

Reviews

Das römisch-fränkische Gräberfeld von Krefeld-Gellep, 1960-1963. By Renate Pirling. 26 × 18 cm. Teil I: 246 pp., 9 pls., 7 col. pls., 9 figs., 2 folding plans. Teil II: 121 pp., 159 pls. Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag for Römisch-germanisch Kommission (Germanische Denkmäler der Völkerwanderungszeit, Ser. B, Bd. 8), 1974. Price 175 DM.

In volume XI of this journal I had the pleasure of reviewing the first two volumes of Dr Pirling's monograph on the Krefeld-Gellep cemetery: it is with equal pleasure that I turn to the third and fourth. I had nothing but praise for the first volumes and have nothing but praise for these; the same high standard of production is evident throughout, and Miss Lenartowski has continued to produce skilful and high-quality drawings, second to none in Europe. Graves 1249 to 2266 are published here, and while we wait with interest the report on the next 2,000 graves we must congratulate the author on the speed with which she has produced this book among her many other duties.

One volume comprises the catalogue and illustrations of the finds, the other a discussion of them. First we are presented with a discussion of the various types of objects found, including a section by Ilse Paar on the Roman coins. To this is added a series of short discussions on problems of the settlement and on the cultural history of the site, and also a series of specialist reports on objects and finds.

Of particular interest to Romanists will be the identification of the earliest Roman site N. of the present village and the tentative identification of the lower levels of the area of the late Roman grave-field with the site of Gelduba, mentioned by Tacitus in A.D. 69. The report on the Roman remains fills about half the book.

But to readers of this journal it is the finds from the Frankish graves which are of the greatest interest, particularly those from the rich *Fürstengrab* (no. 1782). This has already received a certain amount of attention but its full and official publication is presented here, together with coloured reproductions of some of the more important pieces. The objects found include weapons — *Spangenhelm*, shield, sword with gold and garnet knob, angon, francisca, spear, javelin and small *seax*. Among other objects found in the grave were a single gold *solidus* of Anastasius I; a gold finger ring with chalcedony bezel; gold saddle mounts inlaid with garnets and green glass (paralleled only at Ravenna); an elaborate horse-harness; buckles, strap-ends and glass, metal and wooden vessels. The grave dates from the early 6th century and clearly belongs to a man from the highest levels of society. Dr Pirling points out that this is one of the richest graves found in Germany (richer even than the grave of the royal youth excavated below Cologne Cathedral), but that it is impossible even to guess at his identity. It is a pity, therefore, that other rich graves on the site — graves perhaps of equal interest — were robbed in antiquity. The Gellep family must have been rich indeed and might be known to history.

There are some first-rate excursions in this volume by hands other than Dr Pirling. Professor Haseloff has written two short articles concerning special finds at Gellep. One is a summary account of an insular hanging-bowl escutcheon, the most southerly known example of such an object. Haseloff's second contribution concerns a pair of square-headed brooches, the ornament and form of which he treats in some detail. The ornament is seen as a late phase of Style I and not (as Werner would have it) as an early phase of Style II. Haseloff is surely right, and it is unfortunate that he was

unable to enlarge his argument to include Roth's ideas about *Schlaufenornamentik*, which were published while the Gellep report was at press. We will hear much of these brooches in future. Guido Rothhoff writes on the documentary evidence for the Gellep region in the early medieval period in an important article entitled 'Gildegavia-Keldaggouue-Gellepgau'. Rothhoff shows that until the 10th century Gellep was the eponymous centre of a district which stretched from Honenbudberg in the N. to Buderich in the S., and possibly even to Neuss.

The importance of Gellep historically and archaeologically is clearly being revealed in these publications. The medieval castle at Gellep (which now houses the archaeological material from the excavations) is seen as the successor of an important Roman and early medieval centre. In few places in Europe has such a clear and continuous settlement been traced. This type of publication, carried out with enormous energy by a scholar who has the backing of only a small staff, but is aided by enthusiastic colleagues and enlightened authorities, could well serve as a model for some of the larger English archaeological projects.

DAVID M. WILSON

Das fränkische Gräberfeld von Rübenach. By Christiane Neuffer-Müller and Hermann Ament. 26 × 18 cm. 282 pp., 64 pls., 17 text figs., 4 tables, 2 plans. Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag for Römisch-germanisch Kommission (Germanische Denkmäler der Völkerwanderungszeit, Ser. B, Bd. 7) 1973. Price 140 DM.

This is the report of the excavation of an inhumation cemetery of the 6th to 7th century, in the Rhineland near Coblenz. The excavations were interrupted by the war, during which the skeletal material was destroyed. In 1966 there was a further small-scale excavation. The motorway which prompted the investigation of the site was not the first disturbance it had suffered. In the last century a road cut across the site, leaving separate E. and W. areas. Grave-robbing apparently began at a very early date and continued until recently. Thus the cemetery cannot be said to be complete. Nevertheless, with about three-quarters of an estimated original total of 1,100 to 1,200 burials, it does form one of the largest of such cemeteries to be fully excavated and published.

The illustrations, catalogue and descriptions of the material are thorough and clear, although it is a pity that, at least for the 1966 excavations, it was not possible to publish a complete series of detailed grave plans, rather than a selection. The most interesting feature of the book is the fact that it has been written by two people with rather different approaches to the material. The first part, by C. Neuffer-Müller, contains a description and classification of the material according to the system already worked out by K. Böhner. Any detailed criticism of this section would involve discussion of Böhner's work, which will not be attempted here. H. Ament in the second part relies to some extent on this classification but uses it in a different way. Instead of expanding typologies established elsewhere, he attempts to use the distributions of different classes of finds within the cemetery to discover the relative chronology of the site, which he then relates back to absolute dating. This use of horizontal stratigraphy is not always possible, since not all sites develop in a regular way, using one area and then moving to another. But here it does seem to provide a convincing explanation of the cemetery, showing its growth around a central nucleus of the graves of a man and of a horse, at first extending in all directions then only to the E. It is perhaps surprising that the grave thought to have been the focus of the cemetery should have had no grave-goods, although apparently it was not disturbed. It is also true that grave-robbing has removed much of the evidence, especially for the richer classes of find such as brooches or swords. But probably there always would have been larger quantities of the poorer type, such as pottery, which Ament uses. It may be that the incompleteness of the material limits the plausibility of the discussion as to size of population, social structure and historical

reconstruction. But most sites can only yield incomplete information and this section does show the kind of questions which can be asked, and possibly answered, if a cemetery is treated as a complex of associated features rather than as a source of supply for stylistic typologies.

CATHERINE HILLS

Aspects of Anglo-Saxon Archaeology. Sutton Hoo and Other Discoveries. By Rupert Bruce-Mitford. 25 × 19 cm. 356 pp., 112 pls., 61 figs. London: Victor Gollancz, 1974. Price £12.50.

This lavishly illustrated book brings together the author's occasional papers about various aspects of the Sutton Hoo ship-burial published during the past twenty-five years and includes a general interpretation of the discovery in advance of the definitive publication by the British Museum due to appear under his direction shortly. Some of the chapters already published elsewhere have been substantially revised and expanded to incorporate new interpretations. Four are entirely new. As stated in the preface the book is designed to simplify note references in the major publication in which it will be cited throughout. A secondary but scarcely less important object is to draw together these papers, many of which are difficult to come by in convenient form and to act as a less expensive means of access to the main conclusions of the coming major work.

The collection is a fascinating series, in which many of the tentative opinions and reconstructions put forward in the early days after 1939 have been either modified or entirely laid aside. This was inevitable when a discovery of this calibre was made under the shadow of impending war, when it was fortunate to be able to complete the immediate fieldwork and stow the finds in safety before the bombs began to fall.

The present reviewer is not competent to comment on a number of the chapters, which deal with various matters involved in a study of the Sutton Hoo find. They range through a variety of topics which involve detailed consideration of the splendid jewellery and its analogues, and the processes of laboratory reconstruction which have produced, among other things, a change of what was thought to be a harp into a lyre, and a soundly based and more convincing presentation of the true form of the helmet. In the case of the helmet its first reconstruction was only impressive from its obvious uniqueness as the sole face-mask helmet in its class and the magnificence of its decoration. In other respects it appeared to be impracticable in wear and slightly foolish in expression. Now it is a grimly menacing object worthy of a war lord and Bretwalda of ancient time. Associated with this helmet theme there are chapters on the background of the figured bronze plaques decorating the head-piece and also a full account of the study and reconstruction of the Benty Grange helmet, a more truly native piece and the only other example known from Britain in this period.

The same process of intensely careful re-examination has also given the elegant stag figure its rightful place as the missing terminus of the whetstone-sceptre, surely an emblem of kingly office, and removed it from the large iron stand. The latter unique and enigmatic object still lacks decisive explanation of its purpose though the possibility of its descent *longo intervallo* from the Roman military *signum* remains. The author provides persuasive and convincing arguments for this interpretation and believes, rightly in my view, that we have here an example of the type of object which may have been carried by Edwin of Northumbria's *signifer* as testified by Bede. Its form, significantly like a Roman *signum*, could have been arrived at by a misunderstanding of the Roman original as figured on coins.

Two of the chapters examine the geographical and archaeological setting of the royal cemetery at Sutton Hoo. Bede has told us that the East Anglian kings had a residence at Rendlesham 4 miles N. of the burial site and in 1862 another lesser and plundered

ship-burial of the same period was found not far away by the estuary of the R. Alde in the parish of Snape.

An intensive examination of the Rendlesham area has so far failed to reveal the site of the royal residence though various place-names and other possible pointers, including a small cremation cemetery, have been brought to light and may yet lead to its recovery. Consideration of the nature of a *vicus regius* of a 7th-century king leads to a valuable discussion of the evidence for the association of pagan shrines and early Christian churches with royal residences of this period, both at Yeavinger and Goodmanham in Britain and abroad at Old Uppsala and Jellinge. The chapter on the Snape ship-burial also marshals all the evidence about that find, which although it had been robbed of all its valuable content except a fine gold ring, which has providentially been recovered from private possession, is entirely in the same cultural and political context as Sutton Hoo. Though smaller (48 ft. long as against 89 ft. at Sutton Hoo) the vessel used in the burial was of precisely the same type in lines and mode of construction.

Full justice has also been done to the part played by Mr Basil Brown in the 1938 excavations at Sutton Hoo which preceded the main discovery. We now have a verbatim publication of his diary for that period. It clearly illustrates his careful and intelligent approach to his task in excavating several of the lesser mounds at the site including one which contained a robbed boat-burial. His determination to overcome practical difficulties and the educative process by which he arrived at his capacity to recognize what he was involved with as soon as he had begun work on the ship-barrow in 1939 are well shown. Without his swift appreciation of the existence of a large boat under the mound irreparable damage might have been done to its surviving form as a precise pattern of iron ship nails, and its subsequent disengagement as an almost complete entity made impossible.

Prime importance attaches to the first chapter which summarizes present opinion about the significance of the great ship-burial in some seventy pages. This is an admirable and extremely judicious examination of the complex matters which have to be weighed up in coming to a conclusion. A new interpretation of the evidence of the Frankish coins found in the purse (pay for the rowers in the last journey to the next world?) makes it possible to date the burial at or before 625. Thus it can hardly be doubted that Rædwald must be the East Anglian king involved in this royal memorial containing unique symbols of authority and splendid treasures. He was the most important member of the Wuffinga dynasty then ruling East Anglia and held the title of Bretwalda after the death of its first holder, Ethelbert of Kent.

Was Sutton Hoo an inhumation burial or a cenotaph? A commemoration of Rædwald in accordance with pagan rites involving memories of the Swedish origin of his dynasty would not be impossible in view of his dubious position as one who compromised between Christianity and paganism as reported by Bede, nor would this of necessity preclude the inclusion of some Christian objects in his pagan-style memorial, even if his body had been buried according to Christian rites elsewhere.

The acid sand so generously present on the Sutton Hoo site could be relied upon to destroy all inhumed human and animal remains with the possible exception of teeth, but none of these was found. The only hope of proving the former presence of organic remains lay with chemical analysis of the burial area for phosphate content, which was not feasible in 1939, though it has since been performed. Thus it will be interesting to hear the official pronouncement on the true character of the site in the forthcoming definitive publication. The re-examination of the burial area in the ship during the excavations of 1965-9 is briefly described on p. 174 as follows:

“In addition, soil samples were taken throughout the burial chamber area, where in the bottom of the boat the rivet-pattern had not survived, on a grid of one foot intervals. A good deal of solid cream-coloured phosphatic matter was also found in the burial chamber, particularly in the region where the shield and sword had lain, probably derived from a set of ivory gaming-pieces. This evidence has

been duly assimilated into the study of the cenotaph problem in the British Museum's definitive publication . . ."

And so we remain in suspense. In conversation the author has indicated a belief in an inhumation, all visible traces of which have been consumed by the acid sand in which it was finally involved when the chamber roof fell in. As excavator the reviewer is less convinced until decisive evidence for an inhumation can be produced. His reserve is based on the fact that no objects of a personal kind were found, which would have accompanied a richly-clothed body either at the place where it might be expected to have lain among the regalia and weapons or anywhere else in the burial chamber. The man buried at Snape had a fine gold ring but no ring, pendant, wrist-clasps, tag-ends or similar accessories found their place in the Sutton Hoo deposit and the scrupulous re-examination of the area and the spoil heaps of 1939 has produced nothing of this character. There were also no surviving traces of any bed and no animals or their furniture, a fact also recently confirmed. Animal sacrifices were normal and lavish in the royal cremations at Old Uppsala and also in the Vendel boat-graves. The ship- and boat-burials in this part of Anglo-Saxon England are Swedish in inspiration in keeping with the origins of the Wuffinga dynasty and as such are unique on this side of the North Sea; if the Sutton Hoo deposit proves to be a real grave its rites must have been modified by its Anglo-Saxon environment, in which animal sacrifices played no part.

A chapter is devoted to the re-examination of the site in 1965-9. Knowing the conditions of the site well and the state of the excavation as it was left wide open in August 1939, with no attempt at filling, it is surprising to learn how far the lower half of the 'ship-ghost' had survived the hazards of weather and damage during tank training on the heath in the war years. But one thing is puzzling. It was an obvious task for the new excavators to sift spoil heaps and to make a thorough re-examination of the burial chamber to detect phosphates; equally important was the need to recover all surviving evidence about the construction of the ship. But what was the real purpose of this very expensive business of making a fibre-glass cast from plaster moulds of the remaining form of the ship in its sad decay? The survey of ship's lines made by Science Museum staff in 1939, when all but the burial chamber area and the extremities of bow and stern still showed the nail patterns as they had been on the day of burial, must surely be the prime document for the actual form of the ship, even though no doubt some important details remained to be recovered in a more leisurely examination than was possible in 1939. The only justification for this would seem to be the gaining of valuable technical experience in case another ship-burial should occur in similar soil conditions, a not impossible future development on the coast of East Anglia.

To conclude, this is a splendid publication which whets the appetite for more elaborate treatment of its subject which is still to come. The process of learning more about Sutton Hoo has now been protracted over many years and although many may have been restive during the period of waiting the long time afforded for this brilliant study in depth has been well spent. This was the most important single find made to date in British archaeology and it has had remarkably far-ranging influence in opening new vistas in both English and European affairs in a period which is still full of obscure places. A great debt is owed to Dr Bruce-Mitford and his team of helpers for this happy outcome.

C. W. PHILLIPS

Britain before the Norman Conquest. 30 × 21.5 cm. 68 pp., 2 maps. The Ordnance Survey, Southampton, 1974. Price £3.00.

It is always a pleasure to welcome new maps from the Ordnance Survey, and this new production is no exception. The compilers here set out deliberately not to clutter

the maps excessively (two sheets rather awkwardly divided half-way between Scarborough and Whitby — but then Britain *is* awkward to divide!). Their main object is to suggest racial distribution, black for Anglo-Saxon, red for Scandinavian, and blue for Celtic, and they include matter vital for an understanding of late Anglo-Saxon England, the boundary of the Danelaw, towns in their various categories, the *burhs* of the Hidage and of the Mercian Register, and much information on ecclesiastical sites (ranging back here to Taylor's period A, c. 600–800), royal residences, Viking graves, finds and hoards, Anglo-Saxon mints, and fortifications whether of a temporary or of a permanent nature. A special feature is the care taken to show Scandinavian place-names of two specific types, the so-called Grimston hybrids that are peculiar to the English Danelaw, and the elements in *-by* which are common in form if not in meaning to all British territory settled by the Scandinavians. They also include for Scotland and the Isles the representative place-name element *-bolstaðr* which suggests the extent of Scandinavian settlement (though use of the element *-dalr* to indicate Scandinavian sphere of influence would have brought in more of the northern mainland). The maps are clear and valuable as teaching instruments. Some slips in style and content need, however, to be put right in subsequent printings of the introduction. More precision would be helpful in discussion of the boundary agreed on by Alfred and Guthrum (between *Wessex* and the Danelaw from the upper Severn to the Thames — and along the river *Lee*?); Edgar did not *reign* from 946–75; and there is inconsistency over the date of the goings-on at Chester. Sherborne was most certainly *not* a new see in the reign of Edward the Elder and there is a slip in Durham's date (995 *not* 955). Some omissions seem hard to justify: Mersea is of vital importance for an understanding of the Alfredian campaigns, Congressbury is left without her twin sister, Banwell. The necessary complete absence of Ireland leaves a vital element out of the story: by contrast the Isle of Man and the inset maps of Shetland and Orkney provide full and fruitful evidence of Scandinavian presence. Professor Cameron's seminal papers on the Danelaw demand inclusion in the bibliography. The massive recent work of Gillian Fellows Jensen should also appear: her latest views on settlement in Yorkshire make it all the more important to have this new map of the Grimston hybrids. For *Sawker* read Sawyer! It is useful to have this valuable teaching guide readily and easily available.

H. R. LOYN

The Archaeology of Late Celtic Britain and Ireland, c. 400–1200 A.D. By Lloyd Laing. 24 × 16 cm. xxvii + 451 pp., 32 pls., 151 figs. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1975. Price, hardback £11; University Paperback £4.50.

The lack of a comprehensive introduction to the early medieval archaeology of Britain and Ireland has long been felt. Dr Laing's latest book is an attempt to fill this gap, but the result can be greeted only with reservation. *Late Celtic Britain and Ireland* is divided into two parts, the first being devoted to a regional field archaeology, and the second to material culture. In both the reader is introduced to a mass of material, site following site, and object following object, at a rate with which only the most dedicated will wish to keep up. The major disappointment, however, lies in the limited exposition of the material, and in its inaccuracy, both in generalization and in detail.

The book's title is itself controversial. Laing's use of 'late Celtic' in this context is one that will lead to further outcry against 'the extra-linguistic abuse' of the term 'Celtic' by archaeologists. It is a term no less "emotive, restrictive or vague" than the alternatives castigated by Laing (p. xxvi), one of which — 'Early Christian' — he in fact uses throughout the text!

In his preface Laing admits that he has accorded the church "inadequate treatment" and has "minimized" the importance of Ireland because of the relevant publications of Professor Thomas and the de Paors. Excellent though *Early Christian Ireland*

remains, it is over fifteen years old and the de Paors are the first to admit that much of it is now out of date. That Ireland remains our major source of information on many facets of the period emerges even from Laing, who to illustrate a full range of wooden and leather objects, of iron weapons, axes and tools, has had to fall back exclusively on Irish examples.

Quite as remarkable is his decision to relegate manuscripts to an appendix on the grounds that they are "perhaps more suitably dealt with by the art historian than by the archaeologist" (p. xxv). It is, one would have thought, a truism that a manuscript, however ornate, is as much an artifact for study by the archaeologist as a ring-fort or a belt-buckle; the basic methods remain the same.

One consequence of Laing's approach is that the chapter entitled "Art and Craftsmanship" is concerned solely with ornamented metalwork, with the exception of seven lines on leather budgets, tacked somewhat incongruously on the end. Elsewhere during a discussion of the uses of stone (p. 257), there is no mention of carving, as if the high crosses were of no consequence alongside whetstones and weights.

This deliberate minimization of the archaeology of the church and its outstanding achievements has left Laing without the obvious theme that could have brought unity to his book, without which it has deteriorated into a series of catalogues. Balance in approach is a reasonable expectation for the general reader of an introductory textbook. Indeed, it is the author's responsibility to provide him with such.

Laing is right to insist (p. xxvii) that a student does not initially require the *minutiae* of the subject (although it is not clear how he reconciles this view with his own lists of forty types of stick-pin and twenty-one types of bead!). What is required is a synthesis that indicates how people of the period lived and that gives some idea of the quality of their lives. Laing's emphasis is, however, on *where* people lived and on *what* they used. His approach is exemplified by the fact that there is a whole chapter devoted to "Subsistence Equipment" whilst "The Economy of the Early Christian Celts" is dismissed in less than four pages.

A more narrative style is adopted for the chapters on the Norse settlements of the N. and W. This is a subject which requires a wide knowledge of the Scandinavian background if it is to be adequately treated. Laing's generalizations on such subjects as the art-styles and agricultural practices of the Norse settlers do not stand up to close scrutiny, and are as indicative of this deficiency on his part as is his use of *Landnámabók*, the Icelandic 'Book of Settlements', in the following context, "the first Norse settlers at Jarlshof probably made their *landnamabok* early in the ninth century" (p. 187).

Typical of Laing's approach to much of the material is his treatment of the Norse silver hoards of Ireland (p. 231). This consists of a straight summary of a preliminary study published in 1961 by Dolley and Ingold (not Dolley alone, as Laing, pp. 414 and 432). There is no reference to the provisional nature of this paper, nor to its age, and so the reader may get the impression that Laing is recounting the latest research on the subject. There is no mention, even in the bibliography, of Dolley's Sylloge volume, *The Hiberno-Norse Coins in the British Museum* (London, 1966), with its seminal essay on the Viking-age coin-hoards of Britain and Ireland.

Laing's 'scissors-and-paste' technique lays traps for himself, as one example will illustrate. He first states (pp. 199-200) that "settlement in the Western Isles followed the establishment of Norse bases in Ireland", but later declares (p. 225) that the first Norse raids on Ireland were conducted "probably from the Hebrides". The first is (or was) the opinion of Alan Small, the second that of Sir Thomas Kendrick — of Laing's opinion we remain ignorant. The reader, who deserves some guidance through these troubled waters, is left to fend for himself.

Late Celtic Britain and Ireland is not an easy book to use for the index is far from adequate for one that ranges so widely. Whilst the main division of the book into two parts is clear and sensible, there are a number of anomalies. Why are accounts of hoards and high crosses confined to Part 1 (the field guide)? The discussion of "The Irish in

the South-west", in Part 1, should at least have a cross-reference to the discussion of grass-marked pottery in Cornwall in Part 2. Chapter and section headings can also mislead. One would not think to look for a discussion of the Scottish round towers in a section entitled "Pictish Ecclesiastical Architecture", nor expect the treatment of such luxuries as imported Mediterranean pottery in a chapter entitled "Subsistence Equipment".

Such lists of sites and catalogues of finds, as Laing provides, can be of considerable value as a starting-point for future workers. Specialists may have reservations on the close dates he applies to some of the ornamental metalwork, as, indeed, to his interpretations of his own Mote of Mark material. It is distressing to find the Fowler brooch typology not just perpetuated but elaborated; it has served its purpose and is due for retirement. But these are matters of opinion and interpretation; Laing's account of the material must be judged chiefly on its accuracy.

The errors are, alas, too numerous to list — the majority of the forty pages of bibliography and notes being in need of one or more corrections. For example, titles of foreign periodicals are often mis-spelt, and consistency is lacking in the treatment of foreign names with foreign letter forms. The same book is cited correctly and incorrectly in consecutive notes (p. 430, notes 18 and 19). Dr Henry is well known for her book entitled *Irish Art during the Viking Invasions, 800-1020* (p. 418), but these invasions are twice re-dated, to 1020-1170 (p. 410), and then to 1070-1120 (p. 414).

In addition to such bibliographical errors and inconsistencies, there are numerous more important textual mistakes, of which again only a few can be indicated, but sufficient to illustrate the nature and range that the reader may encounter. These include mistaken site locations (e.g. the silver hoard from Tarbat, Ross-shire, is an E. coast not a W. coast find, p. 196), and errors in details of finds (e.g. the 'Tara' brooch is provenanced — to Bettystown, co. Meath — and was *not* found with other brooches, pp. 315 and 360). There are inconsistencies in dating (e.g. the deposition of the Talnotrie coin-hoard is given both as *c.* 910 and as "around 870", pp. 39 and 202). Discrepancies exist between the distribution-maps of imported pottery and the location of finds as given in the text. One misses from the maps the A-ware from Iona (cf. p. 79 and fig. 83), the B-ware from London (cf. p. 275 and fig. 85), and the E-ware from Craig Phadrig (cf. p. 68 and fig. 89); all are finds which significantly increase the previous known distribution of these wares. Examples of this tendency by Laing to forget what he himself has written can be multiplied. The Iona A-ware is again lost from memory by p. 275, where it is stated that A-wares are "absent from Scotland". On p. 174 we are told that "a round tower was added to the west gable" of St Kevin's Church, Glendalough, although two pages later we are assured that round towers were "never attached to" their associated churches.

The reader already confused by such matters will find the illustrations of little help. That Methuen considered some of the plates worthy of publication is a matter of some surprise, since several are baffling in their obscurity. Scales are not provided, although this is perhaps preferable to the captions of some text figures where the scales are *wrongly* given (eleven out of the fourteen brooches in figs. 111-14 have incorrect scales). Captions may be unreliable in other ways, those of the bead figure (fig. 130) being a case in point, since the numbering does not correspond fully with the text descriptions, unless corrected as follows: 2 = 4, 4 = 5, 5 = 7, 6 = 8, 7 = 9.1, 8 = 9.2, and 9 = 9.3. The overall standard of line illustrations leaves much to be desired. Who, for instance, could expect to identify Hiberno-Norse coins from fig. 68? The drawing of an Irish brooch (fig. 113, no. 28) shows, poorly represented, its reverse in a sequence otherwise illustrated by obverses and omits the bar which links its terminals. It is in fact a pseudo-penannular brooch and not a penannular brooch as Laing would have us believe.

The author's admirable intentions have been submerged by his inaccuracies. The result is a careless and misleading compilation. It is distressing that such a book, written primarily for students, should set such poor standards for those it might otherwise have informed and inspired.

Les Structures du Latium médiéval: le Latium méridional et la Sabine du IXe siècle à la fin du XII siècle. By P. Toubert. 2 vols. (Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, CCXXI). 23.5 × 15.15 cm. 1500 pp., 15 pls., 547 figs. Paris and Rome, 1973. Price 245 fr.

The 'structures' analysed in Pierre Toubert's book on Lazio between the 9th and the 12th centuries are not those which normally occupy the medieval archaeologist, for his immense work of exactly 1,500 pages is essentially derived from an extended study of the written sources. A former student at the French School at Rome, which has now published his researches, Toubert covers almost every aspect of life in the lands surrounding the papal city of Rome across 400 formative years during which that area saw many decisive developments in the progress of western European affairs. This is undoubtedly one of those works the significance of which extends far beyond the immediate locality studied. Toubert illuminates numerous fundamental matters, social, economic, political and religious. He gives detailed discussions of archives, narrative sources and notarial records; geography, topography and place-names; land-holding, crops, agricultural techniques, drainage and transport; settlements and desertions; family groupings, legal systems, servile conditions and tenorial contracts; bishoprics, parochial problems and tithes; the Roman bureaucracy and the local nobilities; feudal relationships, public justice and papal government. All these topics will certainly receive prolonged scholarly attention elsewhere. The present notice attempts no more than a strictly limited consideration of the contribution of archaeological techniques to so comprehensive an area-study, a matter of particular concern to that group of British scholars which has its own tradition of interests, archaeological and otherwise, in medieval Lazio.

At the very heart of Toubert's thesis stands the process of "incastellamento", that is the establishment, usually on a previously uninhabited summit, of *castra* or *castella*, which were villages and not castles, though many of them did have a fortress or *rocca* (p. 314, fn. 1). According to Toubert these foundations took place mainly after about 900, and they were not the result of frightened peasants fleeing from the insecurities of the Roman plains to the safety of prehistoric or Etruscan hilltop sites, something which may indeed have occurred in earlier centuries, but rather of a surge of colonization in which the *domini* or *dominatores* settled the rural population into newly-conquered lands centred on the *castra*. For Toubert this was an expansive impulse of agrarian reconquest and demographic euphoria, but it brought to an end a period of pioneering and peasant freedoms, as the noble *populatores* robbed the inhabitants of their liberties and reduced them to a state of dependence, tying them to land and landlord with feudal bonds, establishing effective systems of law and administration, rigidizing family and marital structures, and consolidating these lordly advantages through the elaboration of private, seigniorial churches.¹

Faced with the scarcity of documents earlier than the 10th century and with difficulties in the interpretation of the place-names, Toubert does make considerable use of non-written materials. In addition to the coin evidence, he studies the "milieu naturel", the road and river systems, the cartography and topography, the vegetation and the animal life, and he provides geological maps and photographs of abandoned *castra*. Toubert's work raises many other points which involve the archaeologist: the fate of the late-classical *villa* estates; the chronology of settlement, foundation and desertion; and the material culture of the *castrum* itself, of its houses, churches and defences, its burials, pottery and foodstuffs. Some work in this region has already been done. The

¹ P. Toubert, 'L'Italie rurale aux VIIIe-IXe siècles: essai de typologie domaniale', *I problemi dell'Occidente nel secolo VIII*, 1 (*Settimane di Studi del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo*, xx, Spoleto, 1973), develops some of these points.

Italian Giuseppe Tomassetti and his successors concentrated particularly on the topography, but there has been very little medieval excavation in an area where post-classical studies have to compete with Rome and Ostia as well as with the exciting possibilities of Etruscan archaeology. Thomas Ashby, for long Director of the British School at Rome, continued Tomassetti's topographical work, and about 1950 Ashby's successor, John Ward-Perkins, initiated a survey of the zone W. of the Tiber defined as 'South Etruria'. This programme came to include the systematic exploration of the ground and the collection of surface material belonging to all periods and including medieval sherds; the extensive use of aerial photographs; the exploration of post-Roman roads and bridges; the identification of abandoned medieval sites; a number of small-scale medieval excavations; pioneer work on the medieval pottery, notably by David Whitehouse; and some limited utilization of the written sources. This initiative, something of a novelty in a Mediterranean context, represented the implantation of techniques developed in N. Europe, and collaboration came, in fact, from the Swedish and Danish institutes in Rome. On the medieval side progress has been slow and the results both partial and only partially published, while medievalists are by no means agreed as to the interpretation of the materials assembled.²

Toubert does make very general references to some of this work in so far as it was available to him³ but he faced certain difficulties; for example, the British School's major medieval excavation of what appear to be the buildings of the papal *domusculta* at Santa Cornelia is still unpublished. The medieval activities in Lazio of the British, Danish and Swedish schools have been concentrated largely in the zone W. of the Tiber, partly because all three institutions lie in a part of Rome from which the Via Cassia and the Via Flaminia lead directly into S. Etruria. Furthermore the volcanic nature of the country W. of the Tiber sets it geologically, and therefore to some extent historically, apart from the rest of Lazio. Above all, S. Etruria is a region which contained few towns and no great monastery, and which consequently possesses little or nothing in the way of early medieval archives and chronicles of the type provided across the Tiber by great houses such as Farfa and Subiaco. Toubert had good reason to exclude S. Etruria from his study of medieval Lazio, thus side-stepping several unresolved debates and difficulties. On the other hand, when he complains of the absence of medieval excavations in his own chosen zone E. and S. of Rome, while suggesting both that excavations should be conducted on sites for which better documentation is available and that certain archaeologists utilize only "mediocre" and "second-hand" historical information, he is commenting on deficiencies and difficulties many of which lie beyond the province of the archaeologist.⁴ Meanwhile it cannot be said that archaeological research has added appreciably to Toubert's account of medieval Lazio. Lacking his own excavation team, he had little choice but to approach the problems of his region in the way he did; it is, however, worth considering how the picture might yet be changed.

In 1337, during an enforced stay at Capranica near Sutri, the poet Petrarch set out his speculations and intuitions concerning the origins of that hilltop village. Petrarch, humanist and philologist, noticed no trace of Roman survival, while he interpreted the place-name as a "hill of goats", adding "the situation of the place and its obvious fertility were, as they became known, responsible for attracting, little by little, a fair number of inhabitants, who created a citadel for themselves on a mound of sufficient

² Results and references in *Papers of the British School at Rome*, especially vol. xxxvi (1968); on the excavations, see summary in D. Whitehouse, 'Sedi medievali nella Campagna romana: la *Domusculta* e il villaggio fortificato', *Archeologia e geografia del popolamento* (Quaderni Storici, xxiv, Ancona, 1973); on the survey, see summary in A. Luttrell, 'La Campagna a nord di Roma: archeologia e storia medievale', *Colloquio Internazionale di Archeologia Medievale: Palermo 1974* (Palermo, forthcoming).

³ The most important presentation of S. Etruria survey materials, in *Papers British School Rome*, xxxvi (1968), came out some time after 1968, while Toubert's bibliography, which contains very few titles dating later than 1969, makes it clear that his thesis was completed long before its publication date.

⁴ Toubert, pp. 267, 303-5, 334, 351-2, 629.

eminence . . .”⁵ Such was Petrararch’s “incastellamento” theory. His “*arx eminenti satis tumulo fundata*” recalls the typical *mons ad castellum faciendum* studies by Toubert. Petrararch’s theory is not unlike that advanced by Ward-Perkins on the basis of surface pottery finds from hundreds of late Roman sites, of the excavations at Santa Cornelia, and of the description in the *Liber Pontificalis* of the foundation of the papal estate or *domusculta* of Capracorum by Hadrian I in about 780, that is that “the Roman pattern of open farming settlement was still a going concern when Hadrian created his *domusculta*”, but that by about 1000 “the actual inhabited centres were no longer in the open countryside, but perched securely on the nearest fortifiable hill”. The new, defensible sites first appear in the written documents in the 10th and 11th centuries. Papal authority had collapsed during the 9th and 10th centuries; the Roman roads were partially abandoned; and the inhabitants of the old countryside fled to the security of the hills.⁶ Toubert does not deny that some such movement took place, but he differs as to the chronology and the causes; the 12th-century chroniclers, and many who have followed them, have seen the origins of “incastellamento” in invasions and insecurity, but Toubert firmly belittles the effects of Muslim and other incursions. He sees the advance of “incastellamento” as the most significant development in the history of Lazio between the 9th and 12th centuries, and insists that it was an organized and expansive colonizing movement, not an uncoordinated flight from barbarian invasions and other dangers.⁷

Toubert maintains that “incastellamento” took place predominantly in the 10th century. To what extent does, or could, archaeological evidence modify his chronology? For the period down to about A.D. 600, to which point the pottery can be dated with some confidence,⁸ the evidence of the surface finds is clearly of major importance; but there agreement ends. It may be that many villages are not documented before the 10th century merely because so few documents survive. The interpretation of the excavations of the church dedicated to Santa Cornelia is confused by the fact that while the *Liber Pontificalis*, in a notably ambiguous passage, placed this church on the *domusculta* of Capracorum, the place later known as Capracorum is some 17 km. N. of the excavated site.⁹ Toubert, with his relatively early written evidence from Farfa and elsewhere, repeatedly admits that the first signs of “incastellamento” can be found in the 9th or even the late 8th century,¹⁰ and most parties to the debate would probably agree. Philip Jones, for example, places the beginnings of a move to the hilltops as early as the 3rd century, though he too emphasizes the rapidity and vigour of this change from the 9th and 10th centuries onwards.¹¹

Much of this debate turns on the evidence of the pottery, which has provided a number of sub-controversies, themselves hanging on interpretations of the written evidence. The key pottery type has been the Forum ware found beneath the church at Santa Cornelia. Assuming that this was the first church clearly mentioned in the *Liber Pontificalis* as being founded and built around 780,¹² there is a firm early date for Forum

⁵ A. Luttrell, ‘Capranica before 1337: Petrararch as Topographer’, *Cultural Aspects of the Italian Renaissance: A Collection in Honour of P. O. Kristeller* (Manchester, 1976).

⁶ Summary and references in J. Ward-Perkins, ‘Central Authority and Patterns of Rural Settlement’ in P. Ucko *et al.* (ed.), *Man, Settlement and Urbanism* (London, 1972), 876–8; details in *Papers British School Rome*, xxxvi (1968), 161–79.

⁷ On the invasions, Toubert, pp. 87 fn. 2, 308–13, 523 fn. 1, 970–2.

⁸ See now J. Hayes, *Late Roman Pottery* (London, 1972).

⁹ Cf. P. Partner, ‘Notes on the Lands of the Roman Church in the Early Middle Ages’, *Papers British School Rome*, xxxiv (1966).

¹⁰ Toubert, pp. 311, 321, 328–30, 450–93, 1355–6.

¹¹ P. Jones, ‘La storia economica: dalla caduta dell’Impero romano al secolo XIV’ *Storia d’Italia*, II, pt. 2 (Turin, 1974), 1589–91, 1596–8, 1636, 1639–42 *et passim*. Cf. J. Ward-Perkins, ‘Etruscan Towns, Roman Roads and Medieval Villages: the Historical Geography of Southern Etruria’, *Geog. Jnl.*, cxxviii (1962), 399.

¹² L. Duchesne (ed.), *Liber Pontificalis*, I (revised ed., Paris, 1955), 506. For an interim report on the still unpublished excavations, *Papers British School Rome*, xxxvi (1968), 164; the interpretation of the written evidence remains debatable.

ware and one which is not affected by controversies concerning the problematical whereabouts of the *domusculta Capracorum*. The question of how long Forum ware remained in use is a somewhat different matter, but an important one which requires more attention. On the basis of a growing number of Forum ware finds in S. Etruria, Whitehouse argues that some hilltop sites were founded before the 10th century, but he buttresses his argument with evidence of Muslim raids and general insecurity; this is not the process of "incastellamento" described by Toubert. Whitehouse discusses, as an example of the archaeological evidence, the three pieces of Forum ware excavated by Timothy Potter under the church at Mazzano Romano in the heart of S. Etruria; the absence in the lower levels there of the Sparse-glaze ware, which has been dated by Whitehouse slightly later than Forum ware, suggests a date around 800 for Mazzano, though the first surviving written reference to that *castellum* is as late as 945.¹³ This is a typical example of the way in which the pottery appears to give earlier dates than the written documents. It seems likely, in fact, that excavations in the zone studied by Toubert would provide earlier occupation dates for many of the sites he assigns, on the evidence of the documents, to the 10th century.

The dangers of arguing from small quantities of sherds are evident. The pottery, even if it could be more firmly dated, cannot solve all problems; the absence of Forum ware does not necessarily imply that any particular site is a late one; the pottery cannot indicate what proportion of *castra* were founded before the 10th century, nor what kind of settlement took place on a given site, nor when a *fundus* became a *castrum*. Further study of the pottery is, none the less, important. Potter has recently suggested, on the basis of work in the Ager Faliscus just W. of the Tiber, that the gap in the sequence between late Roman pottery of c. 600 and Forum ware of c. 780 can be filled with 'buff' and 'combed' wares, and that such a solution, if valid, would indicate a break in the continuity of occupation on Roman sites after the 6th century, with the corollary that the classical estates did not survive without modification into the 8th or 9th century.¹⁴ These suggestions are in the course of publication and have yet to be debated; the 'buff' and 'combed' wares cannot be dated securely, though it is also possible that some other type of pottery may be found to fill the gap in the sequence; hundreds of boxes of sherds would have to be searched for evidence of wares not previously taken into account, with the possibility that significant sherds were not collected but left on the ground because they were considered to be 'coarse' and therefore undatable. Potter's hypotheses are, however, likely to stimulate further work on the earlier centuries concerning which there can be little certainty at present. Furthermore, they would fit well into the picture, outlined by Toubert, of a period of abandonment in the 6th and 7th centuries; an attempt around 780 to bring unworked *fundi*, the *agri deserti*, back into cultivation as papal *domuscultae*; and a subsequent movement of "incastellamento". It may be that the retreat to hilltop sites began as early as the 3rd century; that it continued under the pressure of recurrent dangers and insecurities into the 8th and 9th centuries; that, in those centuries, it merged imperceptibly into the initial precocious waves of an expansive tide of "incastellamento", which in the 10th century became a progressive, creative surge. Thus Philip Jones judges that "many *castra* and *castella* were born, during the years of 'anarchy' in the 10th century, not only for reasons of defence but also — and perhaps more — for purposes of colonization or recolonization".¹⁵

Toubert's study of abandoned settlements falls into line with recent tendencies to emphasize that 'desertions' do not necessarily result from 'crises' but may reflect changes brought about by prosperity or colonization, or merely by the shifting of a

¹³ Whitehouse, *op. cit.* in note 2, 864–8.

¹⁴ T. Potter, forthcoming in *Archeologia Medievale*, II (1975). Toubert, p. 309 fn. 1, remarks that no barbarian cemetery has yet been found in Lazio, but for burials at Bagnoregio, admittedly on or just beyond the borders of Lazio, see M. Cagiano de Azevedo, 'Scavi a Bagnoregio: due capanne longobarde', *Colloquio Internazionale di Archeologia Medievale: Palermo 1974* (Palermo, forthcoming).

¹⁵ Jones, *op. cit.* in note 11, 1640.

village to a near-by site. The S. Etruria survey identified traces of at least seventy-five abandoned sites "between Rome and Viterbo",¹⁶ but these have yet to be dated and published, and only very few have been effectively excavated. Toubert exploits documents, maps and the surviving ruins, but not surface pottery finds, to produce lists of abandonments of the 10th, 11th and 12th centuries. He faces the familiar difficulties of placing documented toponyms on the map, of classifying existing ruins, and of identifying them in the documents; some names have changed places, some places have changed names. The terminology can be most ambiguous; deserted *castra* sometimes remained in occupation as farms or *casali*, often with a large tower, while *castra destructa* could remain in habitation and even be rebuilt. Though Toubert's 'estimations quantitatives' obviously remain approximate, they represent a major advance on all earlier lists; they also make it clear how much archaeological activity could contribute to the study of these abandonments.¹⁷

Toubert's book raises numerous issues which cannot be considered here, and points to many problems awaiting solution in the archives and in the field on both sides of the Tiber. His documents illustrate a wide range of those social and economic themes now of concern to archaeologists. On the question of housing, for example, he shows that stone rather than wood was normally preferred for building, "contrary to a notion sometimes accepted by archaeologists without a serious examination of the written sources" (pp. 334-6, 660-3). On the other hand purely archaeological techniques, such as the analysis of pollens¹⁸ or bones,¹⁹ can provide information scarcely available from other sources, as can geological considerations concerning alluvial deposits in the Tiber or elsewhere.²⁰ Only expensive large-scale excavation can answer certain questions, but more modest investigations and surface surveying do produce valuable results, especially when effectively allied to a study of the documents. Across the years, many British archaeologists and historians have benefited from experience in Italy while contributing to Italian studies something of their own heritage; S. Etruria continues to offer fruitful opportunities for such exchanges.²¹

A. LUTTRELL

Zeitschrift für Archäologie des Mittelalters, 1 (1973). Edited by W. Janssen and H. Steuer. 30 × 21 cm. 216 pp., 31 pls., 23 figs. Cologne: Rheinland Verlag with Rudolf Habelt Verlag (Bonn). Price, subscription 75 DM, single volumes 90 DM.

The scope of *Z.A.M.* is made rather clearer by the contents of the first volume than by the editors' foreword which promises a journal of medieval European archaeology (with articles to be published in English, French and German), which will include

¹⁶ M. Mallett and D. Whitehouse, 'Castel Porciano: An Abandoned Medieval Village of the Roman Campagna', *Papers British School Rome*, xxxv (1967), 114. For early notarial evidence J.-C. Maire-Vigueur, 'Les *Casali* des églises romaines à la fin du moyen âge: 1348-1428', *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome: Moyen Âge-Temps Modernes*, lxxxvi (1974). C. Klapisch-Zuber, 'Villaggi abbandonati ed emigrazioni interne', *Storia d'Italia*, v, pt. 1 (Turin, 1973), 311-25, makes considerable use of information derived from the S. Etruria survey, and it too plays down the importance of the barbarian incursions.

¹⁷ Toubert, pp. 350-68, 432-3 fn. 1; he also suggests various sites suitable for excavation (id., p. 400 fn. 3).

¹⁸ e.g. M. Mallett *et al.* in G. Hutchinson (ed.), *Ianula: An Account of the History and Development of the Lago di Monterosi, Latium, Italy* (Trans. American Philos. Soc., LX, pt. 4, 1970).

¹⁹ e.g. G. Barker, 'The Economy of Medieval Tuscania: The Archaeological Evidence', *Papers British School Rome*, xli (1973). This paper provides an indirect response to the complaint of Toubert (pp. 267-8) that in his area archaeology has given no assistance in the study of the place of the animal in agrarian life.

