XVIII.—REVIEWS.

I.—THE OXFORD HISTORY OF ENGLAND: *Roman Britain and the English settlements,* by R. G. COLLINGWOOD and J. N. L. MYRES, pp. i-xxvi, 1-515, with ten maps.

This very notable first volume of a fine enterprise in English historical writing has been awaited for some time with eagerness both by specialists and a growing public attracted by the subjects of which it treats. All are familiar with professor Collingwood's brilliant gift of exposition; and expectation has been further heightened by the inclusion of an authoritative statement upon the settlements of the Anglo-Saxons, by a distinguished exponent of that dark subject.

That a treat awaits the reader is thus a foregone conclusion. But what kind of treat? Professor Collingwood is so good a historian that his real profession escapes many of his readers. On this occasion, his newly won Waynflete professorship enables him to affirm more specifically than hitherto that his real work is philosophy. Philosopher-historians are rare birds, and the point has a bearing upon the character of the book. We may recall that Aristotle thought it worth while to study history seriously, as most philosophers do not, for the sake of what it would teach him of the minds and methods of his fellow-men: and seized a unique opportunity to do this by way of Greek constitutional history. Professor Collingwood chooses a different medium (certainly no less relevant to contemporary affairs), namely, the reaction of one type of social life to another in Britain under the Romans. His work, as he affirms, is neither a military nor a political

history. It is a sociological study, full of profound morals for those who will have the courage to draw them. He who fastens upon this or that detail, criticizing it apart from its context, will miss the true purpose of a book which only a philosopher could have written.

Concentration upon sociological features thus dictates the relative brevity of the political history. In discussing the British artistic gifts, Mr. Collingwood points out that their genius lay in a great ability to work at abstract form, combined with unequalled surety of line. Would it be too much to say that these are exactly the characteristics of his own brilliant prose, quick with inner meaning, strong and sure as the patterns which he loves? Thirty-one pages suffice to describe the physical and ethnological features of our island, as leading up to the expeditions of Julius Cæsar. The significance of the first Belgic invasion, of great political import and gravely detrimental to the native La Tène culture, is defined in a way that will be new to all who read it. Equally remarkable is the treatment of Cæsar's expeditions, which, considered in the light of contemporary affairs in Gaul, are explained as an original plan of complete conquest, boldly conceived upon inadequate information, and finally frustrated by poor reconnaissance, bad weather, ignorant seamanship and the danger of revolt in Gaul. It is an acute remark that if Cæsar took the risk of a Gallic rebellion while invading Britain, his successors risked British aggression while confining themselves to Gaul: and this view of Cæsar's work enables the question of conquest to be posed in new form. The second Belgic invasion, of exiles and refugees, only emphasized the need for including Britain within the empire; and it is rightly pointed out that the question is less why should Britain be annexed, than why should the action have been so long delayed. As Roman home affairs postponed the matter, the need became more pressing. When the invasion came, the right base of operations, at Richborough, had been discovered: and the

defeat on the Medway—a single hitch in a good plan—is explained by Mr. Collingwood as due to expectation, based on Cæsar's experience, that the decisive battle would be fought at the Thames.

The new province founded by Claudius was an interesting blend of client-kingdoms and Roman territory, in harmony with Claudian policy elsewhere. Yet these very comparisons prompt questions pertinent if unorthodox. Is the making of a *municipium* out of Belgic huts at Verulam really comparable with the veteran-settled *municipia* of Mauretania, planted to offset the lack of civil centres? And was Tacitus (*Ann.* xiv, 33) using *municipium* any more exactly than in *Agricola* 22 to describe the *civitas* of Verulamium? Again, was the temple of Claudius at Camulodunum really intended for the whole province? Tacitus cites it as a burden to the Trinovantes: and if the temple is understood as the colony's, in which the tribesmen had an oppressive share, the building itself becomes normal and the personal dedication to Claudius explicable as to the patron of the colony. The excavations at Colchester give no hint of a capital contemplated or laid out before the foundation of the colony in A.D. 50.

