

## Reviews

*Stammesbildung und Verfassung. Das Werden der frühmittelalterlichen gentes.* By Reinhard Wenskus. 6½ × 9½ in. x + 656 pp., 2 maps. Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 1962. Price (linen) 58 Dm.

'All archaeology is contemporary archaeology'—one is tempted to adapt Croce's famous dictum on reading this book. It is perhaps the major German theoretical work to appear since the war, and it is difficult to believe that the theory has not, at least to some extent, been influenced by events of the last thirty years. This is not to detract from the book; quite the reverse. The thesis expounded in the work concerns the nature of the tribe (*Stamm*): this is not a unit designed by nature, but an arbitrary unit created by man's will and imposed, so to speak, on nature. In a group with a common purpose, say in a barrack room, a consciousness of belonging together (*Zusammengehörigkeitsbewusstsein*) may arise, and under primitive conditions the various forces of tribal unity—inter-marriage, tradition, law, myth, etc.—would bind the group into a tribe. In a time of upheaval such as the migration period tribal formation might take place rapidly and the actual combinations that arose would be largely a matter of chance. This is clearly quite a different view from that of the tribe as part of nature, more particularly the Germanic tribes whose imposing ancestry could be traced back to an original separation from the Indo-Germanic stem. In the theories that influenced German thinking up to the war a tribe was regarded as ordained by nature, so to speak, but on this new theory it exists, not quite in spite of nature, but as a rather casual entity, since the only final definition of a tribe is the consciousness of individuals in it of belonging to it.

Not only was the tribe not a fixed, immutable unit, but different tribes had different constitutions, and, moreover, were in a constant state of development and alteration. Broadly speaking with the passage of time the unit tended to grow larger: the emergence of Germanic kingdoms was merely the logical end of a process of growth that had been going on for millennia, and, more important, the only part which, because of written records, was visible to us. 'Kossinna's error was not that he attempted to attach ethnic significance [to the archaeological material], but that he had a romantic conception of *Ethnos* which did not correspond with reality; he transferred to the remote past ethnological facts which derived from information available in the Roman period without considering whether they could have held true in earlier times' (p. 137).

After an introduction the author deals with aspects of the concept of the tribe, or more particularly with the factors that bind it together, and reaches the conclusion that none of these factors in itself makes the tribe. There follows a short section on the ethnic significance of prehistoric find-groups (cultures, we would say). This is a vital question for prehistorians and migration-period archaeologists. One must turn to ethnographic parallels for guidance, but unfortunately their evidence is ambiguous. In north America, for example, the correspondence between material culture and language among the Eskimos from Alaska to Greenland is astonishing. Nevertheless as one proceeds south it is clear that the Eskimos are an exception and that great differences of language are hardly reflected at all in material culture among, for instance, Pueblo Indians. If the 'cultures' of the prehistorian or dark-age archaeologist are merely common factors grouped for classification without ethnic significance, they lose much of their interest; the archaeologist is tempted to concentrate on technology or other subjects that can be studied without much attention to 'cultures'. This is, of course, what has happened to some extent in English prehistory, whereas in Germany before the war, and in the Soviet Union since, the tendency has been to identify 'cultures' with ethnic groups.

Wenskus takes a middle path and accepts some correlation between material culture and tribe, but regards it as something to be used with great caution.

The main body of the book deals with the 'Origin of the ethnic relations of the Germans up to the Roman period'. We start with Indo-Europeans and end with the Germany described by Tacitus. This is matter for the prehistorians which we must pass over. The main point is that, following modern ideas about Indo-Europeans, he sees the creation of the different groups as due to a sort of coagulation out of a bronze-age continuum of related dialects; the Germans would not have been properly differentiated until the early iron age (map 1). There followed a sort of prehistoric migration period before the Germans are first historically revealed to us by Caesar, Tacitus and other classical writers. The long section on the structure and constitution of these older tribes, particularly on the loss of monarchy (map 2) in some of them, is of great interest.

Section V deals with tribal formation in the Roman and migration periods and now really impinges on the field of interest of the medieval archaeologist. Four forms of new tribal formation are distinguished: splitting off by quitting the home region, splitting off by staying in the home region, combining or sucking in during migration, and adding on after settlement. The divisions are a little theoretical since in the scanty sources for the period information is rarely vouchsafed us on these matters. The author then goes on to deal individually with the main participants in the migrations: Goths, Lombards, Alamanni, Franks, Saxons and Frisians and so on. There is perhaps not much new to say about them, but there is little doubt that in the light of the author's theories about tribal formation these tribes take on a quite different appearance from what they had before.

When the migration surge (*Wanderlawine*) struck an area we must imagine groups of people of varied background setting out together, gaining cohesion as they went, particularly if they passed through peoples of very different speech and customs from their own. One thinks of Goths passing through Slavs and Sarmatians. What is abundantly clear is the looseness of the names, particularly those of the tribes between the Rhine and Elbe. It is no wonder that there is difficulty in reconciling the archaeological with the written evidence about the places of origin of the Germanic invaders of this country!

For the archaeologist the book is one of ideas, while the several thousand footnotes and 44 pages of bibliography make it a useful quarry for further material. One is bound to admire and respect it as a solid piece of German scholarship; nevertheless one is constrained to feel that the very interesting ideas in it would have made more impact, and the book have been more widely read, if it had been a third or half of its present length.

M. W. THOMPSON

*Map of Britain in the Dark Ages.* 10½ × 8 in. 64 pp., folding map. Chessington (Surrey): Ordnance Survey, 1966. Price 17s. 6d.

This is the second edition of the Dark-age Map first published by the Ordnance Survey in two sheets (South, 1935, North, 1939) under the editorship of its Archaeology Officer, the late Dr. O. G. S. Crawford. These sheets formed part of the pioneer series of period maps for whose conception and production he was so largely responsible. The new edition is issued as a single sheet covering the whole of England, Scotland and Wales. Since it fell to me more than thirty years ago to review the original South Sheet in Crawford's own paper, *Antiquity*,<sup>1</sup> it gives me particular pleasure to welcome this greatly enlarged and improved version whose compilation has been so ably carried out by Crawford's successor at the Ordnance Survey Office, Mr. C. W. Phillips.

The scale of the map remains the same at 1 : 1,000,000 or 16 miles to the inch, a fact which makes the sheet very much larger than before. Indeed, apart from the necessary increase in height to include Scotland as well as England and Wales, it also

<sup>1</sup> *Antiquity*, ix (1935), 455-64.

now extends westwards to cover almost the full breadth of Ireland, not apparently to provide further information, for Ireland is shown in outline only, but rather to accommodate the much bigger table of references now needed. This increase in size makes the map awkward to handle, and indeed difficult to use at all without a space of some twelve square feet on which to spread or hang it. The presentation of physical features has been altered in two ways. There is, first, a very much simplified layering, with only four changes of colour (at 0, 200, 800 and 2,000 feet) compared with the nine changes of the old South Sheet. This very much reduces the visual effect of the physical relief, virtually the whole of lowland England being divided between two rather pale colours only, one for land under 200 ft., and the other for that between 200 and 800 ft.: on the first edition there were five changes of colour between sea level and 800 ft. The new treatment causes such significant features as the Chilterns or the Berkshire Downs to disappear, which is unfortunate. The second alteration is the omission of the old attempt to indicate areas of natural woodland and marsh, which is probably sensible, since, quite apart from the fussy effect these distinctions made, they were inevitably open to some uncertainty and provoked detailed criticism.

