Patriarcha and other political writings of Sir Robert Filmer. Edited by Peter Laslett. Blackwell, Oxford, 1949, pp. 326, 12s. 6d.

SIR ROBERT FILMER, the eldest son of Sir Edward Filmer, was born in or about the year 1588 at East Sutton Park, where he spent the greater part of his life, succeeding to his father's estate in 1629, and dying there in 1653. To Kent people the name Filmer is well known, and the family connection with East Sutton lasted until the twentieth century. To others the name, if known at all, is known as that of the author against whom Locke wrote his *First Treatise on Government*, wherein " the false principles and foundation of Sir Robert Filmer and his followers are detected and overthrown." The number of people who have read Locke's or Sidney's refutation of Filmerism vastly exceeds the number of those who have any first-hand acquaintance with Filmer's own work. *Patriarcha*, his major work, was published posthumously in 1680 and republished in 1685, but not again until 1884, and then in an unsatisfactory edition. This new edition, which Mr. Laslett has prepared with careful but by no means laboured scholarship is from a previously unknown manuscript which he discovered at East Sutton Park in 1939. Its publication was certainly needed to fill a lacuna in seventeenth century English political writing.

Filmer, like other country gentlemen of the first half of the seventeenth century—including his friend Sir Roger Twysden—was exercised about problems of government. He was a Royalist, although not active in the Civil War. His treatise, *Patriarcha*, which was designed to show the absolute nature of monarchy, based on the proposition of descent from Adam, the first King, was written in 1630, but it was not until 1680, at the time of the Exclusion Bill debate, that the new Tory party, being in need of a statement of political philosophy, revived Filmer's work, and it appeared for the first time in print. Locke, in his answer, had little difficulty in disposing of the positive part of Filmer's doctrine, but he failed to meet Filmer's criticisms of the " social contract " theory, and indeed Locke's account " Of the Beginning of Political Societies " contains matter that is scarcely less fantastic than the views for which Filmer argued. His argument is utterly strange to twentieth century ways of thought, but Filmer does not deserve the reputation for stupidity that has been put upon him by subsequent refuters, of whom, as Mr. Laslett says, " none, or almost none . . . have known exactly who Sir Robert Filmer was, when he lived, what he did, and what he wrote." At last he has been fixed in his historical context.

This volume contains also several other of Sir Robert Filmer's writings, including his *Observations* on Aristotle's *Politics*, on Hobbes' *Leviathan*, and on Grotius' *De Jure Belli et Pacis*. Mr. Laslett's Introduction is well worth the attention of anyone interested in seventeenth century Kent, whether or not he is particularly concerned with contemporary political argument. Filmer was not a great thinker, nor perhaps a particularly attractive character, but we are indebted to Mr. Laslett for rescuing him from the unjust contempt and obscurity beneath which he has been buried for nearly three centuries.

FRANK JESSUP.

Survey and Policy of Field Research in the Archæology of Great Britain. Part I, The Prehistoric and Early Historic Ages to the Seventh Century A.D. Edited by Professors Christopher Hawkes and Stuart Piggott. The Council for British Archæology, 1948, *pp.* 180, 5*s*.

THE economic depression of the late " twenties " and early " thirties " of this century saw a great stride forward in British archæological studies, foreshadowed in the *Report of the Thirty-Eighth Congress of Archæological Societies for the year 1930* and manifested in such " classics " as *Kendrick and Hawkes*, Fox's *The Personality of Britain*, the *Celtic Ornament* of Thurlow Leeds, Clark's *The Mesolithic Age in Britain* and *The County Archæologies*. To-day we are again depressed but this successor to the 1930 *Report* points the way to a still more splendid period of prehistoric research work. The Editors have been helped in the specialized sections by Dr. Kenneth Oakley, A. D. Lacaille, Dr. J. G. D. Clark, Professor V. Gordon Childe, Sir Cyril Fox, W. F. Grimes, B. H. St. J. O'Neill, Professor Ian Richmond, Professor W. Varley, C. A. Ralegh Radford, and J. N. L. Myres—all of whom did pioneer work in the earlier renascence.

