REVIEWS


For almost 60 years the greater part of our knowledge of the first two dynasties of Ancient Egypt has been derived from the results of Petrie’s patient recording and re-excavation of the devastation wreaked in the Royal Tombs at Abydos by Amelineau. It was therefore of extreme importance when in 1936 Emery continued methodically the preliminary work of Quibell and Firth in the Archaic Cemetery at Saqqarah North and uncovered a series of monumental tombs of the First Dynasty, far bigger and more advanced and sophisticated in their architecture than the contemporary tombs at Abydos. Although Emery’s excavations have yielded relatively little historical material, they have been of outstanding importance from the point of view of the architecture and the development of the material culture of the first two dynasties.

Not the least of the merits of Emery’s work has been the exemplary speed of the full publication of his results. But these results have been contained in scientific excavation reports and there has long been a real need for a comprehensive survey of the whole period, a survey embodying the results of the latest discoveries and research, in which Emery’s work must rightly figure very prominently, and presenting them to the general reader. This little book goes far towards remedying this deficiency and as such is to be welcomed.

The biggest single chapter is the first, devoted to a history of the first two dynasties and inevitably having a strong archaeological bias. This chapter is followed by a series dealing with the state, military system, religion, art, architecture, language, trade, industry, agriculture and domestic life. These are very unequal. Emery is at his best in the purely factual results of his and Petrie’s work on the First Dynasty; the sections on the Second Dynasty are far less good and are incomplete and superficial. The chapters on religion, art and architecture are good, on the whole, and full of useful material and observations. The other chapters in general are less helpful: the source material is not fully presented, the themes are not as well developed as one might have wished and often a whole section is presented very baldly as little more than a sub-heading with a single sentence or very short paragraph appended.

The strength of the book lies in its strictly factual presentation, but in severely restricted fields; it is extremely weak and inadequate in interpretation and in comparative studies and hence fails to present an adequate appreciation of the significance of these discoveries. A glance at the Bibliography probably provides the explanation. In recent years very much attention has been paid, and continues to be paid, to these early dynasties: some of these studies were published too late to be utilized in this book, but it is a serious deficiency that the Bibliography does not mention recent work by foreign scholars, that the extremely important studies of Lauer, Ricke and Schott, for instance, are not listed, that other studies in English are also omitted and that on the whole the text reveals little awareness of the work of others.

A most disconcerting remark is made on p. 84. Here it is stated that traces of the simple tumulus inner superstructure found in tomb 3507 (Her-neith) had been found in other early tombs at Saqqarah and that traces of a stepped structure, similar to that of 3038 (Adjib) had been found ‘in most of the big northern tombs of the latter half of the dynasty’. Emery has rightly seen (pp. 144-5, fig. 85) that these facts suggest a steady development from the Saqqarah tombs of the First Dynasty to the Step Pyramid of Zoser, but it is disquieting to note that these facts are not mentioned in his official reports, that, except for 3507 and 3038, his published plans give no hint of them and none of the plans in this book are corrected versions; even though in Great Tombs, III, 73, he stated that traces of a tumulus had been found in 3471, the plan reproduced as fig. 27 still gives no hint of the existence of such a tumulus. In other words, all Emery’s plans are not accurate plans of what he actually found and observed, but are reconstructions some of which he now admits are inaccurate. This is an extremely serious matter. We urgently need to know if there was any inner superstructure at all, and if so, of what type, in the earliest, simplest tombs; we need to know in what tombs traces of the tumulus type of inner superstructure were found, and whether there was a stepped superstructure in the tomb of Ka-a (3505) and in what other tombs it has been noted. There
are more tombs in the Archaic Cemetery at Saqqarah than there are Kings of the First Dynasty, yet the Saqqarah tomb of Semerkhet has not yet been identified and it is obvious that not all these can have been kings' tombs.

The current theory tends to suggest that these double superstructures reflect political facts, that the inner tumulus or its successor, the stepped structure, is the superstructure of the Upper Egyptian king while the outer superstructure is that of the Lower Egyptian king. If this theory be correct, it would seem probable that not all the Saqqarah tombs contained double superstructures and that the presence or absence of these could be of the utmost value in obtaining more secure attributions of particular tombs to specific kings. All these matters are intimately tied up with the whole question of the development of the royal tomb from the early First Dynasty mastaba to the Step Pyramid and the pyramid form in general and could contribute to the theoretical evaluation of the probable form of the superstructure of the royal tomb of the Second Dynasty. A hint of the probable course is to be found in the occasional survival of double superstructures, the inner one being stepped, as in the mastaba (K.2) of Sanakht at Bet Khallaf or the great mastaba 17 at Medum. All these possibilities are now denied to us.

