

REVIEWS

PRINTED MAPS OF LONDON CIRCA 1553-1850. By Ida Darlington and James Howgego. Pp. x, 257. Frontis. 16 Pl. George Philip and Son, 1964.

The first demand for a map of London came from foreign visitors; Thomas Platter of Basel added a copy of Valegio's *Londra*, printed in Venice, c. 1580, to his diary of 1599. Later, the English countryman, appalled by the spread of the metropolis, needed a street plan to help him deal with hackney-coach drivers, chairmen and watermen.

This useful book has a 44-page introduction on the maps and views of London, followed by a 200-page catalogue of the 421 maps published in the period 1553-1850 with their sizes and scales, together with lists of reprints and notes on related maps. The catalogue will be valued by students of topography and collectors of maps, who will accept the caution that the marking of a house, a railway or a canal on a map is not infallible evidence either for dating the map, or even for the existence of a particular feature. The main collections of maps of London are in the Guildhall and L.C.C. Libraries and in the British Museum, but uncommon maps in other collections are listed and described.

The early maps of London, except when they form part of atlases, are rare, and the authors are fortunate in being able to include two recently discovered copper-plates—one, in the London Museum, is on the back of a Flemish picture of the Tower of Babel—survivors of a set of twenty, engraved perhaps by A. van den Wyngaerde. No map printed from these plates has survived, either in whole or in part, but it may well have been the source for much information and a few spelling mistakes in two dissimilar productions—*Londinium* in Braun and Hogenberg's Atlas, Cologne, 1572, and *Civitas Londinum*, the huge wood-cut attributed to R. Agas, only known in a form published in about 1633. The later maps of outstanding importance are Ogilby and Morgan's Survey of London after the Great Fire (1666) and John Roque's map (1746).

Before this, when houses encumbered a site, and survey was difficult, the bird's-eye view, giving the panorama of a town, was more easily made and more readily intelligible. John Norden's great engraving of 1600, the only complete copy of which is in the Royal Library, Stockholm, shows him, a minute figure, waving a pair of compasses, at his *Statio prospectiva*, the tower of St. Mary Overy, Southwark, whence he noted the London sky-line. Later London map-makers often preserved the panoramic element and gave inset views of important buildings, as indeed is done on travel posters today. These London panoramas, which have been listed by Miss Irene Scouloudi and are mentioned in the introduction to the present work, certainly merit publication as a supplementary volume.

J.L.N.

THE COST OF LIVING IN 1300. By Daphne Harper. $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$. Pp. 32. Farnham Branch of the Workers' Educational Association. No date. 5s.

The author, who is a member of our society, has brought a very lively mind to the task of translating into terms of practical economics the results of Fr. E. Robo's study of the Pipe Rolls of the bishops of Winchester published in his book, *Mediaeval Farnham*. Her study deserves to be widely read and would certainly be a valuable addition to the library of a school Sixth Form. The vivid passage on the total use of resources (pp. 4-7) will provide, for many readers, a fresh viewpoint on life in Medieval England.

The author and the Farnham Branch of the Workers' Educational Association are to be congratulated on this first booklet in their project, *The Farnham Papers*.

E.E.H.

THE FIFTH CENTURY INVASIONS SOUTH OF THE THAMES. By Vera I. Evison. Pp. 142 with 11 maps, 30 figs., 18 plates. Athlone Press. 1965. 75s.

This is an unfortunate book. The thesis is that Britain south of the Thames was overrun by an unrecorded Frankish expedition in the middle of the fifth century. The argument is in three parts; a succinct account of Germanic burials of the fourth and fifth centuries in north-eastern Gaul; a survey of selected grave goods found in southern Britain; and a historical conclusion.

The preliminary account makes no attempt to distinguish Franks from other Germans, or Gauls; it assumes that the cemeteries are of *Laeti* and of Franks. But, of twelve units of *Laeti* listed in *Not. Dig. Oc. XLII*, only one is Frankish; and the distribution of the *Laeti* is altogether different from that of the Gallo-German cemeteries. The survey selects half a dozen kinds of small metal-work, glass, and quoit brooches, with the animal ornament engraved thereon; the method is to assert that the objects mentioned are both Frankish and fifth century, but to fight shy of argument in support of the assertion. Sometimes, the objects are unlike those with which they are paralleled; e.g., the mount and chape of the Brighthampton 31 scabbard (Fig. 11) are not in the least like those of the Abingdon 42 and Krefeld-Gellep 43 scabbards (Fig. 22 and Pl. 4a), save that they are scabbard ornaments; the star brooches of Vermand 24 (Fig. 1 g) and Lyminge 10 (Fig. 28 h) are alike only in that they are star designs. Often, the objects are not fifth century; on pages 73-74 the grave associations of ten 'Quoit brooch style' objects are listed, but no attempt is made to date these associated objects, beyond the contradictory comment 'this means that . . . ten were with fifth century Frankish objects . . . It must be added that No. 14 was in a grave . . . of the early sixth century . . . and No. 16 also must have been deposited in the sixth century.' I have discussed this grave (presumably Alfriston 43 . . . references and grave numbers are not supplied) in *Sy.A.C. LVI* (1959), 115, and item 2 is of the same date; I can see nothing of the fifth century in this list. More serious, there is really nothing to associate these objects with Franks; their antecedents lie among the Roman provincials of northern Gaul, but they are found in Anglo-Saxon graves, not in Frankish graves.