The book has but two chapters—one devoted to the present state of our knowledge, the other to future policy of research work with special reference to excavation. Each chapter is split up into sections dealing with the main ages—Palaeolithic, Mesolithic, Neolithic, Bronze, Early Iron, Roman Occupation, Post- and Sub-Roman and Anglo-Saxon—so that specialists may easily ride their own " hobby-horses " in their own territories without harming themselves by straying into strange fields of knowledge.

Kent problems occur everywhere in these pages, in fact the opening paragraph concerns the critical examination of the flaking angle of the " eoliths " of the plateau-deposits and the last deals with Ethelbert's Frankish marriage and the coming of Augustine. Three instances may be cited to show the happy and succinct treatment given to our local affairs. The first concerns the Lower Halstow Mesolithic site, excavated

by J. P. T. Burchell, in which Dr. Clark sees " what may prove to have been a predominantly coastal culture of Atlantic age, most sites of which have since been submerged . . . observation of commercial excavations on the margins of the Thames estuary may yield invaluable information." The Medway group of closed-chamber tombs under stone-faced mounds is neatly dismissed as representing " a small colony from North-west Germany or Holland, probably related rather to the Peterborough culture." Thirdly, J. N. L. Myres thus sums up concerning the existence of the two main elements within the " Jutish " cultural complex whose relationship is obscure " partly because so many Kentish cemeteries were dug before the days of scientific archæology, with the primary object of unearthing the finer types of jewellery and without any proper record of associated finds. It is probable that much light might be thrown on the chronology and significance of the different elements now broadly classified as Jutish, both by the complete excavation of any fresh cemeteries that may be located in Kent and by the re-examination of such known sites as may still retain any unexcavated portions. Such work would also serve a useful purpose in setting the finer jewellery in its proper context of association with the less spectacular facets of the culture : it may be that too much attention has been given to these jewels, and too little to the humbler associated objects, in the endeavour to determine both the date and the connexions of the Jutish culture."

The Editors rightly assess the great contribution of the county and local societies to the increase of archæological knowledge. The latter's steadfastness in promoting excavations and publishing papers—" which in their technicalities may often have been beyond the scope of many subscribing members "—merit the highest praise. But what of the future, in an era in which specialization tends to oust the keen amateur ? Archæology is now a science and its prominent practitioners are mostly university-trained, full-time scholars of a narrow period of time. Can the " ordinary member " venture into the " Holy of Holies " of the expert ? The present reviewer believes that he may, by still being the provider of some of the raw material for studies. The scope of provision will, however, be reduced from what it was in the past. Both chapters in the *Survey and Policy* constantly point to the dangers of haphazard, unorganized digging. For instance, " the excavation of *sepulchral sites* (*long barrows*, *megalithic tombs*), however ruined their outward appearance, should only be undertaken if a very experienced excavator and ample resources can be spared for a total examination of the entire monument and its structural features." Given the expert supervision (*crede experto*), the " ordinary member " doubtless provides the " ample resources " and further contributes to the cause by training to be a skilled labourer on a site where he can

have all the thrills of unearthing "finds" and yet can leave the responsibility to the director of excavation. This responsibility includes the taking of samples for pollen-analysis and geochronological examination—technical "mysteries" usually beyond the layman's ken.

A point which should have been stressed but which is missed in the book is the importance of the amateur in reporting possible sites and "finds," either to the expert or to the local museum which should know where to seek expert advice. He is useful, too, in tackling such trivial yet important jobs as keeping a watchful eye on road excavations and quarrying operations. In other parts of the country this work of amateurs has been organized. The Yorkshire Archæological Society has two sections—a Prehistoric and a Roman Antiquities Committee—and their sole function is to excavate and record. Trained amateurs, at short notice, can go and excavate competently any threatened site. Such organization needs a long-term policy for training recruits and it has been obtained by attracting the beginner to large-scale excavations, where the digging continues for a number of years under expert supervision and the art of wielding spade and trowel is mastered.

One other quibble concerns references, which are omitted—in the reviewer's opinion a lost opportunity for doing good, for nowhere is there an up-to-date survey of British archæology with details of where to find the numerous excavation accounts which are scattered throughout many volumes of proceedings and transactions.

