

## REVIEWS

AN ARCHAEOLOGY OF SOUTH-EAST ENGLAND. A study in continuity. By Gordon J. Copley. Pp. 324, with 16 plates and 42 figs. London, Phoenix House. 1958. 50s.

In some ways this book falls between two stools. It is too large, expensive and detailed to be popular, yet fails the specialist in that it deals with too restricted an area (corresponding to no historical reality in any period except the area readily reached from modern London), and lacks sufficient references to primary authorities. It is probably designed to appeal to the enthusiastic amateur: indeed the dust-cover claims as much. It is from this point of view that we must examine it.

First we must pay tribute to the range of reading and the detailed local knowledge which the book reveals in its author, no less than to the easy style and good arrangement of the chapters. Surrey readers will be disappointed that there is no mention of Farnham in the Palaeolithic chapter. A good deal of knowledge is presumed in the reader, however, as when the term "secondary peoples" is introduced in the Neolithic chapter. This term is not explained, yet its use in this sense is relatively new and in need of definition.

The chapters are by period, and most of them contain maps and diagrams illustrating the remains concerned in various parts of the region. At the end of each chapter is a very short bibliography referring to the main pioneer articles on the major aspects of the period in question. What we miss, however, are the detailed footnote references to authorities for statements in the text, or to accounts of things or places there alluded to. Any amateur worth his salt will want to follow such things up, and even a specialist will find not a few statements which will surprise him, but which he is deprived of any means of checking handily.

In the present complexity of archaeological knowledge only a polymath could hope to write a book like this entirely free of error. The Iron Age and Roman chapters contain a number of errors, and in the Roman one in particular they are so numerous and glaring as to make one wish the author had asked for help in MS. reading from a specialist. For in the absence of footnotes, as explained, these errors will not be immediately detected by the general reader.

It is impossible in a review of this length to make a complete list; but as a sample, we have on p. 95 the astonishing statement "It is doubtful whether any of the hill-forts were permanently inhabited." And why should the discovery (p. 93) of "the burnt remains of three adults and a child in a pit at Casterley" indicate that Iron Age storage pits were sometimes lived in? Excavation rarely finds people still in their houses: the grave is a more usual locality.

Parts of the chapter on Iron Age B are now very out of date, and the reader should be referred to the forthcoming proceedings of the C.B.A. Conference on the Iron Age of Southern Britain held in December, 1958: in particular for a reassessment of the whole Brittany question. Similarly the chapter on Iron Age C is misleading on such questions as the Belgic penetration of Oxfordshire and beyond. It is disappointing to find perpetuated the theory that "a later alternative name for the Roman city (Chichester) was *Regnum* from the tribal name *Regni*" (p. 115); for it is well known that the evidence for the latter name is based on confusion, and that the derivation of *Regnum* from the *kingdom* of Cogidubnus, and the tribal name *Regnenses* from it, is so self-evidently correct as to need no argument.

To call the Claudian camp at Richborough a promontory fort (p. 131) is a misuse of terminology: the theory of a Claudian landing at Selsey is in no way credible or based on evidence; nor can it be rightly claimed that Stane Street

had a military purpose. For if the road is Claudian it linked the client kingdom with the province, and was thus precisely non-military in character. But the pottery at Alfold and Hardham (on which the date is based) is probably no earlier than the 70s—there is a notable absence of Julio-Claudian samian—and it would be wiser to assign these stations to the take-over of Cogidubnus' kingdom on the death of that monarch in the Flavian period.

The references to Roman London are remarkably muddled: there is no evidence or suggestion that the Cripplegate Fort "originated as an earthen camp" or that its stone walls were added "a century later or thereabouts." Both rampart and walls are contemporary.

On p. 133 we read that this fort was enclosed with a stone wall *c.* A.D. 140, and that the city wall was built to join up with two corners of the stone fort: on p. 134 "the wall of Roman London was built about A.D. 120." In fact, as stated, the fort rampart and wall are contemporary and date from the 80s or thereabouts, and the city wall was added not earlier than a century later, *c.* A.D. 190-200.

The account of Roman Richborough (p. 144) is similarly inaccurate, and those of Verulamium (p. 135) and Dover (p. 144) are out of date; nor is it correct to describe the Gosbeck's Farm Theatre at Colchester as of classical pattern.

On p. 143 we read that at Farley Heath a square enclosure of the Roman period replaced an earlier polygonal *temenos*, the inference being that the latter may be prehistoric. This is quite contrary to the evidence. The excavations of this Society in 1939 showed conclusively that the polygonal enclosure was Roman but that the earthen banks were neither square nor Roman.

