

REVIEWS

An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in the City of York. Vol. I. EBVRACVM, Roman York. R.C.H.M., 1962. £2 12s. 6d. pp. xlv, 168, 70 pls. and 89 figs., with folding map.

This Inventory starts with a masterly introduction by Professor I. A. Richmond who places York in its setting in Britain and the Roman Empire. The first third of the volume gives a topographical analysis of the buildings in the Fortress, the Colonia and suburban sites. The second portion describes the burials and pottery arranged in five regions. Miss A. S. Henshall has reported on the cloths from the burials with gypsum, and a summary is given of Professor R. Warwick's valuable analysis of the Trentholme Drive skeletons. The two-colour reproduction of the air photograph facing p. 7 is very effective and detailed plans like figs. 62 and 70 preclude frequent reference to the admirable folding map on the scale of 6 inches to 1 mile.

In the third part full justice is done to the inscriptions, sculptures and architectural remains. Dr. D. B. Harden describes the glass from Roman York, and the jet industry forms an instructive conclusion to the text. Much credit is due to Mr. H. G. Ramm and those responsible for the photography and recording of the sculptures and inscriptions. In one instance, no. 5 on pl. 36, a line-drawing would have been more effective. On fig. 85 the drawings would have been less overwhelming at $\frac{1}{8}$ scale. In a few instances a little more evidence can be gleaned from the stones. In no. 31 MARTI E was visible, at least in 1941. In no. 56, l. 1, DAII is followed by a leaf-stop and not *s(anctae)*, even though the half-tone makes this seem plausible. L. 4 reads MAIISI AVI, probably *Maesi Aulspicati*, and l. 5 FI(LD). Here there is not space for full discussion.

On the tombstone, no. 77, in l. 3 *Saenius* can be read, in l. 4 a stop separates *C* from *Aeresius*, in l. 5 *Augustinus* is too long; here *Saenus* is legible, though with difficulty. In no. 90 in l. 4 the final letter is not L but E, perhaps for (H)E(RES). In no. 84 for the damaged names in l. 2 the compiler has followed the version in *JRS* by R. G. Collingwood, who later by autopsy was able to amend his reading to *Mantini[al]e Mae|ricae*, as the draughtsman has virtually shown in the drawing, no. 84 on fig. 84. This provides the single individual to whom the pronoun *eius* in l. 3 refers. In no. 76 the compiler has missed the reinterpretation of the text given in *JRS* XXXII (1942) 117, which takes *sec(us)* as a preposition governing *Crescentem*. In no. 92 the drawing is inaccurate; Haverfield's reading in *EE* should be accepted. In no. 109 E C at the end can hardly be *e(ius) c(ausa)*. It might be E cut in error for *F(aciendum)*, or *(he(res) c(uravit))*. But in general these monuments are admirably recorded.

Tribute should also be paid to those who have produced the first two portions of the volume. Much of this scrutiny of newspapers, manuscript notes and printed records is tedious and exacting. So too are the later stages of editing, so skilfully achieved by the Editor, Mr. A. R. Dufty, and his executive staff, with the expert advice of Professor I. A. Richmond and Mr. C. A. R. Radford. Excavators in recent decades have added much to the picture and co-operated fully in this record. The product is a monumental volume which has long been needed with its wealth of maps, plans, illustrations and classified information. It should be encouraging to those who have laboured so hard to say that we now have the solid basis from which further substantial advances¹ can be made.

R. P. Wright

¹ When a reprint is in preparation it may be useful to note certain slips: on p. xliv the reign of Vespasian began in A.D. 69, not 71; Hadrian's visit did not precede A.D. 121. On pp. 52, 63 Gough's Camden should be cited by the edition of 1789 as well as of 1806. On p. 63 read Dickinson. On p. 114 under no. 27 read *CIL* 1223 u, not V. On p. 130 in no. 107 for *evocatus* read *evocato* in three places.

Eric Birley, *Research on Hadrian's Wall*. Royal 8vo., pp. i-xvi, 1-319, figs. 1-38 and frontispiece. Titus Wilson, Kendal, 1961. Price 37s. 6d.

Any reader who opens this remarkable work in the belief that research means excavation will soon discover that the book is not a study of archæological excavation on Hadrian's Wall but a detailed and fascinating account of the studies made of the Wall by all sorts and conditions of men since the sixteenth century until the present day. Nothing at all like it has previously been attempted; it will not need to be done again; and no one but its author, whose addiction to prosopography has been exercised in so many fields, could or would have achieved the feat. As for the men commemorated, weak and strong alike, of them the phrase *carent quia vate sacro* will never now be used. The work is a mine of information, full of surprises even to those well acquainted with Hadrian's Wall and its literature. It is dedicated to Gerald Simpson whose work is rightly regarded as crowning all efforts to define and interpret the most complex series of frontier-works in the Roman world.

