evident to anyone who chooses to examine the numerous references to the *Itinerarium* which occur in the *Britannia Romana*. For the most part they are of the nature of corrections, but only in one instance is the faintest flavour of acidity discernible. This is in a footnote to the preface, and those who read it carefully will agree that the comment is not a whit too severe. On the other hand, Gordon is given the fullest credit for the one or two original contributions of value which he did make to the subject. Much the most interesting of these was his discovery of the signal-stations on the Cumberland coast, re-discovered independently a year or two ago by Mr. R. G. Collingwood. As the passage in the *Itinerarium* has been overlooked in recent discussions, I may be permitted to quote it *in extenso* :

"These very Turrets [mentioned by *Bede*], last Summer, I had the Satisfaction to discover their Vestiges, on that very Ground, and placed at regular Distances, some a Mile, some two, from one another, along the whole Coast of the South Side of the *Solway Firth*, reaching from the End of the Wall at *Bulness*, to the most Westerly Promontory of that *Aestuarium*."<sup>117</sup>

<sup>115</sup> *Itin. Sept.*, p. 82.

<sup>116</sup> Nichols, *Lit. Illustrations*, ii, p. 803.

<sup>117</sup> *Itin. Sept.*, p. 91.

Thus much for Horsley's justice. As to his generosity, it will be enough to point out that he utters no word of complaint against Gordon for having robbed him of the distinction of being the first to identify the stations *per lineam valli* by turning the *Notitia* list to proper account. It has long been customary to attribute the honour to Gordon and to regard it as his "one great feat,"<sup>118</sup> but a scrutiny of the evidence leaves no manner of doubt that, when Gordon printed the identifications in the *Itinerarium Septentrionale*, he was merely stealing Horsley's thunder. On general grounds it is very difficult to believe that the idea of collating the testimony of the remains with the text of the *Notitia* should have escaped a lifelong student of the mural monuments who was also an excellent scholar, and should yet have presented itself in a flash to a casual visitor who in matters of the kind was little better than an ignoramus, labouring, as he did, under the impression that 'Pancirolus' was the author of the Imperial army-list and not merely the Italian professor, Guido Panciroli, who had edited it with a Latin commentary.<sup>119</sup> Again, had the discovery been Gordon's own, we should have expected him, being what he was, to herald the enunciation of the principle with a loud-sounding flourish of trumpets. But he does nothing of the kind. Rather, he treats the principle as something that could be taken for granted.

Not so Horsley, who is careful to set it out at length in his chapter on the 'Antient and Present State' of the Walls and who in various passages both in the *Britannia Romana* and in his letters refers to it unequivocally as his own. Thus, in his discussion of the slab from Benwell, which he saw in Dr. Woodward's collection in London, he tells how pleased he was to find upon it the

<sup>118</sup> *J.R.S.*, xi, p. 51.

<sup>119</sup> I think this is quite clear from the expressions used in *Itin. Sept.*, pp. 69, 79 and 84. A passage in Nichols, *Lit. Anecdotes*, v, pp. 330 f., is not irrelevant: "Mr. Gordon . . . set about the study of Greek; but is said to have been so ill furnished with Latin, as to have translated in one of his publications the concluding sentence of Herodotus' first book, where horses are said to be sacrificed to the sun, as *deo perniciosissimo*, the most *pernicious deity*."

name of the *Ala I Asturum*. His words are: "I was agréably surprized with the sight of it, because it is a farther confirmation of the scheme I had advanced concerning these stations."<sup>120</sup> Moreover, so long as he was alive, no question was raised by others as to the priority of his claim, even after the *Itinerarium Septentrionale* had appeared. Stukeley, for example, writing to Gale on February 4th, 1728/9, about his first meeting with Horsley, says: "I am of opinion he has hit upon the true way of accommodating the Notitia Imperii to the Linea Valli, and that others have begun at the wrong end."<sup>121</sup> It will be remembered that Ainsworth, in the Latin note which I quoted some time ago,<sup>122</sup> was equally emphatic. He expressed his admiration for the "*vel sagacitatem vel felicitatem*" with which (as he could personally vouch) Horsley had located Condercum at Benwell without being aware of the inscription which had preserved the name of the garrison. In the face of all this, and other confirmatory evidence that could be cited, it is impossible to suppose that the identifications of the *Itinerarium* are anything more than crumbs that had fallen from the table of Horsley's conversations with the author. The failure to acknowledge the obligation was ungrateful and, as events have proved, it was dishonest to boot.

