

## Reviews

*Issendorf: ein Urnenfriedhof der späten Kaiserzeit und der Völkerwanderungszeit*, 1 (Materialhefte zur Ur- und Frühgeschichte Niedersachsens, Heft 6). By Walter Janssen. 210 × 295 cm. 116 pp., 76 pls., 18 figs., 1 folding plan. Hildesheim: August Lax, 1972. Price not stated.

The great cremation cemetery of Issendorf near Stade on the lower Elbe has the unusual distinction of having been first described and in part explored by one of the earliest pioneers of German archaeology, Pastor Martin Musshard (1699–1770), whose manuscript account of his researches, compiled in 1755 and entitled *Palaeogentilismus Bremensis*, was eventually published by E. Sprockhoff in 1927.<sup>1</sup> It contains a mass of still valuable information on the antiquities of the region, accompanied by illustrations which enable many of the objects to be identified. The present publication, *Issendorf* I, contains an analysis of some 300 cremations in urns excavated by Janssen in 1967, and will be followed in due course by *Issendorf* II, which will cover the excavations of 1969 in which a further 517 urns were recovered. It is clear from the site plan that these two seasons' work leave a substantial part of this extensive cemetery still unexplored, and the conclusions to be drawn from them must therefore remain to some extent provisional.

Issendorf is of special interest to English students because, in the absence of a full publication of the material from the Perlberg cemetery, it is now the best documented site of this period in the Stade area on the lower Elbe, whose Anglo-Saxon remains bear the closest resemblance, as J. M. Kemble pointed out long ago,<sup>2</sup> to those used by the earliest Saxon settlers in Britain. Both the brooches and the pottery from this area between the Elbe and the Oste are nearer in their main types to much of our English material than are those of the region to the W. between the Oste and the Weser, whose type-site is the great cemetery of Westerwanna.

This report is therefore to be welcomed as providing a useful basis for the detailed study of these resemblances. The material is clearly displayed in line drawings and half-tones of good quality and has been described and arranged efficiently, with the urns and their associated objects illustrated together so that the book is very easy to use. The burials appear to range in date from the 3rd to the later part of the 6th century, the lower date being provided by a rectangular attachment plate of bronze, burnt but unfortunately not associated with an urn, which is decorated with zoomorphic ornament in an advanced stage of Salin Style I.

The criteria used for dating the more significant of the grave-goods from the urns, notably the few (19) brooches and more numerous (43) combs, follow current German practice, and require no special comment. They provide no surprises, except for those who may still find it odd that urns of types not uncommon in English cemeteries should be associated with 4th-century objects (e.g. Issendorf 65, 73, 82, 103, 110, 113, 127, 131, 246, 281, 282 (all brooches); 64, 198, 200, 205, 243, 248, 249 (all combs)). But difficulties do arise from Janssen's reliance on Plettke's typology of 1921 for the classification and dating of the urns themselves.<sup>3</sup> It is more than time that German scholars took a more critical look at Plettke's types and the evidence on which he relied for dating them. Tischler demonstrated nearly twenty years ago that much of Plettke's dating was some fifty years too high and that several of his types were contemporary, or at least over-

<sup>1</sup> In *Jahrb. des Provinzial Museums Hannover*, 1927, 41–172.

<sup>2</sup> *Hovae Ferales*, 1863, 221–32.

<sup>3</sup> A. Plettke, *Ursprung und Ausbreitung der Angeln und Sachsen* (Hildesheim, 1921).

lapping, rather than consecutive.<sup>4</sup> By relying on Plettke so implicitly for the dating by form of the Issendorf pots Janssen has landed himself, without apparently realizing it, in some absurd contradictions. Thus Issendorf 61, dated by form in the 3rd century (p. 38), contained a 5th-century equal-armed brooch (p. 55); 65 and 103, also by form 3rd-century, both had 4th-century brooches; 113, 131, 281, placed on Plettke's dating about 300 (p. 39), all had later 4th-century brooches; so, too, of Janssen's 5th-century 'Sondergruppe G' (p. 42), 278 and 281 are both dated about 300 (p. 39), and both 17 and 73 in the 4th century (pp. 54-5).

Confidence in Janssen's use of formal typology for dating the urns is not increased by his quotation of some supposed English parallels. Thus he equates the plain biconical urns of my *Anglo-Saxon Pottery and the Settlement of England* (Oxford, 1969), fig. 1, with Plettke's A3 group of 3rd-century wide-mouthed bowls (p. 38); but none of my examples are wide-mouthed or of bowl-form. He also uses the urns on my fig. 33 as the equivalent of Plettke's A7a without perceiving that my fig. 33 was designed to illustrate the use of chevron-and-dot designs on vessels of various shapes without any reference to Plettke's typology (p. 40). Similarly most of the Issendorf urns classified under Plettke's A7a group (p. 40) are not the equivalent of the elaborate *Buckelurnen* of my figs. 23 and 24, as here stated, but are various kinds of shoulder-boss urns mostly with panel-style decoration. Janssen dates all these in the 5th century, but, if he had studied my English typology more closely, he would have seen that they are mainly 6th-century pieces. Their proper recognition as such would help him to fill out the otherwise inexplicable absence of urns in his series that can be plausibly dated after 500 (p. 41). The fact is that 6th-century pottery has scarcely been recognized at all in the N. German cemeteries; study of the more securely dated English series would show that there is quite a lot of it to be found, both at Issendorf (40, 155, 159, 259 and 283 are obvious cases) and elsewhere.

It is very much to be hoped that before *Issendorf II* is published attention will be paid to these serious defects in the treatment of the pottery in *Issendorf I*; otherwise what is in many respects an admirable publication of this important material will be liable to lead students into needless error and confusion.

J. N. L. MYRES

*The Anglo-Saxon Cemeteries of Caistor-by-Norwich and Markshall, Norfolk* (Reports of the Research Committee of the Society of Antiquaries of London, no. 30). By J. N. L. Myres and Barbara Green. 20.5 × 27 cm. xx + 262 + 5 pp., 71 figs., 24 pls., 3 maps. Oxford: Society of Antiquaries of London, and Thames and Hudson, 1973. Price £12.00.

This long awaited volume reports the patient study of excavations undertaken forty years ago by the late F. R. Mann. 439 urns are illustrated from Caistor, with the grave-goods, from a total of 496 known cremations and 60 late inhumations; from near-by Markshall 101 urns are illustrated from an estimated total of several hundreds. A map and a gazetteer list 156 Saxon burial grounds in East Anglia, E. of Royston and N. of Harwich, though space excludes references. The late Rainbird Clarke describes earlier Roman use of the future cemetery site, and the last years of Roman Caistor are discussed.

The volume is much more than a site report. Caistor is at present the most important of the great English urnfields, for it is the best published. In time it will be overshadowed by the more numerous urns of Elmham, Loveden and other sites; but the reports and interpretations of these sites are bound to draw heavily from the Caistor evidence. Myres has therefore classified and dated the Caistor urns, and his volume will serve as a basic reference work.

<sup>4</sup> 'Der Stand der Sachsenforschung archaeologisch gesehen', 35 *Bericht der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission*, 1954, 66-7.

The relative dates stand foursquare; and so do most of the continental parallels, showing whence the English came. The main conclusions are likely to endure, for, though Myres himself makes limited use of associated grave-goods, their evidence firmly endorses his main inferences. Myres' *Caistor and Anglo-Saxon Pottery and the Settlement of England* (Oxford, 1969) much advance the frontiers of knowledge, for they have systematized the evidence, enabling future workers to identify vessels with greater precision.