These simplifications in the presentation of the physical background leave the field of the map more free for the indication of the archaeological remains and their accompanying place names, and both are now far more conspicuously shown. They have also greatly increased both in number and in differentiation. The old South Sheet used only sixteen symbols for different categories of remains and all were uniformly coloured black: on the present sheet there are over forty different symbols, and many of them appear in more than one colour, for black, red and blue now distinguish roughly, if not always indisputably, between antiquities of pagan Saxon, Christian Saxon and Celtic origin. This distinction by colour does not, however, apply to place names, most of which remain black,<sup>2</sup> the use of upright characters for Anglo-Saxon names (whatever their origin) and sloping characters for Celtic names being carried over unchanged from the first edition.

The great increase in the number of distinctive symbols employed on the map arises in part from the combination of the original two sheets into one, for the old South Sheet did not need to show symbols for classes of antiquities occurring only on the North Sheet, and *vice versa*. But the main reason is the attempt now made to distinguish more precisely between different categories of dark-age antiquities. In reviewing the first edition in 1935 I asked for some additions and distinctions to be made in any future revision. I pressed, for example, for the inclusion of the main Roman roads and the main Roman towns, as indicating available lines of communication and conspicuous objects in the Anglo-Saxon landscape. I asked for a separate symbol for monasteries to distinguish them, where possible, from 'other places', and I asked for the use of different colours to distinguish antiquities of the pagan period from those of Christian times. All these things have been done, and many more besides. The pagan cemeteries, for example, are now divided into those primarily of cremation, those primarily of inhumation, those where both rites were practised together, and those consisting, so far as is known, of only a very small number of burials of either kind. Distinctive indications are now given for such specialities as ship burials, royal residences, pottery-kilns, hermitages, pagan shrines, and even for sites in the Celtic west where certain categories of household equipment, such as imported pottery from Gaul and the Mediterranean, have been noticed. The inclusion of this last group (involving three separate symbols), while no doubt useful to the specialist, could be criticized as passing beyond the limits of reasonable provision in a general map of this nature. Indeed it is hard to see how the marking of Mediterranean and Gaulish imports on Celtic sites in the west can be justified, if continental imports on Saxon sites in the east

<sup>2</sup> Modern rivers and coastal features, however, are blue, a confusing hangover from the first edition, which should surely have been altered when blue was chosen for the distinctive colouring of Celtic antiquities.

(one thinks of certain sorts of glasses, bronzes, weapons, brooches, bracteates or belt fittings, for example) are to be left out. It would surely be better to keep a map of this general character for sites and monuments of a permanent nature rooted in the soil, and to leave the plotting of movable property in personal and household equipment to the distribution-maps that necessarily accompany all specialist studies of such things.

The use of an increasing number of separate symbols on a map of this kind, while very welcome in itself, inevitably increases the range of possible error and confusion, not merely from accidental misdescriptions, or because there may be genuine doubt under which of several headings a given antiquity can best be placed, but because it becomes easier for the less distinctive to slip through the net altogether. It would be ungrateful to raise too many queries of these kinds, but I have not been able to locate on the map, or at any appropriate point in the index, the (apparently cremation) pottery from Scampston Park, Rillington (now at York), whose absence from the first edition I noted in 1935. The significant 5th-century pottery from Great Stambridge, Essex (now in the Prittlewell Priory Museum at Southend), from Little Oakley, Essex, (still, I believe, in private hands), and from a hut site at Stevenage New Town (now at Hitchin), seem also to have been missed. A single cremation in an urn from Hertford (in the Hertford Museum) would also be worth adding. Between them this group would help to fill the empty spaces north and east of London. And I still look in vain on this edition for some interesting place names, whose absence from its predecessor I deplored in 1935. Such are Inderauuda, used by Bede of Beverley,<sup>3</sup> and some folk names and early district names in the south-east: the Faenn-ge, Gegingas or Hrothingas of Essex, or the early *provinciae* of Kent. The evidence for all these is at least as good as has led to the welcome inclusion of a number of other such names on the map.

But everyone will have his private grumbles about the detailed execution of the vast work of compilation which lies behind its production. For the map touches dark-age life and dark-age studies at all their most sensitive growing points. The vigour of that growth in the past thirty years is abundantly illustrated by the mass of new information which this edition carries compared with its predecessor of 1935. I ended my review of that pioneer effort with these words:

‘. . . gratitude for the present publication far outweighs any criticism that may be made against its details. In the Dark Ages more perhaps than in any other period maps are the only sure basis of historical knowledge . . . Now at last, thanks to the Ordnance Survey, the historians of these dark centuries can get on with their job.’

This is as true now as it was then.

J. N. L. MYRES

*Irish Art in the Early Christian Period to A.D. 800.* By Françoise Henry. 8½ × 6½ in. xvi + 256 pp., 126 pls. (14 in colour), 34 figs., 3 maps. London: Methuen, 1965. Price 63s.

This revised edition appears 25 years after the first issue of this book. ‘The method of illustration has been changed completely, the emphasis being put on the definition of detail. This means that fewer objects are illustrated.’ The excellent photographs of Belzeaux-Zodiaque taken specially for this book and its French edition emphasize the wisdom of this decision and constitute a collection which enables the reader to appreciate the artistic excellence and technical virtuosity of many of the objects. The present volume carries the story down to A.D. 800. A second is promised to cover the period of the Vikings to their defeat in the early 11th century, followed by a third extending to the arrival of the Normans at the end of the 12th century.

<sup>3</sup> *H.E.*, v, 2.

Miss Henry opens with surveys of Irish art in pagan times and of the beginning of Christian art. These are an essential preliminary since one of her main theses concerns the continuity of Irish art. 'It is a Christian art with a strong pre-Christian background, an Early Medieval art to which the points of view of the Iron Age are still familiar.' 'In Ireland, as everywhere else, Christian art was at its beginning based on the existing art of the country.' This emphasis is most welcome. Too many discussions of Irish art have been concerned with the identification and assessment of foreign influences to the neglect of the underlying unity, which the author brings out so effectively, as for example in her analysis of the curvilinear construction of the intricate geometrical patterns.

'This book attempts to give as coherent a picture as possible of works of Irish style, whether they were actually made in Ireland or in some of the Irish extensions abroad.' The italic is the author's and the proposition unexceptionable. It is the application that will raise doubts. In the historical context it is entirely just to consider the products of Iona as Irish. But can the same be said of Lindisfarne on the basis of an Irish foundation two or three generations earlier than the date of the works under discussion? 'There can be little doubt that at least one and perhaps several of the manuscripts we are going to study were written at Lindisfarne. To call them "Northumbrian" or "Saxon" betrays a warped approach to the history of northern England at that time. Like the Bobbio manuscripts they are too intimate a part of Irish decoration to be cut off from it.' Nor does the argument stop at Irish foundations. At Echternach, founded by the Northumbrian, Willibrord, who had studied in Ireland, 'we are probably faced by a group of scribes, who had come with Willibrord from Ireland'. At Whitby, founded by a Northumbrian king, 'there were inscriptions partly written in Irish majuscules . . . witnesses to both the Saxon and the Irish elements, which formed the background of the monastery at the time of its foundation'. This subjective approach must not be forgotten when considering the author's discussion of objects, of which the provenance lies outside Ireland.

After the opening surveys there are separate chapters devoted to sites and architecture, metalwork, carvings and decoration of manuscripts. Each subject is fully discussed with a deep knowledge of the Irish remains and a wide command of the comparative material. Some of the conclusions will be questioned by specialists, but the general picture will command a wide measure of assent.

