

Reviews

Deserted Medieval Villages. Studies. Edited by Maurice Beresford and John G. Hurst. 25 × 19 cm. xviii + 340 pp., 31 pls., 42 figs., 16 tables. London: Lutterworth Press, 1971. Price £8.00.

On the whole small unwallied human settlements tended to have a limited span of life before their inhabitants moved on elsewhere, and on first sight what strikes one as remarkable is not indeed that there should have been desertions among villages in the middle ages but on the contrary that the vast majority of them should have survived up to the present day. Among pastoral people a change of settlement is easy and sometimes desirable, while among early cultivators it was necessary because of soil exhaustion. The open-field system of agriculture in this country, as we meet it after its heyday, avoided soil exhaustion by rotation of the fallow field, but the whole method of strips and communal pasture rendered each member of the community dependent on the others. It is, indeed, difficult to think of a system more calculated to discourage someone with a reasonable holding from going elsewhere. A small reduction in the community was not a bad thing—larger shares for those who remained—but a sharp reduction, particularly in a community that was already small, made the system almost unworkable. It came therefore as no surprise to find in Maurice Beresford's first book on desertions (*The Lost Villages of England*, 1954) that the rate of desertion increased greatly in the later middle ages when the general population itself was falling, and that the great majority of abandoned villages had previously had smaller numbers of inhabitants than the contemporary villages that persisted.

That there had been desertions was known to local historians, even if they had merely tried to identify the place-names in their county section of Domesday book, and there had been local studies on this subject before the war, but it was the merit of Professor Beresford in his earlier work that he raised the subject to a national level. Since 1954 he has turned his attention to other matters and consequently on the historical side there are not great advances to report. There has been a large increase in the number of known sites (2,263; county list on pp. 68–69 and individual sites with grid references on pp. 182–212) and no doubt, when a comprehensive list is achieved, the figure will be well over 3,000. Further advance in the subject is, indeed, largely delayed until progress is sufficiently uniform all over the country to allow the matter to be tackled statistically. This would also permit the rather constricting and artificial divisions by counties to be abandoned. At present the distribution map (fig. 13) tends to demonstrate not so much incidence as areas of intensive study. By selecting one site it is possible to demonstrate one point, by selecting another just the opposite: so that generalizations to have any validity must have a sound statistical basis. The map certainly suggests geographical factors at work in the south-east, and clearly all kinds of permutations will have to be tested. The study of adjoining villages that were not deserted (fig. 4) suggests some element of pairing up and should prove a fruitful line of enquiry.

In his earlier book Beresford espoused the cause of the Tudor moralists, who attributed the desertions to deliberate depopulations by landlords anxious to obtain the profits from wool. It is always satisfying to denounce human wickedness, especially if we confine it to a class which excludes ourselves! There was certainly too much smoke for there not to have been some fire. The author had some difficulty with 15th-century wool prices in his first work, and the block diagram (fig. 1, p. 13) in this one is not entirely happy. Suppose the figures had been extended back to 1300? Open-field farming was always mixed farming, as we can see in the attenuated example at Laxton; the small villages that suffered from enclosure were likely to have plenty of pasture, so why

did not the tenants equally gain from increased wool prices? Emparking was also a motive for depopulation. An example familiar to the reviewer is Kirby Hall, Northants., where the large house was started in 1570 but where two plans of the 1580s show a few straggling houses and the church to the south and west of the big house and garden. No doubt shortly after this the owner caused these village remains to be removed; this was the immediate cause of deace, but for the historian the real interest is what factors had brought the village to this shrunken and emaciated deathbed state before its final dissolution.

The main advance in our knowledge since 1954 has not been in the causes or incidence of desertion but in the impressive quantity of information yielded by the abandoned sites, which throws light on the villages as they were before the time of withdrawal. Mr. Hurst has summarized the results of twenty years' work at Wharram Percy and at many other deserted sites. House-plans have been laboriously exposed. Formidable difficulties have been encountered and overcome. Early hopes that medieval pottery could be closely dated proved too sanguine and it tends now to be treated like Romano-British coarse wares. Floor-levels were not definable within the houses and absolute levelling, widely used in peat deposits in Denmark for analogous reasons, has had to be employed. Moreover the 'open-area' excavation, identifying the horizontal surfaces first and then fitting layers to them, marks a virtual abandonment of sectional trench-digging of orthodox archaeology upon the value of which it may well raise doubts. Surely Hurst is less than just to his predecessors when he speaks of the one-period plan (p. 76) being the sole object of the medieval diggers of the early part of the century, since the coloured multi-period plans of St. John Hope set something of a model for the rest of Europe. Indeed the wheel has turned full circle, since the plan of Wharram Church (fig. 30) looks exactly like one of St. John Hope's plans of seventy years ago, except that it lacks the colours. Perhaps the diggers would have experienced less bewilderment in the early years at Wharram had they been familiar with the kaleidoscope view of medieval building among these pre-1914 scholars.

The medieval village as it emerges in the field is rather different from our idealized version. The main point is the impermanency of the houses and plan. Buildings that were not intended to last more than a generation and that were usually rebuilt on a different axis produced a fluidity which made it easy to alter streets and plans. In contrast to a modern village it was the fields, not the houses, that were the permanent element. The kind of timeless, National Trust feeling that we associate with modern villages is largely due to the erection of permanent buildings since Tudor times. A distant view of a medieval village, like a group of Nissen huts around the church in the bleak landscape of the open fields, could be a disturbing sight for a modern environmentalist!

In the opening chapter of his recent work, *Religion and the Decline of Magic*, Mr. Thomas discussed the factors conducive to insecurity in the Tudor environment which encouraged people to have recourse to magic. Similarly one may wonder how the outlook of people living in these ephemeral surroundings was influenced by this fact. I suggested that the constant rebuilding in a rather similar way after fires at Novgorod induced a degree of fatalism. A craving for permanence one might expect and against this transitory secular background one perhaps sees the foundation of monasteries and chantries in a sharper light. The matter will certainly provide food for thought. After the Reformation the peasant house changed from a wasting asset, like a motor car, to a capital investment, often not owned by the occupant.

Much else in Hurst's remarkable summary deserves attention: constructional materials, house-plans and village-plans. The reversion from stone to timber in the later middle ages seems puzzling. Is it due rather to some alteration in the seating of the timbers or infilling of the panels? The probable ubiquity of the long-house and the discussion of the use of this term are valuable. The enlargement of the village-plan by an adjoining foundation is an interesting discovery. To judge by the attenuated example at Laxton, the open-field community generated a very powerful spirit of self-help, one of

the most attractive features of the open fields, and one may wonder whether this alone was not sufficient to make such new foundations without invoking the Seigneur (or the spirit of the bastides!). The cleanliness of the houses is another interesting point. This reviewer knows of coal being used for burning lime in 15th-century building-operations but to find it used as fuel at the bottom of the social scale in peasant houses is surprising.