Leaving the shifty and not over scrupulous adventurer, Gordon, I turn now to a far more sinister figure. John Warburton bears an evil name as the Vandal who openly boasts of having prompted the scheme under which Hadrian's Wall was destroyed for many miles, in order to facilitate the building of the Newcastle-Carlisle road. He is usually said to have been a surveyor, and he

<sup>120</sup> *Brit. Rom.*, p. 211. Similarly, when he sends the list to Roger Gale in order to illustrate his interpretation of the Rudge Cup, he calls it "my scheme" (*Stukeley Corr.*, iii, p. 101). In saying (*Arch. Ael.* (4th ser.), viii, p. 183) that Dr. Christopher Hunter had identified Chesterholm as Vindolan(d)a in 1702, Mr. Birley has been misled by Hodgson, *Hist. of Northumberland*, pt. 2, vol. iii, p. 201. It is not Hunter whom Hodgson quotes there but Horsley (*Brit. Rom.*, p. 225). Hunter published the inscription in the *Phil. Trans.*, but said nothing whatever as to its significance.

<sup>121</sup> *Stukeley Corr.*, ii, p. 71.

<sup>122</sup> *Supra*, p. 18.



certainly published a map of Northumberland in 1716. At one time he had a collection of Roman inscriptions, and in 1753 he issued a handy quarto volume entitled *Vallum Romanum*, to which there is prefixed a fairly accurate plan of the Roman works on the isthmus. William Hutton, who carried the plan with him in his famous walk along the Wall in 1801, was so much impressed with the virtues of the book that he spoke of the author as "the judicious Warburton, whom I regard for his veracity,"<sup>123</sup> and thus invested him with a cloak of respectability to which he had not the shadow of a title. If by being judicious is meant having an eye to the main chance, the first part of the description may pass without serious challenge. But, so far from being a person who deserved regard for his veracity, Warburton was a consummate and unblushing liar. As an antidote to Hutton's eulogium, let me quote a thumb-nail sketch of him by his younger contemporary, Francis Grose, who was elected a fellow of the Society of Antiquaries in 1757, the very year in which Warburton, who had ceased to belong to that body some time before, was expelled from the Royal Society, because his subscription was hopelessly in arrear.

"JOHN WARBURTON, Somerset Herald, was born in the north of England, and (as I have heard him say) was, at his first setting out in life, an exciseman; after which he became a supervisor. He had little or no education, being not only ignorant of the Latin, but incapable of writing two sentences in good English. All the publications under his name, both books and maps, were done by others, hired by him: his knowledge of the mathematics was not at all superior to his other literary acquirements; I can myself aver, that he scarcely knew the difference between a right and an acute angle; and when I knew him he could not have done his duty as an exciseman, though gauging, like navigation, as practised by our ordinary seamen, consists only in multiplying and dividing certain numbers, or writing by an instrument, the rationale of both which they are totally ignorant of. Although he wanted learning and true abilities, he possessed what, in the commerce of the world, often answers the ends of both; that is, he was possessed of a deal of low cunning, and not being impeded by any principles of honour, he

---

<sup>123</sup> *The History of the Roman Wall* (1802), p. x.

frequently gained both profit and reputation, to which he had not the least title.

“ The following is an instance of his readiness to catch at any opportunity that offered to impose on the unwary. Walking one day through the streets of London, he passed by the house of Mr. Stainbank, a rich merchant, over whose door he saw an achievement or hatchment, on which were painted three castles, somewhat like those borne in the arms of Portugal: he went immediately home, and wrote a short note, begging to see Mr. Stainbank on very particular business. The gentleman came; when Mr. Warburton, with a great deal of seeming concern, told him the Portuguese Ambassador had been with him, and directed him to commence a prosecution against him for assuming the arms of Portugal; and besides, meant to exhibit a complaint against him to the House of Lords, for a breach of privilege. Mr. Stainbank, terrified at the impending danger, begged his advice and assistance, for which he promised to reward him handsomely. Warburton, after some consideration, said he had hit on a method to bring him out of this very ugly scrape; which was, that he should purchase a coat of arms, which he would devise for him, as like as possible to that on the achievement, and that he would show it to the Ambassador, and confirm its being his legal coat of arms; and say, that the similitude complained of was owing to the blunder of the painter.

“ The arms were granted in due form, and paid for; when Warburton, over and above his share of the forty pounds, asked and obtained a particular reward for appeasing the representative of his Portuguese Majesty.

“ NOTWITHSTANDING this, and many other like dirty tricks, he clearly proved the truth of that proverb which says, Honesty is the best policy—by dying a beggar.