However, nothing except good can come out of this *Survey and Policy* and whoever reads it from cover to cover will emerge with high hopes for the future and with admiration for the authors' skill in compressing so much into so little space.

L. R. A. Grove.

The Hundred of Hoo. By Ralph Arnold. $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$, *pp. ix.* + 164, 11 *plates. Constable,* 1947, 12*s.* 6*d.*

This is a very agreeable book by a member of a family which has over a long period done much for archæology in Kent and played an active part in our society. The author describes it as "an experiment in searching out and recording the story—or such bits of the story as interested, intrigued or amused me—of a little-known district in a well-known county." The title of the book might lead one to expect a more comprehensive and detailed treatment of the Hundred than is in fact attempted, but Colonel Arnold makes it clear in his first chapter that his choice of material has been dependent on his own predilections. "I have wilfully begun the Hundred's story in the fourteenth century, ignoring the traces left by the Romans and Anglo-Saxons. As wilfully, I have omitted any description of the Hundred's churches." He

admits that he is not much interested in " very early and extremely shadowy " persons such as Odo of Bayeux or Earl Godwin. Colonel Arnold's interest is clearly in persons rather than in places, and his treatment of his subject is mainly biographical. To the ordinary reader this is no disadvantage, and the dry-as-dust atmosphere of many topographical works is admirably avoided ; but the archæologist and naturalist will be aware that much has been left unsaid. Thus we are warned that " there will be next to nothing about birds " in the book ; one cannot but regret such an omission, for the Hundred is particularly rich in bird life. Nor has the Author anything to say about place-names ; one would gladly have read something of the origins of such names as Egypt Bay and Shade House.

The Author wisely includes Cooling in his book, even though this is not strictly part of the Hundred of Hoo. It seems a pity that Cliffe was left out, for Cliffe, too, forms part of the " natural region," if not of the Hundred, and has numerous points of interest.

Colonel Arnold's first chapter explains how the book came to be written as " the attempted spare-time re-education of an individual in an interest in the social and political history of England." The Author (very reasonably) cherishes a theory " that all British history should be taught in relation to the repercussion of events in the educational victims' own localities and districts," and in casting round for a more or less self-contained area with " an identity of its own," he fixed on the Hundred of Hoo as a subject for research. The ten following chapters are arranged in roughly chronological order according to their subject matter.

A full chapter is devoted to Sir John de Cobham and the building of Cooling Castle. Here the views of Canon Scott Robertson come in for some criticism. The Castle was completed in 1385, four years after the Peasants' Revolt. Was it designed chiefly to overawe a countryside still restless after the supression of the Revolt, or to protect the coast lands from a possible French invasion ? It is probable that Sir John had both of these motives when he entrusted the rebuilding of the Castle to the great Henry Yeverle. (This spelling of the name is not, by the way, among the numerous variants given by Mr. John Harvey, the author of *Henry Yevele.*)

A chapter on *Great Expectations* renews the old discussion about the opening scenes of that novel. The reasonable conclusion is reached that Dickens had in mind certain features of Lower Higham, Cooling and Hoo St. Werburgh, and combined them in an imaginary picture of Pip's village. The anecdote of Tennyson and the " sea-blue bird of March " (page 127) is much to the point.

Colonel Arnold writes very entertainingly of two Victorian characters, Henry Pye, the farming " King " of the Hundred, and the Rev. Robert

Gascoyne Burt, the son of the priest who married the Prince Regent. "When Henry Pye went to live at St. Mary's Hall, he kept a stock of quinine for his workers and their wives. By 1909, the year in which he died, ague was practically unknown in the district."

The last chapter brings the story of the district down to the present time. It recalls the successful lawsuit brought against the Corporation of London who, in exercising their alleged rights over the waters of the Thames and Medway, reopened the Yantlet channel in 1823; the arrivals and departures of Royal personages at Port Victoria; and the establishment of the petrol refineries at Grain.

We make one minor point of criticism—"say indulgences" on page 35. Surely the Author means "say Masses" or "Requiems"?