Space precludes a longer catalogue, but enough has been said to show the desirability of extensive revision of these chapters in any future edition. A protest, however, must be added against the map of the Roman coastline on p. 145. Roman Richborough was certainly not on an island; and the fact that the land has sunk about 12 ft. in relation to the sea since Roman times makes it extremely doubtful whether even Thanet was an island before the Saxon period.

The Saxon and Mediæval chapters contain much of interest, and there are sections on place-names and elementary field-work which together with the gazetteer will prove helpful to the beginner.

S. S. FRERE.

LOCAL HISTORY IN ENGLAND. By W. G. Hoskins.  $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ . Pp. xii. 196 with 9 plates and 5 maps and plans in the text. Longmans. 21s.

In this volume Dr. Hoskins sets out to encourage amateurs who are studying English local history and topography, especially those who hope to publish a history of a particular town or parish. He urges them to use their eyes intelligently as they walk along the streets and tramp the ground in their search for information. As well as studying maps, directories and written records relating to the parish and tapping the memory of the older inhabitants, the local historian is told of the necessity to get down to earth and devote more time to consideration of the actual use made of the land and of the lives of the men and women who worked as part of the community, rather than to the actual organization of the community: in the country they should think of the village rather than of the manor.

Dr. Hoskins draws his illustrations from those parts of the country he knows best, the Midlands and the South-West. His book, however, will be of considerable value to those writing about Surrey towns and villages, particularly if it is studied in conjunction with other recent books on local history, more especially Mr. R. B. Pugh, *How to Write a Parish History* (1954), which he commends. Both writers insist on the importance to the local historian of monographs and articles based on local studies from outside their area. This is particularly important in a country with a *Victoria County History* completed in 1912, when the emphasis of the parish histories was mainly on manorial descents. As Dr. Hoskins suggests certain local historians may find it more rewarding to devote themselves to a close study of a limited period. To some

of these (including the non-Latinists whom Dr. Hoskins does not wish to deter) the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries may prove a fascinating period. It is, moreover, one in which their researches taken together would yield valuable results on a national scale.

Although the author deliberately does not include a guide to printed and written sources, the omission of any reference to a compilation as new and important to research workers in all fields of English history as E. L. C. Mullins, *Texts and Calendars, an Analytical Guide to Serial Publications* (Royal Historical Society, 1958) is a serious one. Possibly the volume was received too late for a reference to be included. A number of the classes of public central and local records that may be consulted are mentioned. The County Archivist may perhaps be permitted to suggest that as attention is drawn, for example, to the use that may be made of land tax assessments, the actual records of the court of quarter sessions might have been named as a quarry deserving attention.

M. GOLLANZ.

EARLY DAYS IN HORLEY, SIDLOW AND SALFORDS. By Elisabeth Lane.  $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ . Pp. 38 with 4 plates and 1 double page plan. 1958.

This admirable little book, written largely from original records, is (according to the writer of the introduction) a "first instalment of Mrs. Lane's copious notes on the history of a simpler and quieter Horley." It has been brought out with the support of the Horley Local History Association, and is sold at the cost price of 2s. 6d. The stiff paper cover is perfectly adequate, but the sheets would have been better sewn than fastened with wire staples. Since there are no footnotes it would be helpful if the author could send a typed list of her authorities (with references to pages and lines) to such libraries as acquire the book.

Mrs. Lane deals with such subjects as the mills, the bridges, the houses, and the woods. We may just note that Bures is the only house in the parish to have belonged to the same family (the Charringtons, brewers and coal merchants) from the reign of Elizabeth I to that of Elizabeth II, and that Kinnersley was the home of Sir William Monson, "Admiral of the Downs and Narrow Seas."

T. E. C. WALKER.

MORTLAKE PARISH REGISTER (1599-1678). Transcribed and edited by Maurice S. Cockin, M.A., and David Gould.  $9\frac{3}{4} \times 8$ . Pp. v + 117. Borough of Barnes History Society. 1958.

This valuable transcript of Mortlake's earliest surviving register consists of stencilled sheets stapled together and cased in a printed paper cover. An index of personal names is followed by another of places. Among the many points of interest are the names of tapestry workers from the Low Countries. Mr. Cockin contributes a flowery introduction in which he praises various organizations but omits a reference to the Society of Genealogists.

The local historian is greatly indebted to the patient labours of such transcribers as Mr. Cockin and Mr. Gould. With a full realization of the work involved may we hope that more Mortlake transcripts will follow?

T. E. C. W.