More troublesome are the absolute dates, especially of the earliest period. Myres' introduction gives much space and heavy emphasis to his view that English burials in Britain began much sooner than his colleagues have supposed. In 1969 he suggested "say 360". Now he considers it "quite possible" that the Caistor cemetery came into use in the 3rd century, and asserts "that it was so used on an increasing scale from at least the middle of the 4th century can be taken as certain" (p. 13). The 4th-century "increase" assumes that prior 3rd-century use was not merely 'possible', but probable, if not 'certain'.

This view matters, for it entails a radical reappraisal of how and why the English came to Britain, and also of the recorded policies of successive late Roman governments towards the employment of barbarian troops. If it is silently accepted and then proves mistaken, it will mislead a generation; for many will read the conclusions set forth in the introduction and quote them as gospel, but far fewer will have the means or the experience to scrutinize the evidence which purports to justify them. This evidence must therefore be the main concern of a short review. Enquiry cannot begin with the Caistor report, for much is there taken for granted. It must go back to square one, and look at the nature of the evidence upon which all datings of the Germanic migration period rest, and at the ways in which modern scholars have used it.

The starting point for all archaeological datings in western and central Europe in the early centuries A.D. is Roman literature. Most Roman pots and sites are dated either because they are found with the coins of emperors, whose reigns are dated by surviving writings, or because the foundation or destruction of sites is reported by writers; and most barbarian objects are dated by association, direct or indirect, with datable Roman objects, or by notices which report the dates at which various barbarians moved in and out of particular regions.

A single statement by one contemporary writer concerns the migration of the English to Britain. In 441 or 442 Britain passed "*in dicionem Saxonum*", "under Saxon control".<sup>5</sup> The words were written ten years after the event by a northern Gaul, who could not know that in the future 'Saxon control' was to be overset, and not permanently reasserted until the 570s. Before then Gildas, writing about 540, just within living memory of the event, describes (ch. 23) the overthrow of the constituted government of Britain by rebellious Saxons, who had previously been invited peaceably into Britain by a 'proud tyrant', whom later texts call Vortigern, some years after Italy had abandoned Roman Britain; the first settlers had been few, but they had been followed soon by large reinforcements, in the time of the same ruler. The contemporary notice places the first arrival of the English not later than 441; Gildas, who was born about thirty-five years after Vortigern's death, places it after Italy had abandoned Roman Britain, in 410. Other evidence argues that the main migration was over, and much of the homeland deserted, by about 500 A.D.

These are not dubious texts, at variance with archaeological evidence. On the contrary, it is upon these texts that modern German scholars have based their dating system, and they still remain today its ultimate criteria. The essentials of their dating have endured, robust because they are firmly built upon contemporary written evidence, not only upon typological speculation. The fundamental survey of the evidence is the seventy-page thesis of Alfred Plettke, completed in tragic haste; his preface is dated

<sup>5</sup> *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi*, ix, *Chronica Minora* 1, 615 ff.

4 August 1914, and a few weeks later he was killed. His work was published in 1921 by his father, the director of the Morgenstern Museum and excavator of Westerwanna, who added two pages of important cautionary notes.<sup>6</sup>

Plettke recognized, more clearly than many others, that in N. Germany and Scandinavia there is no independent native date criterion whatever. For the Roman period he used and extended the work of his predecessors, O. Almgren and others, whose main guide to dating had been Roman imports or imitations thereof, especially brooches. For the migration period he anchored his dates upon the statements of the Gallic Chronicler and Gildas, which he found through the historical work of L. Schmidt. His argument is clear. "After 407 . . . Prince Vortigern took a band of Germans into his pay . . . But more and more Germans pressed in . . . The Germans were victorious in 441/42 . . . Not until the battle of *Mons Badonicus* was the advance of the Angles and Saxons halted" (p. 65). He was as clear about the consequence for the homeland, emphasizing that "I know of no Anglo-Saxon cremation cemetery in north-west Germany . . . that lasts beyond . . . the 5th century" (pp. 69-70).

These texts gave him a simple and effective yardstick. Types found in both Britain and Germany are in principle 5th-century; those found in Germany alone are 4th-century or earlier, and those found in Britain alone are 6th-century or later. The yardstick is used repeatedly. The A7 urn-type (*Buckelurnen*) is 5th-century "because it is particularly plentiful in England" (p. 45); the date of the early cruciform brooches is fixed "because their presence in England indicates the period about 400" (p. 15), but, in contrast, their predecessor, the *Armbrustfibel* "is still missing in England . . . which argues . . . a typical 4th-century form" (p. 17). Similar judgements recur again and again.

The researches of half a century have adjusted Plettke's conclusions in detail, but have left his main fabric untouched. Myres still uses his categories to describe German pots. In Germany in 1954 Tischler's thorough reappraisal of the evidence emphasized that "in the last analysis, my chronology deviates only slightly from Plettke's", and in 1969 P. Schmid's discussion of Feddersen Wierde opens with the assertion that Plettke's "arrangement of the material still today forms the starting point for chronological evaluation . . . in the North Sea coastal area".<sup>7</sup>

Plettke was a starting point. Later work has modified much detail. Though it has confirmed that most sites ended in the 5th century, a few burials on a few sites are later. Some types that Plettke did not know in England have now been recognized here, and therefore on this criteria "extend into the 5th century". But the most important modification was already printed in his book. His father's notes (p. 84) drew attention to Brenner's important article, published in 1915, warning that many dates should be up to half a century later.<sup>8</sup> War-time publications and small print are easily overlooked, and it was forty years later that Tischler worked out this redating in detail; in particular, he shifted the A3 and A4 urns from the 3rd century to the 4th, and the "early 4th century" A5 urns moved with them, extending into the 5th century. But not everything moved automatically later. It is still true that no *Armbrustfibel* has yet been found in England; and though one or two may be found in the future, their rarity would still mark them as characteristically 4th-century. But they are often found in urns indistinguishable from those that contain their successors, the early cruciform brooches. Similar urns persisted through the decades about the turn of the 4th and 5th centuries, in which the new brooch fashion ousted the old.

Fruitful new considerations have also emerged. Myres has convincingly argued<sup>9</sup> that earlier classification concentrated too exclusively on the shapes of vessels, too little on their decoration, and also that imitations of much earlier forms, or anticipations of

<sup>6</sup> A. Plettke, *Ursprung und Ausbreitung der Angeln und Sachsen*, (Hildesheim, 1921).

<sup>7</sup> F. Tischler in 35 *Berichte der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission*, 1954, 21 ff.; P. Schmid, 'Feddersen Wierde', *Neue Ausgrabungen und Forschungen der Niedersachsen*, iv (1969).

<sup>8</sup> E. Brenner in 7 *Bericht der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission*, 1915, 253 ff.

<sup>9</sup> *Anglo-Saxon Pottery and the Settlement of England* (Oxford, 1969), 23 ff.

later forms, are natural and normal. German scholarship has also tended to avoid over-precise dating, for even the abundant material of late Roman pottery can rarely be pressed to a closer date bracket than half a century, and has emphasized periods or stages. As B. Almgren and D. M. Wilson have shown, a period cannot normally be less than a generation of thirty or forty years, the working life of a craftsman and the adult life of his customers; and the shorthand symbol of 'the time about 400' cannot mean more than the limits of about 380/420.

German datings have stayed steady, and have not faced serious challenge to the fundamental arguments upon which Plettke based them. The study of the English material has been more erratic. Until about twenty years ago almost all scholars, including Myres, accepted Bede's mistaken date of 'about 450' for the first arrival of the English without critical enquiry, and ignored the evidence on which German dates were founded, while German scholars paid no attention to Bede. Confusion naturally followed. In particular, the important double grave at Dyke Hills, Dorchester-on-Thames, which contained a late Roman officer's belt and a woman's brooch of a prototype cruciform type, paralleled in Germany but not in Britain, was squeezed back to about the mid 5th century, and the early cruciforms that followed, in Germany and England, were dated mid or later 5th century.<sup>10</sup>

English studies also suffered from an unfortunate division of labour. Leeds studied the brooches, Myres the pots. Leeds' sensitive perception of detail was thwarted by his curious assumption that the 'invaders' should have buried their earliest brooches near the coast, and left progressively later types as they slowly 'penetrated' inland by recognizable 'routes'. The notion was never explained, or even discussed, but was maintained against overwhelming contrary evidence, which placed many of the earliest burials deep inland, especially in the Abingdon region, and showed no 'routes'. The imaginary puzzle confused a generation.

