

XIX.—REVIEWS.

- 1.—*The Ordnance Survey Map of Roman Britain*, 3rd Edition, 1956, 4to., pp. 1-43, figs. 1-5 and folding map. The Ordnance Survey, Chessington, Surrey. Prices, text and folding map 7/6; map, unfolded, 3/3.

The credit for this fine map, built anew upon the foundations laid by Dr. O. G. S. Crawford, is shared by the Director-General of the Ordnance Survey, his Archæology Officer and Assistant Archæology Officer, namely, Messrs. C. W. Phillips and A. L. F. Rivet, and the cartographers. The new map renders the older edition obsolete, and is as notable a contribution to learning as was the first edition. The introductory pamphlet, which describes in detail the numerous changes, forms a judicious and unobtrusive epitome of present knowledge about its various sections. There is a good chronological table, admirable maps depicting Ptolemy's British sheets and the Antonine Itinerary respectively, three topographical maps, a comparative table of Roman geographical names, and a grid reference to every major symbol on the map, related to the National Grid at present in use.

The folding map, also obtainable unfolded for display, is clear, and extends, with the aid of insets, from the Scillies to the Shetlands. This widened area has a new importance: for by use of small dots, an attempt has been made to mark every authenticated small find (or groups of such), so that an estimated density of Romanization is now available for every corner of the province and its outlands. The significance of each dot is recorded in the Archæological Division and represents a truly formidable archive. Northerners will observe with special interest the density of finds marking the

heartlands of the friendly tribes of the Damnonii and Votadini beyond Hadrian's Wall. This perhaps illustrates the strength of the new convention. Its weakness is more apparent in Yorkshire, where the greater densities coincide with thorough regional studies. It is still more apparent in the South, where a dot, which may mean a coin in Fife, can mean anything short of a minor settlement in, say, Dorset. The picture, in short, must be viewed critically and then, as the authors observe, acts as a challenge, both to those who possess unrecorded knowledge and those who would explore new fields. If this aspect of the map thus provides a novel stimulus, the additions to previously existing classes are equally exciting. In the North once more, the tale of temporary and permanent works has changed profoundly, particularly in Strathmore and in south-west Scotland, though in both areas the picture has an unfinished look. All over the area knowledge of signal-stations has greatly improved: the embarrassingly crowded cluster on the Gask Ridge is rivalled by that on the Cumberland coast, where the problem of distinguishing mile-fortlets and signal-towers creates special difficulties, not satisfactorily solved, and underlines the authors' remark that in some districts saturation-point at this scale has been reached. The two Walls have long merited sheets to themselves: a combined sheet of both would make a splendid map. A great advance is apparent in nomenclature of sites, and the different type distinguishing certain from probable identifications makes reasonable conjecture possible without misleading. Another valuable innovation is the conjunction of fort-symbol with settlement-symbol where substantial extramural communities are known, and the registration of over forty examples south of Hadrian's Wall illustrates a state of affairs hitherto not widely appreciated. The North hardly shares in the mapping of agriculture by the symbol for Celtic fields, but this makes those of Wharfedale the more welcome. The walled township, now shown to be so common in Southern Britain, is also a rarity in the North, occurring so far at

Carlisle and Catterick only. Milestones are numerous, and it is interesting to see that at Ingliston (West Lothian) marked, though the site of discovery remains unknown.

It is not here the place to speak of southern Britain in detail. But the gains there are no less great. The large number of small walled towns has already been noted. But the greatest change is the disappearance of the native village, following upon the recognition of these sites as farms or homesteads. Ultimately a new symbol may here be needed, which could be shared in the North; and its coming is perhaps foreshadowed on figure 5, of the Dorset-Wiltshire area, which should have been combined, however, with a convention for Celtic fields. Another outstanding change is the development of knowledge in the Roman topography of the Fens and their settlements. Ptolemy's Salinae in the territory of the Catuvellauni must be connected with salt-pans there, and would point to a distribution of the tribe closely corresponding to that of their coins. Most interesting also is the use of double symbols to indicate early fortresses and forts later abandoned as the frontier moved forward. In this category should be included Buxton; also, on the basis of tombstones, Cirencester and Bath, while Wroxeter should be subsumed in the category of both fort and fortress. London, however, should be excluded, for there the Cripplegate fort was an integral part of the administrative centre and lasted not only long but probably late.