The book concludes with three sections on deserted villages in Scotland, Wales and Ireland. Except in the recent notorious cases of Irish plantations or highland clearances the lack of documentary evidence makes this a very difficult subject in the Celtic areas. Some modern survivals may throw interesting light on vanished practices in England. It is going to be very instructive to compare the presumably different time of desertion in the Celtic areas with that in this country.

In medieval archaeology the prow of the ship, as it were, has been the study of deserted villages, with the two editors of this book, a remarkable partnership of prolix academic and taciturn man from the Ministry, acting as the bows breaking through the difficulties and prejudice that beset the subject. It has been a long voyage and, while the final port is still not in sight, it is now much easier sailing, for we are seeing really significant results. Spectators like the present reviewer can only stand in silent admiration at what has been achieved and wish the partners every success in the pursuit of the task to which they have dedicated themselves.

M. W. THOMPSON

Code pour le classement et l'étude des poteries médiévales du nord et nord-ouest de l'Europe. By Marie Leenhardt. 29 × 21 cm. 79 loose pp., 8 loose figs., 10 sample cards and 39 sheets of signs and symbols, all in a folder. Caen: Centre de Recherches Archéologiques Médiévales, 1969. Price F 31.75.

This is an attempt to revise a code, prepared by Mr. J. C. Gardin in 1962 to classify pottery in the middle east, for use in NW. Europe. The idea is to break down all the main factors of a vessel and to express these on a card by a series of numbers, letters and symbols in a set order. The hope is that this will make the classification of medieval pottery easier and at the same time provide information that can be used in a punch-card system or fed into a computer. It is claimed that this will enable parallels to be located more simply than by usual methods, that it is more scientific than traditional descriptions, that it is easy for anyone to use whatever language he speaks, thus avoiding confusions in translation, and that it can be used as easily for sherds as for complete pots.

The classification is divided into fourteen main headings with twenty-four subdivisions and over a hundred individual traits within this. The first section, A, gives the basic horizontal shape. B classifies the vertical shape of the body, and C the shape of the base and any supports. D shows the external and internal features of the base and E the shape of the neck. F is a complex method of describing rim-forms by their shape, dimensions and amount of in- or out-turning. It is most confusing that all the samples drawn have their section to the right. If the whole code was this way round it would not matter but all the complete drawings have the section on the left in the usual manner. These rims, therefore, with no lines going off them to show which is inside or out, make the whole series much more complex than it need be. Rims are difficult enough as it is without having to work out which is the inside, or outside, of the vessel.

G is a valuable classification of handle-types. H shows to which part of the pot the handle is attached and how many handles there are, while I gives the shape of the handle and its angle of attachment. J shows the type of handle-section and K deals with any other points such as spurs. L classifies the main types of spout, M the form, and N the unusual types. P deals with more specialized parts or additions to a vessel such as bung-holes, perforations and knobs. Q₁ shows the size and proportions of the vessel. Q₂ gives the chemical composition of the fabric, while R gives the colour, based on fifty-

three divisions of the Munsell colour-chart, together with the type of manufacture, tempering and texture. S classifies the type of decoration and colour of the glaze in twenty-five divisions. T divides up the various decorative motifs.

The last four sections deal with the more general points. V gives the type of site from which the pot comes—kiln, burial or habitation. X shows the date of the pot by centuries, with quarter-centuries if required. Y shows the origin, with sixteen divisions for areas of France, ten for Germany, five only for England and one each for eight other countries. Z leaves space for any other special points not covered under the other headings.

A tremendous amount of work has clearly gone into this project and on the whole the system has been transposed to NW. Europe very satisfactorily and it is not possible to think of many types or shapes which cannot be accommodated under the general umbrella of the code. There is no doubt that if all the medieval pottery of NW. Europe was on these cards it would be possible to do a great deal of comparative work and it is likely that many important conclusions would emerge. But one begins to wonder if it is all worth while.

I have two main criticisms. First the symbols are purely symbolic in most cases so that they not only have to be learnt or looked up but looking at one of the cards it is quite impossible for anyone to say even what type of vessel it is (and nowhere is one allowed to say the pot is a jug, etc.) and thus without some traditional description as well, together with a drawing, it can hardly entirely supersede normal types of publication. It may be that future excavation-reports will have lists of pottery in which decoration is shown as Ss2.2 T12qB T17rB T17pB, but it takes all the character out of the study of the material to depersonalize it so completely. Is it really necessary to call the last quarter of the 13th century 9y when L13 is only one number more and could be instantly recognizable? In the same way for country of origin, would not B immediately tell one it came from Belgium rather than the proposed E, which is purely arbitrary? Pottery reports are often much too long, but the crucial information does need to be published. I think, therefore, that some universal code could be used, but it should be made simpler and more understandable. I doubt if even the pottery experts could memorize all the many hundreds of symbols, so that the time taken to look up each pot would be incredible and put many people off pottery altogether.

Secondly the code is too precise in things such as the colour of the fabric and the glaze. Colours used in present reports are very subjective, but it should be possible to use fewer basic Munsell numbers than the fifty-three proposed. Each medieval pot is an individual creation and not only will each pot tend to be a different colour but many pots vary in colour depending on how they were fired in the kiln. By giving quite separate numbers to two sherds visually different, but from the same pot, a computer would never join them. This is even worse where a red sherd has been reduced after firing for some reason. Only a human eye would link them together. The method therefore has its limitations for excavated settlements, where the material is likely to be so varied. If there is a vast deposit from a kiln, the code would clearly be a valuable way of evaluating the various types and forms. But, here again, is the length of time taken in filling in all the cards worthwhile for the results obtained, especially when a great deal of time would have had to be spent previously sticking all the sherds together?

On a more general basis it might be possible to draw valuable conclusions by taking typical pots from various areas and comparing them, but is any medieval pot typical of its area, since there is so much variety? It will be interesting to see what results Caen get from the coding of their medieval pottery. It may well be that significant results will emerge, but I still think that a few days spent looking at pots and drawing them will produce more results than this endless tabulation. Where the code is of great value is in some of its suggestions for classification and standardization of terms. If this could be done, and some symbols agreed internationally, which would be recognizable rather than arbitrary, this might be a major advance in the study of medieval pottery. One

rather despairs, though, when several recent attempts to standardize in this country have failed because every specialist has his own subjective terms for the things he writes about.

J. G. HURST

Bodenfunde der Völkerwanderungszeit aus dem Main-Tauber-Gebiet. By Robert Koch. 2 vols. 30×23 cm. Vol. I, viii+247 pp., 13 figs., 4 tables, 2 maps: vol. II, 102 pls. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter for Römisch-Germanische Kommission (Germanische Denkmäler der Völkerwanderungszeit, Ser. A, Bd. VIII) 1967. Price DM 138.