Meanwhile, the conquest went forward. It had been interrupted by Caratacus, and the Silures maintained the struggle which he bequeathed. Whether it was so severe as to involve the loss of the western legionary fortress our authority does not say (Tac. *Ann.* xii, 38). The relations with Cartimandua, client-queen of the Brigantes, now become important, and all will be grateful for the unravelling of the tangled story (pp. 93, 96-8, 107). Action against Wales did not come yet. The permanent conquest of the Degeangli is shown by lead pigs as complete in A.D. 74: but Mr. Collingwood dates the creation of Chester five years later still. This provocative view is a complete reversal of Haverfield's trend, and will perhaps inspire the recovery of decisive evidence on the site itself. If Caerleon can yield "ample proof" of its original date, so can the

sister-fortress: and still more so can Wroxeter, where even less is known of the matter at issue.

To treat Agricola's work in perspective would have daunted most of writers; for if others had no biographer, Agricola had a singularly doughty one. Yet this section is probably one of the best in the book. Two points attract the reviewer's attention. The inference that the fifth campaign was "overseas" is based on the worst part of a corrupt passage otherwise acknowledged to yield no sound guidance. Again, granting that Agricola's strategy was to prick the Caledonians out of their fastnesses, opinions will differ as to how far, and where, they emerged. The Roman troops marched a long way to meet them; there were many occasions on which army and navy met. Does not this seem to place *mons Graupius* beyond Strathmore?

The period between Agricola and Hadrian is treated sparingly and well. The problem attaching to the Stanegate frontier is shown to be one of extent rather than function, and, incidentally, of special interest to this society. It is well known that, since the author wrote, fresh confirmation has been obtained of the close relation between Wall and Vallum. His description of the dual frontier as fiscal and military nevertheless leaps ahead of the spade, and it will be interesting to see how it will be overtaken. The Wall-question, indeed, moves so fast as to excite the mirth even of those who work upon it: and excavations published in these pages now show that not only the Wall but its forts were modified during building. The author's account, however, is by far the most comprehensive and up-to-date so far produced, and will be especially welcome to the general reader.

The reinforcement of Hadrian's Wall by the Antonine Vallum, from Forth to Clyde, presents other problems, to which it is impossible to do real justice here. The author and reviewer are not at one about the "unusual weakness" of the Scottish barrier, but apart from that, agree upon the scope and purpose of the *limes*. One must indeed regret

that the exploration of the Antonine Wall has not been accompanied by further exploration of the forts beyond it; for views both as to purpose and failure of the *limes* must depend upon a knowledge of the treatment and history of the land between Forth and Tay. The evidence for equating the disasters on the Scottish Wall with events south of Hadrian's Wall is penetratingly criticized by professor Collingwood. Finality is not yet: but we gain the very stimulating suggestion that the "cutting-off" of Brigantian territory may well have coincided with the foundation of a *colonia* at York. So long as this territory is not confused with that of the Parisi, the notion accords well with the Castleford milestone, numbered from York and not, like the north-Yorkshire milestones, from Aldborough.

The military history is then brought to an end with an account of the restoration and campaigns of Severus, and the author is free at last to bring his mind to bear upon the civil province. These chapters are among the most valuable in the book. They open with an excellent account of the civil government, followed by a chapter on the people, in which the author revises his previously published figure for the population, putting it now at a round million. The remarks upon physical type and racial features are particularly valuable at a time when science is in continual danger of prostitution to racial prejudice. Whether the Spitalfields bones in fact belonged to Boudicca's victims is perhaps not susceptible of proof: but the common burial wins some support from the sepulture of the legions of Varus (Tac. *Ann.* i, 62). The treatment of the people in order to render them fit for membership of the Roman world is then recounted. The Roman held that to civilize was to urbanize, and acted accordingly. Despite slow progress, the programme of providing each canton with an urban centre of government was carried through. Agricola, who claimed to understand the Britons, was not deterred by lack of enthusiasm for the scheme: but it is significant that the task had finally to be carried

through by Hadrian, on the lavish autocratic scale that marks all his actions in the island. The man who never flinched from his soldiers brooked no civilian interference with his plans. However men may have disliked the cost of his schemes, they must have appreciated their healthy coherence. The province protected by a magnificent new frontier was to be well equipped with the machinery of citizenship as the heart and head of the empire understood it.

The factor which destroyed this ideal all over the empire was partly political and partly economic. As professor Collingwood points out, the outwardness of the decline has been defined by Rostovtzeff. Army revolutions and frontier-wars bore throughout the third century more and more heavily upon the tax-paying unit—in other words, the town authorities—until bankruptcy of resource in the governing and the governed ran in a vicious circle. Small wonder that the fundamental dislike of northern folk for town-life re-asserted itself until towns stood ruinous and exchequers empty of all but essential payments. Yet side by side with this, in Britain especially, the country was prosperous and still effectively shielded against invasion. This country-side is subjected to a closer analysis than ever before, in which professor Collingwood makes liberal acknowledgment to Mr. C. E. Stevens. The Romanizing of the country-estate was a field in which Briton and Roman were least antagonistic of all, and where Rome undoubtedly won her greatest success. It is a curious and not irrelevant point that these remains still exercise the greatest hold upon British interest and imagination. The villa-culture embraced all the wealthy native aristocracy and farmers, and this reviewer has shown, in a previous volume, how it worked its way among remoter and less wealthy people like the Parisi. Contrasted with the villas, sometimes mingled with them but more often occupying poorer land in distinct groups, are the villages, teeming with folk upon an altogether different level of culture.

Many highly important things are said about the villages and villas. There is good reason for thinking them connected with quite different types of agricultural practice; and for suspecting that in Wiltshire, estate owners became interested in sheep-walks and that villages were abandoned. If the relations between the two units are still full of obscurity, these distinctions mark a real advance in our knowledge of them.

On the economic life of the province very useful points are also made. It is shown that an adverse balance of trade was steadily corrected as the province created its own producers, and, incidentally, adjusted its demands better to suit a thinly lined pocket. While bearing in mind that Appian did not count Britain a profitable province, we must remember that this was the government's point of view. Local affairs were thriving, and their needs were being met on a more lavish scale than ever before, but there was an absence of large-scale enterprise. Not a few interesting points emerge. The wide-spread distribution of the coal-trade, the industrial villages of Anglesey, the replacement of town-markets by rustic fairs, are all facts scarcely current before the publication of this volume. External trade, to Scotland and Ireland, fills two useful paragraphs.

In art, on the contrary, the Briton was no apt pupil. Professor Collingwood is at his happiest in explaining why this should be, because the whole trend of British art had been towards abstract form, the very antithesis of classical ideals. Not only were the master and pupil at cross-purposes, but the unity of the school had been disturbed before the new master came by a great accession of Belgic folk who never acquired its older La Tène tradition. This view is elaborated with great success to show why native tradition was so rapidly stifled; why native works in the Roman manner were nearly always so devastatingly bad; and why, finally, native tradition should yet emerge at the close of the Roman occupation, and grow to new

strength in the seventh and eighth centuries. In considering his varied examples, Mr. Collingwood never overstates the case: and it is particularly interesting to see him hesitating over the question of a Gallic sculptor for the Bath Gorgon, the one case of a classical subject suiting, with startling result, the northern tradition. In the reviewer's opinion, based upon Gallic monuments, the hesitation is very amply justified.

In religion, Briton and Roman were upon better terms once more. Indeed, it is only in virtue of their adoption of Roman dress that the native cults win surviving recognition. The story of these cults is well known to all, but the distribution-maps make it plainer. Indeed, Vitiris, long familiar to students of the Hadrian's Wall, wins an entirely new place in the local pantheon by virtue of such a map. The growth of Christianity is also discussed with more sound sense, and therefore with truer reverence, than in many works.