RICHARD C. STONE.

Roman Ways in the Weald. By Ivan D. Margary, M.A., F.S.A. pp. 286, 16 *plates, maps. Phoenix House*, 1948, 25*s.*

No less an authority than Mr. O. G. S. Crawford in his foreword describes this book as "a record of the most important investigation of the Roman roads of England that has ever been undertaken," and, he adds, "it will become a classic." Certainly, Mr. Margary's book is of capital importance, not only for the very clear and thorough exposition of his methods of work, both in the study and in the field, but also for the many new facts which he has brought to light. If we are at last beginning to realize that in Roman times the Weald was not entirely a trackless and uninhabited wilderness, much of the credit must go to the pioneering work of Mr. Margary. He has in fact, says Mr. Crawford, "revolutionized our conception of the Weald in Roman times."

The first two chapters, "Roman Roads—Character and Form," and "The Geography and Communications of the Weald," set out the nature and purpose of Roman roads in general and the peculiar local circumstances which conditioned the road system in the Weald. Methods of construction and routeing are described and the factors which have caused the disappearance of some roads and the preservation of others are explained. It is pointed out that the sections of road most informative to the archæologist are those which were left derelict and thus preserved from damage by later traffic.

In his third chapter, "Finding the Way," Mr. Margary indicates what may be gleaned from maps and documents, the study of place-names and local traditions, records of ancient "finds," air photographs and other material before work is begun in the field. Particular attention is paid to parish, field, and wood boundaries. The field work is divided into three phases: 1, General reconnaissance; 2, Detailed

examination ; 3, Excavation ; and there is valuable advice to beginners. Everywhere the ideal is to prove one's hypothesis by excavation.

"The field worker," the author insists, "is under a serious obligation to provide as promptly as possible a full, concise and accurate account of all that he has found." In Chapter IV, "Recording the Way," he describes in abundant detail his method of preparing strips of the Ordnance Survey 6 in. map for publication.

The remaining chapters deal with particular roads or local systems of communication. A very full and interesting chapter is devoted to Stane Street, which was, of course, by far the most important of all the roads crossing the Weald. Here Mr. Margary acknowledges his debt to the work already carried out by the late Mr. S. E. Winbolt. A lesser-known road ran from London to Brighton (Chapter VI).

In Chapter VII we reach Kent on the London-Lewes Way, which enters the county near Blythe Hill, Lewisham, and after passing through Beckenham and West Wickham, forms the county boundary from Rowdown Wood nearly to the crest of the North Downs above Titsey. Here the Way passes into Surrey, but it re-enters Kent at Kent Hatch, passes as a long straight stretch through Edenbridge and continues into Sussex across the Kent Brook W. of Cowden. The road linked London and the corn-growing area of the South Downs, and was used for carrying iron from the Sussex forges, southwards to certain small Channel ports and northwards to London.

Mr. Margary next describes the "Sussex Greensand Way" (along the greensand outcrop westwards from Barcombe Mills to Stane Street), and a number of minor roads in the Pevensey area.

Around the villages of Ripe and Chalvington, between Lewes and Hailsham, is an area about 2 miles (E.-W.) by 1½ miles (N.-S.) where the field boundaries and lanes conform to a rectangular lay-out. It has been proved that no Enclosure Act has been applied to the area, and that the names of the existing fields and lanes can certainly be traced back to the fourteenth century. Clearly the unusual lay-out cannot be attributed to the unmethodical Saxons ; and the fact that the area was in later times divided in very detailed fashion between three manors indicates that it is most unlikely to be due to the Normans, who, in any event, were not accustomed to lay out their manors on rectangular lines. Mr. Margary was driven to the opinion that this lay-out is a Roman survival. His tenth chapter, perhaps the most fascinating in the whole book, sets out brilliantly and convincingly the reasons for this conclusion, arguing from the analogy of Roman land settlement areas in Italy and North Africa. These areas were laid out in *jugera*, with sides which were multiples of 120 Roman feet (i.e. one *actus*) in length. Mr. Margary shows in detail how the sizes of fields and the distances between parallel lanes in the Ripe area

conform to this rule. "Incredible as it may seem, we do appear to have in this area a survival of Roman land measurement too detailed to be by any possibility an accidental coincidence."