Die Grabfunde der Merowingerzeit aus dem Donautal um Regensburg. By Ursula Koch. 2 vols. 30×23 cm. Vol. I, viii+265 pp., 30 figs., 1 map: vol. II, 116 pls. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter for Römisch-Germanische Kommission (Germanische Denkmäler der Völkerwanderungszeit, Ser. A, Bd. X) 1968. Price DM 158.

These four stately volumes continue the systematic topographical survey of Germanic antiquities undertaken by the Römisch-Germanische Kommission in Series A of the *Germanische Denkmäler der Völkerwanderungszeit*. Together with the corresponding volumes by H. Dannheimer on the antiquities of Mittelfranken, which formed Band VII and were issued in 1962,¹ they cover a very large part of central and S. Germany in a standard presentation of the material preserved from cemeteries and settlements over all this area. The result is a very valuable work of reference indispensable for anyone in search of comparisons or contrasts with portable antiquities of every sort belonging to the post-Roman and early medieval centuries in other parts of Europe.

The arrangement of each pair of volumes follows a similar but not too rigidly standardized pattern, with the descriptive texts, lists, and indexes in the first, accompanied by a small number of text figures and one or two folding maps of the region, while the second is wholly taken up with full page line-drawings and half-tone plates, including a number of plans illustrating the relationship of the various sites to the modern villages and towns that are their present-day equivalents. These plans serve to bring out the interesting fact that the pre-Christian cemeteries almost invariably lie well beyond the limits of the medieval urban and village *nuclei*, and in particular bear no obvious connexion with the churches around which the latter normally cluster. At the same time their presence in the immediate neighbourhood is a phenomenon so regular as to suggest a marked continuity in the centres of population between pagan and Christian times, the building of churches merely creating new local *foci* within a pre-existing pattern.

The visual presentation of the material in these volumes maintains the high standard set by the series as a whole. Its arrangement follows the same conventions which I discussed and found some reason to criticize in reviewing Band VII.¹ On the half-tone plates the objects are for the most part arranged typologically, while the line-drawings display the same material with additions arranged as grave-groups site by site. This has certain obvious advantages, even if it often means having vol. II open at two or more places simultaneously, while studying the relevant descriptions, again at two or more places, in vol. I. But unfortunately the practice is still maintained of illustrating the decorated side of most metal objects only by half-tone, while the corresponding line-drawings show only their uninformative back sides. However good the photographic reproduction may be, there are often details of decoration that can only be displayed effectively by drawings, and their absence in the case of many important objects included in these volumes very seriously detracts from their value to the student.

¹ Reviewed in *Med. Archaeol.*, VIII (1964), 300-2.

Comment could usefully be made on the classification and dating here proposed for a number of the categories of artifacts illustrated in these volumes. The pottery sequence, for example, in this part of the Danube valley is of particular interest. Ursula Koch here suggests a division of the hand-made pottery into three successive periods (p. 113). The first (p. 106), which she places in the 1st half of the 6th century on the strength of two associations with brooches of that period (Barbing-Irlmuth graves 21 and 31, Taf. 35 and 38), comprises small carinated bowls with horizontal linear decoration, of a kind very similar to some varieties of the smaller *Schalenurnen* that are common in East Holstein and the lower Elbe valley a century earlier. Though the style may have persisted, in view of these associated brooches, much later in S. than in N. Germany, it may perhaps be doubted whether all the examples there need be as late as the 6th century. If some of them could be dated closer to the N. German parallels, it would not only ease an awkward typological discrepancy, but would serve to provide some archaeological evidence for Germanic population in the upper Danube region in the 5th century, which, to judge from these volumes, seems otherwise strangely lacking.

The second of Ursula Koch's ceramic styles is quite different: it comprises vessels of sagging profile often elaborately decorated with random stamping, or with pendent triangles of stamps unaccompanied by lines. This style she places in the 2nd half of the 6th century (pp. 107-9) and suggests that it was abruptly terminated about 600 by an intrusive fashion for hand-made *biconi* imitating wheel-made types from the Rhineland and thus indicating the final dominance of the region by Frankish cultural influences.

Now this dating for the non-linear stamped style in pottery is of considerable interest in the light of corresponding developments elsewhere in Europe. In England, for example, it represents the last phase of the stamped panel style (otherwise entirely missing in S. Germany), and thus falls in the late 6th and early 7th century, not much later than Ursula Koch's dating. On the other hand H. Dannheimer, in his account of similar pottery in Mittelfranken in Band VII of this Series, placed it all after 650, a date which I ventured to question as too late in reviewing his book in these columns.² There is obviously some scope for reconciling these discrepancies in the dating of similar material between adjacent parts of Germany and it may be suggested that not only the English but also the Swedish parallels could usefully be brought into the argument. It is moreover not only the date but the derivation of this style in central and S. Germany that needs explanation: is the sudden appearance there of a fashion whose earlier typological stages are only found in quantity in England to be treated as a matter of historical significance, or is it merely a freak of coincidence?

The pottery sequence in the Main-Tauber region is less complex than it is in the Danube valley, mainly because this area was earlier and more completely dominated by Frankish fashions from the Rhineland. But here again, if Robert Koch's dating (pp. 79-81) is correct, there survived up to some ill-defined point in the 6th century decorative features of N. German origin that had been popular in the Elbe-Weser region nearly a century earlier. Particularly striking are the examples of sharply biconical bowls with faceted carination below an enclosed zone of linear chevrons or sometimes a line of stamps (e.g. Werbach, Taf. 61.14, Neckarelz grave 7, Taf. 46.26). This style too, which Robert Koch is at pains to distinguish from the so-called Alamannic *Rippengefässe* of Württemberg (p. 79), has its parallels in England.³ But in this country the faceted carination has normally given way in 6th-century examples to a more or less continuous line of bosses, and this in its turn leads the type to its natural place as a variety of the bossed-panel style. Here again it would be interesting to know what significance, if any, attaches to these apparent stylistic links between the pottery of the Main-Tauber region and that of 5th- and 6th-century England. One is tempted to recall Bede's

² *Ibid.*, p. 302.

³ An extraordinarily close English parallel to the bowl from Neckarelz grave 7 is South Elkington 108 (*Archaeol. J.*, cviii (1952), 42, fig. 9). If these were both from this country it would be tempting to suggest that they came from the same workshop.

mention in *Hist. Eccles.*, v, 9, of the Boructuarii as one of the tribes that took some part in the movement to Britain.