English attitudes began to change after 1954, when Kirk and Leeds republished the Dorchester double grave, dating it firmly to the end of the 4th century, with the consequence that the first pagan cemeteries, whose earliest brooches are of slightly later types, might reasonably be assigned to the early 5th century. In the same year Tischler revised the German evidence. Later German dates and earlier English dates for the grave-goods of the first English in Britain removed the main cause of confusion, and Myres then undertook the rethinking of the pottery dates. But the unfortunate division of the material persists, for no comparable reconsideration of the brooches has yet appeared. Its absence hinders estimates of date, for brooches and other metalwork survive in quantity from inhumations, pots principally from cremations; and all evidence agrees that the first immigrants practised both forms of burial simultaneously in various regions. No satisfactory conclusions can therefore be drawn from studying a section of the evidence on its own, either pots or brooches.

This is the context in which Myres' analysis of the pottery and his report on Caistor appear. The report begins with the historical background. At Caistor, "Romano-Saxon pottery, late Roman military equipment, and early Germanic cemeteries have all been recorded in close association . . . It is most natural to suppose that these finds represent two aspects of the same phenomenon . . . Germanic mercenaries who . . . defended the walls . . . and . . . were buried . . . outside" (p. 32). The factual statement is formally true in the sense that pottery, equipment and cemeteries were all found in and about the same town; but they are no more 'in association' with each other than they are with earlier Roman material on the same site. The supposition is not 'natural', for it confuses unlike evidence.

'Romano-Saxon' ware was identified by Myres in 1956.<sup>11</sup> A tiny proportion of the

<sup>10</sup> N. Åberg, *The Anglo-Saxons in England* (Uppsala, 1926), 13.

<sup>11</sup> 'Romano-Saxon Pottery' in *Dark-Age Britain: Studies presented to E. T. Leeds*, ed. D. B. Harden (London, 1956), 16 ff.

output of late Roman kilns imitated decoration popular in NW. Germany. Its purchasers lived and died chiefly in civilian towns, large and small, in East Anglia and the E. midlands; and it is also reported from four Saxon Shore forts and three or four rural sites, mostly farther to the W. The status of its users can only be guessed. It is probable that people who favoured German ornament over successive generations were of German origin, and remained in Germanic communities, not assimilated into Roman society. They may therefore have been a British equivalent of the *gentiles* and *laeti*, descendants of Frankish and Sarmatian prisoner-of-war families settled under military control as dependent cultivators on the estates of some towns and some landowners in Italy and Gaul. It is not probable that they were authorized to wear military insignia, or entrusted with the defence of town walls; but garrisons and citizens needed subject cultivators to feed them, and perhaps to discharge some minor police functions. Their wares are not found in pagan English cemeteries, at Caistor or elsewhere.

Myres is however seeking to explain supposed 3rd and 4th-century burials at Caistor. He therefore holds that "the military belt fittings . . . were undoubtedly used by barbarians in Roman service . . . When the Roman military command withdrew, the 'regular' barbarians may have . . . joined their irregular compatriots . . . It seems certain that some . . . settlers were established before the breakdown of centralized Roman rule in the first decade of the fifth century" (p. 33).

Though many units were doubtless posted to other frontiers in the late Empire, no 'command' was ever 'withdrawn', and there was no early 5th-century 'breakdown'. From 407 military and civil officials were appointed and paid by a Roman government in Britain, no longer in Italy. The devolution of sovereignty did not affect military or other equipment. But other causes brought a change. The belt (*cingulum*) was the badge of rank of civil and military officers, whatever their nationality. Surviving examples have been thoroughly studied by Riegl, Behrens, Bullinger, Mrs. Hawkes and Dunning, and others. They extend all along the European frontier zone, from Britain to the Black Sea, with a few in the interior and a few in German graves, either loot, or the property of former officers. Their fittings range from large ornate plates, often decorated in chip-carving, fit for the highest dignitaries, to the simple buckles of other ranks. They are held to be of Balkan rather than Germanic origin<sup>12</sup> and to have disappeared from the West very early in the 5th century, after the fall of the Rhine frontier. They were not buried in the Caistor cemetery, and are found in Britain only on Roman sites, apart from a few survivals and imitations of simple buckles.

The notion that belts were barbarian stems from a modern belief that most of the late Roman army was German. The information available to the late Empire Prosopography records a German origin for about 15 per cent of the known western 4th-century officers, and suggests that German other ranks were proportionately fewer. But whatever their numbers and national origin, enlisted men issued with belts were quite distinct from the large forces of federate allies raised for particular campaigns in the 4th century, often in civil wars. Both differed from the 5th-century federate settlers, legally established with their families on Roman soil, under their own laws and rulers. They used their own cemeteries, and when they were pagans, like the Franks and the Saxons, they practised their own burial rites and buried their own grave-goods. The first such federate settlement recorded in the West is that of the Visigoths in 418. It was a novelty, and there is no evidence to suggest that it had an unrecorded British precedent, though similar federate settlements soon followed. Among them were the Saxons, or English, in Britain. The wearers of belts, the purchasers of wheel-made Romano-Saxon wares, and the immigrants buried in pagan cemeteries were three different groups, not 'associated'. That is the simple explanation of the clear and abundant evidence, that neither the belts nor the wheel-made wares were buried in the cemeteries, either with cremated or with inhumed bodies. Direct statements, the record of Roman Europe, and the datings of

<sup>12</sup> H. Bullinger, *Spätantike Gürtelbeschläge* (Dissertationes Gandenses, XII, Bruges, 1969), 69-70, 74, 78.

modern German archaeologists agree in placing the first arrival of the English in Britain after 407, probably after 418, but well before 441. Later British tradition names a precise year, 428; its source is not known, but a date in or about the 420s fits the known evidence.

The known evidence would need to be reconsidered if it were sharply contradicted by the early Caistor urns. The hard evidence for their date is compressed into five pages of the report (43 ff.). The discussion is in two stages. First, a Caistor urn is matched with a continental parallel; then a date is assigned to the parallel. Space prevents illustration of the vessels compared, and the argument therefore turns on references to a multitude of publications, not all of them easily accessible. The authority for the date, when it is given, is usually the opinion of a modern scholar, but his evidence and reasoning is not always stated. Since not everyone will have the means or the time to scrutinize the dense argument and look up the parallels cited, some of the more important must be discussed here.

Footnote 9, p. 45,<sup>13</sup> compares eight Caistor urns with eight Westerwanna urns that contained '4th century brooches'. Six of the brooches are *Armbrustfibeln* and one is an early 'equal arm', all brooch types not yet reported in Britain. The eighth contained a *tutulus* brooch; its English parallel is not mentioned, Abingdon grave 106 (pl. xvi), which also contained an applied saucer brooch with five (?) running scrolls, of the 5th century. The urns have a general overall similarity; they are of types which overlapped the change of brooch fashion, from *Armbrustfibeln* to early cruciform, in the late 4th and early 5th centuries. But within the overall similarity there are marked differences of detail. Three of the matched pairs are of identical shape, but three of the German urns are noticeably narrower in relation to their height, and two are considerably taller in relation to their girth. Three of the German urns are plain, but the English urns are decorated, all but one of them quite elaborately; Westerwanna decoration is however in all instances confined to the upper part of the vessel, whereas the English decoration extends well into the lower part. The brooches and the overall similarities confirm the general date horizon of 'the time about 400', meaning the date bracket of around 380/420; but the differences of detail do not warrant the inference that the urns were buried within thirty years of each other, and the differences common to the English group argue the work of a different potter, or potters, working in the same tradition, but separated by an interval of some years from the German potter(s).

Several other vessels instanced belong to the same date horizon, and might be supplemented by the evidence from Jutland, not discussed in the report. Arguments for dates significantly earlier than 'about 400' rely chiefly on the dates put forward by Albrechtsen for his recent excavations on the Danish island of Fyn. The reasons for these dates are not discussed; but they are throughout too early, and Myres is compelled to revise them by a number of awkward corrections, as on p. 46, note 4, where he notes that corrugated urns, assigned by Albrechtsen to date bracket 325/400, "persist into the 5th century in Schleswig". But similar vessels did not differ in date in these two regions; from Plettke to Genrich, German scholars have agreed that Fyn is "at one with north Schleswig", in "the same cultural region".<sup>14</sup> What is 5th-century in Fyn is 5th-century in Schleswig, and also in England.

The purely typological arguments are as tenuous. "Hatched triangles" are a popular "3rd century fashion", and a Caistor example, N102, is "closely matched" on Fyn "by pieces datable before A.D. 325" (p. 44); but, "N102 contained part of a comb . . . that can be dated with some certainty to the decades around 400" (p. 45, note 3; illustrated fig. 10). Y23, a "breakdown" of this style, "providing a direct link" with "corrugated technique which came in before the middle of the 4th century" is compared with a Suderbrarup urn (grave 5 is meant); but that urn is of quite different form, its decoration

<sup>13</sup> Cf. *op. cit.* in note 9, fn. 4.

<sup>14</sup> *Op. cit.* in note 6, 60; A. Genrich, *Formenkreise und Stammesgruppen in Schleswig-Holstein* (Neumünster, 1954), 30.

by no means so 'broken down', and the parallel leads nowhere, for the Suderbrarup urn is dateless. A more informative instance of the 'hatched triangle', not at all broken down, is Westerwanna 85, not cited, a 5th-century *Buckelurn*. The short answer is that this decorative motif lasted for a very long time.

One urn, P15, firmly asserts an early date (p. 43 f). It has plenty of 2nd and 3rd-century parallels. But it is also "somewhat similar" to a Hammoor bowl with an "early 5th century brooch". "Bracketed between these dates", it is therefore "no later than the second half of the 4th century",<sup>15</sup> not "as late as the closing years of the 4th century" (p. 44). Such splitting of the difference between several centuries gives no firm date, but the vessel is probably at least as early as Myres allows, for the Hammoor brooch, unparalleled in England, is 4th-century, probably well before 400.<sup>16</sup> It is wiser to endorse P. Schmid's view (cited *Caistor*, p. 44, note 4) that "P15 would not be in place much later than the 3rd century at Feddersen Wierde". It is also out of place at Caistor. This solitary urn underscores Myres' own warning that a few throw-backs, antiquities or imitations thereof, are to be expected in any considerable assemblage of pottery.

Myres' discussion does not support the view that burials began at Caistor before the 420s. But he has handled the urns for forty years, and intimate acquaintance teaches more than anyone can learn from words and flat drawings. It is, in theory, possible that if the dates were discussed at proper length with adequate illustration, a better case could be made; but on present evidence the possibility seems remote.

It is however likely that some of the earliest vessels were at the height of their fashion nearer 400 than 420, as are a handful of the earliest brooches from other sites. Any migration brings with it a proportion of elderly material. When the Romans landed in 43 A.D., they imported a quantity of Arretine ware, twenty or more years old when it reached Britain, most plentiful in London. But no one would argue that Arretine imports discredit Roman reports of the invasion date, or found London, without native wares, a generation before the conquest.

The prominence accorded to the argument for very early dating obscures the solid worth of the volume, and the important conclusions to which it points. As Collingwood observed long ago, what matters most is to get the questions right; for there can be no answers till the questions are posed. Though Myres' answers may be disputed, dispute is possible only because he has put the questions, drawn attention to Romano-Saxon ware, classified the pagan urns, and indicated their parallels. What his analysis spotlights is an abnormally high proportion of very early burials, firmly establishing Caistor as one of the few cemeteries that unquestionably belong to the first of the incoming English.

The matter deserves better presentation and publication. There is too much need of avoidable thumbing back and forth. The grave-goods, especially from inhumations, are meanly illustrated, and dismissed as "not of great interest" (p. 210), though to many scholars some are of high interest. But above all the unnecessary price is an impediment to scholarship. The volume need not have been priced above £3 or £4 at present costs, as Hull Museum's publication of Myres' Sancton has shown, half the length, issued at £1; its minor typographical faults could have been avoided by a more skilled compositor without extra cost, and its urns are as well illustrated, its grave-goods much better. Publication in this sumptuous coffee table form nowadays savours of vulgarity; it is a taunt to the many younger scholars who should buy the volume, but cannot.

The Caistor volume is a prelude to Myres' corpus of pagan English pottery. That corpus is likely to remain a standard reference work for a century or more, for it will embody a classification and a periodization that is likely to endure. It is to be hoped that it will be reasonably priced, and that views about the absolute date of the earliest period will be more judiciously expressed, as they are in the Sancton volume, the arguments for and against dispassionately balanced; for there is a risk that if our grandchildren

<sup>15</sup> *Op. cit.* in note 9, 72.

<sup>16</sup> From grave 72: *op. cit.* in note 6, 26, Taf. x, 1, and Genrich, *op. cit.* in note 14, Taf. 15E.

are confronted with a reference work whose opening pages may seem to them to expound a buried error of the distant past, they may treat Myres' life's work with something less than the high respect which it deserves.

JOHN MORRIS

*Beiträge zur Frühgeschichte des Xantener Viktorstiftes* (Rheinische Ausgrabungen, Bd. 6). By Hugo Borger and Friedrich Wilhelm Oediger. 26 × 17 cm. xii + 272 pp., 25 figs., 36 drawings, 30 pls. Dusseldorf: Rheinland-Verlag, 1969. Price not stated.

Xanten, linked geographically with the *colonia Ulpia Traiana*, is one of the oldest christian centres in the Rhineland. The collegiate church (*Stift*), dissolved in 1802 after one thousand years of continuous history, and its associated buildings form an important historical monument; they are mainly, in their present form, of medieval or post-medieval date. The importance of the site was long recognized and work within the church began before the second world war. The inspiration was largely due to Walter Bader, to whom this volume is dedicated. Eventual publication, planned by Bader, is promised as a massive series, of which four parts have appeared. The present volume, which is not a part of the series, contains a 3rd preliminary report (by H. Borger) covering the excavations between 1961 and 1966, and a summary of the early history and organization of the community down to 1300 (by F. W. Oediger).

The following stages in the history of the site have been established. An artisan settlement with an associated cemetery alongside the road running S. from the *colonia* was destroyed by fire in the middle of the 3rd century. In the 4th century this area and a separate area to the E. formed parts of the cemeteries of the *colonia*, which in these areas were predominantly by inhumation. The eastern area was centred on a double grave, marked by a *memoria*, forming the core around which the medieval church grew. There succeeded to the inhumation graves Frankish cemeteries of the 6th to 8th centuries. The earlier burials were mainly in wooden coffins; the later had stone-lined graves. The *memoria*, which had undergone various changes, received certain additions about 700 or a little later, at a time when there is evidence of an intensive search for graves of the martyrs. The earliest church, of which the *memoria* formed the nave, is assigned to the third quarter of the 8th century. From this beginning the development of the Carolingian church and monastery proceeded until the destruction of the church during the Viking invasion of 863. During this period a separate trading settlement grew up alongside the old Roman road to the W. of the church. In the 10th century a new church and associated monastery with a regular claustral plan were begun, probably by Archbishop Bruno of Cologne (953-65), the brother of Emperor Otto I. The layout included an episcopal castle and dwelling to the W. of the church, the whole enclosed with a massive defensive ditch. The traders were moved S. to the market place of the later town of Xanten and the Roman road was cut into by the defensive ditch. Though begun in the middle of the 10th century, the work was spread over a long period; the plan seems to have been laid down from the start.

Such, in short, is the early development of the site. Taken in conjunction with the early christian discoveries at Bonn and elsewhere, the conclusions have an importance reaching beyond the immediate region. It must be emphasized that this is a preliminary report and may need correction in detail when the very numerous finds have been worked through. The point is well brought out by the corrections here made to certain of the earlier conclusions, including points in the first and second preliminary reports published by Borger himself, some ten years ago, in *Bonner Jahrbücher*. But the main picture is convincing and it seems unlikely that the broad outline here summarized will be materially modified. The book is illustrated with a magnificent series of period plans; but here one caution is needed: some, but not all, indicate the extent of the excavations, though in every case this can be ascertained from the data provided and a careful

reading of the text. In cases where the bounds of the excavated areas are not shown, a superficial use of the plans could be misleading. There is also an excellent series of half-tone plates. No review can bring out the full value of this work which must be studied in detail. A few notes follow, mainly concerned with matters of interest to workers in comparable fields in England.

The cemetery under the later church, with its numerous tombs rising above ground level and surrounded by inhumation burials without grave-goods, amplifies the picture of the 4th-century christian cemeteries found on other continental sites. The central *memoria* was built over two men, who had met their death by violence and were buried after 348 and probably not before 361. This is a late date, but the headless male skeleton buried in another important *memoria* after 364 is a reminder that martyrdoms are known to have occurred as late as the end of the 4th century in the pagan countryside. Of even greater interest is the evidence that a systematic search for the bodies of martyrs was made at the date of the Carolingian foundation. The searchers failed to find the double grave around which the cemetery grew up and it seems that late Frankish graves of the 7th and 8th centuries were among those providing relics of the martyrs. The history of St. Albans at the time of Offa is an interesting parallel.

The plans of the Carolingian and Ottonian *monasteria* are a most valuable contribution to our understanding of church organization at this time. *Monasterium* must be understood in the contemporary sense. It was a house of clerks or canons, who lived according to rule, and was governed by the *Institutio Canonicorum* of 816. Later reformers were to deny to this type of community the term monastery. At Xanten the common way of life had been given up by the 13th century. In passing it may be noted that St. Norbert, the founder of the order of Praemonstratensian Canons Regular, was at one time a canon of Xanten.

Xanten lies in Lorraine and the custom of Lorraine formed the model for much ecclesiastical reorganization in pre-conquest England of the 11th century. Archbishop Ealdred of York and Bishops Giso of Wells and Leofric of Exeter all turned to this source. The emphasis on the common dormitory and the common refectory occurs in the relevant English documents. It is unlikely that these ephemeral reforms led to buildings on the grand scale of the Ottonian rebuilding of Xanten, which must have been approaching completion at the time when Archbishop Ealdred was in the Rhineland as the ambassador of Edward the Confessor. But many of the simpler earlier *monasteria* like the Carolingian buildings of Xanten doubtless survived. They are the models of what should be sought in late pre-conquest England.

Finally note should be taken of the archiepiscopal *Pfalz*—castle is perhaps the nearest English equivalent in this particular context—which occupied the whole western side of the Ottonian enclosure. Its layout goes back to Archbishop Bruno and the middle of the 10th century. The hall, chapel and associated buildings are advanced and sophisticated by contemporary English standards, but fall into place alongside the imperial palaces in Germany. The *turris*, first mentioned in 1096, is more surprising. Medieval pictures, supported by the excavated foundations, show that it could be described in English terms as a keep. The author modestly claims that "it must be termed one of the first feudal castles of the Lower Rhine"; a wider claim would be fully justified.

C. A. RALEGH RADFORD

*A Catalogue of the Anglo-Saxon Ornamental Metalwork, 700-1100, in the Department of Antiquities, Ashmolean Museum.* By David Hinton. 28×22 cm. xii+81 pp., 20 pls., 40 figs. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974. Price £9.50.

This catalogue, which must be warmly welcomed, contains detailed descriptions of forty ornamental metal objects in the Ashmolean Museum. The objects are those

considered by the author, David Hinton, a former departmental assistant of the Museum, to be of late Anglo-Saxon origin. It is only to be expected that there will be disagreement over a number of his selections and a few of these are referred to below. All the objects listed are illustrated not only by plates (unfortunately not of the highest quality) but also by many excellent drawings. Space has not, however, been found for any illustrations of comparative material referred to in discussion.

Hinton has chosen to model his catalogue on D. M. Wilson, *Anglo-Saxon Ornamental Metalwork, 700-1100, in the British Museum* (London, 1964), but with one significant exception. Wilson used the factual information contained in his catalogue proper as a basis for a general discussion of the artifacts themselves and of the stylistic developments which they display. Hinton has evaded this task with the compliment to Wilson that his "introductory chapters have made another general survey of metalwork superfluous" (p. xii). It is, however, ten years since these chapters were published and, important though they are and will remain, it would be unwise to regard them as a final, definitive statement. The publication in catalogue form of the only other major collection of late Anglo-Saxon metalwork would, one might have hoped, have stimulated its author to a detailed scrutiny of Wilson's conclusions.

Hinton has opted instead for "lengthier individual discussions" of the objects, and we are so rewarded in the case of the most significant objects in the collection (e.g. the Alfred and Minster Lovell jewels, the Abingdon sword and the Sandford reliquary). The approach, however, is not sustained with some of the lesser objects, which are deserving of more extensive discussion than they receive, in some cases if only to justify more fully their inclusion in the catalogue. A particular instance would be the silver gilt pin from Gilton sandpit (no. 3), which belongs to a type previously considered to be of Scandinavian origin, and indeed two related pins in the British Museum are not to be found in Wilson's catalogue. An Anglo-Saxon origin certainly seems more probable, but one would like to know the reasons that led Hinton to include it. One might also wish for further discussion in justification of his pre- rather than post-conquest date for the clasps from Mildenhall (nos. 20 and 21), and for his Anglo-Danish rather than Scandinavian origin for the small brooch from West Stow Heath (no. 35).

By including an object in his numbered list, a cataloguer is in effect making a considered statement that he believes the piece in question to be of the date and origin encompassed by his work. It must, therefore, be methodologically unsound for Hinton to have catalogued a ring (no. 40) thought to be fake, simply on the basis that it was in need of full discussion. Such a need would have been better served in an introductory chapter, where room might also have been found for other general topics that are raised briefly and then dropped.

Hinton finds it 'interesting' that the incised geometrical patterns on the two strap-ends from Sutherland (nos. 33 and 34) resemble patterns on 7th-century cloisonné jewellery and in the Lindisfarne Gospels and then concludes, without further comment, that this "is not enough to question a ninth-century date for these strap-ends" (p. 62). He omits to mention that the hoard which contained these strap-ends otherwise consisted of 8th-century Pictish penannular brooches (A. Small, C. Thomas, and D. M. Wilson, *St. Ninian's Isle and its Treasure* (1973), I, 82; II, pl. xxxvii, a and b). Is there not perhaps a case for these strap-ends also being of 8th-century date?