“ His life was one continued scene of squabbles and disputes with his brethren, by whom he was despised and detested.”<sup>124</sup>

It is plain that Christian charity did not bulk very largely among the ingredients of the ink which Grose used in penning the foregoing portrait. But Warburton's own namesake William, the well-known Bishop of Gloucester, is hardly less severe, though naturally much more restrained and dignified. Writing to Stukeley on June 9th, 1764, five years after the subject of his strictures was dead, he says:

“ I received a plain and modest letter from the son of your old acquaintance, Mr. John Warburton, the Somerset Herald. You well know the character of the father, whom I never saw but once, 40 years ago, and had never any transaction with him further than my once demanding of him, by my agent, some rent due to me as Rector of Frisby, from the Berry estate; which he declined to pay,

---

<sup>124</sup> Grose, *The Olio*, 2nd ed. (1796), pp. 158 ff.

unless I would see him in person. I refused this condition; and so never got my rent."<sup>125</sup>

John Warburton's lack of education is beyond dispute. That he should "want languages to derive words," as he himself puts it to Roger Gale,<sup>126</sup> is not a point to be stressed against him. Much more reprehensible is the weakness revealed by a perusal of the reprint of extracts from his autograph notes on chapels, etc., in Northumberland. 'A callebet watter,' for 'a chalybeate spring,' and spellings like 'blulwark,' 'prespeterian,' 'per-tiquularising,' 'mencon'd,' and the like go far beyond the utmost limits of eighteenth-century licence.<sup>127</sup> He did, however, succeed in learning something about heraldry. At all events, Noble winds up his account of him by remarking: "Impartiality has compelled me to give what I found relative to a character which I admire for his love for science, and despise for his dishonesty and querulous scurrility."<sup>128</sup>

But it is not Warburton's "love of science" that matters to us here. It is his relations with Horsley. The current view regarding these is conveniently summed up in a sentence of Mr. Crawford Hodgson's:

"In early life he entered the service of the Inland Revenue as an officer of excise, and it was probably in connexion with his official duties, that in the memorable year 1715, he came up to Northumberland, where he made the acquaintance, and apparently gained the friendship of the learned John Horsley, author of *Britannia Romana*."<sup>129</sup>

This is plainly based upon Warburton's own allusion to "my late learned friend, and coadjutor, Mr. John Horsley, of Morpeth, in Northumberland," and his further statement that

"This gentleman, during my survey of that county, frequently accompanied me in my journeys, and perambulations, and to him

<sup>125</sup> Nichols, *Lit. Illustrations*, ii, p. 59.

<sup>126</sup> *Stukeley Corr.*, iii, p. 81.

<sup>127</sup> *Arch. Ael.* (3rd ser.), xiii, pp. 3 ff.

<sup>128</sup> *History of the College of Arms* (1805), p. 392.

<sup>129</sup> *Arch. Ael.* (3rd ser.), xiii, p. 1.

I submitted the reading all the Roman inscriptions I discovered on my survey, before they were engraved in my map."<sup>130</sup>

Long before getting so far in my investigations, I had come to realize that it was impossible to believe a single word that Warburton had written, unless it could be corroborated by independent evidence. I therefore thought it well not to proceed farther without endeavouring to ascertain the real facts as to his early connexion with Northumberland. Fortunately the records of the Board of Excise are still in existence, and Mr. Leftwich, the librarian of the Custom House in London, was good enough to go through the official files and send me a *précis* of the relevant documents. Here is the story that they tell.

On February 8th, 1705, "John Warburton, certified by Mr. Brabin, Supervisor, to understand Arithmetick and write a good hand, to be well affected to Her Majesty's Government and of the Communion of the Church of England," was admitted as a recruit on the recommendation of Lord Derby. He was, I should add; a Lancashire man, having been born at Bury, where the Board directed that he was to receive his training. In July, 1706, he received his first appointment, which was to be 'supernumerary' in the Cumberland Collection. On August 18th, 1708, being then an 'officer' at Ravenglass, he effected an exchange to Cockermouth. It looks as if the exchange had represented an attempt to cover up his tracks, for three weeks later he was reduced to the grade of 'assistant' and sent to Newcastle upon Tyne. His misdemeanour was ante-dating his surveys, which means entering in his diaries reports of visits he had never paid. Two months were apparently deemed sufficient to purge him of his offence, for on November 6th, 1708, he was appointed 'officer' of Darlington Ride station, moving less than a year later to Hartlepool. He appears as an 'officer' at Newcastle on January 10th, 1711, on which date he was promoted to be 'examiner'

<sup>130</sup> *Vallum Romanum*, p. viii.

or 'acting supervisor.' Further promotion followed on April 29th, 1712, when he became a full-blown 'supervisor.' Next day he was posted in that capacity to Hexham.