These questions in the field of ceramics may serve to illustrate just one of the many ways in which these volumes of the *Germanische Denkmäler* will be of value to those studying the archaeological problems of the post-Roman centuries. If at first the publication of this great mass of material may seem to raise more questions than can at once be answered, that is the most useful service that can be performed in the present state of knowledge. The Römisch-Germanische Kommission is to be congratulated on its steady output of the basic information on which future progress in these studies can be built.

J. N. L. MYRES

Absatzgebiete frühgeschichtlicher Töpfereien in der Zone nördlich der Alpen (Antiquitas, 3 Ser., vi). By W. Hübener. 2 vols., 27 × 19 cm. Vol. 1, ix + 308 pp.: vol. II, 231 figs., 70 maps, 8 pls. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1969. Price DM 195.

Dr. Hübener, in his survey of early medieval pottery north of the Alps, presents a corpus of over 3,000 pots found in the historical tribal areas of the Bavarians and the Alamanni, datable between the 6th and the 9th centuries. Only one kiln-site is known, and very few settlements have been excavated, so that most of the evidence comes from the cemeteries of the 'single-graves-in-rows' culture (*Reihengräberkultur*) and therefore mainly belongs to the 6th and 7th centuries. Most of the finds are concentrated in the NW. corner of the area surveyed, centred on the Main, Rhine and Moselle river areas. It is not clear whether this is a result of more intensive field-work from Mainz or whether such a distribution reflects a greater concentration of settlement in this area. This survey has enabled Hübener to divide the pottery into a series of groups and to discuss the importance of these and their interrelations. This is the first major survey of the pottery from the area and Hübener disarmingly points out that his system is not the only possible interpretation of the evidence.

The dating of the pots found in the cemeteries is made difficult by the fact, only too well known in this country, that less than 15 per cent of the vessels are associated with grave-goods. When they are associated the other items are often neutral dating-evidence, such as knives and undecorated iron buckles. It is also hard to determine whether different distributions and frequency of certain grave-goods reflect a change in date, differing funeral customs, social structure or the relative wealth of the people concerned. In the female graves the main differences in grave-goods are due to varying costume fashions, while, in the male graves, the determining factors are both costume and the types of weapon used. A system of archaeological stages is therefore proposed, each characterized by one distinct small find (bird-brooch, animal-brooch, S-brooch, etc.) which can be given a general range of date. Where two such finds are found in the same grave this enables the different periods to be correlated. Nevertheless Hübener can only give very general dates in the 6th and 7th centuries to most of the pottery-groups. There is a list of the graves containing pottery cross-referenced to the illustrations.

The main section of vol. 1 describes the four main types into which the pottery has been divided. Over 1,800 of the vessels are wheel-thrown and are divided into I, those with a rough surface, and II, reduced vessels with a smooth surface. In type I (660 vessels) 200 are various types of cooking-pot with an ovoid or globular profile and rounded, everted rims, decoration being confined to horizontal grooves. Another 250 are jugs and it is of importance to see how firmly the jug survives in this area; there are not nearly so many pitchers.⁴ With the virtual disappearance of the jug in NW. Europe between the 5th and the 11th centuries those areas where it continued in such large

⁴ Jugs with lips for pouring, and long handles from the rim to the body, are found in Roman and medieval times. In the Anglo-Saxon period they are almost entirely replaced by pitchers which have small applied tubular spouts, and one or more short strap-handles from the rim to the shoulder.

quantities must have considerable bearing on its later re-appearance, though Hübener is not able to date any of his groups of jugs later than the 7th century. Type II is the most common, accounting for 70 per cent of the whole assemblage. 1,600 vessels are biconical and represent an important series of Merovingian types, the different groups being decorated with horizontal or combed lines, simple or more complex rouletting or individual stamps. Spouted pitchers, rather than jugs, are the main liquid containers, but there are very few of them, just as there are very few bottles similar to those from our Jutish cemeteries.

Type III are the hand-made vessels, of which there are 350. One hundred of these are rough, amorphous shapes ill-fired and hard to classify. The other 250 are finer pots decorated with bosses, stamps and lines in varieties of patterns. These have many similarities to our own Anglo-Saxon urns and are of interest in showing how these basic types develop, moving south through Germany, from the same basic Elbe origins as the English series, in the 6th and 7th centuries. Type IV is the eastern group comprising basic Slav types which, starting in the 7th and 8th centuries, continue right through the medieval period, with very few changes, over most of eastern Europe. The first three groups mainly peter out at the end of the 7th century and these pots with their typical horizontal or wavy combed decoration (*Kammstrichware*) seem to be the dominant type in the Alpine foothills throughout the Carolingian and Ottonian periods.

The whole series shows most interesting influences on the area, deriving from Roman survivals to Merovingian, Saxon and Slav fashions of pottery, which all seem to merge in this area of southern Germany in this formative period. It is suggested that the distributions of pottery-types may be as much due to migrant potters as to export and trade, for, when some of the pots of Mayen type were thin-sectioned by Prof. Frechen, it was found that, though of Mayen shape and style, they were not made from Mayen clays, and so must be regarded as local copies. The second volume with its 3,000 drawings on 231 figures, and eight pages of plates, mainly enlargements of rouletted patterns, is a most valuable corpus of types and one of the fullest published anywhere for this period. The distribution of the types and groups is given on 70 maps and the find-spots are all listed. It is a pity that there are no individual descriptions of the pots, which is rather a handicap when one wants to check a parallel. Nevertheless we are greatly indebted to Dr. Hübener for this most valuable corpus, which gives us much new material to consider from an area very little known in England.

J. G. HURST

Sylloge of Coins of the British Isles: Royal Collection, National Museum, Copenhagen, Part III A-C. By Georg Galster. 25 × 18 cm. xxiii + 326 pp., 158 pls. (in 3 vols.) *Do.*: *Ancient British, Anglo-Saxon and Norman Coins in Midland Museums.* By A. J. H. Gunstone. Same format, xxvi + 68 pp., 30 pls. London: Oxford University Press and Spink & Son, for the British Academy and (Copenhagen) the Carlsberg Foundation, 1970 and 1971. Price £16.50 and £4.40.

These two contributions to the *Sylloge* are something of a distribution-study in themselves. Each volume of Dr. Galster's is subtitled 'Anglo-Saxon Coins: Cnut', followed by the mints in alphabetical order, with 'imitations' at the end—4,416 pieces in all. This includes everything in the name of Cnut the Great (as he is to the Danes), Scandinavian imitations and posthumous issues, save only the few that are explicitly Danish in title and mint—the same mixture as the comparable section of the Swedish Royal Collection, in B. E. Hildebrand's great catalogue of 1881. The truly English and contemporaneous element is about 90 per cent of the whole, in three types only. Almost exactly half the total can show a recorded provenience in one of the Scandinavian or N. European, but not necessarily Danish, hoards. In 'Hildebrand' Aethelred slightly outnumbers Cnut, but Copenhagen has been selectively acquiring the latter, to give

their showing of him an 'edge' over Stockholm, and over Aethelred. As a mass-sample, then, Stockholm is still preferable, but only in the *Sylloge* is such a vast corpus available in full detail to a student at his desk. It need not be argued that the energetic research, in particular Mr. Dolley's, of the last twenty years has exhausted the subject. Die-sinking techniques, forms of personal and place-names are but two subjects that will profit from such wealth of material. The British Museum becomes ever more 'out on a limb', with its hopelessly antiquated catalogue.