By including the Ixworth spur (no. 29) Hinton has added his voice, even if with reservation, to those who feel that this piece must be of late Anglo-Saxon origin. It is, however, hard to understand on what he bases the suggestion that it "might conceivably have been a pointer" (p. 46). On a further point of identification, Wilson's opinion that the Cricklade fragment (no. 7) is part of a strap-end must be laid aside; this is in fact queried by Hinton, but once again not discussed. On the grounds of its size and shape, it has recently been suggested that this fragment formed part of a mount similar to the Trewhiddle and Burghead horn-mounts (*Med. Archaeol.*, xvii (1973), 43 ff.).

Even if the absence of introductory matter will be a disappointment to some, this

is of little consequence in comparison to the gratitude that many will feel to David Hinton for having made available, in such splendid detail, this important collection of material.

JAMES GRAHAM-CAMPBELL

*An Introduction to English Runes.* By R. I. Page. 21 × 14 cm. 237 pp., 39 figs., 19 pls. London: Methuen, 1973. Price £4.65.

In his preface Dr. Page explains that this book is written for 'the informed beginner' and that it is intended not only to provide a general account of the English runes and the methods used to examine them, but also to act as the introduction to a corpus of Anglo-Saxon runic inscriptions. Accordingly he does not confine himself to a survey of the extant inscriptions known or believed to be Anglo-Saxon, but examines in some detail the background material to English runic studies and also the many problems that confront runologists. Thus the book opens with a discussion of the various applications of the words 'rune' and 'runic' and a brief account of the history of runic studies from Tudor times to the present day. It considers where, when and why runes were invented, and examines their distribution in England both geographically and chronologically. The shape of the runes is discussed, as well as the problems posed by their transcription, while a detailed examination of the futhorc, of rune names and of ambiguous rune-like characters, is followed by what is for me one of the most interesting chapters in the book, though it is of necessity one of the most speculative: 'How to use runes'. The inscriptions themselves are considered from a number of points of view, with brief discussions of their condition and state of preservation, the nature of the material on which they are inscribed, and any relevant archaeological, numismatic and historical evidence relating to the objects on which they occur.

In order to provide an introduction not just to English runes but, more specifically, to a corpus of inscriptions, Page has to cover ground that is often difficult and sometimes dangerous. Fortunately for us one of his great strengths lies in his scholarly caution and scepticism. He judiciously identifies and avoids the pitfalls that have trapped so many of his predecessors in the field and is not afraid to admit to ignorance or inability to reach a conclusion. Time and time again he reminds the reader of the need for an objective, scientific approach and the near impossibility of attaining it: "There is a subjective element in many examples of runic transliteration, and the student must recognize, accept, and be on his guard against it" (p. 58). "There will remain many unanswered and perhaps unanswerable questions, topics where certainty is impossible and we have to be content with likelihood or even possibility. The difficulty about writing a general introduction to the Anglo-Saxon runes lies in this area of uncertainty where, however hard he tries to be objective, the writer's opinion controls the way he presents the sparse data . . . All the writer can do is caution his readers to be on the watch for his prejudices" (p. 16).

At the same time, Page is not afraid to put forward new theories and explanations. Perhaps the most interesting of these is his suggested explanation of the inconsistencies on the back of the Auzon, or Franks, casket. The mixture of Old English and Latin and of two different spelling conventions in the Latin of the main text of this he suggests may be due to the fact that the rune-master had before him an original which was in Latin and some form of Roman script. This he translated and transliterated as he went along. However, half way through he forgot to do either and instead copied it directly. "Noticing his error he finished his sentence necessarily in Latin but returned to runes using a pronunciation spelling which he thought more appropriate to a vernacular script" (p. 179). This is, of course, no more than conjecture, but it is a very satisfying and plausible conjecture, and one that may help to explain more than the shifts of language and spelling convention. Thus, as Page suggests, the form *end*, 'and', for the expected

*and* or *ond*, can be explained away as the result of an error on the part of the rune-master, who started to cut the Latin *et* and then switched to Old English (though, as he will doubtless point out in his corpus, *end* as a variant of *and* is vouched for by other Old English texts). No less ingenious is Page's explanation of the puzzling *Giupæsu* as "a confused form of Latin *Giupæus*, a form of *Iudæus*, 'Jew'". For a detailed argument of his case we have again to await the publication of the runic corpus. In the meantime, however, I would venture to make the following comments on his interim "summary account". First of all, the term 'Latin' applied to the hypothetical form *Giupæus* is somewhat misleading: *Giu-* for *Ju-*, like the form *feġtaþ* for *fehtap* in the same inscription, must surely be an instance of the adoption of Anglo-Saxon non-runic spelling convention, all the more surprising here because of the existence in the futhorc of a special j-rune. Secondly, the pronunciation spelling of Latin *-æus* at this time would be *-eus*, while *Iudeus*, not *Iudæus*, is the form normally found in Latin manuscripts of the early middle ages. If *Giupæsu* is to be explained as a pronunciation spelling of a Latin word, then it would seem likely that the underlying Latin already had the confusion *-easu*. In view of the similarity of the letters *a* and *u* in certain scripts, including Anglo-Saxon minuscule, and, the error *fugiant* for *fugiunt* in the Latin part of the Auzon inscription, I would tentatively suggest that one possible explanation for this confusion could be that the rune-master's original (or his original's original) read *Iude<sup>u</sup>s*, and that the correction *u* for *a* was interpreted as an added final letter. This theory, of course, like Page's, requires us to suppose that the rune-master either tended to copy mechanically, or had a very rudimentary knowledge of Latin, but it has the advantage of not necessarily forcing us to "assume that the carver was careless, which he was not" (p. 179).

Page concludes his book with the modest statement that investigators trained in the modern, subtle, methods of linguistics are bound to derive more from the English runic inscriptions than the old-fashioned philologists, like himself, who have worked on them so far. However, in view of the new light that he throws on the more baffling inscriptions, and his scholarly approach to the subject in general, one must strongly contest the validity of this claim. *An Introduction to Runes* is a thoughtful and restrained but at the same time stimulating and provocative work. It will make all those who are interested in the study of runes look forward all the more eagerly to the appearance of Page's long-awaited corpus of Anglo-Saxon runic inscriptions.

JANET M. BATELY

*Early Christian Ireland: Introduction to the Sources* (The Sources of History, Studies in the Uses of Historical Evidence). By Kathleen Hughes. 14×22 cm. 320 pp. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1972. Price, paperback £2.25, hardback £4.00.

Early Irish history has been well served by specialists but not until very recently by scholars who would attempt syntheses on a broad historical front. The last two years, however, have seen the production of several general books on the early history of Ireland, some containing important new analyses, but often so constricted by series size and format that both student and specialist need further help in assessing the author's interpretation of sources—I am thinking in particular of Donncha Ó Corráin's work *Ireland before the Normans*. Fortunately we have now been given a first class guide by Dr. Hughes. This introduction to the rich and intricate labyrinth of Irish historical materials not only marshals the sources and the major secondary studies but also contains the fruits of her own researches into the Irish annals. For this reason alone it would be difficult to over-emphasize the importance of this book to both historians and archaeologists. Although the annals provide the framework of Irish history they are only available at present in uncritical and often misleading editions, with the notable exception of the *Annals of Innisfallen*. By clear and logical steps Dr. Hughes leads her reader through an

analysis of the various recensions, providing a guide to local bias and provenance and in so doing gives a masterly demonstration of historical method. Alongside this work on the annals are chapters dealing with the different groups of sources available to the historian. In the difficult areas of secular law and literature it is both useful and reassuring to have a guide, who not only brings one up to date with printed sources and specialist studies but who has also referred the general survey back to these same specialists for their criticism, in these chapters to Professors Binchy and Jackson respectively. In matters ecclesiastical the same clarity and deceptively simple style is maintained, no mean feat when the subject is one that Dr. Hughes has made her own.