The chapter on the sites and architecture is the least satisfactory, largely because few of the more important monasteries and settlements have been carefully investigated. Lagore, more systematically explored than most, has yielded valuable results, but the centre of the crannog had been destroyed by a 19th-century drain before the careful excavations were carried out. When the very numerous ruined churches are considered the author tends to adopt a high chronology, which is open to criticism. Of the cathedral at Glendalough, a building 'much larger than any we have seen so far', she writes: 'From the middle of the 8th century Glendalough figures prominently in the Annals, so that there does not seem to be much reason to hesitate in dating it to that time.' Leask's considered history of the development of early Irish churches places this and similar churches in the 10th century, a dating recently confirmed by the discovery of an example in the Isle of Man, where a date much before 950 is unacceptable for historical reasons. Other buildings, where a date before 800 may be questioned include Ratass, Fore and Clonamery; the framed doorways at the last two may be compared with Tomgraney, which there is good reason to identify as the church erected by Abbot Cormac O'Killeen, who died in 969 (H. G. Leask, *Irish Churches and Monastic Buildings*, I, 69).

The dating of the Irish high crosses has long been a matter of controversy. The period considered in this volume has three dated examples, one of doubtful validity. The cruciferous pillar at Kilnasaggart refers to the gift by Ternoc, son of Ciaran the Little, whose death is recorded in c. 715. The cross at Bealin was erected by Tuathgall, abbot of Clonmacnois, who died in 810 or 811. The doubtful example is at Nova Ferna,

a monastery in the Irish dominated area of Scotland. The reference to Reothaide, abbot of Ferna (*ob.* 762 or 763), may well be commemorative like the Cross of Patrick and Columba at Kells. The most important of these three is the cross at Bealin, which has a fully developed wheel head and ornament in low relief. The Ahenny group, which the author ascribes to the 8th century, includes examples with a more advanced form of wheel head in which the upper arm is elongated and capped, prominent moulded angles, high relief including bosses, and elaborate sculptured bases. The high dating here proposed is justified by a comparison of the patterns with metalwork, the bosses being considered analogous to the glass or enamel studs. The argument is attractively set out, but it may be doubted whether it is really conclusive. A date in the 8th century (even allowing an extension into the early 9th: see p. 139) seems to postulate too long a gap between the Ahenny group and monuments admittedly of the 10th century, such as the Cross of Muiredach (*ob.* 923) at Monasterboice.

In conclusion we would express the hope that the promised second and third volumes will swiftly follow that under review. Miss Henry has devoted her life to the investigation of early Irish art and has spared no trouble to visit the remote and often inaccessible monuments in the distant parts of the island. Her previous books, *La Sculpture irlandaise* (1932) and the first edition of the present work (1940) opened a new stage in the scientific study of this fascinating and often tantalizing subject. All students of the early medieval period are already deeply in her debt and must hope that the debt will be increased by the completion of her finished and considered survey of the whole development.

C. A. RALEGH RADFORD

*Viking Coins of the Danelaw and of Dublin.* By Michael Dolley. 5½ × 8½ in. 32 pp., 16 pls., 1 map. London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1965. Price 5s.

This little book provides both a summary and a substantial part of the documentation of an unfamiliar aspect of the history of the British Isles. We are habituated to seeing Ireland in the Viking age from the viewpoint of the Celtic annalists and England from that of the chroniclers of Wessex, which narrowly withstood the Danish incursions and preserved and nourished, together with her vernacular culture, a bare civilization that was essentially early Carolingian—a unitary monarchy and coinage, a conservative architecture and art. Yet half of England gave in to the Danes and the Norseman clave the Celtic world down its Atlantic spine and altered its character for ever. It was forty years from the Frith of Wedmore till the reconquest of East Anglia and Lindsey, *c.* 918, and nearly another forty to the final reduction of Northumbria, while the Pale of the Ostmen half enthralled, half assimilated, almost endured until the twice transplanted Norsemen established it again in 1169. In all three regions the Vikings, though but newly acquainted with money, struck their own, which was by no means always a slavish imitation of the English. It is sometimes barbarous, but where it is legible it may illustrate what little the chroniclers tell us of Viking politics or, more often, it may only reveal their deficiencies—several powerful chieftains are known only from their coins. Occasionally a deliberate pagan symbolism cohabits with its usually militantly Christian evangelism; the use of liturgical legends reminds one of Islamic coinage, but it never shows the almost 'Anglican' conformity of Wessex.

The Danelaw and the Norse north-west passage are distinct, but Northumbria partakes of both. It is in East Anglia, where not a single pre-Danish charter and, with one possible exception, no pre-Danish building has survived, that the coins best illustrate the character of the culture, neither English nor Scandinavian in stamp and in some ways superior to both, that grew up under the Danish occupation. The moneyers of the 'memorial' coinage of St. Edmund that appeared within a quarter of a century of his martyrdom have predominantly Frankish names. The coinages that branched off the Carolingian stem independently from the English in Northumbria and Lindsey

likewise name Frankish moneyers and are allied to those of the Viking-held port of Quentovic near the Somme estuary. Traces of continental craft-traditions in other things—pottery for instance—are less noticeable in the north than in East Anglia, but this unexpected *mission civilisatrice* of the Vikings in what was not so much a devastated territory as a newly-opened land of opportunity has its written attestation on coins. It might be called the first Norman conquest, and, as far as the north went, the second Norman conquest undid it. The northern coins sometimes carry mint-names as enigmatic as those of the chieftains, but attempts to place them outside Northumbria are unconvincing. There are also coins of slightly better known pretenders, such as the two Anlafs, one of whom is the sand-grain of historicity in the character of the 'Prince of Denmark' and both of whom were based on Ireland. Neither they nor their successors struck coins in Ireland until long after their Northumbrian adventures had been suppressed. The Irish issues seem to have begun with the agreement of Aethelred and then, like all Irish coinages, gradually deviated from their English model along insular lines.

There are enlarged photographs of 53 coins, all in the British Museum, where possible with proveniences, and with an annotation and dating more precise than anything obtainable from existing reference-books and due entirely to the recent concerted studies of Old English coinages to which Mr. Dolley has contributed so much. Field-work on sites of the period is beginning to add to the all-too-few well-attested single finds, but it may be remarked that the later 'St. Edmund Memorial' pieces are only 'notably rare' because they post-date the vast Cuerdale hoard; in fact they are the only coins of their genus that have occurred several times in excavations. Two of Mr. Dolley's attributions still seem questionable: no. 1, showing a squat derivative of the long-lived temple-type of Louis the Pious, with a short lower step, and the names of 'Aethelred' and an English(?) Beorn . . . , seems only less removed from the original than the similar Bohemian coins that borrow the name of Aethelred II; and the coin from Geashill, co. Offaly (no. 25), 'a decade ago not recognized as English', may still be some sort of *Wendenpfennig*, like the Strasbourg-type imitations found at Pinjum in Friesland, but the date is not far wrong. Short though it is, this booklet will be used for reference and deserved an index.

S. E. RIGOLD

*The Military Organization of Norman England.* By C. Warren Hollister. 6 $\frac{3}{4}$  × 11 in. xiii + 319 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965. Price 45s.

Of recent years Professor Hollister of Santa Barbara, California, has made a number of contributions to the subject of Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman military organization, scattered in various periodicals and in his previous book, *Anglo-Saxon Military Institutions on the Eve of the Norman Conquest* (Oxford, 1962), to which the present volume is something of a companion piece. It is welcome, amongst other reasons, because it incorporates and summarizes all this earlier work, as well as offering substantial additions of its own. It is also welcome as a clear discussion and investigation of the problems of the origins of English feudalism, for Professor Hollister is very well aware that there is more to military history than battles and armies, and is willingly led into wider and deeper issues. On the main issue, he shows himself sound, for he has no doubt that knights and castles, fiefs and quotas, and therefore feudalism, are Norman innovations. Beyond this, he takes the reasonable line that post-conquest military organization and feudal custom were influenced by pre-conquest Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Scandinavian practice, but, it may be thought, follows it too far. Thus it is probable that he exaggerates the continuing value of his 'Great Fyrd' and 'Select Fyrd', and in any case the Conqueror, as duke of Normandy, was familiar, through the *arrière-ban*, with the principle of 'national' as opposed to 'feudal' military service. As, indeed, Professor Hollister is aware, the evidence to support the theory that the Normans borrowed both the idea of the commutation of military service and a sixty-day period of service from pre-conquest English practice is very thin. Again, one does not have to attribute

the life-fees of early Anglo-Norman feudalism to the influence of the Anglo-Saxon lease, for in the beginning on the continent the feudal fief itself was not hereditary. Above all, one must protest against the notion that the Conqueror and his Norman captains only learnt the true value of infantry the hard way at Hastings. Norman infantry, after all, took part in that engagement, as they had done elsewhere in Norman history; Hastings was won because, amongst other reasons, the Normans had heavy cavalry, knights, *as well as* infantry; and the victors of Hastings, southern Italy, Sicily and the First Crusade had little to learn in military matters from the obsolete tactics of the vanquished English.