He remained at Hexham for almost four years, and there he found an opportunity of attracting the favourable notice of the Government. On March 2nd, 1716, a minute of the Board ordered that

"John Warburton, Supervisor in Northumberland Collection, having distinguished himself by his eminent services in the late Rebellion by giving notice from time to time of the several steps made by the Rebels whilst they were in Northumberland, and having been since serviceable to the Commissioners appointed to enquire into the forfeited estates by giving them an account of and making discoveries to them of the said estates be Collector of Reading."

Seemingly, however, he never took up duty at Reading, for on March 12th he was appointed from Reading to be collector at Richmond, Yorks. It looked as if his foot were now firmly planted on the ladder. But alas for human frailty! On August 28th, 1718, he was reduced to be 'supervisor' at Wakefield. It appears that, while he was out on his official duties at a market-town, he had behaved with great impropriety, having been hopelessly drunk, treated all the women of the place, and created trouble generally, finally leaving the local officers to foot the bill. Six or seven weeks later he resigned. It is scarcely necessary to ask whether that is the type of man whom Horsley would be likely to admit to his friendship.

Very soon after he quitted the customs service, he was busy with the preparation of a map of Yorkshire, to be published by subscription. Although he was a scoundrel, he was evidently a plausible scoundrel, and, for a time at least, he was able to cast a spell over Ralph Thoresby, the Yorkshire antiquary and topographer, from whose papers we get glimpses of his *modus operandi* and with whom he was actually on visiting terms, his host speaking of him as "an acceptable guest."<sup>131</sup> The earliest

<sup>131</sup> D. H. Atkinson, *Ralph Thoresby the Topographer* (1887), ii, p. 320.

reference to the enterprise as a 'going concern' is in a letter from Thoresby to Charlett, Master of University College, Oxford, dated December 6th, 1718. What is said there indicates that the roads were used as the framework of the survey.<sup>132</sup> There is, indeed, ground for believing that roads were Warburton's main topographical interest: witness his letters to Roger Gale, his acquaintance with whom is probably to be explained by the fact that Gale was a Commissioner of Excise.<sup>133</sup>

Map-making is a quaint avocation to have been adopted by one who was hazy as to the difference between a right angle and an acute. But it is very unlikely that much, if any, of the surveying was done by himself. Grose's statement on that head is borne out by Thoresby's allusions to Warburton's "chief surveyors," two young men from Leeds, named Payler Smith and Bland, who had been engaged on Thoresby's recommendation.<sup>134</sup> His own time would be occupied in canvassing for subscriptions and seeing to the coats of arms of the subscribers, the printing of which on the map was held out as one of its chief attractions. We may guess that his preoccupation with coats of arms accounts for the strange transformation that took place in 1720, when the ex-collector of excise blossomed out into the Somerset Herald. In the same year he was elected a fellow of the Royal Society and of the Society of Antiquaries. I need not follow him to London or refer to the maps of other counties which he published after removing to the capital. But it was worth while dwelling for a moment on his doings in Yorkshire because of the light which these shed

<sup>132</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 316.

<sup>133</sup> The letters are printed in *Stukeley Corr.*, iii, pp. 74 ff. As they appear there, they present a striking contrast to the gross illiteracy of the excerpts from Warburton's own MSS. which were published by Crawford Hodgson in *Arch. Ael.* (3rd ser.), xiii, pp. 3 ff. It looks as if at some stage they had been carefully edited, and the suspicion is strengthened by what can hardly be anything but a mistake in the date of the last of them. It purports to have been written on December 13th, 1723; and yet criticizes a view expressed by Gordon in *Itin. Sept.*; pp. 102 ff. Gordon first visited the district in 1724, and the *Itin. Sept.* was not published until 1726. Has '1728' been misread as '1723'?

<sup>134</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 330 and 332.

on what we may suppose to have been his procedure in Northumberland.

According to Thoresby, the Northumberland map had been a huge success. It was published in 1716, and three years later "it is not to be got for money," as it was only issued to subscribers.<sup>135</sup> Long afterwards Warburton himself claimed that the interest it had aroused had led directly to the revival of the Society of Antiquaries in 1717, a claim which, even at a distance of nearly forty years, so fluttered the London dovecots that at two successive meetings the Society seriously and solemnly discussed the steps that should be taken to "confute" it.<sup>136</sup> In some respects, however, the map does mark a definite advance upon its predecessors. That published by Speed in 1610 had been decorated with 4 Roman inscriptions and 8 coats of arms. Warburton increased these numbers to 25 and 359 respectively. The British Museum copy, doubtless that presented to the Prince of Wales, who had accepted the dedication, is brilliantly coloured, the heraldic blazonry making a brave show. The scale was considerably larger than anyone had employed before, and this made possible an attempt to distinguish the different elements of the 'mural complex.' For the first time the Military Way is separately marked, another indication of Warburton's interest in roads. On the other hand, it cannot be said that the Roman works are laid down with any degree of accuracy. The inscriptions, too, are frequently misread. Even Gordon, whose own epigraphical knowledge was sadly circumscribed, comments severely upon Warburton's readings,<sup>137</sup> and the numerous blunders are, of course, firmly but politely corrected in the *Britannia Romana*.

<sup>135</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 319, in a letter from Thoresby to John Anstis, Garter King of Arms. Horsley, however, speaks (*Brit. Rom.*, p. 239) of "the last edition," as if there had been more than one.

<sup>136</sup> On January 17th and February 14th, 1754. Mr. H. S. Kingsford has kindly sent me the relevant extracts from the Minutes. The statement to which exception was taken will be found in *Vallum Romanum*, p. vi.

<sup>137</sup> *Itin. Sept.*, p. 76.

The idea of the map may have occurred to him while he was still an 'officer' at Newcastle, but its realization must be assigned to the period between 1712 and 1716, when he was a supervisor at Hexham. That the roads served as the framework of the survey in Northumberland, as they were afterwards to do in Yorkshire, may be inferred from what he says in the preface to the *Vallum Romanum*, although there it happens to suit his purpose to pretend that it was the "Roman military ways" that he used.<sup>138</sup> On the strength of Grose's assertion, combined with our knowledge of what happened in Yorkshire, it is a fair assumption that the real work was done for him by others. Indeed, it seems certain that "such leisure as he could spare from the neglect of his official duties" would be fully absorbed otherwise. In addition to canvassing and the study of coats of arms, there would be the search for new Roman inscriptions to lend a touch of novelty to his margin. All his life long he was a ruthless and indefatigable collector. He broke not only into Roman forts but into prehistoric cairns and barrows in the barbarous manner approved by the seeker for curios,<sup>139</sup> with the result that he accumulated what Stukeley describes as:

"a vast treasure of remains of the Druids and of the Romans, which he has collected from about the Roman Wall, Northumberland, coins, fibulas, pins of brass, celts with their cases in brass in which they were cast, glass beads, rings, balls of the Druids, etc."<sup>140</sup>

Here and there the scene of his depredations can still be identified. Hodgson, for instance, mentions a "large green tumulus" near Housesteads, which has a cut through it "made, I believe, by Warburton."<sup>141</sup> Again, we have it on his own confession that he rifled a hypocaust at the place "by Mr. Camden called Magna, but by the

<sup>138</sup> *Vallum Romanum*, p. iv. From a careful comparison of the names Mr. Bosanquet infers that he relied a good deal on Gibson's *Camden*.

<sup>139</sup> *Stukeley Corr.*, iii, p. 82.

<sup>140</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 139.

<sup>141</sup> *Hist. of Northumberland*, pt. 2, vol. iii, p. 288.



vulgar, *Chester-in-the-wood*,"<sup>142</sup> a descriptive name which (Mr. Bosanquet tells me) can only indicate Chesterholm. That his operations were much more nearly akin to burglary than to scientific excavation is clear from the account of them which we get in the *Britannia Romana*. In his introductory remarks on the inscriptions of Northumberland, Horsley writes :

" Mr. Warburton had made the largest collection, who was at a great deal of pains and expence to collect the most curious *Roman* stones he could find in this county; but he unhappily broke many of them in order to make them more portable, and so carried off only that part of the stone which had the inscription. By this means it has happened that many of the stones collected by him are only faces of altars, and in several instances the inscriptions themselves have suffered damage by this unhappy frugality."<sup>143</sup>

It is true that, long after Horsley was dead, Warburton " denies the charge in every part," as he puts it, " in vindication of himself from this unjust accusation of a parsimonious incuriosity." But his word cannot stand for a moment against Horsley's, particularly as he adds by way of explanation that " the *Romans* frequently broke and defaced altars on particular occasions."<sup>144</sup> It is inconceivable that the scholar who gave the world the *Britannia Romana* should ever have been a " coadjutor " in archæological research conducted along these lines. He certainly knew Warburton. Possibly he visited Hexham from time to time to see any additions that the collection had received, for (as we know) he made a point of measuring and drawing every Roman inscription that came to light. Even as to that, however, we cannot be sure. He would have ample opportunity to make a personal examination later on, seeing that the owner left the collection behind him when he was transferred to Yorkshire. Warburton does indeed affirm that the read-

<sup>142</sup> *Stukeley Corr.*, iii, p. 76. The altar there found is correctly attributed to Chesterholm by Horsley. Warburton himself in the *Vallum Romanum* declared that it came from Procolitia (Carrawburgh), to which it is also attributed by Gordon (*Itin. Sept.*, pp. 74 f.).

<sup>143</sup> *Brit. Rom.*, p. 182.