Discussion of the contribution made by archaeology and art history is interesting and comprehensive, but disappointing because the opportunity has been missed to consider just how far one can use the magnificent series of crosses, of ornamental metal-work, and of illuminated manuscripts as historical evidence. The historian does indeed ask "fundamental general questions" of archaeology (p. 17), but he also needs to ask specific questions about particular sites and artifacts. Any claim that a particular piece can be dated to within a half or quarter century needs careful scrutiny. The degree of precision possible and the basis of the judgement are of great importance and deserve discussion in a wider context than that of excavated sites (p. 30). The central difficulty lies in dating the majority of the pieces. It would be salutary to show the historical student how the series, or rather, genealogical trees of apparently closely related pieces, may be pinned upon one inscription, a colophon that can perhaps be securely dated. The problem of absolute chronology brings one full circle to the annals and why their evidence is so important. Unlike most peoples of contemporary Europe the Irish, with minor exceptions, did not produce and use either coins or pottery, the twin props of independent archaeological dating. Another feature of Irish life of similar importance is the absence of urban communities and all that this implies; their social and economic roles came to be filled by the great monastic *paruchia*, as Dr. Hughes has shown elsewhere. Indeed when first considering the sources the remarkable unity of Ireland in the early middle ages perhaps also merits some discussion and explanation. It is so easy to accept without question that Ireland's geographical unity makes the island an historical unit, although consideration of Britain during the same period shows that this is far from usual. It is paradoxical that although politically a mosaic of tiny pieces arranged in gradually shifting groups, in culture and language Ireland was sufficiently homogeneous to be studied as a whole. The student reader might have benefited from the underlining of these obvious but very important points.

No two people, however, would write the same book on the same subject and very few could have achieved such a splendid result with such difficult materials. It would be unjust as well as a poor return to my own mentor not to end by congratulating Dr. Hughes for providing an invaluable aid and stimulus to Irish studies.

S. M. YOUNGS

*Château Gaillard, Études de castellogie médiévale*, VI (Actes du Colloque International tenu à Venlo). 27×20 cm. 205 pp., figs. and plates. Université de Caen: Centre de Recherches Archéologiques Médiévales, 1973. Price not stated.

The biennial conferences on castle studies that started informally at Château Gaillard in 1962 continue to thrive and yield valuable volumes, formerly published by the host country but now produced at Caen. There has been some variation in the flexibility of the word 'castle' in the different countries, and in Germany in particular it has been fairly generally interpreted to mean medieval settlement archaeology generally. In the volume under review only one of the seventeen contributions, that on medieval pottery in Poland, takes us away from castles altogether. Although there is a pre-

ponderance of articles dealing with excavation it is the non-excavation ones that are the most stimulating, as indeed is usually the case.

There can be no more striking example of the shortcomings of archaeological evidence alone unsupported by documentary sources than the Danish Viking camps of the Trelleborg type. Dr. Roesdahl describes her excavations at Fyrkat and her interpretation of the remains. The reviewer must confess that what she has to say seems to fly in the face of the obvious interpretation and is not very convincing. A dormitory does not require a fireplace, particularly in the spring or summer; a few wives or female slaves would leave evidence of women; if the camps were places of assembly before embarkation there would not be much evidence of destination; there could be quite different use of the forts during the period when their intended occupants were away—and so on. At all events we shall have to think harder about these ring-works even if, like prehistoric stone circles, they will always retain their secrets.

The Danish earthworks belong to that class of communal strongholds found in many parts of Europe that precede true castles, with which there may or may not be some affiliation. With the articles by Chatelain, Coulson, Janssen and Neumann we meet the castle proper, the symbol of lordship. In England, Wales or Ireland the castle is so often regarded as the stronghold of an alien ruler that the legal status it conferred on him is sometimes forgotten. Just as town walls seemed to be more important for legal status than defence, so with a castle it was a title deed to a certain status in society. Mr. Coulson's article on *rendability* (obligation to render the castle up to a superior lord) in medieval France is very revealing of the continental background to what was introduced from there into England. M. Chatelain's article on Romanesque keeps in western France—in some respects the highlight of the volume—has since appeared as a book. The discussion on the pilaster buttresses is particularly valuable, especially the fascinating suggestion that they may in origin be a skeuomorph of stockwork (horizontal logs)—if so, surely a pointer to Scandinavian origin (p. 46). These French keeps are directly related to the English ones and there is much material for discussion here. The German term *Wohntürme* reflects another aspect of keeps from that of the French word *donjons*, and could of course be applied to peels of the later middle ages where protection, not legal status, was the main purpose of the tower. In Germany, in contrast with France and England, there seems to have been some measure of continuity in the construction of keeps, for Neumann is able to cite 13th-century examples in his interesting account of mottes and keeps in the zone between the rivers Lippe and Ruhr. Dr. Janssen's paper reflects modern rather than medieval pre-occupations, since it deals with the social and constitutional historical problems of castles of the motte type.

Other papers deal with the representations of Rouen Castle and the house at Bosham on the Bayeux tapestry and—a valuable contribution—chapels in castles in the Lyon area. Chapels are mentioned in castles almost as early as castles themselves are recorded. Mr. Rigold makes a valuable study of fixed wooden bridges in English castles, which pass through a sequence of development: uprights buried in the ground, uprights mortised into plates, and trestles with lateral supports or braces. There are useful summaries of recent digging at Ludgershall and Bedford castles and accounts of several excavations in France and Germany, as well as the interesting work on the 'crannogs' at Solvig in Denmark.

M. W. THOMPSON

*The Moated Sites of Yorkshire* (The Society for Medieval Archaeology, Monograph Series, no. 5). By H. E. Jean Le Patourel. 24.5 × 18.5 cm. x+137 pp., 12 pls., 42 figs. London: The Society for Medieval Archaeology, 1973. Price £3.50.

It is not only economical to publish in pairs; it brings out the differences and negative aspects of comparable sites. Mrs. Le Patourel cites several such double-yolked

publications in her footnotes, but the rationing of space in periodicals demands a special vehicle to do justice to several sites at once. Here she gives us three, together with a brief account of a fourth in which she played little part. All lie within a small sector of the Vale of York and, although the persons responsible for having the moats dug were in each case of different status, it is fair to ask whether these four are a sample of anything. Four out of, at a guess, two hundred in the Vale, over three hundred in all Yorkshire, and hundreds more in what would seem to be smallest significant 'region' to sample, the whole north-eastern plain, of which the moat-bearing parts of Yorkshire, the Vale and Holderness, are the tips, open-ended to the S. Of course they are not meant to be a sample: they are simply three-and-a-half excavation reports, sandwiched between the first and last chapters, the Survey and the Gazetteer, because their subjects happen to be somewhere in Yorkshire. If there is a sample it is provided by lowland Yorkshire itself, a slice of the significant area. The unity is in the first and last chapters.

I apologize for this criticism, because all parts of the composite work are absolutely first-class and the modesty of presentation may obscure this fact. To take the excavations first: though in the case of one of the three principal sites, Rest Park, Mrs. Le Patourel gives full credit to the preliminary work of Messrs. Davison and Wainwright, the remainder was all under her direction. At Newstead fairly wide areas were stripped: at Rest and East Haddlesey she used the economical 'trench-method' in masterly fashion to produce complete and convincing plans, and, at Haddlesey, to find an earlier complex of slots and post-holes, later uncovered in full. To use sections with such assurance and success distinguishes the polymath scholar from the mere technician, to whom such excavations are often left today. The introductory chapter shows the same wide background-knowledge of terrain, of geology, of documentation, and of the often misleading interpretative literature. It weighs the various typologies and finds them wanting and, within its compass, is the best introduction to the whole subject yet—or would be if it were made clear that 'Yorkshire moats' are not a subject in themselves but a sample, and particularly, a sample of something less than 'English moats'. The next stage of study will have to be statistical, to determine whether or to what degree north-eastern moats differ from those of other regions. Mrs. Le Patourel notices that eastern moats in general differ from those of the W. midlands in seldom having the enclosure raised. My superficial impression is that north-eastern moats are generally wider than south-eastern, better integrated with larger watercourses; in fact, despite what Mrs. Le Patourel says, more seriously defensive (after all, this is wilder country, where the Scots could penetrate to Wharfedale in the 14th century). But only massed figures could prove it.