Because it is to be hoped that this useful book will be widely used, it should also be pointed out that academic analysis of the kind attempted in it can sometimes blur as well as clarify the past. Contemporaries were not aware that they were 'feudal', and, unlike historians, made no sharp institutional distinction between 'feudal' and 'mercenary' forces. St. Anselm in one of his frequent parables of feudal society refers to the three kinds of soldiers at the courts of secular princes, those who serve in return for their land, those who serve to regain lost fiefs, and those who serve for pay.<sup>4</sup> All three categories were equally members of the military, feudal, upper classes, and the landless knights who fought for pay tended to be younger sons in search of fiefs, lordlings if not yet lords. 'Mercenary' has become a loaded word, but it is as well to treat 11th-century mercenaries with some respect when we find that William the Conqueror, recruiting great numbers of knights in 1086, even hired Hugh, brother of the king of France, together with his company, and regardless of expense.<sup>5</sup> The authentic contemporary note is struck, signifying the difference in status and honour but scarcely class, when the discontented Robert Curthose, the Conqueror's eldest son and heir, declared that he could not for ever be his father's *mercenarius*.<sup>6</sup>

Professor Hollister's study is evidently based upon wide research into the relevant sources, though there are a few surprising omissions in his bibliography, which contains no specific reference to Marie Fauroux, *Recueil des Actes des Ducs de Normandie, 911-1066* (Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie, xxxvi, Caen, 1961), and no reference to Ferdinand Lot, *L'Art Militaire et les Armées au Moyen Age . . .* (Paris, 1946), Jean Yver, 'Les châteaux-forts en Normandie jusqu'au milieu du xii<sup>e</sup> siècle' in *Bulletin de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie*, LIII (1957), the work of Henri Prentout and Leopold Delisle, and some of that of Michel de Boüard. At times the author shows himself curiously out of sympathy with the period of his choice by repeated 'anti-feudal' remarks (pp. 125, 169-70, 223, 227, 253, 277), but in general this book is a valuable and balanced survey of a difficult and controversial subject, for which students, both young and older, should be grateful.

R. ALLEN BROWN

*Drevnii Kiev. Ocherki po Istorii Materialnoi Kultury Drevnerusskogo Goroda* [Ancient Kiev. An Outline History of the Material Culture of the Medieval Russian Town]. By M. K. Karger. 2 vols. 8 × 10½ in. Vol. I, 579 pp., 100 pls., 141 figs., 2 maps; vol. II, 661 pp., 77 pls., 164 figs., 1 map. Moscow/Leningrad: Institut Arkheologii Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1958 and 1961. Price: I, 35 r. 10 k., and II, 3 r. 50 k.

Leroy-Beaulieu defined the ingredients of European civilization as the Classical heritage, Germanic intrusion and Christianity, and applying this definition to Russia, in spite of the different form of Christianity and different background on which the

<sup>4</sup> *The Life of St. Anselm Archbishop of Canterbury by Eadmer*, ed. R. W. Southern (London, 1962), p. 94.

<sup>5</sup> William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, ed. W. Stubbs (London, Rolls Series, 1887-9), II, 320.

<sup>6</sup> Ordericus Vitalis, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. A. Le Prevost (Paris, 1838-55), II, 378.



influences acted, he found there was a common experience. The point was rather an academic one, since the product of this shared experience, medieval or Kievan Russia, was obliterated by the Mongol Tartars and Russia was wrested violently from Europe by Asia. Although rich chronicle evidence survives, on the whole documentary sources are poor for Kievan Russia, a deficiency that has no doubt encouraged intensive archaeological study. The great strides made in this field in the last few decades allow us to see how far Russia resembled and how far it differed from western Europe before the catastrophe of the Mongol onslaught.

The river Dnieper at Kiev was too broad to bridge until the 19th century, so that the medieval city was one of the rare medieval capitals without a bridge. The left bank of the river is subject to seasonal flooding but on the right bank there are several hills, on the highest of which the medieval city grew up. An initial hill-fort occupied in pagan times (discovered in recent excavation) was enlarged in the 10th century, when Christianity was adopted by Prince Vladimir, who, in 989, within the newly enlarged area, erected the Tithe church, the first stone building in medieval Russia, built, or at all events designed, according to the chronicler, by Byzantines. In the first half of the 11th century the defended area was vastly enlarged by Yaroslav the Wise, who constructed the cathedral of St. Sophia within it. The full circuit of the earthworks, which was never walled, was  $3\frac{1}{2}$  km., but there were almost certainly further suburbs of the city by the riverside. From the 12th century Kiev went into political decline, losing its authority over the other Russian cities. In December 1240 after a few weeks siege it was taken by storm by the Mongol armies of Batu Khan, when a large number of its inhabitants were killed and many of its buildings destroyed. The hilltop town was abandoned, but occupation continued in the Podol area by the river.

After a long period of Mongol, Lithuanian and Polish rule it was captured by Muscovite Russia in the 17th century. The new fortifications constructed on the site of the old town almost obliterated the medieval ramparts, and until the 19th century one of the main preoccupations of the St. Petersburg government at Kiev was with fortification. The defeat of Napoleon, which led to such an upsurge of national consciousness in Russia produced a great interest in Kiev. Karamzin's *History of the Russian State* published in 1816 was a volume which, according to Pushkin, 'everyone, even the ladies of fashion, rushed to read . . . Ancient Russia had been discovered by Karamzin as Columbus discovered America'. A great deal of research on medieval Kiev took place from the 1820s onwards, although proper excavation and the identification of sunken houses was first undertaken in 1907-8 by Khvoiko (his name is also associated with the Tripolye settlements). Since the revolution Kievan Russia has occupied a central place in Soviet archaeological studies, as is witnessed by the fact that the main posts in archaeology are held by medievalists and by the resources employed in the excavation of sites of this period. M. K. Karger directed a permanent 'expedition' at Kiev itself, jointly financed by the federal and state Academies of Science, between 1938 and 1952 (interrupted by the German occupation), and these two magnificent volumes record his own work and anything worth while that had been done before. They are likely to remain the standard work for many years to come.

The first volume covers all archaeological remains except stone buildings, which are treated in the second volume. The nine chapters in the first volume deal with the history of archaeological research in the city, the oldest settlements and graves, the settlements of the 8th-10th centuries, the 'necropolis' of the 9th-10th centuries, the town's fortifications, palaces, citizens' houses, crafts (small finds), and finally Kiev and the Mongol assault. The second volume is divided into four chapters which treat the stone buildings of medieval Kiev in chronological order: 10th to early 11th, mid 11th, late 11th to early 12th, and 12th to 13th centuries. Remains of the archbishop's and royal palaces have been discovered, and fragments of two gateways survive, but in fact the volume deals almost exclusively with ecclesiastical remains. For this reason in the present review I propose to discuss some of the matters raised in the first volume and

touch very briefly only on the somewhat unfamiliar ecclesiastical architecture of the second volume.

It should be said at once that Karger is a medieval archaeologist of the first rank, equally at home with chronicle, architectural or excavation evidence. Although the book is an account of the archaeology of Kiev the author is always aware of written sources, contemporary or later. He uses many engravings and his quotations from the official correspondence at the time of the construction of the first Muscovite fortifications in 1654-55 (pp. 234-39) are most illuminating. There is an exhaustive bibliography of works in Russian, Ukrainian and other languages. The standard of scholarship throughout is of a very high order indeed.

Roman influences over a considerable part of south Russia were much greater than is generally appreciated. These reveal themselves as actual imports, mainly coins, and in deeper, more important influences on material culture. A number of coins have been found at Kiev, mainly in the Podol area, and also, here and there, burials of the 'burial field' cultures. First recognized by Khvoiko, who regarded them as La Tène, the burnished and fumed pots found in the burials point unmistakably to Roman influence. Although it has been suggested by some Russian archaeologists (not Karger) that the people buried in these graves were Slavs, the fact that their fine wheel-turned pots are replaced by crude hand-made ones suggests that the users were replaced by someone else, i.e. Slavs. There is no evidence at this stage for earthworks on the hills. Between the 5th and 8th centuries A.D. there is something of a hiatus, filled only by a small number of casually-found silver ornaments which are attributed to the *Antes*.

In the traditional chronicler's story of the creation of Kiev three brothers founded three settlements on three different hilltops which later were concentrated into one; it is therefore of particular interest that remains of the 8th-9th centuries have been found on two other hilltops at Kiev besides in the original earthwork in Vladimir's city. Karger has plotted the occurrence of Kufic dirhems and Byzantine coins in and around the city. The latter are surprisingly rare. Dirhems are much more numerous and it is interesting that the hoards are mainly from the first half of the 10th century, slightly earlier than the two large hoards from the base of the Novgorod deposit. Trade with Central Asia, which seems to have reached something of a climax at this time, was one of the prime factors in the foundation of the two great Russian medieval cities.

In a long chapter Karger describes the pagan burials in the 'necropolis' on the site of the old town, partly obliterated by the city's eastward expansion when it became Christian, one log chamber being actually under the Tithe church. He divides the graves into aristocratic (i.e. of *druzhniki*) and ordinary, and in both cases there is a curious mixture of cremation and inhumation. The sacrifice of a slave or a horse with the interred man in some of the burials recalls Scythian practices. As might be expected the author is an anti-Normanist, but he does sort out the brooches which may be regarded as definitely of Scandinavian origin. As a preview of the pagan population of the later Christian city the burials are of great importance.

It is a pity that we cannot reveal by excavation the plan either of a prince's or a boyar's palace, of which no clear impression can be gained from the chronicles. Karger squeezes every drop of information that he can from the written sources and makes a very valuable list of palaces in or near the town. Some parts of the palace named in the chronicle can now be more fully understood, since the houses from Novgorod have been published, and this has rendered Karger's text rather out of date.

The defences of Kiev have been largely obliterated; the author has worked out the course of the bank where it is no longer visible and given an invaluable account of its later history. In 1952 part of the rampart of Yaroslav's city was sectioned revealing that within the soil it had been built of horizontal oak-log chambers six deep and arranged in pairs of twelve (fig. 50). The forward face survived to a height of 5.55 m., but its full original height, as well as the form of the parapet, is of course uncertain. There were three gates in the rampart, of which the surviving 'Golden Gates' were a cere-

monial arched passageway without flanking towers built by Yaroslav (described in vol. II). Judged by western standards, compared with Château Gaillard for instance, the defences of the capital of Kievan Russia were incredibly weak.

In contrast to Novgorod, where streets and yards have been revealed, no general plan has yet been established at Kiev to which the houses can be related. However, several score of houses have been identified of a type which subsequent discoveries have shown to be normal in south Russian medieval towns. This was a building roughly 10–20 ft. square with its lower part, 2–5 ft., buried in the ground. It was not a 'Grubenhäus' since it had vertical walls of clay-covered plaited withies (or possibly horizontal logs in some cases) supported by corner uprights; the roof was probably domed of clay-covered branches. It was entered down steps and always contained a clay oven or stove, and sometimes had raised platforms. The contrast with the log cabins of north Russia (notably Novgorod) is so great that the subject has given rise to heated controversy. To an outsider the difference seems to be a matter of simple geographical influence. As Blomkvist has shown, in the modern folk culture where coniferous wood is available it was used for log cabins, and in some cases south of the coniferous forests rich peasants actually had pine logs sent by train to use in their cabins. Where deciduous wood had to be used it was plastered with clay or lime, or, before the winter, an elaborate jacket of straw was built round the cabin. The straight stems of coniferous wood made an airtight joint practicable, but with deciduous wood a close fit was impossible and steps had to be taken to prevent draughts in the Russian winter. Surely the explanation is the same for the semi-subterranean houses at Kiev; their square shape suggests a log-cabin derivation, and in graves or the city's rampart where draughts did not matter the normal construction of horizontal oak logs was used.

A long chapter deals with crafts: blacksmith, gold, silver and coppersmith, glass- and pottery-making, wood, bone and stone working, leather-working, textiles and ikon-painting. Most of the houses that have been discovered reveal that to some extent they were used as workshops. Although published in 1958 the text appears to have been written before the publication of the mass of material from Novgorod and so has to a great extent been superseded. In both cities one of the remarkable achievements has been to reveal the extent to which they were craft centres, which tempts one to compare them with, for instance, Dekker's London in *The Shoemakers' Holiday*.

Karger, like many Russians, sees the Russian resistance to the Mongol assault as a terrible sacrifice in which Russia was destroyed and western Europe thereby saved. No doubt there is some truth in this but nevertheless geography played a part; the Mongols were steppe nomads and once they entered the dense forest in the north (Novgorod was spared) and mountains in the west their advance lost its momentum. Kievan Russia had lost all political cohesion so that Batu Khan could simply take one town after another. Perhaps even more serious was the weakness of the urban defences which resembled rather the *muri gallici* encountered by Julius Caesar than the formidable fortifications like Krak des Chevaliers, with which the Crusaders confronted their oriental antagonists.

The author is satisfied that all over the hilltop town at Kiev there is an unconformity above the 13th-century levels which are succeeded by those of the 17th–19th centuries. In some cases, as in the piled skeletons in the house in Zhitomirskaya street, the skeletons of two girls in a house close by and the great 'fraternal' graves with as many as 2,000 skeletons in them, the traces of the catastrophe are only too plain. Kiev then became the only example of a deserted medieval capital in Europe. Whether the failure to recolonize the old city is significant may well be a matter for discussion; possibly the value of the port by the riverside outweighed the advantages of the hilltop defences.

In the study of the ecclesiastical architecture in the second volume many recent advances are recorded. The 19th-century church built over the Tithe church has been demolished so that it has been possible to recover the whole original plan, while the

discontinuance of religious use at St. Sophia has allowed extensive research, particularly on the tile mosaics of its floors. The number of medieval churches, some monastic, now revealed beneath the ground or beneath baroque plaster is impressive. The Kievan church had a centralized plan, a crossing under a central dome, three aisles and apses, sometimes with side and western galleries. With no transepts there was no encouragement to form a cloister so that it would be very interesting to know how the domestic buildings were arranged at the Pechersk monastery, for instance. Many other points of interest are raised: the use of brick, the early practice of alternating stone and brick courses (presumably a continuous survival from late Classical times), and so on.

Kiev must have presented a curious spectacle in November, 1240, when the army of Batu Khan assembled on the woody slopes of the south side of the city, with its engines ready to batter the wooden defences. The besiegers with their hundreds of horses and carts were a remarkable sight, so were the besieged behind their great walls of horizontal logs, and behind them the curious shapes of their semi-subterranean houses, the domes of St. Sophia and the other churches . . . It is a vivid picture that is painted for us in these two fine volumes.