The initial relationship between this reviewer and Gerald Simpson is left to conjecture, but it can be briefly stated. We met first at Cawthorn in 1924 and again at his Aesica excavations of 1925, after which he asked me to become his colleague. Continued work at Cawthorn prevented our collaboration on the Wall until 1928. Thenceforward all published plans of our joint work were of my surveying and productions and all reports were drafted in full by me for our dual consideration and revision. It was a fruitful and unbroken collaboration in which our planning and interpretation was truly cooperative, an understanding friendship such as he maintained with no archæologist, and no one rejoices more than this reviewer at the tribute paid to it.

Assessments of past work will always differ. Camden's

scheme for the Wall might be hailed not merely in terms of "how cleverly it makes use of the literary sources" but as the first example of the supposition that work in the study will resolve questions in fact soluble only by excavation or field-work, a misconception through which the study of the Wall has often suffered. Bede had indeed already started the process much earlier and since he, like his sixteenth-century successors, describes the height of the Wall without stating whether it was standing to full height or not, his figure must surely be taken with reserve. There is room for doubt also whether the height of the Narrow Wall differed from that of the Broad Wall in sectors intended to be occupied by the latter since the turrets had already been erected to the Broad Wall scale. Further west, where the Narrow Wall and Intermediate Wall replaced the Turf Wall, matters were presumably dictated by the lower height of the last. On the Craggs excavation has shown that the Broad foundation is much more often present than not. As for the use of clay in the Broad Wall it was H. L. Honeyman who with an architect's eye for such detail pointed out (in his *Northumberland*, 1949) that this Wall was, again in architect's terms, "mud" built, basing his observations upon the long Heddon section before it was grouted anew by the Ministry of Works. The hard white mortar, which causes such difficulty to would-be destroyers, appears to be characteristic of the Severan reconstruction. Honeyman's observation is not lightly to be set aside.

On points of detail it may be observed that the larger size of milecastle 52 has been explained on the grounds that its garrison had an extra installation to maintain at Pike Hill signal-tower. The whole question of signalling demands a more careful consideration of the roofing of turrets and the levels within them which are associated with roof-tiles, while in the state of present knowledge a tabulated list of dismantled turrets as known to date would have been of the greatest service. A gateway through the Wall to east of Greatchesters is unproven. The assertion that the Vallum causeways at milecastles were "never, however, revetted in

stone" is at complete variance with the views of the excavators of milecastles 50 TW and 51, where the demolished stonework was found and where, at milecastle 50 TW, it is impossible to explain the culvert in the ditch on any other supposition; for the culvert defines the causeway of undisturbed subsoil as so narrow that a stone revetment would be obligatory. The important observation about possibly post-Hadrianic centurial stones is of great importance in relation to any theories based upon a unitary treatment of them. In the list of Cumberland coast-sites Crosscanonby calls for a place, possibly as milefortlet 22.

Comments upon matters concerned with field-work may include the following: The reason why Pike Hill signal-tower had no ditch round it (if it was ever more anterior to the running work of the Wall than a turret) is the very sharp fall-away of the knoll on which it stands, combined with its rocky nature. At Chesterholm the contours west of the fort are not sufficiently marked to impose any particular size of fort within the usual range. The reason why the known fort at Carvoran was not included in the Vallum was that it was not yet built, while the old one (if it existed) was presumably abandoned. The Military Way is clear further west than stated, namely to west of Turret 78a, where a culvert was noted. The native farmstead inland from Maryport can hardly be described as fortified. As at Cwmbwrwyn and Castle Flemish, such enclosing works are fences rather than fortifications.

On inscriptions the reaction against the restoration of the Jarrow stones commemorating the building of the Wall does not mention the observable fact that the top margin is detectable, upon which much depends. If the altars from the Newcastle bridge, the Pons Aelius, stood in a shrine, as is regularly supposed and in itself inherently likely, then they are most likely to have been put there on its inauguration, as indeed the dedications would so well suit. The choice of the name *Banna* for Carvoran ignores the inscription from the site attaching the territorial title *Magnenses* to a unit stationed

there. The occurrence of the goddess Coventina in Spain might favour the Aquitani as her introducers at Carrawburgh.

The complications of the additions to the original plan for the Wall are so great that anyone may feel at liberty to choose his own emphasis in describing them. But at Housesteads the circumstances of the burial earlier than the fort so acutely noted by the author are eased by the fact that the turret was occupied for a significant length of time before abandonment. Again, at Chesters the fact, that the Broad Foundation was actually laid on the site which the fort came to occupy and that here also occupation material occurred inside the turret, is worth record.

Something should be said about the illustrations. Figures 2 and 3 have reduced somewhat clumsily. Figure 12 is full of minor blemishes. Figure 21 is a disappointing version of my original drawing which reduces very well. On figure 36 the recent discoveries could well have been added. Certain plates suffer somewhat from over-inking. But the selection is as interesting as the rest of the book and as stimulating to thought.

If a second edition is contemplated the following points may be noted, for typography. On p. 141, l. 10, *7a* should be referred to fig. 2. On p. 162, l. 24 a past participle seems to be missing after "vexillations". On p. 165 *quingeneria* should read *quingenaria*. On p. 207 *retentura* and *prae-tentura* should change places. That this list is so short is a tribute to the care of production of a lasting work.

I. A. Richmond