Some minor points may be added. In Scotland it was perhaps rash to mark Gourdie as a permanent work, and Gatehouse of Fleet is probably a small fort. The Troutbeck group of works includes a permanent fort. Among temporary camps there are two at Dunblane and Featherwood, Cawthorn has four works, and the Silloans group is missing. Lead might have been associated with Caermote and iron with Risingham. Ewe Close is no more important than other Westmorland native homesteads which remain unmarked. There is no proof that the road marked between Bowes and

Corbridge is Roman, the visible structure on its line having all the characteristics of a London Lead Company's road. Bede's Campodonum, once Cambodunum, has been identified as Dewsbury rather than Cleckheaton. The name for Lundy Island is Silura, and for the Scillies Sylinancis. Canvey Island is Covunnus.

I. A. RICHMOND.

- 2.—*An Introduction to Anglo-Saxon England*, by Peter Hunter Blair. $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$. Pp. xvi + 382; 16 plates, 5 figures, and 9 maps. Cambridge University Press, 1956. 30s.

The Syndics of the Cambridge University Press did well to promote the writing of this book, and the result is something of an achievement. Since the days of the early Saxonists in the seventeenth century the English have never lacked for studies of their ancestors on the historical and literary side. They had to wait till little more than a generation ago for the first analytical account of the antiquities of pagan England. The two disciplines have remained largely distinct, and few indeed have been found competent to handle both with equal assurance and adequately to fuse the results.

This book is the product of a deliberate effort to induce students to see not only the period, but the material, as a whole. And not the least interesting consequence is the author's ingenious policy of presenting the literary sources as archæological documents, and where possible (Kirkdale Sundial, the Franks Casket) the archæological material as literary documents.

The work is expressly addressed to beginners; but in so wide a field most of us will be beginners somewhere, and for that very reason will the more gratefully appreciate the clarity and directness of the exposition. For the outstanding

merits of the book are the comprehensiveness of its range and the simplicity of its presentation. The whole of the matter is laid out in six chapters. In the first two the historical aspect is at once disposed of, the coming of the Vikings providing a natural line of cleavage. Against the chronological background thus early established the author proceeds to discuss the broad topics of Church, Government, Economy, and Letters. With each chapter clearly divided into appropriate sub-headings, the book is one of the easiest imaginable in which to find one's way about.

So far as one ill qualified to pass final judgments may say, standard of scholarship never flags. But readers of this notice will not need to be reminded of the author's special contribution to the study of that baffling lacuna in the history of the north of England and southern Scotland which extends from before the end of the Roman occupation virtually to the introduction of Christianity. In a footnote the author modestly describes his conclusions on this phase as "conjecture not history"; maybe, but before that we had not even the benefit of conjecture. Here his views fall into place as a natural part of the larger mosaic, where it may be hoped that they will also reach a wider public. Not only here but throughout full justice is done to Celtic sources and the Celtic background, both secular and ecclesiastical. That is an element essential to any genuinely comprehensive view of Anglo-Saxon studies—a fact too often forgotten. That it is given full weight here both heightens confidence in the author, and reminds us that he is an old pupil of Chadwick.

In a book of this kind many matters of detail must be debatable; but one point at least definitely calls for correction. The *opus Anglicanum* (p. 300), so much esteemed abroad in mediæval times, can be called a "textile" only in the most general sense, and had nothing whatever to do with the manufacture of cloth. The term refers solely to embroideries, such as may still be seen in a number of European collections and treasuries, including that of the Vatican.

Format and production are admirable, and the book is a pleasure to handle. That it is also a pleasure to read is due to the author's impeccably limpid prose style. No one who knows the school in which he was reared will be surprised at that.

J. D. COWEN.