M. W. THOMPSON

*The English Medieval House.* By Margaret Wood. 9 $\frac{3}{4}$  × 7 $\frac{1}{4}$  in. xxxi + 448 pp., 73 pls., 117 figs. London: Phoenix House, 1965. Price £8 8s.

The history of medieval domestic building has in recent years received a vast amount of attention. Great numbers of buildings hitherto unknown, or known only to the local specialist have been recorded and now provide the general historian with an invaluable corpus of comparative information. Research has been active, too, in the by-ways of medieval building such as roof-trusses and the development of timber framing, which have been studied in immense detail and the battle of king-post and crown-post has been joined. We know more today of the tiles on the floor, the paintings on the walls and the chimney-pots on the roof than ever before. Little, however, has been written of the houses of which they form part.

The dating-sequence and background-history of many individual buildings has been examined in the Royal Commission volumes, the long line of *Country Life* articles, the Ministry of Works guides and Professor Pevsner's rapidly growing gazetteer. These are mostly houses of manorial scale and above. We owe a steadily-growing knowledge of peasant and sub-manorial houses to many excavators and to organizations such as the Deserted Medieval Village Research Group and the Vernacular Architecture Group. All this is specialist information to be found in the proceedings of local and national societies. Some of the conclusions reached may be tentative, but it is the very nature of research that finality is never reached.

From time to time it is necessary that the threads should be drawn together so that the whole pattern should be made clear. In a subject such as the development of medieval domestic building in England this is a formidable task, if justice is to be done to the mass of research that has been carried out. It was first undertaken on a serious scale by T. Hudson Turner in his *Some Account of Domestic Architecture in England*, the first volume of which was published in 1853. Turner's work, completed by his colleague Parker, was a brilliant achievement. It gives a consecutive account of the development of domestic architecture, making a progressive survey from century to century, illustrated by a number of examples, both physical and documentary, which is astonishing considering the date at which it was produced. Nearly a century passed before the subject was taken up again by such writers as Addy, Gotch and Lloyd, none of whom added anything of significance to Turner and Parker's conclusions. Bond and, more recently, Webb pass lightly over domestic work in their studies of medieval architecture. The greatest advances have been made, curiously enough, by writers with a specialist bias. Hamilton Thompson in his *Military Architecture in England* (the chapter on 'The dwelling house within the castle'), Salzman in his *Building in England down to 1540* and

the first volumes of the *History of the King's Works* all break new ground. All these, however, only extend Turner's scope, though, indeed, they form a substantial extension to his basic work. They do not revise it. Nor is its pre-eminent position challenged by the present work, wherein the author sets out to 'attempt a survey of the medieval house, as it evolved, and study its growth'.

This is a lavish book, well printed and extensively illustrated. For such a book the photographs are disappointing. It should, for instance, have been possible to do more justice to so important an example as the great hall at Penshurst than pl. xl(a). Side by side with the photographic illustrations are beautiful reproductions of engravings, mostly those of Parker, Turner and Pugin. It is an interesting reflection that these engravings, few later than the middle of the 19th century, are infinitely superior to the photographs when judged on their merits as illustrations of architectural detail. A considerable number of plans are reproduced from a variety of already published sources, but their diversity of format is somewhat confusing and the author would have been better served had they been redrawn using uniform conventions and some simple relationship in scales. In an architectural book of this kind the reader has a right to expect some such consideration and the author should have required a more careful presentation of the visual aspect of her work. Full praise, however, must be given to the setting of the text, which is a pleasure to read.

One vital aspect of the history of the medieval house is its development as a living unit, its adjustment to meet the changing needs of each succeeding generation and, within these generations, the variations demanded by differing social levels, each with its individual rate of change. The form of a manor house, for example, changed considerably from the 13th to the 15th century, whilst the peasant house remained virtually unaltered. Over the same period, on the other hand, the great house or palace underwent a fundamental process of transformation. These are the broad divisions across which regional characteristics might cut, producing such concurrent variations on the same theme as the stone semi-defended manors of the north and the picturesque timber moated manors of the west midlands. A second aspect is that of the changing fashions in architectural and structural details. Some comparison should be made here with national trends in other fields. We need to be shown, not so much what a typical 13th-century door is like but how the treatment of the doorway is affected by its domestic context. Some features, such as fire-places, roof-louvres and garderobes, are to be found by their nature only in domestic building so their development must be explored fully, contrasting, e.g., the timber and plaster hood of the yeoman's fire-place with the embattled and heraldic surround that was held to be fit for his lord. Others, such as windows and floors, call for a comparative treatment which, moreover, must cross the social scales.

These two aspects of the subject present a difficult problem in treatment; they could be dealt with in two separate sections, one on the growth of the house, the other on the development of architectural and structural features. Turner and Parker chose to present a separate survey of each century followed by illustrative examples from which the reader is allowed to make his own deductions as to the development of features. The present volume attempts a compromise based in the main on the elements of the house rather than the house itself. As a result no clear picture emerges of a whole house at any particular period.

There are two chapters devoted to typological themes. In the opening chapter on Norman town houses, the author's choice of treatment has prevented her from drawing any conclusions from the facts set out. The 'Music House' at Norwich, which is quoted as a town house, and Boothby Pagnell manor appear under differing headings, so that their important similarities are lost to view. In particular the vital differences in the treatment of the vaulting of the two compartments of the lower story of the Music House (shown incorrectly in fig. 2) only become clear when discussed in a later chapter on vaulted cellars, so that the parallel with Boothby Pagnell and other buildings of

this class is missed. Another chapter deals with 'Plans of the later middle ages'. In fact only a small and rather special section of such plans are discussed, mostly those of priests' and chantry-houses. The great houses of the period, such as Compton Wynyates and South Wingfield, are only cited elsewhere and then only in reference to their individual elements. Their common plan-development is hardly touched upon, so that the two-story corridor of the late 15th-century prior's house at Wenlock can be quoted as being an unusual medieval feature, whereas it is typical of a whole class of houses of this period and appears at Compton Wynyates, Knole, Hengrave and Gainsborough Old Hall among others.

Any typology based on individual elements unrelated to a developed theme is bound to lead to misconceptions if not errors of fact. A chapter on first-floor halls places the hall of the 'Constable's' house at Christchurch, Hants, in the same category as Cardinal Wolsey's college hall at Christ Church, Oxford, although the two buildings are so vastly different in purpose and origin. So it is with other elements, such as staircases. To group these according to their appearance tends to obscure rather than to clarify their meaning. Whether the entrance to a stair is external or internal (p. 334) is surely a characteristic of the room to which it leads, not of the stair itself, or even necessarily of the period in which it was built.

The real value of this book lies in the impressive body of information that it contains, so much of it based on Dr. Wood's own careful explorations and close observation, to which have been added a wealth of examples, the fruit of wide reading, gathered in from published (and some unpublished) sources. For all this we must be grateful. It provides a much-needed compendium of information not previously available in one volume. Each chapter is followed by an excellently-referenced list of the buildings quoted with their dates. A very full bibliography is given, which is probably the best yet produced on the subject.

Dr. Wood's enthusiasm and love of her subject permeate her work, which, though it cannot be claimed to be definitive, must be assured of a place in the library of any student of medieval domestic architecture who can afford to buy it.

P. FAULKNER

*Oxford Studies Presented to Daniel Callus*. Ed. R. W. Southern. 9 × 5½ in. viii + 319 pp., 1 pl., 14 figs. Oxford Historical Society, n.s. xvi. Oxford: University Press, 1964. Price not stated.

This review is concerned only with the study by W. A. Pantin, 'The halls and schools of medieval Oxford: an attempt at a reconstruction', pp. 31-100.

It is not usually realized that the collegiate system at Oxford and Cambridge is a relatively late development and that originally scholars lived in halls and were taught in schools, small units which existed in large numbers. Mr. Pantin examines the evidence for Oxford and says that most scholars lived in halls, which were in general ordinary medium-sized houses. In 1231 it was ordained that a scholar should be registered on the roll of a regent master and when by 1410-20 it was understood that he should belong to a hall, such an academic institution would be controlled by a master of arts. There is a useful list made by John Rouse in 1440-50 dividing them into grammar halls, halls for artists, and halls for legists. In time colleges usurped their function and thus, although there were 69 halls in 1444, there were only eight in 1552 but thirteen colleges. In 1483-90 aularian statutes regularized the system by ordering that scholars should come together in their halls for meals and lectures.

The types are examined, both the shape of the message and the character of the house upon it. The large hall open to the roof, kitchen and buttery and chambers, often forming a quadrangle, are illustrated in a series of plans and perspective drawings, and these reconstructions are based either on physical remains, which are rare, or on contemporary inventories and other documents, aided by Mr. Pantin's knowledge of

medieval domestic architecture. Furniture and studies within the chambers are mentioned and interesting dates for the academic use of a hall, possible rebuildings and later uses are given.

A necessary part of the scholastic background, other than accommodation, was the provision of lecture-rooms or schools and there was a large group of these at the north end of School Street on a site now occupied by the Divinity School and the Arts School. As many as fifty-four schools are described, most of them within a quarter of a mile square and the period of greatest demand for them was between 1276 and 1305.

Halls and schools were scattered because the town was there before the scholars, who had to fit in where they could. The position and size of halls and schools are given by reference to the late Dr. H. E. Salter's *Survey*, but a map of the area of greater concentration would have been useful.

Such a difficult subject could tend to become a catalogue, but Mr. Pantin avoids this in a useful paper, with valuable deductions about the beginnings of the university, the history of which has been adequately covered by others, but not the living conditions of the scholars in it.

E. A. GEE

*Königshagen, ein archäologisch-historischer Beitrag zur Siedlungsgeschichte des südwestlichen Harzvorlandes.* By Walter Janssen.  $6\frac{1}{4} \times 9\frac{1}{2}$  in. viii + 246 pp., 21 figs., 20 plans and maps in separate folder. Historischer Verein für Niedersachsen, Quellen und Darstellungen zur Geschichte Niedersachsens, Band 64. Hildesheim: August Lax, 1965. Price not stated.

The *volte face* after 900 years of almost continuous advance of settlement to a retreat that apparently affected the greater part of Europe seems to have taken place everywhere at about the same time, the early decades of the 14th century. The traces of what we may call the spring tide of medieval settlement occur as much on the continent as they do in this country. In Germany, indeed, an interest first arose in medieval desertions (*Wüstungen*) in the 1930s, and, as can be seen in the bibliography in this book, an impressive amount of publication in German on this subject already exists. The main difference between the study of the subject in the two countries is the very much larger body of written evidence—so skilfully used by Professor Beresford—that survives in England, owing, of course, to the political unity of this country in the middle ages and the happy preservation of the national records.

The book under review is an abbreviated version of a dissertation offered at Göttingen University in 1963. It falls into two very distinct parts. The first third is an outline of the settlement—relying almost exclusively on place-name evidence—of a region in Lower Saxony on the south, or more particularly the south-west, of the Harz Mountains (*Harzvorland*). The second two-thirds form a study, firstly historicogeographical and secondly by archaeological excavation, of the chosen deserted village of Königshagen (Gemeinde Barbis, Kr. Osterode/Harz) that lies in this area, only a few hundred yards N. of the modern border zone with E. Germany.

The *Harzvorland* is not a flat region but is divided in the middle by hilly ground with the land in the W. drained by rivers flowing N. and in the E. by rivers flowing south. Prehistoric settlement is recorded by a vestigial layer of early, perhaps non-Germanic, place-names found throughout the area, but the influence of the watershed made itself felt in early medieval settlement. On the Thuringian side the earliest names have suffixes in *-ingen* or *-ungen*, cognate and contemporary with English *-ingas*; on the Saxon side the earliest settlement is rather later and denoted by the suffixes *-hausen* or *-ingehausen*. It is a basic assumption of the author (but not, I believe, of our own place-name specialists) that the preference for this or that suffix changed every two or three centuries and that therefore the progress of forest clearance can be followed by plotting the different suffixes on maps, each group of sites with the same suffix represent-

ing a new advance. The main period of settlement, 9th–11th centuries, is represented by the numerous *-rode* (lit. assart) or *-ingerode* names, and the final settlement of the 12th–13th centuries by *-hagen* (cognate with English hedge) names. The excellent maps provided show the surviving and deserted sites bearing the relevant names. The gradual extension into the wooded and more mountainous areas (the watershed being virtually the last area settled) is very evident. The extent of abandonment after 1300 (pl. vii) is remarkable.

Two very interesting points are made by the author. He draws an analogy between the very extensive *Bandkeramik* neolithic settlement with (as he believes) a subsequent recession in the bronze and iron ages, and the great medieval expansion followed by later retreat. However, in view of the impossibility of reliably calculating the extent of prehistoric settlement this can only be an interesting suggestion; the evidence in this country could hardly bear such an interpretation.

The second point is one of the fundamental but controversial issues of medieval history, the reason for the retreat from the early 14th century, on which Janssen only lightly touches. If one sees the middle ages as developing like the religious orders and reaching a climax in the 12th–13th centuries, then the 14th–15th centuries are ‘the waning of the middle ages’ and the recession of settlement fits into this pattern. However, it is not so easy to reconcile other aspects of medieval society with this, for instance the continued or accelerated advance in technology (gunpowder, printing and so on), nor does the word ‘recession’ easily fit the activities of Henry the Navigator, Columbus, Cabot and Vasco da Gama. Janssen believes that in some cases desertion was due to warfare (he considers this was so at Königshagen), although, as he points out, the peculiarly savage fighting of the Reformation wars and the Thirty Years War led to hardly any desertions. The distribution of the deserted villages (pl. vii) does not indicate a marginal retreat; the sites are often in the best land in the valleys. In his view they do not indicate a population decline. The factor at work suggested by their distribution is the influence of the towns or larger villages. The growth of industries in the towns either attracted the rural population into them, or, where the villages were small and not viable units, they ‘balled-up’ into larger villages in which, no doubt, domestic industries, such as weaving, could be practised. Professor Beresford has shown from the richer written sources in this country that the English deserted villages were predominantly smaller ones. Obviously on this interpretation the desertions were not, perhaps, a sign of economic good health but they were not necessarily a sign of ill-health either, and the villagers were not turned out by the landlords but left of their own free will. Such a view evidently offers much ground for discussion!

Königshagen has little written history. It is first recorded in 1228 as being given by Heidenreich, count of Scharzfeld and Lauterberg, to the monastery of Pöhlde. Then, as now, Königshagen was on a frontier and in the 12th century it probably formed part of what was a sort of marcher lordship created out of royal domain or forest (hence the name). Janssen believes the village came to a violent end in 1413–20 but the evidence is a late source. The weakness of documentation and the peculiar frontier position are the facts to remember about the site.

The historico-geographical account of the site is valuable but perhaps excessively long. The main interest is the study of the fields (terraced strip-lynchets), pollen-analysis from the ditch-filling of the ringwork and an intensive study of the later history of the fields, which were worked from the small town of Barbis nearby. The fields of the abandoned village did not become a sheep run, but were, to some extent at all events, kept in cultivation, perhaps by their former owners. Seven samples for pollen-analysis were taken from the ditch-filling above, in and below, the charcoal layer believed to have been produced by the destruction of the church in the ringwork. These indicated that natural afforestation (more tree pollen) had already started before the destruction accompanied by, and no doubt related to, a decrease of cereals and weeds associated with cultivation. The return of the forest, so painfully cleared by the first settlers, is a



normal feature following desertion in Germany, and the pollen-analysis suggested that it started even before the final desertion of the village.

The surface remains of the village consisted of a ditched ringwork and the somewhat irregular bumps of house sites disposed in no recognizable order. The only stone building found was in the centre of the ring. Janssen believes that in origin it was a keep (*Wohnturm*) standing in the middle of a palisaded ringwork. Material had been heaped up in the middle, perhaps to furnish a dry surface, since to the reviewer's way of thinking 'motte' can only be used if the height of material was in itself a deterrent to an attacker. The site at this stage could be regarded as a castle but, perhaps after its acquisition by the monastery, it underwent a remarkable transformation; a tower was added at the W. and a chancel at the E. end so that the keep was converted into a church. At the same time the palisade was replaced by a continuous row of buildings facing inwards. These later went out of use and the whole area became a graveyard. The modern field-name still refers to the long-vanished church. One must inevitably have certain misgivings about the early stages of the transformation, which study of the plan (pl. x) does not entirely dispel, although Janssen's explanation certainly seems to cover all the facts.

Compared to the ringwork it would be fair to say that the houses outside were no more than tested by excavation. Two remarkable facts came to light: in two cases the houses had cellars, and in some cases the timber-framed houses with wickerwork walls stood not in isolation but in groups arranged around a courtyard. This is very different from Wharram Percy, for instance, although there are parallels on Dartmoor. It is abundantly clear, however, that the village has only been sounded, and many years of work will be necessary before its full history is worked out.

For the English student of deserted villages there is much to ponder: the desirability of extending study to cover original settlement as well as final abandonment, and of studying the later use of the arable fields of the deserted village and, generally, of the constantly changing geographical equilibrium before and during settlement and after final desertion.

M. W. THOMPSON

*The Deserted Villages of Oxfordshire. The Deserted Villages of Northamptonshire.* By K. J. Allison, M. W. Beresford and J. G. Hurst. 9 $\frac{3}{4}$  × 7 $\frac{1}{4}$  in. 47 and 48 pp., each with 2 maps and numerous tables. Department of Local History Occasional Papers, nos. 17 and 18. Leicester: University Press, 1965 and 1966. Price 10s. 6d. each.

It has taken a long time to generate a serious interest in the deserted village sites of Britain, for at least 2,000 are known in England alone. The areas of hummocky pasture lined out with the banks of old crofts and house places and still seamed by old grass-grown lanes have long been a common feature of the midland scene, but they are also well scattered from Northumberland to the Channel. Sometimes a ruined or isolated church remains; in other places the memory of the lost village is only preserved by the name of a wood, field, or farmhouse; elsewhere the decline has been restricted to the shrinkage of a place which still survives.

Interest in this subject grew between the two world wars and owed much initially to the late Canon C. W. Foster of the Lincoln Record Society, appropriately coming to a head at the Lincoln meeting of the Royal Archaeological Institute in 1946. Since then there has been a rapid advance, which is chiefly due to the tireless work of Professor M. W. Beresford and Mr. J. G. Hurst. A Deserted Medieval Village Research Group which carries on work all over Britain and maintains contact with similar activities on the continent has been in existence for a number of years. Concern for these sites has been roused just in time, for after long immunity from disturbance because of the obstacle which they present to older levelling methods, they are now capable of being destroyed in a matter of hours by modern earth-moving machinery. Modern agriculture has no use for them.

These two papers of handsome and convenient format cover two typical midland counties and are the result of thorough field examination in which air-photography and some excavation have played an important part. Here documentary research is all-important and the main relevant classes in the Public Records have been examined by Miss Betty Grant in an attempt to locate deserted sites and supply the date of their desertion. As the authors say, further and more local research in manorial and other records should notably increase information on both these points, but in the meanwhile these papers show the way and, in the lists supplied, must go far to cover the topographical side of the enquiry. The measure of their success is that out of 100 sites at present known to have existed in Oxfordshire they have completely failed to locate only two, though nine more are not closely identifiable. The comparable figures for Northamptonshire are 82 : 1 : 10.

Both of these counties have had more than the normal share of depopulation. The authors have established five periods capable of national application in which the desertions may be grouped. Period I has no lower limit and closes soon after 1086 with the Domesday record; period II covers the phase of prosperity and expansion from 1100 and closes in 1350, when climatic change and pandemic plague had inaugurated a harsher time; period III runs from 1350 to 1450, during which population declined, agrarian troubles became insistent, and many marginal settlements of the previous periods were abandoned as unprofitable; period IV from 1450 to 1700 sees the full impact of enclosure for sheep-farming with wholesale depopulations, most of them completed before 1500; period V after 1700 is mostly concerned with the resiting of villages by wealthy landowners to create parkland and other amenities for their own enjoyment.

In default of excavation, which is a slow and expensive process, the only way to establish the date of a desertion is by unequivocal documentary evidence. The immediate sources of information are chiefly the Domesday Survey of 1086, the Hundred Rolls of 1279 where they survive, the *Nomina Villarum* of 1316, tax assessments of 1327 and 1334, the poll-tax records of 1377 and 1381, taxation lists of 1428, the subsidy assessments for Henry VIII in 1524, the Hearth-Tax returns of 1665, and the early census figures beginning with those of 1801. This would appear to be a fairly comprehensive cover, but the authors show the perplexities which may be met with in using these sources, particularly those which arise from the lumping together of numbers of unnamed villis for assessment under one named example. This becomes a serious complication with the 1334 assessment and continues. In effect, however, in the great majority of instances, both certain and less so, the evidence suggests in varying degree that most of the desertions and depopulations took place in periods III and IV as a result of the disasters of the middle of the 14th century and the series of consequences culminating in the widespread enclosures for sheep-farming. No other factors had comparable effects either before or after.

In each paper the results of the enquiry are summarized in two clear maps, one showing the names and positions of all sites whose locations are even approximately known, and the other showing the same distribution but using symbols for each site to show the period of desertion and whether it is certain or not. Other aspects of the sites are analysed in a series of clear tables. Finally the whole work in each county is summarized into a gazetteer, which gives precise or approximate locations and uses a number of conventions to show date of desertion, the present physical condition of the site, a series of dates with relevant taxation and population statistics, and a succinct account of the historical and topographical information available for each site.

The authors make no claim for the finality of their conclusions, but regard their work as a preliminary essay towards a result which can only be perfected by much closer local research. It is to be hoped that these papers are the heralds of a continuing series, for an admirable beginning has been made.

The following books have also been received:

- English Rural Life in the Middle Ages.* By J. W. Higgs.  $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$  in. 10 pp., 20 pls. Bodleian Picture Book, no. 14. Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1965. Price 2s. 6d.
- The Grey of Ruthin Valor . . . of 1467-8.* Ed. R. I. Jack.  $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$  in. xi + 138 pp., 1 fig., 2 pls. Sydney: University Press, 1965. Price 50s.
- Why Should we Study the Anglo-Saxons?* By H. M. Taylor.  $7\frac{1}{4} \times 5$  in. 50 pp., 9 figs. Cambridge: University Press, 1966. Price 5s.
- The Preparation of Archaeological Reports.* By L. V. Grinsell, P. A. Rahtz and A. Warhurst.  $5\frac{1}{2} \times 8$  in. 71 pp., 5 figs. London: John Baker, 1966. Price 10s. 6d.
- Excavations, Annual Report, 1965.* Ministry of Public Building and Works.  $7\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$  in. 30 pp., 20 pls. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1966. Price 3s. 6d.
- Domesday Book and the East Riding.* By F. W. Brooks.  $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$  in. 62 pp., 3 figs. York: East Yorkshire Local History Society, 1966. Price 5s.