The trouble is not merely that the facts are wrong; their selection and treatment offend against the grammar of archaeological evidence. The reader is not made aware that he is dealing with a few dozen objects selected from tens of thousands of excavated grave goods; no pottery is examined, and the main characteristic brooches are ignored. Yet the elementary common-sense canons of archaeological scholarship emphasise that you cannot place a date or found a historical conclusion on isolated objects; you must date your object within a typological series, date a grave or a cemetery not on selected items, but on the whole assemblage of excavated material. The objects here selected are for the most part those which do not fit into a series, and are relatively uncommon. The common objects, belonging to dateable sequences, are studiously ignored, and they argue that the Anglo-Saxons were Anglo-Saxons, and Jutes.

The historical conclusion may speak for itself. Citing the authority of Leeds, it sets out to redate the written record 'in order to fit the facts of archaeology'; the 'facts' being those presented in the preceding survey. Since Frankish history is ill-recorded,

(p. 83) it is no wonder that an expedition to Britain should have gone unrecorded. Archaeological evidence, however, goes on to tell us that some of these people transplanted themselves in the second half of the fifth century throughout England south of the Thames. . . . If it was these who undertook the leadership of the initial invasion, Frankish settlers, *foederati* and Franco-Roman soldiers . . . then the result must have been a well planned and co-ordinated operation carried out by the top-rank fighting men of the age . . . a single, concerted operation. . . .

Aelle was the first to have imperium . . . Aelle in command of and directing the attack, would have a central position in the flotilla . . . Cerdic and Cynric, with Stuf and Wihthgar, invading Hampshire to the west, and Hengest to the east in Kent . . . the main force of the attack . . . from the south towards the upper Thames and the Croydon area.

(p. 84) We may then take the liberty of allocating the date 449 to the arrival, not only of Hengest and Horsa's reinforcements [sic], but of Aelle and his fleet in Sussex (instead of A.D. 477) and of Cerdic and Cynric in Hampshire (instead of A.D. 495). The arrival of Port . . . at *Portes-mutha* (given as 501) should also be placed at . . . 449.

In the sequel, Ceawlin and the 'Battle of Bedford' [sic, for Bedcanford, despite the philologists] are to be dated 65 years earlier than in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. Anglo-Saxon Chronicle dates are difficult enough on their own; many of us have tackled them but they will hardly stand such simple liberties.

This is all unfortunate because it brings the undermanned discipline of Anglo-Saxon archæology into disrepute with serious scholars; and because it does unnecessary damage to the author's reputation. She has already given us some excellent excavation reports, and this book gives a few tantalising glimpses of those which still await publication. It is to be hoped that the damage will be undone by the publication of her important discoveries at Dover, which may confidently be expected to be of the calibre of her previous reports.

JOHN MORRIS.

ROMAN WAYS IN THE WEALD. By I. D. Margary. Third (revised) edition. $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$. Pp. 296 with maps, 15 pls. London: Phoenix House, 1965. 36s.

The third edition of this distinguished work is most welcome. Readers of the two earlier editions will be glad to find that adjustments have been made in the maps to tally with new constructions, local changes and modern nomenclature. Also a most helpful amount of new knowledge has been embodied in the book, relative to the discovery of the western terminal of the Greensand Way and to the even more important and recent discovery of the Roman way from Chichester to Silchester. Other minor but necessary corrections have also been made.

Mr. Margary's reputation among archæologists is very great indeed. His life work, and one which will endure for many years, has revolutionised our knowledge of Roman communications throughout the country, and particularly, as in this book, of South-East England. Serious students will read the new edition with great profit and enjoyment.

To the reviewer, the chapter on the Roman roadgrid at Ripe (Chap. 10) seems Mr. Margary's finest achievement; for forceful argument, deduction and comparison it can hardly be beaten. It is pleasing to find that Chapters 3 and 4, embodying methods of search, documentation, mapping and recording have been retained in the new edition. At the risk of being perversely critical, one would suggest that in the fourth edition (which is sure to be required) the strip maps could be placed more closely adjacent to the text they illustrate. No doubt this is difficult to achieve, but when on the actual site of the roads described, looking with the eyes at the ground contour and holding the book with the fingers inserted in different spots in the book is quite a troublesome procedure.

H.W.R.L.