In complete contrast with this part of one collection is Mr. Gunstone's volume which covers eighteen collections, holding, *inter alia*, fifty-seven coins of Cnut, of which four are local, midland, finds, and the rest without known find-spots, but many certainly from Scandinavian hoards that 'got away'. With certain reservations, then, the archaeological interest of the volume is marginal, and the distribution of the collections is, like most distributions, rather personal—what is accessible from Birmingham. Worcester and Northampton are 'in', Gloucester and Bedford are 'out'. Explicitly 'museums on the eastern fringes of the region' are excluded. But are the midlands a 'region' in any meaningful archaeological sense? Most of the book is simply a series of local selective collections, concentrating on what are not always correctly identified as local mints. As such it has its uses, and would have had more had it included the 'Tealby' issue, which is quite 'Norman' in technique, just as Henry II, duke of Normandy before he became king, was, if anything, more of a Norman than Stephen. The natural break in the English coinage is 1180.

There remains an important archaeological residue. Nearly all the Ancient British coins have local proveniences. So do the few sceattas, though the pattern of sceatta-finds from Mercia is not yet clear. Besides the fairly large Nottingham hoard of Stephen, of which the preserved sample is given in detail, there are some two dozen significant local finds, including two, perhaps three, small hoards, one of which, from the 'well described' Jewry Wall dig at Leicester, had quite been forgotten. The finds from the removal of the castle earthworks at Worcester and Northampton are of great interest in themselves, apart from their site, and this book was the occasion of their first thorough examination.

S. E. RIGOLD

Town Defences in England, an Architectural and Documentary Study, A.D. 900-1500. By Hilary L. Turner. 14 × 22 cm. 246 pp., 40 pls., 4 line drawings. London: John Baker, 1971. Price £2.90.

On modern street-plans of many towns the former line of the town wall has left a permanent mark on the direction of the streets, and not surprisingly the continuous street along the former ditch has caught the eye of the City Surveyor as suitable for conversion to an inner ring road. The demolition of the adjoining houses has often exposed great lengths of town wall formerly hidden in back-yards or covered by buildings. Examples are at Hereford, Worcester, Colchester, Norwich and elsewhere. At a time when so much town wall is emerging into the light of day it is particularly appropriate that a book should appear devoted to the history of these walls.

The matter is not an easy one, mainly because of the lack of earlier work on it; the walls of some individual towns have been studied, but there is no great pre-1914 study from which to launch out. Miss Turner has therefore had to create the subject for herself, which she has done by making murage-grants, recorded (like licences to crenellate) in Patent Rolls, the backbone of the work. The three appendices tabulate the information derived from these, and in appendix B the receipts from the imposts are compared with recorded expenditure. Map 2 shows the towns arranged in six groups according to the date of the first murage-grant between 1220 and 1520. The greater part of the book (130 pp.) is a gazetteer of the 133 walled towns that she has been able to trace; this alone is likely to make it a permanent work of reference.

Unlike castles, which had a relatively short lifespan, town walls have existed ever since there have been towns, that is to say for the last 9,000 years. In this country there appear to have been three major periods of town-wall building: 2nd to 3rd centuries A.D., c. 900 A.D. against or by Danes, and 1200–1500 by independent boroughs. The most insubstantial defences were those of the second phase, since they were largely earthworks. Miss Turner confines herself to the last two, but some comparison with at least the sizes of areas enclosed in Roman Britain would have been valuable. A further table comparing these with the areas of a selection of continental medieval towns would have been interesting. For not a few English towns the most severe test the walls ever experienced was during the Civil War, and to do the subject of town defences justice there ought to have been at least some account of the walls up to 1660.

108 of the 249 towns which possessed a charter by 1520 were walled (p. 91): it was therefore possible to qualify as a town without having walls, but the more interesting point is whether it was possible to have defences and yet remain a village. Wellow, Notts. (not in the gazetteer), is a case in point, where there are defences, and Pleshey (p. 138) surely was never more than a fortified village. At Richard's Castle, Herefordshire, the addition (not original, p. 22) of the defences certainly seemed to be associated with an attempt to achieve urban status (*J. Brit. Archaeol. Assoc.*, xxxii (1969), 17–19), but whether this was always the case may be open to doubt. It is the old question of whether a burh is the same thing as a borough. The 'semi-circular tower' at Richard's Castle (p. 208) has been demonstrated by excavation to be an innocuous dovecot with walls only four ft. thick (too thin to carry a wall-walk and parapet), and the defences there were always earthen. One must doubt whether the authoress makes a sufficiently sharp distinction in her own mind between earthen defences, bank and ditch, cheap and thrown up relatively quickly, and the slow, laborious and very costly stone walls which the murage-grant—as the name implies—was specifically intended to finance. The former must have been common in the 12th century, but need have left no documentary or other tangible trace. The intensive siege-warfare in the fighting in the minority of Henry III seems to have been something of a turning-point with a loss of faith in earthworks (in castles as in towns), and it is an interesting fact that there are scarcely any 12th-century walls of stone, but not a few of the 13th century. It is surely misleading to quote the 114 foundations between 1086 and 1200 identified by Professor Beresford (p. 22) and say that only three are known to have been originally defended (especially as one, Richard's Castle, was not), when so much obscurity attends their foundation. For example, St. John Hope was able to show that the town must have been part of the same foundation as the castle at Ludlow in the late 11th century, but it is most unlikely in this situation that there was not some original defence, even if the first murage-grant was in 1233 (p. 207, although not shown in the table on p. 238). We might as well argue that London had no defences before the first murage-grant in 1222, although its Roman wall still existed. Murage-grants surely normally represented a desire to convert earth and timber into permanent stone.

The failure of the printers to align the two sides of the table on pp. 238–9 makes it almost unusable. If Winchelsea had its first murage-grant in 1295 (pp. 176–77) why does the appendix (p. 238) show the first grant in 1260–70? Is this for Old Winchelsea, since the new town had not been founded, or is it a slip? Discrepancies like this or the Ludlow entry are very disturbing in a book of this kind, and should be weeded out.