H. W. Fairman


Though these two books are primarily of medico-historical importance, archaeologists will find in them much of interest, for the doctor-authors, besides their medical qualifications, possess also expertise in non-medical aspects of their respective subjects. Dr. Ghalioungui is the Senior Professor of Medicine at Ain Shams University, Cairo, and, though he does not claim to be an Egyptologist, he has made a close study of any relevant papyri and texts. His excuse for writing the book was that he felt that 'his knowledge of his country and his countrypmen, and a practice of over thirty years among them, could bring some contribution to the understanding of the Medicine of the Ancient Egyptians, and also of their errors and superstitions'. In reading his erudite book, one is impressed by the way that he has extracted the scientific elements in ancient Egyptian practice from its overlay of magico-superstitious or ritualistic observance. Diagnosis and prognosis, within the limits of available knowledge, were carefully taught. Observation of the patient was stressed, and if diagnosis could not be made from a single observation, the patient was to be 'moored to his stakes' (i.e. left at his habitual regime for a while) and then re-examined more than once. For prognosis there were three possibilities: certain cure ('An ailment which I will treat'); a possible cure ('An ailment with which I will contend'); and a hopeless issue ('An ailment not to be treated'). Treatment, with or without magic and ritual, and whether medical or surgical, was probably as efficacious as at most later periods preceding the advent of Lister's work on aseptic surgery, and the relatively modern development of empirical medicine and use of anti-biotics. Another feature of this book which is of wide interest is the indebtedness of the Greeks (as Hippocrates 'The Father of Medicine', Pythagoras and the Philosophers) to Egyptian learning. The author suggests that the priest-physicians of Egypt not only knew much of the organs of the body, but had some sort of knowledge of the circulation of the blood. Specialisation and embalming procedures are but a few of the subjects covered. It is also recommended for the intelligent analyses of the texts quoted and the illustrative material from extant monuments.

Dr. Bonser was first Librarian-in-Chief of the Medical Sciences Library of University College, London, then University Librarian in Birmingham, and is now Honorary Librarian of the Folk-Lore Society. In common with the above author, he has based much of his thesis on information extracted from documentary sources. He writes that he has 'come into contact professionally with the books on all the subjects involved'. Thereupon he puts his excellent bibliography of MSS. and published sources (complete up to 1953, for this is a work whose publication has been long delayed) at the start of the book, where it will serve
as a ready reference for many scholars of the period. With his encyclopaedic knowledge of the material and his linguistic ability, Dr. Bonser's hope that this work will be of use to those engaged in literary and historic studies of the time, as well as to medico-historians, is justifiable. As an example, his detailed work on epidemics and their dates helps explain background factors in economic or other conditions. Such a plague might, he suggests, be stressed as a cause of England's weakness at the time of Æthelred the Unready. Hospitals, food, drink, diet, and the treatment by magical means (such conditions as devil-possession, childbirth, the King's Evil, etc. were especially prone to be so dealt with) are but some of the subjects discussed. Unlike Egypt, Anglo-Saxon England has no surviving monuments of the type that can serve to leaven, by illustrations, this solid documentation. Nor did these peoples equal the Egyptians in their scientific approach. As the author writes (p.12):— 'As is shown from the descriptions of disease, especially in the Leechbooks, the Anglo-Saxons were very weak with regard to diagnosis. They had no specific knowledge of the interior organs of the body or of their diseases, and in consequence seldom took matters in hand until, judging from the descriptions given of the symptoms, the patient was already dying and human aid was too late'. Especially interesting, therefore are the accounts of the different approaches of the healers in the Pagan and Christian eras. Insofar as scientific medicine is concerned, the 'Dark Ages' is no misnomer for this period, but for the humanistic background, beliefs and practices for this 'Migration Period' Dr. Bonser's book is a mine of information which will ensure its possession by all serious students of this phase of our history.  

M. AYLWIN COTTON


By R. K. HARRISON. English Universities Press Ltd., London. Price 7s. 6d. each.

This trilogy by Professor R. K. Harrison, of Wycliffe College, University of Toronto, is a contribution to the series known as 'The Teach Yourself Books'. Agreeably printed and illustrated, the slim volumes can be conveniently slipped into a commuter's overcoat pocket. There can be no doubt that these books are admirably suited for their purpose. Dr. Harrison seems equally at home everywhere in the Near East and he is abreast of all the archaeological discoveries which have illuminated the Biblical texts. The growing, and often irritating, practice of relegating footnotes to the back of a book is here fully justified. The narrative runs easily in a lucid style while an array of references is at hand to introduce the inquirer to the more specialized literature.