²⁰ To the many details in Toubert, pp. 136-7, 631-40, add Ward-Perkins, *op. cit.* in note 11, 394-7, and C. Vita-Finzi, *The Mediterranean Valleys: Geological Changes in Historical Times* (Cambridge, 1969), 72 *et passim*.

²¹ Any reader interested in the varied opportunities for study and collaboration which the S. Etruria survey provides may write to the Secretary, Faculty of Archaeology, History and Letters, British School at Rome, 1 Lowther Gardens, Exhibition Road, London SW7 2AA.

both the results of recent work and review articles, with bibliographies, of past work. It is left to Professor Jankuhn in his 'Outline of Medieval Archaeology' to attempt a definition of the subject and to suggest what period it should cover. His date limits are, of necessity, arbitrary but while many would agree with the 11th to 12th century as a lower limit in the E. and N., his adoption of 768 or even 800 in the Frankish west seems strange and the suggestion that medieval archaeology might include, e.g. industrial archaeology, bizarre. A short summary of the development of medieval archaeology from its sepulchral origins manages to avoid a definition of what archaeology is, but emphasizes the links between it and documentary and architectural history. Then comes the most useful part of the essay — an examination of the three areas of research, settlement studies (which here, at least, does not include towns), the economy, and *Archäo-Technologie*, into which the subject can be divided. This tends to be a list of possibilities rather than achievements but, when read with the Janssens' excellent review of Rhenish archaeology between 1945–72, produces some interesting comparisons with recent work in England. The most obvious differences, beyond the fact that most of the English work is unpublished, are in the amount of church archaeology, again hardly touched on by Jankuhn, and the archaeology of raw materials and manufacturing. These account respectively for 268 and 154 of the 1,400 publications (including a large number on general topics) listed by the Janssens. In England it is only in the last five years that even 5 per cent of the sites listed in the annual summaries in *Medieval Archaeology* have been concerned with raw materials and manufacturing, while, unlike Germany, the greater part of the work on church archaeology over the last seventeen years (c. 25 per cent of all sites) has been concerned until recently with monastic rather than parochial churches.

With the beginning of the Royal Archaeological Institute research programme on the origin and early development of the castle there has been a similar shift of emphasis in England in 'defence archaeology' — paralleled in Austria by the adoption of a research programme on *Hausbergen*. An excellent paper by Fritz Felgenhauer proposes a new definition for these marcher strongholds, provides a political and administrative context for them, and summarizes the extremely well documented sequence at Gaiselberg (NE. of Vienna). Their purpose is further clarified by two papers (by A. Eibner and M. Mitterauer) on the political and administrative structure and the defence sites of the Gars valley (NW. of Vienna); these include a number of *Hausbergen* in addition to that excavated at the Tabor, a castle, and one of the rare Slav ring-works. At Gaiselberg there was no underlying Slav occupation and the first, 12th-century, phase consisted of a fully fledged *Hausberg* — concentric inner and outer ditches surrounding a low plateau of upcast, into which two *Grubenhäuser* were cut. These were only replaced by a central fortified building of stone (probably with timber upper stories) in c. 1240. The origin of this class of defence sites, which although normally found on low hills does include promontory forts, is still uncertain. Their relationship to single-ditch ring-works is not thought to be close, and Felgenhauer feels that their prototype is more likely to be found in W. Europe than in the areas of earlier German and Slav contact.

Among the finds from Gaiselberg was a large part of a late 13th-century glass beaker of the so-called Syro-Frankish group, decorated with a panelled frieze of griffons and 'leopards' (or lions?) separated by vegetation. A detailed chemical analysis of the glass, its colours and corrosion (by Sauter and Rosmanith) follows a description and discussion by Felgenhauer-Schmiedt. Her puzzlement as to how the object reached Gaiselberg might have been reduced if she had considered the possibility that it was a Venetian rather than a Syrian product (cf. D. B. Harden, 'Ancient Glass, III: Post-Roman', *Archaeol. Jnl.*, cxxviii (1961), 106 fn. 129).

The remaining three articles in the volume are those by Steuer on the development of trade in pottery in N. Germany (particularly the shelly wares of the Ems-Weser region), Liestöl on runic inscriptions from Bergen, and Někuda on deserted medieval villages in Moravia. This last provides a useful summary of the historical evidence for

desertion starting in the late 12th and early 13th centuries and reaching a peak in the 15th and 16th centuries. Unlike Jankuhn's summary it considers the failed and successful villages as a whole, but reaches some doubtful archaeological conclusions, particularly about house and village forms, on the evidence of only three excavated sites (although this is partly the result of the failure to publish others). The evidence available for the field-systems and the economy of the villages is summarized clearly, but the animal bone (as in Felgenhauer's article on Gaiselberg) is dealt with in a perfunctory and rather uninformative manner.

The articles announced for the second volume of *Z.A.M.* promise much the same balance as in the first: the place of archaeology in medieval studies, the E. Baltic boat from the 9th to the 13th century, the development of the Rumanian town (a useful addition to the national surveys presented at Oxford), archaeology and the Bohemian village, deserted villages in Sicily, a further bibliography (lower Saxony since 1945), a newly discovered harbour in N. Sweden (St Olafshafen), Romanesque tombstones in the archbishopric of Cologne, and botanical evidence from urban excavations in Neuss (presumably not a revision of the work already published in *Rheinische Ausgrabungen*, 1).

The journal is well produced and illustrated, although some photographs seem superfluous and it would be helpful if individual items on blocks (e.g. Abb. 4) were numbered. A list of illustrations would be a welcome addition, as would more location maps or at least better descriptions of the whereabouts of some sites. Similarly it would be of considerable value to an international readership if regional or equivocal chronological terms (e.g. *Babenbergerzeit*, *Zeitabschnitt der Feudalismus*) could either be dispensed with or given calendric equivalents.

A. CARTER

Medieval Pottery from Excavations: Studies presented to Gerald Clough Dunning. Edited by Vera I. Evison, J. G. Hurst and H. Hodges. 15.5 × 23.5 cm. 262 pp., 13 pls., 66 figs. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1974. Price £4.50.

The achievement of Gerald Dunning in developing the study of medieval pottery into a more precise subject is well celebrated by this collection of articles. The extensive bibliography of his work and the biographical note by Miss Evison and Hurst make clear the gratitude that those interested in medieval pottery owe him both for the scale of his work and his enthusiasm in encouraging others. His descriptions, drawings and distribution maps marked a new clarity that Hurst aptly demonstrates by comparing the Kidwelly with the Pithay report.

The diffuse nature which characterizes some *Festschriften* is avoided by grouping the articles around three themes; the technical aspects of pottery manufacture, Anglo-Saxon pottery, and continental pottery. The bibliography and the basic studies represented by some of the articles make this an essential volume of reference. Of the articles on continental pottery Hurst's study of the later Saintonge imported pottery is a very thorough analysis of the British finds closely related to the recent work in France. These parallels show the increasing attention given to medieval pottery on the continent; whereas Dunning was only able to refer to pieces in museum collections, Hurst is now able to refer to excavated and published material in France. Dr Beckmann's article provides a very valuable reference of types of the first four periods of Siegburg production, though too little is said about the exact criterion of the division into types. The significance of typological analysis in terms of chronology is questioned by Hurst in his reference to finds of Saintonge pottery at Southampton. K. J. Barton's study of northern French pottery provides new material but it is rather confusing that he uses the general term blackware for pottery that he mostly describes as grey.