<sup>144</sup> *Vallum Romanum*, p. 40.

ings were all submitted to Horsley before they were engraved upon the map, and that therefore any errors which appear there are Horsley's own.<sup>145</sup> The second part of this statement is obviously false. If there is any truth in the first part, it can only mean that Horsley thought it was not worth while discussing such subjects seriously with one whom he knew to be a charlatan. Nevertheless Warburton, who was an adept at picking the brains of better men than himself, appears to have got something out of Horsley after all. On no other hypothesis is it possible to account for the fact that three of the *Notitia* names occur on the map in their proper positions—Cylurnum (*sic*), which Gordon failed to find, Procolitia, and Borcovicus.<sup>146</sup>

Once the map was published, Warburton's enthusiasm for Roman inscriptions evaporated. He first tried to sell the Chesterholm altar and some of the others to Humphrey Wanley, "my Lord Oxford's library-keeper." When the negotiations broke down, as a result of his demanding "ten times their value," he next thought of presenting the altar to the King, but was discouraged by Roger Gale, who told him it was unlikely that the King would ever see it.<sup>147</sup> Ultimately he disposed of the collection to Dr. Christopher Hunter, and the stones were transported from Hexham to Durham, where they are now to be seen in the Cathedral Library. By this time he had moved to Yorkshire. With the inscriptions he apparently dismissed the Wall from his mind. More than thirty years later, however, he again stepped into the limelight in Northumberland. The scare occasioned by the Highland raid of 1745 had awakened the Government to the need for

<sup>145</sup> *Vallum Romanum*, p. viii.

<sup>146</sup> My attention was drawn to the significance of this by Mr. Bosanquet, who examined the map for me before I found it possible to get access to it myself. Horsley must have been elaborating his scheme as early as 1712-16.

<sup>147</sup> *Stukeley Corr.*, iii, p. 76, and *Vallum Romanum*, pp. 162 f. Wanley's account of the business will be found in Nichols, *Lit. Anecdotes*, viii, p. 363: he describes Warburton as "extremely greedy, fickle, and apt to go from his word." There was an amusing sequel when the two came to negotiate about the purchase of manuscripts (*ibid.*).

a trunk road between Newcastle and Carlisle, and an Act authorizing its construction was passed in 1751. What Warburton's share in the business really was, it is impossible to say. If it were worth while, a search in the Record Office might reveal the facts. But his own version was that the plan was merely a revival of one that he had put forward in 1715, and that "after an application of thirty-eight years I at length obtained my desire, and have now the pleasure of being a coadjutor in the re-edification of this truly royal military road."

The sentence just quoted is from the preface to the *Vallum Romanum*, the book by which he is best known, and also the book in which he played a last shameful trick on Horsley's memory and at the same time created what may unhesitatingly be called the fiction of his own survey of the Wall. The volume appeared in 1753. Towards the end of the preface, which is dated "Herald Office, January 1, 1754," he makes the allegations I have already cited that Horsley had been his companion and collaborator in 1715-16, and that it was Horsley who was responsible for the mistakes, "if any such there are," in the inscriptions engraved on the map of Northumberland. He then concludes :

"This affair has laid me under a necessity of copying his remarks and observations, and I do not fear the reader's being displeas'd with me on that account."

So seemingly frank an admission prepares one for finding extensive quotations from the *Britannia Romana*, and it has been generally recognized that the work is a mere *rechauffé* of Horsley. But only a line-by-line comparison makes it possible to appreciate the atrocious nature of the piracy. There are 159 pages of text, and I think I am within the mark when I say that half a dozen of these would afford comfortable accommodation for the whole of Warburton's own contributions, if they were strung together end to end. There are a few insignificant changes, such as 'Camden' for 'Cambden' and two

or three so-called 'corrections' of Horsley, the most noteworthy of the latter being the systematic alteration of 'Watling-street' into 'Ermin-street,' as the name of what would more properly have been called Dere Street. Otherwise what we get is a *verbatim* reprint of extracts from the *Britannia Romana*, ingeniously pieced together so as to run like a continuous whole. When the first personal pronoun occurs, as it does very frequently, the voice may be the voice of Warburton, but the hand is always the hand of Horsley.

Thus, on pages 7 and 8 we read :

"The length of *Severus's* wall is certainly known, it having been three times measured of late; once by Mr. *Gordon*; a second time by my order; and a third by the board of ordnance, *Anno 1750*: And as there is little difference between the three measures, it is a proof that there is no material mistake in either. . . . The number of stations (or places of observation) upon the same principal stationary line, in the survey I ordered to be made, were an hundred and sixty-four; the length of the wall sixty-eight miles and three furlongs, including the length of the stations at each end."