When these indications of the scope and character of Romano-British culture have been discussed, the political history is resumed once more. In three final chapters, the end of Roman Britain is discussed anew. The first chapter describes the growing paralysis of the central government, despite its brilliant reorganization by Diocletian and his successors. So far as the north is concerned, the end has come in this chapter: for Mr. Collingwood fully accepts the current view of an evacuation of the Wall under Maximus, finding a place between him and Stilicho for the traditional federate-kingship of Cunedda. Further south, the central government was less ready to retract its hold. After at one time advocating strongly an evacuation of the province in A.D. 410, on a literal interpretation of the numismatic evidence, Mr. Collingwood now recognizes the essential weakness of that evidence in an age when money was counting for less than ever before." He therefore accepts the arguments of Bury and Stein, and postulates a tenuous re-occupation of southern Britain

under the *comes Britanniarum*, supported by few troops and an ever-growing number of *foederati*. There is nothing improbable in the view; and various traditions agree in suggesting that the new start gave strength to the tribal communities to carry on the work of governing the cantons for nearly half a century, with or without central aid. Then came a change. Whether the spiritual tension of the effort had been too great, or whether bolder spirits were making themselves felt more completely in the work of church rather than of state, the Britons now gave way, and allowed themselves to be dominated by tyrants of the federate-king class; and these called in the Saxons. After some decades of misery, one outstanding attempt was made to bring peace to the country, organized by Arthur and his knights: for Mr. Collingwood's explanation of this age-old legend as applicable to a squadron of cataphracts and their *dux*, on the model of the *comes* for which the Britons had pleaded in vain, is one of the most remarkable achievements of his brilliant mind. To read these chapters is an education: to re-read them brings the conviction that their main outline is right beyond cavil. They form a rich epilogue to a story re-created throughout with a surety of touch which we have already praised.

On turning to the final sections of the book, by Mr. Myres, the reader is at once aware of another atmosphere. It is no impoliteness to say that these chapters lack the fire and zeal of the Romano-British section, because their treatment must necessarily be different. As the bibliography reveals, Mr. Collingwood is telling a story of which the framework is already published and generally current. Mr. Myres has the very different task of presenting the reader with the actual evidence upon which his case is built. This evidence is of highly diverse character, not collected in popular form before, and indeed few are capable of its collection. Thus, to read this very cautious prose is a treat of an entirely different kind. It is neither aglow with conviction nor alive with apothegm, for the

subject has not yet arrived at this stage. Nor is the present reviewer competent to criticize all the detail presented. The whole work reads to him as a scholarly presentation of the material upon which an account of the subject will some day be based, when each division of the inquiry has been further advanced. Nevertheless, the outlines are there. We are introduced to the homes of the invaders beyond the seas, and guided, partly by tradition in literature and place-names, and partly by archæological material, to follow the fortunes of each group in their new settlements in Britain. The whole presentation is a model of cautious and weighty treatment. Readers of this journal will be particularly interested in the chapter on the Humbrenses, in which Mr. Myres confesses a debt to an unpublished thesis by Mr. G. S. Keeney. Here the double character of the settlement of Deira and Bernicia is emphasized; the former closely connected with other settlers radiating from Ouse and Trent; the latter isolated and dependent upon either the Tyne valley or the coastal fastnesses of Lindisfarne and St. Abb's. To Bernicia the relations between Anglian lord and British vassal gave the very distinctive complexion which survived into the twelfth century. Let the reader therefore pay no less attention to the second part of this book than the first, realizing that both represent different stages well and soundly reached in the great study of man.

I. A. RICHMOND.

II.—Official guides to Norham, Dunstanburgh and Warkworth castles. H.M. Office of Works.

The Ancient Monuments department of the Office of Works has done well to entrust the writing of these handbooks to a pair of experts to whom Northumbrian archæology already owes much. Such a partnership is an ideal arrangement by which the history and the architecture of the buildings concerned receive an equal share of attention. It is no easy task, in dealing with a complicated series of structures, to combine clearness of statement with conciseness of handling, and to meet the needs of the ordinary tourist while endeavouring to satisfy the enquiries of more serious students. So far as it is possible to achieve such success, Mr. Blair and Mr. Honeyman have used their skill to the best advantage. Into his historical sketches Mr. Blair has managed to pack a remarkable amount of information, while Mr. Honeyman's architectural descriptions show a sense of essential details and a grasp of the organic existence of the three castles without which descriptions, however accurate, may easily degenerate into mere inventories.