In the Anglo-Saxon section the articles by Miss Evison on the Asthall type of bottle and by Philip Rahtz on pottery in Somerset are both valuable, and show how much

work still remains to be done, particularly in the analysis of fabrics. Professor Cunliffe carries forward the work on later Anglo-Saxon stamped pottery and his article suggests further questions about the relationship of this pottery to the stamped pottery in E. England. The article on Winchester ware by Martin Biddle and Katherine Barclay stands out in the precision of its analysis and in the use of statistical techniques. The discovery of Winchester ware is a major addition to our knowledge of late Anglo-Saxon glazed pottery and this will be a model for future studies.

In the technical section, Professor de Bouard discusses a recipe for preparing potters' clay and a recipe for glaze which appear in a treatise of Eraclius, and relates them to 13th-century pottery found in N. France. In the light of the remarks by Henry Hodges on the lowly status of potters one wonders who was the potter who added the chapter and for whom it was intended. It is very gratifying to see the fundamental work by John Musty on the typology and technical aspects of medieval kilns at last in print. Hodges' study of the status of the potter is one of the less satisfactory articles. There is no adequate discussion of the potter in relation to tilers or indeed other craftsmen. More work is needed on the status of potters particularly on the differences between countries and on the changes in the late middle ages.

It seems clear that the future of the study of medieval pottery lies in the closer scientific analysis of pottery and it is to be hoped that work in this field and on the standardization of descriptions will eventually provide us with as great a contribution to the subject as that of Gerald Dunning.

J. CHERRY

Landscape Archaeology. By Michael Aston and Trevor Rowley. 21.5 × 15.5 cm. 217 pp., 19 pls., 51 figs. London: David and Charles, 1974. Price £5.50.

Fieldwork in Medieval Archaeology. By Christopher Taylor. 21.5 × 14.0 cm. 176 pp., 27 pls., 35 figs. London: Batsford, 1974. Price £2.75.

Fieldwork has now come to mean outdoor archaeology that does not involve excavation. Its increasing importance is recognized in many recent publications, such as those by Fowler of fieldwork in Wiltshire and by Cunliffe in Hampshire. It is supported too by current Government policy in stimulating site and monument records. Excavation comes a bad, destructive and often unnecessary second to the authors of these books. The pioneer work of Alcroft, Crawford, Grinsell, Bowen and others was on sites of all periods. The emphasis in both of these books is on medieval sites, especially those of lowland England; they may be seen as worthy successors to M. W. Beresford and J. K. St Joseph's *Medieval England: An Aerial Survey* (1958). Aston and Rowley are mainly concerned with the midlands, and Taylor with Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire and Dorset, reflecting their professional experience.

The authors stress the dangers of limitations of area and especially of period. Taylor's title limits his theme, but his approach is more towards 'total history', multi-period, multi-disciplinary studies, than the others. His classic papers on Whiteparish were among the first to define what this meant. His plea for a concentration on medieval sites is based on their greater survival and documentation, and hence the wider information their study can yield; and the greater their loss in the present destructive era.

Aston and Rowley's book is very much a basic textbook, aimed at the wide variety of working groups that they have been so successful at teaching in adult education. It is accordingly fuller and more explicit on the elementary bases of such studies as those of maps and aerial photographs. Taylor's in contrast, while describing basic techniques, assumes a good deal of his readers. His book consists largely of a series of elegant and sophisticated case studies. He does, however, deal more thoroughly with documentary

evidence, and with the problems of publication. He is more concerned with open earthworks and buildings, while Aston and Rowley have much interesting material on the survey and analysis of villages — existing, shrunken and deserted. Their chapter on towns is especially informative.

Recording is thoroughly covered. Aston and Rowley give a useful series of comparative recording forms. While they favour the 'sketch survey' as developed by Bond and Aston for the recording of a rapidly vanishing W. midlands landscape, they do describe accurate surveying methods. Taylor does not think such a two-standard approach is needed. He describes fast methods of accurate survey, which he has developed in his own work in the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments, and successfully used with adult field groups. This reviewer also prefers his R.C.H.M. style of drawing. More perhaps should be said of contour surveys as the only absolute record of a site.

It is indeed in the matter of ultimate historical interpretation that the two books differ most widely. Aston and Rowley are more concerned with recording and site analysis. Such 'explanation' as they offer is largely based on the influence of environment on settlement location and history. Discussion of more complex factors is sparse and hazy.

The relationship of castles to villages in chap. 6 is not explicit: they seem to imply that castles were set up to protect villages, which on the other hand "grew up" in their outer baileys. The analysis of Bristol (p. 98, fig. 25) may be refuted by Ponsford's recent work. Taylor tends to probe beyond the deterministic view of a geographer's approach to landscape history and emphasizes the complex and often human factors which have brought about earthworks in their present state. These are largely based on the author's considerable personal experience.

Both books are profusely illustrated with many specially-drawn figures, though Aston and Rowley's suffer from over-reduction and over-inking. Does Taylor's fig. 42 really merit two-thirds of a page? His half-tones are poor, owing to the cheaper process used, and vary from copy to copy. The bibliographies are both full. Aston and Rowley's is rather buried in footnotes annoyingly grouped together at the end under chapter headings. They would have been more useful arranged in a Harvard system or grouped under site-type or subject headings as in Taylor.

Misprints and errors are few and unimportant. The outer earthworks of Old Sarum are not, however, all prehistoric (A/R, p. 17); 'Etherlan' (*sic*), = Ethulon, is obsolete, and not to be recommended as a drawing film even if obtainable; ink flakes off it, it tears, and it melts in modern dye-line printing machines (A/R, p. 55).

As often happens, two good books on the same subject appear together. Both of these are recommended to the reader; they are complementary and will prove invaluable for adult teaching inside and outside universities. Aston and Rowley should perhaps be read first, or given to the beginner, though it is unfortunately at present only in expensive hardback; while Taylor's may be seen as less of an elementary textbook and more as an advanced commentary.

PHILIP RAHTZ

The following publications have also been received:

Landscapes and Documents. Edited by A. Rogers and T. Rowley. 13.5 × 21.5 cm. 85 pp., 14 figs. London: Bedford Square Press of the National Council of Social Service for the Standing Conference for Local History, 1974. Price £1.65.

Anglo-Saxon England, III. Edited by P. Clemoes and others. 15.5 × 23.5 cm. 270 pp., 10 figs. Cambridge: University Press, 1974. Price £7.50.

- The Viking Age in the Isle of Man. The Archaeological Evidence* (C. C. Rafn Lecture no. 3).
By D. M. Wilson. 17.5 × 23 cm. 48 pp., 23 figs. Odense: University Press, 1974.
Price Danish kr. 25.00 plus sales tax.
- Four Minster Houses.* By S. R. Jones. 18 × 24 cm. 56 pp., 11 pls., 20 figs. Lincoln:
Friends of Lincoln Cathedral, 1974. Price not stated.
- Minster Yard* (Lincoln Minster Pamphlets, 2 ser., no. 7). By K. Major. 14 × 22 cm.
31 pp., 1 pl., 1 fig. Lincoln: Friends of Lincoln Cathedral, 1974. Price 50p.
- Framed Buildings of England.* By R. T. Mason. 14 × 21.5 cm. 136 pp., 33 pls., 30 figs.,
and several unnumbered drawings. Horsham: Coach Publishing House Ltd., 1974.
Price £3.00.
- Excavations at the XIVth Century Village of Roeselare (Sint Margriete) (East Flanders, Belgium)*
(Dissertationes Archaeologicae Gandenses, xv). By A. van Doorselaer and
F. Verhaeghe. 22 × 27.5 cm. 75 pp., 33 figs. Bruges: de Tempel, 1974. Price not
stated.
- Redundant Churches Fund, Sixth Annual Report.* 15 × 24 cm. 32 pp., 8 unnumbered pls.
London: Redundant Churches Fund, 1974. Price 10p.