If this be looked at alongside of the passage quoted some time ago<sup>148</sup> from the *Britannia Romana*, it will be seen that there are only three differences—the insertion of the words "and a third by the board of ordnance, *Anno 1750*" and the consequential substitution of "three times" for "twice" and of "three" for "two." The second survey, then, which has hitherto been generally believed to be Warburton's, was really Horsley's. There is no room for a survey by Warburton at all. Yet his brazen effrontery has deceived even the very elect. Being honourable men, they have supposed that the sentences just quoted were to be read in connexion with the opening sentence of his preface :

"As an introduction to this work, I must inform my readers that, in the memorable year 1715, I caused a survey and plan to be made of the ancient Roman-wall and Military-way."

That is demonstrably untrue. If Warburton were here,

<sup>148</sup> *Supra*, p. 20.

he would probably put forward the defence that it was his map of Northumberland to which he was referring. That, however, will not do. The "ancient Roman-wall and Military-way" ran on into Cumberland, and their course within that county is laid down upon the Northumberland map in a fashion which proves that Warburton's knowledge of it was of the vaguest. Further, it was in Northumberland that all his inscriptions from the Wall were collected. His name figures only once in the Cumberland section of the *Britannia Romana*, and it is an exception which proves the rule. A stone in his possession bore an inscription which suggested to Horsley that it might have come from Bewcastle. In the *Vallum Romanum* (p. 112) Warburton adds a note that he had found it at Poltross, which is of course on the county border. His archæological journeys, unlike Horsley's, would seem to have been restricted within the limits of his official district, a self-denying ordinance which would have one obvious advantage. It would be easy to arrange that they should be made at the public expense.

Now that we know that the legend of Warburton's survey had no foundation, it is pertinent to inquire how it passed into common currency. Gough in his *British Topography*<sup>149</sup> took the statement in Warburton's preface at its face value and repeated it without comment. But the chief responsibility probably rests upon Hutchinson, who fell headlong into the trap that had been so cunningly set. In his *View of Northumberland* (1776)<sup>150</sup> he reprinted the account of the three surveys exactly as it had appeared in the *Vallum Romanum*, down even to the incriminating "either," excepting only that "by my order" became "by order of Mr. Warburton," while "the survey I ordered" was changed to "the survey Mr. Warburton ordered." From that day until this no one has ventured to be a doubter. There has, however, been some difference of opinion as to when Warburton's survey was made. Hutchinson, as might be expected from the authority he

<sup>149</sup> Ed. 1780, vol. ii, p. 62.

<sup>150</sup> Vol. i, p. 27.

was following, seems to have assumed that it was in 1715-16, and so do Messrs. Gibson and Simpson in their account of the fort on Haltwhistle Burn.<sup>151</sup> John Hodgson, on the other hand, assigned it to 1751.<sup>152</sup> Dr. Collingwood Bruce concurred, believing that Warburton had been the surveyor employed by the "board of ordnance."<sup>153</sup>

There is one more difficulty to be disposed of. What about "Warburton's own map of the Wall, which is in many ways superior to that contained in Horsley's work?"<sup>154</sup> There is no doubt that the map prefixed to the *Vallum Romanum* has done more to bring credit to Warburton than any of his other achievements. Unfortunately, like the text and the rest of the illustrations, it is no better than stolen property. That was the conclusion I arrived at, as soon as it was clear to me that the story of his survey was apocryphal. Nor was it difficult to guess where it had come from. On Warburton's own evidence there had been three surveys of the Wall. We know that the map which might have resulted from Gordon's was never published. We know that the fruits of Horsley's are to be found in the plates of the *Britannia Romana*. There only remained the one which was made by the "board of ordnance." The map in the *Vallum Romanum* must have been based upon that. If this line of reasoning were right, it ought to be possible to discover the original.

No help was forthcoming from Southampton, as the Ordnance Survey Department did not really come into existence until a considerably later date. But enquiry at the British Museum evoked an immediate response. In the bound copy of the Acts of Parliament for 1751 which is preserved in the library there (*General Acts, 24 George 2*), and immediately in front of the Act authorizing the construction of the Newcastle-Carlisle road, there

<sup>151</sup> *Arch. Ael.* (3rd ser.), v, p. 213.

<sup>152</sup> *Hist. of Northumberland*, pt. 2, vol. iii, p. 283.

<sup>153</sup> *Arch. Ael.* (N.S.), vi, p. 222.