The significance of this survival and its bearings on the nature of the Anglo-Saxon settlement have yet to be worked out. It should be pointed out, however, that as long ago as 1935 there appeared in Volume XXV of *Norfolk Archæology* a paper by Dr. Gordon Ward dealing with what appears to be an example of centuriation near Brancaster. The purpose of the paper was to suggest "that the sites of certain Roman soldier settlements in Britain can still be identified." Dr. Gordon Ward drew attention (with diagrams) to examples near Lincoln and in the Gillingham and Rainham districts of Kent; but, he remarked, "no other area of the sort was noted in Kent, although Roman roads are frequent." May there not, however, be other such survivals in Kent, where relations between the Romano-British and Jutish populations seem from several indications to have been peculiarly close?

The main interest of the book for most Kentish readers will, however, be in Chapter XI. The bulk of the material has already appeared in *Archæologia Cantiana* (Vol. LIX), and it is therefore only necessary here to refer readers to that volume. It is pointed out that the alignment of the three roads Rochester-Hastings, Maidstone-Kingsnorth-Lympne, and Hemsted-Kingsnorth-Canterbury is much less accurate than that of the major Roman roads, and this probably means that their origin was commercial rather than military, and at a time comparatively late in the Roman period.

The evidence for the "lost" portions of the road from Ambergreen (Chart Sutton) to Kingsnorth is admitted to be slight, and probability can only be turned into certainty by excavation at suitable points. Traces of the Hemsted-Kingsnorth road are much more abundant. The course of the road between Kennington and Canterbury seems to be somewhat hypothetical.

One minor point—the cutting through which the Rochester-Hastings route descends the ragstone escarpment between Scotchman's Bank and East Hall (page 217) is certainly not 50 ft. deep; 25 ft. would be nearer the mark. And the sides have fallen in badly during recent winters, owing, no doubt, to severe frosts and the activities of rabbits.

The final chapter of the book deals with prehistoric trackways, which doubtless remained in use throughout the Roman period. In Kent these include the North Downs Ridgeway and associated "Pilgrims' Way" which was "from the earliest times the main link between the Continent and the central Downland area of Wiltshire"; a ridgeway from Ticehurst to Newenden, apparently ending at Castle Toll (which Mr. Margary considers to be probably an Iron Age camp);

and a route from Oldbury Hill by Shipbourne to Tonbridge and Frant along one of the very few dry N.-S. ridges of the Weald, connecting the " camps " at Oldbury and Saxonbury.

A final note suggests the desirability of further investigation to establish the existence of branch roads, which were doubtless numerous in the Maidstone area, where there are many Roman sites.

There is a very full and useful bibliography.

Mr. Margary writes with an infectious enthusiasm, but he never lets his imagination run away with him, and his painstaking accuracy and love of sober truth are always evident. The book is at once solid and brilliant.

RICHARD C. STONE.

NOTICES

In *Merlin's Island*, a series of provocative essays on Britain in the Dark Ages (Methuen, 10*s*. 6*d*.) Mr. T. C. Lethbridge emphasizes the continuity of archæology and history. He puts forward certain " damnable heresies," as he calls them, which any reader with imagination will enjoy to the full. The Irish missionaries, for example, travelled to Greenland and America, and in Roman times men sailed from Britain and made friends among the Eskimos. There are some interesting speculations on the origins of house forms and boats and the connecting links between them. An essay on " Kent and the Education of the Barbarians " reminds us that in this area Anglo-Saxon women returned to some extent to the clothes and ornaments of the classical world.

Late Saxon and Viking Art, by Dr. T. D. Kendrick (Methuen, 32*s*. 6*d*.) is a sumptuously illustrated and detailed account of tenth and eleventh century manuscripts, the late standing crosses, and English Romanesque sculpture; it is a continuation of his unique study of Anglo-Saxon art. Kentish readers note with particular interest that the Reculver cross is now thought by some authorities to date in the ninth or tenth centuries: the usually accepted date is that of the foundation of the Minster.