The castles are so well known that there is no need to dwell here upon their leading features: on these the handbooks may well speak for themselves. But it may be remarked that the authors have been fortunate in the variety of the types of castle on which they have worked. There is a great difference between the development of the castle plan at Norham, working on normal lines with the great tower as its nucleus, and the elaborate conversion of a fortress into a palace of which there is no better or clearer example in England than Warkworth. While both these grew, each in its own way, from a mount-and-bailey origin which later building at Warkworth never obscured, Dunstanburgh is a castle of comparatively late foundation,

without a predecessor on the site which Thomas of Lancaster began to fortify in 1313. Although there is more than one other instance at earlier and at later dates of the transformation of a gatehouse into a keep, this development at Dunstanburgh, accompanied by a somewhat economical provision of domestic buildings, seems to have been intended to give final security to a stronghold which it was impossible to complete on the scale originally contemplated by the builders of the gatehouse.

The Dunstanburgh handbook is admirably illustrated, and two of the four photographs give an excellent idea of the site. It is a pity that the only photograph of Warkworth is the very pretty general view from the river. Of the three views of Norham one is a reproduction of the Bucks' print, which in this case gives a good representation of the outer walls and gatehouse. In addition to carefully shaded and easily legible folding plans, first and second floor plans of the keep at Warkworth and a first floor plan of that at Norham are given. In this connexion the convenient elasticity of the term "keep," unknown to the builders of these castles, may be noted, as applied equally to the twelfth-century donjon at Norham, the blocked gatehouse at Dunstanburgh, and the tower-house on the mount at Warkworth. As regards the date of the last of these buildings, which Mr. Cadwallader Bates contended was erected by the first earl of Northumberland, the opinion expressed here is that it may have been planned in his time, but was not built until later. This is probably right, for, while Mr. Honeyman suggests that Salvin's repairs to the south-west part of the tower may give a mistaken impression of late date, the details of window-openings and recesses throughout do not admit of the acceptance of a date so early as that postulated by Mr. Bates. Whether, on the other hand, the cruciform chapel in the bailey, of which the foundations and vaults remain, formed part of a scheme projected by the first earl is very uncertain, and it is very much more likely to have been

begun in the days of the fourth earl. The absence of documentary evidence for these important fifteenth-century additions is much to be regretted.

The Hermitage at Warkworth is described in a shorter pamphlet, which does full justice to this curious and interesting monument and its employment of architectural forms in the adornment of a rock-hewn habitation. As Mr. Blair reminds us, the site has been the theme of legendary treatment unsuitable for the pages of a serious guide-book. It is certainly one of the great advantages of this series of official handbooks, issued at a low price, that they can do much to dispel those popular superstitions which, in the absence of sound and easily obtainable information, have deluded credulous visitors to ruined abbeys and castles for generations. Mr. Blair's devotion to truth, now as on many previous occasions, rejects the spurious if time-honoured form "Pudsey" for the name of the prelate responsible for the keep of Norham castle. He was actually, however, Hugh, not of Puiset, but of Le Puiset, if we are to give him his proper name. We note in the Dunstanburgh handbook that Thomas of Lancaster is said to have been executed in the hall of Pontefract castle. As a matter of fact, he was beheaded on the hill at some distance from the castle, where St. Clement's chapel afterwards was founded in his memory. This, however, is of no great moment in the context. It is a compliment to Mr. Blair to say that, severely compressed as his historical narratives are, his vivid sense of the life and colour of the past make them very different from inanimate recitals, and the austerity with which he regards legend is not proof against the story of the coming of Sir William Marmion to Norham some generations before the time of Scott's fabulous hero.

A. HAMILTON THOMPSON.