<sup>154</sup> *J.R.S.*, xi, p. 53.

is inserted a folding map, which is signed "N. Hill sculp<sup>t</sup>" in the lower right-hand corner, and which is without question the original from which the map in the *Vallum Romanum* has been copied.<sup>155</sup> It was probably issued either for the use of Members of Parliament when discussions were proceeding, or for the information of the general public after the Bill had reached the statute-book. There are differences between the two, but their substantial identity is unmistakable. The original is on a somewhat larger scale and has the course of 'The New Projected Road' indicated by a dotted line, engraved and washed with colour. Naturally it does not go beyond Newcastle on the east and Carlisle on the west. It betrays its military origin by the entry "Gen<sup>l</sup> Wade|Encamp'd here|1745," which is left out on the copy. This was the very time when first-rate engineer officers, like Watson and Roy, were devoting a great deal of time and attention to surveying in the north of England and in Scotland. Is it for a moment credible that the army authorities would enlist the services of the Somerset Herald, now verging upon seventy, and a notoriously disreputable character besides? Or is it in any way surprising that their map should be superior to that which George Mark, with far less experience, had produced for Horsley?

Warburton, then, with or without leave, utilized the map of the "board of ordnance" to provide one for his book. This is hardly the place for a detailed comparison of the two. But a few salient points may be noted. The titles, including the mis-spelling "CASTALLA," are the

<sup>155</sup> Mr. Bosanquet has ascertained that there is a copy in the Public Library at Newcastle. While there is no evidence that Nathaniel Hill, the engraver, had any official position, it is perhaps significant that in 1748 he engraved a set of charts entitled *Plans of Harbours and Roads in St. George's Channel; Lately Survey'd under the direction of the Lords of the Admiralty*. I owe this information to Mr. Skells of the Map Room in the British Museum, who has supplied a further link by pointing out that Hill was the engraver of Warburton's map of Hertfordshire. If the whereabouts of the original map of 'The New Projected Road' could be discovered, it would probably reveal the names of the actual surveyors. It was suggested to me that it might be among the archives kept in the Victoria Tower. But Lord Macmillan, who has been good enough to make enquiry, tells me he is informed there are no maps there of older date than 1794.

same down to the word "lye," after which the official map has merely the words "upon this Survey," whereas the copy runs on: "adjacent thereunto and are described in the History and Antiquities of the said Wall lately Published by John Warburton Esquire, Somerset Herald and Fellow of the Royal Society." Five of the six insets in the *Vallum Romanum* version are borrowed from the original, but the sixth, showing the plan of the forts, is an adaptation from Horsley. As the choice of names shows, the *Britannia Romana* has also been drawn upon for the completion of the Wall between Carlisle and the Cumberland coast, and also, though to a less extent, for the country between Newcastle and the sea. Some of the entries on the military map, such as 'VINDOLONA' (*sic*), are omitted. But the great majority are reproduced, including 'PROCOLITA' (*sic*), while some absurd blunders have been made in the process of transcription, 'Gosford' becoming 'Gofford' and 'Humps Haugh' masquerading as 'Rumps Haugh.' These and other like errors are a clear symptom of hack-work. The oddest and most revealing of them relates to Dere Street. On the military map this is designated 'Watling Street.' On the copy it appears as 'Rmin Street.' This means that Warburton's instructions to his engraver were given verbally, and that he pronounced 'Ermin' as 'Armin.' The only additions of any importance, apart from those at the two extremes, are one or two relating to roads, such as 'A Military way call'd Wreken Dike,' and the inevitable 'Devil's Causeway,' of his association with which Warburton was inordinately proud. He more than once boasts that he was its discoverer.<sup>156</sup> If this is true, he probably gave it its name. If not, it will at least be conceded that he would have been an eminently appropriate godfather.

And so we may take farewell of John Warburton, whose scandalous, if undeservedly successful, career has been so strangely interwoven with my story. Before I end, let us for a moment glance back, by way of contrast,

<sup>156</sup> *Stukeley Corr.*, iii, pp. 75 and 81 f.



at the picture which was presented in the earlier portion of this lecture. John Horsley was revealed as able and learned, courteous and high-minded, just and generous, warmly esteemed by a wide circle of friends and neighbours. Diligent in business, alike as pastor and as head of a school, he nevertheless found leisure to write a book that marks an epoch in the study of the Roman Empire. He was cut off in his prime. Yet, throughout the eighteenth and the greater part of the nineteenth century he bestrides the narrow world of Romano-British archæology like a Colossus. We do well to hold him in remembrance to-day. Scanty as is the information that can be gathered regarding his life and personality, it is still amply sufficient to justify us in feeling serenely confident that

“ Whatever record leap to light,  
He never shall be shamed.”

#### POSTSCRIPT.

Since I passed the proof of this lecture for the press, information has reached me which suggests that the original map of the Wall, which Hill engraved and Warburton copied (pp. 54-56 above), may be preserved in the War Office.