Moats have been less often studied for their own sake, more often for the associated structures. They cover a relatively limited band of social status. It is not difficult to extend the word 'seignorial' upwards to the lay and spiritual lords and downwards to the franklins and to look within moats for remains of superior-quality buildings, including *bâtiments d'exploitation*. I sympathize: the archaeology of buildings is central to medieval archaeology. Such buildings, however, are much the same whether moated or not and, rightly, Mrs. Le Patourel does not pursue the matter too far. On the other hand, there is full discussion of the antecedent timber buildings at Haddlesey and Newstead, both in use quite late in the 13th century and neither, it seems, very much older; yet both have holes for earth-fast posts, sometimes with sunken stylobates, and both are irregularly laid out. Haddlesey, which also has ill-set-out beam-slots, down the centre of one building and defining the other, is the subject of a special chapter by J. T. Smith, whose remarks on the conservative features of Yorkshire vernacular buildings are also relevant to Newstead. At both sites the buildings are surprisingly archaic. That at Newstead is the more interesting: its plan is more complete and it has close, and rather older(?) analogies at Ellington, Hunts., and Brookland, Surrey. That at Haddlesey provides the text for a learned essay in hypothetical reconstruction, but there is little firm evidence. The case for a ridge-post roof may be strong here, but there is often too much readiness to use

this most impractical and almost unevidenced solution. Could not the central slot have held the supports for the bridging-joint of a floor?

Many other lines of research radiate from these three, or four, productive sites. There are useful contributions to those of bricks, ridge-tiles and, especially, *late* medieval pottery, but only one find could be called a work of art—the exquisite grisaille window from Haddlesey.

S. E. RIGOLD

*Vernacular Architecture of the Lake Counties.* By R. W. Brunskill. 16×22 cm. 164 pp., 74 half-tone and line ill. London: Faber and Faber, 1974. Price £4.35.

The price should be noted; 75 per cent up (with 25 per cent fewer pages) on that of the *Illustrated Handbook of Vernacular Architecture* which emerged from Dr. Brunskill (and Faber and Faber) four years ago. Such is the pace of inflation.

On this occasion Brunskill is concerned to demonstrate those several techniques of study, principally the checklist method of survey, outlined in the *Illustrated Handbook*, by bringing them to bear on those parts of these islands he knows best: namely, the homogeneous region of the Lakeland counties. Here, as before, a photograph and a full page of admirable, annotated diagrams are used to illustrate in turn each of the region's building types. The book examines the Large House (of which there are seven categories), the Small House (four classes), Cottages (three classes), Farm Buildings (and layout), Urban Vernacular Buildings (with a brief excursus into town history), and Materials (with distribution maps). Each photograph is supported by a concise summary . . . (“ . . . the tower house had a simple rectangular plan . . . they were three storeys in height; the ground floor was set under a low segmental barrel vault . . .”).

One by one each building type is seen to succumb to the pressures of the wider world and thus to pass over the threshold of politeness into regions outside the range of the book. The cottage, for example, comes into purview only late in the 18th century (what might be said of the earlier impermanent cottage?) and out again scarcely a century later, when uniform materials, carried cheaply from distant sources, conspired to eliminate the products of the local craftsman and his traditional procedures.

Herein perhaps lies the only flaw in the book: the preoccupation with typology and system inherent in the Brunskill technique precludes a proper examination of the effects of devolution. And what, after all, is vernacular architecture but the product of devolution?

But such flaws are small when the worth of the book is finally weighed and if others in the series (for Fabers have promised a series of such handbooks) measure up to this one then vernacular studies will be very well served.

BRIAN ANTHONY

*Bodiam Castle Medieval Bridges. Hastings Augustinian Priory* (Hastings Area Archaeological Papers, nos. 1 and 2). By David Martin. 21.5×14 cm. 1, 24 pp., 2 pls., 7 figs.; 2, 48 pp., 7 pls., 18 figs. Hastings Area Archaeological Research Group, 1973. Price of no. 1 not stated, of no. 2, 75p.

These are the first of a series, printed locally and excellently (if one can tolerate that ‘sans’ type). No. 1 describes the re-excavation of bridges discovered in 1919, no. 2 the excavation of part of a priory, under a cinema; both directed by D. Martin, who is responsible for the entire reports, the lucid text, the admirable photographs and drawings, some strictly architectural. The standard throughout is far above that of most such local productions, but thin booklets are hard to refer to and hard to distribute. Why then, since the area is just outside Kent, which takes reports of such quality in its stride,

have they not the protection of the hard covers of *Sussex Archaeological Collections*? In the chapter-house of the priory, abandoned when the Old Borough decayed, a fine monument of ultimate Romanesque has been partially recovered.

S. E. RIGOLD

The following publications have also been received:

*Background to Archaeology: Britain in its European Setting.* By D. Collins, R. Whitehouse, M. Henig and D. Whitehouse. 14 × 22 cm. 116 pp., 59 figs. Cambridge: University Press, 1973. Price, hardback £2·50, paperback 95p.

*Diocletian's Palace: Joint Excavations in the South-East Quarter.* By J. and T. Marasovič, S. McNally and J. Wilkes. 24 × 31·5 cm. 49 pp., 14 figs., 26 pls., 15 plans. Split: University of Minnesota and Urbanistički zavod Dalmacije, 1972. Price \$3·00.

*The Anglo-Saxon Churches of Hertfordshire* (Herts. Local History Council, occasional paper, no. 3). By T. P. Smith. 18·5 × 24·5 cm. 42 pp., numerous figs., 8 pls. Chichester: Phillimore, 1973. Price 50p.

*A Critical Account of the Written and Archaeological Sources of Evidence concerning the Norse Settlements in Greenland* (Meddelelser om Grønland, CLXXXII, 4). By H. Jansen. 29 × 18 cm. 58 pp., illustrated. Copenhagen: C. A. Reitzel, 1972. Price not stated.

*Norske Stavkirker: Dekor og Utstyr.* By R. Hauglid. 22 × 30·5 cm. 558 pp., 39 pls. Oslo: Dreyers Forlag, 1973. Price not stated.

This book, which is intended as the first part of a larger work on stone churches, discusses the decorated wooden doorways and other fittings. New suggestions as to the origin and dating of stave church art are put forward.

*Medieval Pottery of the Oxford Region.* By D. A. Hinton. 10·5 × 15 cm. 32 unnumbered pp., 19 pls. Oxford: Ashmolean Museum, 1973. Price not stated.

*Medieval Alabaster Carvings in the Castle Museum, Nottingham.* By F. Cheetham. 17 × 22·5 cm. 62 pp., 1 fig., numerous pls. Nottingham: Castle Museum, 1973. Price not stated.

*Brasses and Brass-Rubbing in England.* By J. Bertram. 14·5 × 21 cm. 206 pp., 90 figs., numerous pls. Newton Abbot: David and Charles, 1973. Price £1·25.

*The Deserted Medieval Villages of Hertfordshire* (Herts. Local History Council, occasional paper, no. 4). By K. Rutherford Davis. Chichester: Phillimore, 1973. Price 50p.

*Hertfordshire Past and Present*, no. 13 (1973) (Herts. Local History Council). 14 × 21·5 cm. 56 pp., 5 figs., 4 pls. Chichester: Phillimore. Price 50p.