The arrangement is in the main chronological. Particularly well done are the two pages which bring to life the Babylon of the Jewish exile and the chapter which summarizes the evidence for accepting St. Luke as a serious historian. The author is rightly critical of a book now thirty years old entitled The Bible is True, but the unprofessional student might be warned that archaeology is not the only discipline needed to establish the factual veracity of Bible stories. Literary analysis is not the subject of these books, and to show that the Patriarchal narratives faithfully reflect the social background of Mari and Nuzu does not in itself establish the historicity of the Patriarchs. The reader may not be aware that the story of Joseph and his brethren is quite unlike the Abraham and Jacob sagas and may have been composed as late as the time of Solomon or Rehoboam. The chapter on 'Israel in Egypt' obscures the fact that what were known as the Twelve Tribes did not exist in Egypt, and that those who fled from captivity may have been only one element in the tribes which were formed when Palestine was occupied. Incidentally the date given for the Exodus, 'about 1500 B.C.', is not quite consistent with the claim that Hebrew forced labour was used for the building of Pithom and Rameses under Rameses II (c. 1290-1224 B.C.). One may be permitted to doubt whether archaeological finds are likely to establish the historicity of the Book of Esther, and it is hard to see how archaeology can substantiate the story of the Massacre of the Innocents in St. Matthew's Gospel, which, we are told, is 'in full accord with the later years of Herod the Great'.
A discussion of Israel’s cultus is surprisingly omitted in view of the comparative material provided by excavations, particularly at Ras Shamra — and no attention is given to the myth-and-ritual school of critics. One result of these developments is to give an earlier date for many of the Psalms than was favoured a generation ago.

For readers of this Journal the volume on the Dead Sea Scrolls may prove the most rewarding of the three. It gives a brief and admirably clear survey of the discoveries made in and after 1945 at Qumran and elsewhere, the hazards which the finds have encountered and the scientific tests applied to them. A well-balanced assessment of what they signify for the Bible records is no mean achievement while the debate is still continuing in a large and controversial literature.

The reader of these books may be encouraged to pursue his course of extramural studies under the guidance of a wise, learned and stimulating tutor.

E. P. Baker


The classification of any branch of Coptic art is not an easy task. The archaeologist in Egypt has for the most part been concerned with the Dynastic, the Hellenistic or the Islamic periods; Coptic art has tended to be regarded as a somewhat embarrassing occurrence between the decline and resurgence of maturer styles. As objects of Coptic origin frequently bear no indication of provenance or circumstance of recovery, classification tends to rely on stylistic analysis. In addition, the objects themselves are seldom inscribed with a date or other attributions in contrast with their Islamic parallels; even the rare inscription on the door lintel from the church of al’Mo’allaqa, which might have served as a point from which to work, has been so restored that the reading is not a complete certainty. Yet against these odds, John Beckwith has brought order into the study of Coptic sculpture, as he had done earlier with that of Coptic textiles. Particular attention is given to the question of the Alexandrian style, and in discussing the difficulty of regarding the style as distinct from the Hellenistic trends elsewhere, the author points out that the standard of Hellenistic art in Alexandria was actually in decline at an earlier moment than in other centres bordering the eastern Mediterranean. Just as the political links with Byzantium were finally broken when the Council of Chalcedon declared the Monophysite Alexandrian church heretical, so the arts of the Copts became less dependent on the eastern Court. Yet in spite of the calamities that Alexandria suffered at the hands of Byzantium and then of Islam, it continued to flourish as an artistic centre until its position was eventually superseded by that of Fostat. Severed from declining Byzantium with only tenuous cultural links with Rome, swamped by invading Islam, the nadir of Coptic art was inevitable. The evolution of the sculpture of the Copts which typifies the fortunes of their art generally, over a span of a thousand years, has been told in this book with particular skill. The scope of the study is limited to an account of the development of Coptic sculpture, and the author does not touch on the problems of its possible influence on sculpture elsewhere. In any case, this book will serve as a valuable source for those who may wish to re-examine the long-standing theories of Strzygowski, Dalton, and others, concerning the obvious visual resemblance of Coptic sculpture to that of western Europe of much the same date.

There are some minor lapses in proof-reading, for example in the spelling of the proper names Oxyrhynchus (p.11) and Abu Saifain (p. 31). It is sobering to compare the excellent quality of the illustration of the cedar doors from Sitt Miriam in the British Museum’s Guide to the Early Christian and Byzantine Antiquities of 1921, with those in this latest publication. However, the excellence of the text will ensure that this will be accepted as a standard handbook on the subject.

S. D. T. Spittle


This book summarizes what is known of the aboriginal inhabitants of Venezuela from the times of the early Paleo-Indian hunters until the arrival of the first Spanish settlers. It
is written primarily ‘for the benefit of the non-specialist and the layman interested in Venezuelan archaeology’, and it is to the authors’ credit that they have kept this potential customer in mind while writing a book which the specialist will find useful. The opportunity has been taken to bring the same authors’ earlier and larger book (An Archaeological Chronology of Venezuela, Pan American Union, 1958–9) up-to-date, and recent discoveries, like the important site of Rancho Peludo with chopping tools and two early pottery styles, are discussed against the wider background.

It is all too easy for a professional archaeologist to assume that the layman shares his background knowledge and familiarity with terminology. Rouse and Cruxent have avoided this temptation by including two excellent introductory chapters dealing with the geographical background, the history of research in Venezuela, and the methods used by the archaeologists to reach their conclusions. The discussion of classification and terminology is a model of its kind. Every term is defined and the strict definition adhered to throughout the book. One term, ