

XV.—REVIEWS

1. *The Roman Occupation of South-Western Scotland*, J. Clarke, J. M. Davidson, Anne Robertson and J. K. St. Joseph, edited by S. N. Miller. Quarto, pp. i-xx, 1-246, pls. i-lxvi, figs. 1-12; Glasgow, 1952; to be obtained from the Hon. Secretary, Glasgow Archæological Society, 2 Ailsa Drive, Glasgow, S.2.

Publication of these important topographical studies has been delayed for thirteen years, during which substantial gains in knowledge have accrued in neighbouring districts. Account of these is taken in the editor's historical summary, which closes the book and is now posthumous. It may be said that without his example, encouragement and judgment the Glasgow school of Romano-British archæology would hardly have flourished as it has. His wide outlook, passing beyond provincial studies to embrace the Empire, prevented his school from becoming regional in scope or bias: and it is a significant testimony to his belief in the unity of studies that he secured a major contribution in the book from an outsider.

No study of Roman roads in Northern Britain so detailed as Dr. St. Joseph's has yet been published: it is a model of its kind, important not only for local topography, but for the system's general significance. An interesting appendage is Mr. Davidson's account of the Kelvin bridge, which invites supplementation by the spade. Then come the forts, necessary complement to the roads, and here studied by aeroplane, by trial trenches and by large-scale excavations, the last still in progress when the texts were prepared. The accounts of Milton (Tassiesholm), Castledykes and Loudon Hill, how-

ever welcome as interim statements, are largely ephemeral. But those of Bothwellhaugh, Crawford and Wardlaw forts, Durisdeer, Fairholm, Dalmakethar and Barburgh Mill fortlets, and the nondescript site at West Galloberry, perhaps a practice-work, represent all likely to be issued for some time. Bothwellhaugh gave evidence for an Antonine occupation of two periods and the fort is big enough for 1,000 men; but Plate lviii is useless and a larger plan would have been welcome. Crawford fort is less than half as big and furnished proof of two periods of occupation. Wardlaw, $7\frac{1}{2}$ acres, is exceptionally large, as if to house sea-borne supplies in bulk. Among the fortlets, detailed excavation fell to Durisdeer and Milton. The Durisdeer rampart was of broken rock, though no hint was recovered of revetments or gateway structures. Its elliptical curves are unusual and oddly related to the internal timber building. The plan of the work is the worst in the book and one would think it had been more like Milton. Fairholm (fig. 9) is of exceptional interest, if the rampart to east heralds a large new site, as at Milton. If the fortlet was polygonal, it is matched on the German *limes*. Dalmakethar presents interesting rampart structure. Barburgh Mill is of normal pattern, like Redshaw Burn, where, however, the single gateway bisects the longer side, as at Roper Castle.

The historical summary is a valuable stock-taking. To the topographical framework must be added new discoveries in Galloway and Renfrewshire, ever enriching Tacitus: but Miller's study sets much of the picture, just as his comments upon Fendoch, Dealgin Ross and Bochastle emphasize the blank between Bochastle and Balloch. His assessment of the early occupation is equally prescient, though more might even now be made of the consolidation of Agricola's work and a date provided for the destruction early in Trajan's reign by the burnt coin-hoard of A.D. 98+ at Corbridge. The survey of the Antonine period valuably stresses the different history of the Antonine Wall and its hinterland. If the latter provided the Brittones for Germany, their work

surely reflects designs by their *officiales* from the British province rather than their own talent. On the other hand, it seems certain that the Nithsdale and Galloway forts go to Lollius Urbicus and not later. The discussion of Pausanias is a delightful piece of scholarship; but a verdict on the date of evacuation, at present based upon negative coin evidence, must await better ceramic evidence. Even now the correspondence between *mortarium* stamps associated with the destruction of A.D. 197 and Scottish forts is suggestively close. Upon this hangs to some extent the view, first advanced by Miller in the *Cambridge Ancient History*, that Severus undertook the final occupation of the Antonine Wall. But to deny an occupation lasting till 197 and admit one in 209-11 on precisely the same coin evidence is as curious an argument as this thorny question has ever evoked. It is not supported by an appeal to Dolichenus, who was worshipped at Benwell under Antoninus Pius. What is still wanted is an excavation of an Antonine Wall site in which the pottery of the three periods is kept separated for study.

I. A. RICHMOND.

2. *The Ancient Burial-Mounds of England*. By L. V. Grinsell. $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$. Pp. xviii + 278. 24 plates, and 12 figures in the text. Methuen: Second Edition, 1953. 25s.

In the lives of each of us there come moments when, by some obscure process, events in themselves otherwise unremarkable remind us, in a way that all the other available evidence does not, of the passage of time. For your reviewer just such a moment struck with the appearance of a second edition of Grinsell's *Burial-Mounds*. It takes indeed no small stretch of the imagination to realize that it is now seventeen years since the appearance of the original edition first brought before the notice of the public the

name of a new and young writer on prehistory then unknown outside a small circle. It was a good book then, well planned, and firmly constructed; but since 1936 much has been achieved within the territory it covers, while the author's own knowledge and experience have widened and deepened. The result is virtually a new book. The whole of Part I—the commentary—has been completely re-written; while Part II—the inventory—has been largely re-written and considerably extended in its scope. In its new guise the book is even better than before.

This book can be used with profit both by the expert field archæologist, and by the beginner who seeks no more than to have some reasonable objective for his walks. To the former it supplies a summary, written in the light of the most up-to-date prehistoric research, of all that is thought and has been done on this wide subject and recorded in a vast and scattered literature. For such people the work is worth having for the bibliographies alone.

To the non-expert its value will be even greater, for the author begins indeed at the beginning. He takes nothing for granted in the way of previous knowledge, and his directions on procedure are always practical. It is, however, rather in the atmosphere that runs right through the whole work that its greatest and most valuable merit lies—the certainty that there are endless new things yet to be found, and the persistent sense of anticipation of fresh discovery. And that this sense of anticipation is justified beyond all doubt is proved by the career of the author himself who, in a comparatively few years, starting with the simplest of equipment, has added great slices of knowledge in a field which older or less eager folk might well have been excused for supposing to have been more than sufficiently explored.

It would be profitless to attempt to summarize a book which is itself a closely packed summary, and no attempt to do so will be offered here. Those who are interested must read the book for themselves. But for north-country

readers it can only be a source of satisfaction that the former limitation of the topographical survey to the southern and midland counties of England is now abandoned, and the survey extended to the Border. The previous omission of the northern counties from its compass was indeed the only serious fault in a book which has justly taken its place as a standard work. And now that too is corrected.

J. D. COWEN.