The publishers tell us on the jacket flap that the volume is 'in a sense, a companion to Derek Renn's *Norman Castles in Britain*, recently published by us'. The latter is of larger format than the book under review, but has the inestimable advantage of plans at the same scale. This is a real weakness of Miss Turner's book: it requires a great many line-drawings, tracings from the 25-in. O.S. maps, and so on, to be intelligible. How can the alterations of circuit at York or Leicester or London, or the relationship of the wall to the castle or river or hill possibly be described without plans? It cannot be done. How can towers be described without a cross-section? The book is really an expanded article

on murage-grants, and as such it is a valuable starting point for the subject, but if it is to be a definitive study of town walls, it requires a vast increase of illustrative line-drawings (and some more plates, especially air-photographs); it falls far short of Renn's treatment of castles. Renn of course had the advantage that he was not a pioneer in the field like Miss Turner. This little book will be essential for reference in a field where previously there was none, but may we hope that after a few more years of study and investigation (and perhaps a little drawing) Miss Turner will produce a much enlarged and more solid work on the subject?

M. W. THOMPSON

The Monastic Grange in Medieval England. By Colin Platt. 21 × 14 cm. 272 pp., 16 pls., 27 figs. London: Macmillan, 1969. Price £4.00.

In this book Dr. Platt has provided a much-needed pioneer study of monastic granges, complementary to the earlier work of Mr. Bishop and Dr. Donkin on their economy and geographical distribution. The first half of the book deals with the buildings, estates and staff of the granges, and the changes that took place in them during the later middle ages and at the dissolution. The second half is occupied by the report of Dr. Platt's excavation of the Cistercian grange at Cowton, and by a selective but extremely useful gazetteer giving notes on some seventy-six granges mostly in Yorkshire, the midlands, and the south-west of England.

Although the book deals with the granges of different orders of monks and canons, special importance is rightly attached to 'the firm association of the grange with the Cistercians', and the most controversial parts of the text are those concerning the vexed question of how a Cistercian grange was run in the 12th and 13th centuries when the lay-brethren were still an effective force in the life of the order. From the 14th century onwards there can be little doubt that a Cistercian grange was barely distinguishable from a grange of black monks or canons, and here Platt is on firm ground and gives a clear and acceptable account, supported by ample evidence.

But for the 12th and 13th centuries documentary evidence is scanty and structural evidence is non-existent in this country, and the scholar has little straw with which to make his bricks. Platt argues persuasively that English Cistercian granges are unlikely to have been run wholly by lay-brethren without secular aid, and that it is unlikely that a communal life demanding communal buildings was lived on them. His conviction is summed up by his definition of the 12th-century grange—'functioning as a demesne farm, directed by lay-brethren and worked by a dependent peasantry'.

Now, although it is clear enough that the English Cistercians, with their occasional early acceptance of mills, churches, labour services and other traditional forms of endowment, fell short of the rigid requirements of the Burgundian fathers of the order, it does not follow that they did not make a more serious attempt at conformity than this book would allow; and there can be little doubt about what conformity entailed, for it is set out with remorseless logic in the code. The renunciation of worldly sources of wealth in the *Exordium*, depriving the Cistercians of the conventional means of subsistence, is followed immediately by the institution of the lay-brethren to fill just that gap. In the *Consuetudines* each lay-brother, far from being 'not the required material for routine domestic tasks, better performed by servants', is required to have the qualities that will compensate for the services of one hired labourer. Division is made between the *conversi de abbatia* and the *conversi de grangiis*, and the rules for the life of the latter make specific reference to the communal rooms—chapel, frater, dorter and warming-house—that the grange is expected to contain for their accommodation.

It was on this and on his knowledge that similar 12th-century communal buildings existed at Fraville that the late Prof. Aubert based his description of a grange, and it would be unwise to dismiss that description as being too imaginative. Lacking 12th-

century English examples, it is equally unwise to assume, as this book does, that they were probably not radically different from surviving Benedictine and Cluniac examples. Had we lacked surviving examples of 12th-century Cistercian churches, would it have been prudent to suppose that they were not radically different from Benedictine and Cluniac ones?

The answer to this problem must lie with excavation, for what is needed to advance our knowledge of the early Cistercian grange is a comprehensive view of its buildings, similar to that provided for the estates of the military orders by the excavation of South Witham. The only serious attempt to solve the problem by the spade has been Platt's own excavation of Cowton, here published in detail, and by an outrageously cruel stroke of luck this promising and well-documented site provided singularly little evidence of the nature and arrangement of buildings before the 14th century.

The flavour of *parti pris* that sometimes makes uncomfortable reading of those parts of the book that deal with the early Cistercians should not be allowed to blind one to its other very considerable merits. The documentation is excellent, and Platt's most useful contribution is his study of grange estates, where he has made a significant advance in plotting the physical extent of individual granges by the use of tithe maps. Here we have something not seen before—the actual extent on plan of grange estates and their relationship not only to the grange buildings but also to the neighbouring pattern of settlement. It is pioneer work that will be essential on the bookshelves of all who are interested in medieval monastic economy.

R. GILYARD-BEER

De Groninger Sint Walburg. By A. E. van Giffen. 24 × 16 cm. 46 pp., 13 figs. Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff, 3 ed., 1970. Price not stated.

The connexion of St. Walburg, Walpurgis, or, in her native tongue, Wealdburh, with witchery is accidental and unfortunate. In reality she was a 'straight' and worthy person, almost the first of the long line of English missionary ladies, a kinswoman of Boniface and sister of Winebald and Willibald, who died in 779 after thirty years and more of strenuous work on the fringes of the Frankish realm. Eichstätt claimed her bones, but her *cultus* extended to the eastern Netherlands, with dedications, among others, at Zutphen, Arnhem and Groningen. At this last place there stood, until it was demolished between 1611 and 1627, a 'centrally-planned' church, with a rotunda some 30 m. in diameter, dedicated to her, but within the precinct of the great church of St. Martin. Engravings recorded something of its appearance, but the precise position and plan were uncertain until the site was excavated between 1950 and 1968. The present work is not the excavator's report, but a summary by the veteran Professor van Giffen, topographically rather than architecturally inclined and contrasting the facts with the brave but mistaken reconstruction by C. H. Peters in 1891.

There was a timber structure, presumably a church, on the site beforehand, but the stone church, of tufa on a footing of cobbles, was little altered during its existence, save by lengthening the chancel and inserting a vault in the ambulatory that involved responds and heavy buttresses, which presumably mean that the tribune and lower story were thrown into one, as the large windows shown in one engraving would also imply. As in the probable archetype at Aachen, it had a heavy W. tower or westwork and, originally, a small square sanctuary, doubtless also of two stories. Unlike Aachen, it had only one stair turret, ten piers, instead of eight, and twenty sides. Like Aachen, and nearer at hand, like Nijmegen, and, for that matter, like Hereford, centrally planned, if not polygonal, it probably originated as a palace chapel. The author assigns the building to the last eight years of Bishop Bernold, or Benno, of Utrecht (d. 1054), after the emperor Henry III had enfeoffed him with Groningen. This is a likely date, and sets it in the context of the Byzantinism of the Ottonian period and the two following

generations. Here, when the much-needed comparative study of centrally-planned churches is made, it should take its place beside St. Bénigne at Dijon, beside Wulfric's church at Canterbury and the surprisingly complete, if disguised, yet little known, St. John at Liège.

S. E. RIGOLD

Building Accounts of King Henry III. Edited by H. M. Colvin. 22 × 14 cm. xvi + 472 pp., 16 pls. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971. Price £7.00.

It is a curious fact that, although medieval building accounts have been published by local societies or in periodicals before, this must be the first occasion in which their transcription and translation have been the sole purpose of a book published by a university press. Several factors made the publication possible. First, it was commissioned by a builder, the late Mr. Norman Wates, who wanted to know how medieval buildings had been erected. Second, the editor was available who had just described the structures that form the subject of the accounts in the *History of the King's Works*. Third, the accounts themselves are inherently interesting, since they span the period 1221-72 and comprise the earliest and indeed practically all the accounts of this nature known before the last 3rd of the 13th century, when survival becomes more common. The Latin transcription and English translation have been printed on opposite pages, a great aid to those whose Latin is weak or negligible, no doubt in a majority today.

The first point to make is mundane: the book will be of great assistance to anyone else who may wish to do the same thing. There is an ample index, and we may be certain that, when two heads with the experience of those of Mr. Colvin and Mr. L. C. Hector (whose help with the original text is gratefully acknowledged by Mr. Colvin) have applied themselves to the manuscripts, the best reading possible has been obtained. Both vocabulary and phrasing will be helpful. Among very slight slips one, £36 in the Latin (p. 264) and £26 in the English (p. 265) which gives the right sum, is worth mentioning.

Building accounts are not of much interest unless (a) the structure itself survives and (b) the nature of the operation in progress can be identified. In the present accounts the only buildings that do not survive are those, apart from the hall, at Winchester and those at Westminster Palace, although in the first instance something is known about them from excavation and in the second from early 19th-century plans and views. It is the difficulty of identifying the work going on that is the most disappointing feature of this type of record. We are at the mercy of the scribe: a painstaking one who locates the work transforms the nature of the document. One of the worst examples of uninformative accounts are the five 15th-century ones for Tattershall Castle, Lincolnshire. In the present series there is normally no doubt about the building even if we are sometimes a little at sea as to the precise part of it being erected. Unlike the preliminary writs printed here, which were the authority for the persons to whom they were issued, the accounts record not work intended but work done, and so, in spite of their very erratic survival, they constitute evidence of a unique kind about the particular building to which they refer. When this itself is one of the landmarks of English Gothic architecture, like Westminster Abbey, their value is even more enhanced.

In his Introduction Colvin discusses the social information about building that can be derived from the accounts: organization, scale of work, wages and holidays and so on. The table on p. 7 tabulating the number of men employed at Westminster Abbey in 1253 is of great interest (albeit published before), as well as the calculations on holidays, the number of paid holidays being much larger than one might have supposed. The distinction in the account between feasts which belonged to the king and those which belonged to the masons is a curious way of overcoming the difficulty of too many feast days. There must have been several grades of mason from apprentices to master, to judge by the different rates, for example seven rates on pp. 94, 96. Why was Master William

Chancellor (p. 74) paid less than the three masons next on the list? Was there some concealed payment in kind, like that to Master Ralph, the dyker (p. 78)?

In modern construction one of the most interesting points is the ratio of costs of labour to those of materials. For example in restoration-work on an ancient monument materials normally constitute a negligible expenditure, but in the erection of a pre-fabricated building materials are the preponderant cost. In medieval work labour was probably always dominant but the ratio of material costs must have fluctuated considerably. The owner of a rural building often also owned quarries and woods and for carriage it was a short haul. In an urban operation—and all three buildings dealt with here were urban—the materials probably had to be purchased and then carried much longer distances. For these royal buildings materials were brought great distances: Caen stone, Purbeck marble, Cornish tin and so on. Expenditure reached its maximum on an ecclesiastical work, like Westminster Abbey, where not only was the scale of use of the luxury imports greater, but that most expensive of materials, lead, was extensively used on the roof. It comes therefore as no surprise to find that at Westminster Abbey (pp. 248–88) the wages for a labour force of perhaps 300 men could be greatly exceeded in the same week by the cost of purchases (although this sometimes included indirect labour costs for worked stone or indeed direct labour costs). Perhaps even for an ecclesiastical building this was not typical in the 13th century.

An interesting point is carriage. Both Dover and Westminster (there was a quayside at the palace) could be reached by water, and much material was ordered by the boat-load. On later medieval undertakings in rural situations it was not unusual to send a wagon or wagons with drivers in full-time employment, since their uninterrupted use was necessary to maintain the flow of work. These three urban operations could rely on hiring, as was done on a daily basis at Westminster. The expression 'per equos . . . portari' (p. 64) at Dover sounds like pack-horses. At Westminster the vehicle used was a 'biga' (normal) or a 'carecta' (p. 338). The latter was probably a two-wheeled cart, but 'plaustrum' (wagon) is never used. Perhaps 'plaustrum' was a hay-wain and 'biga' a goods wagon. A 'biga' was drawn by two horses (p. 382); in a rural setting one might have expected traction by oxen.

We must be extremely grateful to Mr. Colvin for undertaking so successfully what must have been an exceedingly exacting and tedious task, especially when it had to be fitted in with so many other noteworthy pieces of research. All would agree with Sir Nikolaus Pevsner in his Foreword, when he hopes that this will be the first volume in a series of medieval building accounts that will form a corpus of reference on the subject (p. xi).

M. W. THOMPSON

Illustrated Handbook of Vernacular Architecture. By R. W. Brunskill. 22 × 14 cm. 230 pp., 148 half-tone and line illustrations. London: Faber & Faber, 1970. Price £2.50.

This is a most valuable book, compact, concise, systematic and covering aspects of the subject hardly touched elsewhere: the sections on industrial housing and the American offshoots of English practice are among the best in the work. Nearly everything is treated in two-page 'spreads'—a photograph to typify each sub-section, a judicious summary beneath it, and a full page of annotated diagrams. The effect of this is necessarily somewhat procrustean and not all will agree with Dr. Brunskill about what warrants such a sub-section and what does not, but within these limitations the economy is admirable and the diagrams, which are often isometric, are seldom overcrowded or unclear. The photographs should be more precisely identified; one or two are foggy, but the majority are brilliant for the size of reproduction, which is, however, much too small for photographs of line-drawings. There are distribution-maps of walling-materials, incorporating the published work of Mr. J. T. Smith. These show, which the

title does not, that, apart from the American excursus, the subject is vernacular architecture in *England and Wales*.

Nevertheless the book has some of the drawbacks of its origin, in the Manchester University School of Architecture, the source of much of the graphic material. Brunskill, as a disciple of the late Professor R. A. Cordingley, regrets that he never lived to produce 'a comprehensive and authoritative account of vernacular architecture in England'. Inspiring teacher though he was, I do not think that Cordingley was the man to do it and I would venture to say that, though far off finality, Brunskill has bettered his master. Whereas Cordingley's predecessors, Addy and, especially, Innocent, had an almost ethnological approach, which (though Brunskill is rid of it) is not yet fully exorcised from the study, and underestimated the effects of devolution and dissemination, Cordingley himself was too preoccupied with notional system and deductive typology. Brunskill benefits from his methodological discipline yet transcends it. Both approaches are rather Teutonic and have inhibited the empiricism of English archaeology. Vernacular architecture is still very much at the empirical, data-collecting stage, and general theories must not run ahead of expendable hypotheses. To his credit, Brunskill sends up no new balloons. The real, and totally objective, father of the study was Ralph Nevill, working in SW. Surrey, then a remote and uncontaminated area, but the meeting-place of at least two traditions of building, and a decade and more before Addy. His works are not mentioned in Brunskill's full bibliography, which is, like much of the work it covers, and like the Manchester School itself, eccentric in the literal sense, heavily weighted towards the 'highland zone', towards the poor and stony fringe-area beloved of Innocent, whose practices may be conservative but not necessarily vestigial, nor indicative of practices once more extended. This bias restricts the utility of an otherwise excellent book. A work in which Brecon and Cumberland each provide one-sixth of the examples cannot be taken as representative of England. If the tale of parishes and church-accommodation is an index of medieval and sub-medieval population, Suffolk and Norfolk together far exceeded the whole of Wales, and Suffolk alone has more vernacular building earlier than the 18th century. I use 'medieval' and 'sub-medieval' in their commonly accepted senses—'medieval' as in the foundation-terms of this Society and this journal. What, when all reservations have been expressed, is the beginner, whose needs, among others, this book so patiently supplies, to make of a typology of doors and windows which carries the middle ages 'almost to the 18th century' and the sub-medieval phase to the mid 19th? If he comes from the areas where truly medieval vernacular buildings exist by the thousand, if he does not come from those tracts where accepted chronology has no meaning, he will be baffled. It is not enough to say that the 'great rebuilding' of c. 1570–1620 (an overestimated concept, except in parts of the midlands and south-west) did not reach the wilder shores until a century later. There are huge areas where it came a century earlier, and precedents for almost every technique, of brick and stone as well as timber, can be cited from earlier dates yet. To cite them is not to proclaim oneself a diffusionist but to provide a normal standard of reference.

S. E. RIGOLD

A Manual of Monumental Brasses. By Herbert Haines, with an Introduction, Biographical Note and Bibliography by Richard J. Busby. 15 × 24 cm. cclxiii + 286 pp., 200 illustrations, 1 plate. Bath: Adams and Dart, 1970 (a reprint of two volumes published by J. H. and Jas. Parker, 1861). Price £5.25.

This is one of the great standard works which every subject tends to have inherited from the last century and constitutes indeed something of a landmark in the development of medieval archaeology. The original volumes have been fitted into one binding and furnished with a photograph of Haines and such biographical facts as it has been possible to recover. He developed an interest in brasses while an undergraduate

at Exeter College, Oxford, and this grew to fruition when he was a Latin master at Gloucester, where the great work was written. It would be an act of impiety to attempt to review a book of this kind. Many thoughts are prompted by the book: a list of 122 subscribers of whom 55 were in holy orders (what would the ratio be today?), 4 copies to Augustus Franks, Director of the Society of Antiquaries and an indefatigable promoter of antiquarian research in all fields, and so on. We are indeed fortunate to have this classic work made available to us at such a modest price.

M. W. THOMPSON

Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde. Founded by Johannes Hoops; 2 ed., enlarged and fully revised. Edited by H. Jankuhn, H. Kuhn, K. Ranke and R. Wenskus. Bd. 1, Lieferungen 2-3. 24×17 cm. 270 pp., 58 figs., 25 plates. Berlin: Verlag Walter de Gruyter, 1970. Price DM 24 (fasc. 2) and 28 (fasc. 3).

The first fascicule of this revised *Reallexikon* was briefly reviewed in volume XII (1968) of this journal and there is no need to say more than that they continue to appear, albeit slowly. The principal entry in the second fascicule deals with Alamanni, and among others of interest are Alans, Alpine passes, Altlandschaftforschung and our Secretary's entry on the Alfred Jewel, the symbol of our Society, proudly displayed on the jacket of its journal. The three principal entries in fascicule 3 are Angles, Anglo-Saxons and Anthropology.

M. W. THOMPSON

The following publications have also been received:

Deserted Villages. (Sources of History Series). By K. J. Allison. 22×15 cm. 64 pp., illustrated. London: Macmillan, 1970. Price 50p.

The Suffolk Review, IV (1). Edited by W. R. Serjeant. 14×20 cm. 52 pp., illustrated. Ipswich: Suffolk Local History Council, 1971. Price not stated.

The Angles, the Saxons and the Jutes. By J. N. L. Myres. 25×15 cm. 32 pp., 7 figs. London: published for the British Academy by the Oxford University Press, 1971. Price 40p.

Saxon Farnham. By Elfrida Manning. 25×19 cm. 37 pp., illustrated. Chichester: Phillimore, 1970. Price 50p.

The Journal of the Farnham Museum Society, 1. Edited by K. W. Clark and A. Parker. 25×18 cm. 56 pp., illustrated. Chichester: Phillimore, 1971. Price 80p.

Report of Imitative Ploughing Experiments with Copies of a Prehistoric Ard with Passing Through Stilt (Doestrup-type), 1962-68, Reports from Experiments in Lejre, 1 (1968). By Hans-Ole-Hansen. 30×21 cm. 78 pp., illustrated (incl. 6 colour-transparencies). Lejre: Historical-Archaeological Research Centre, 1969. Price not stated.

The Alfred and Minster Lovell Jewels. By Joan R. Clarke and David A. Hinton. 14×22 cm. 12 pp., 2 pls., and coloured frontispiece. Oxford: Ashmolean Museum, 1971. Price not stated.

The Art of the Manx Crosses. By A. M. Cubbon. 22×14 cm. 41 pp., illustrated. Douglas: Manx Museum and National Trust, 1971. Price 30p.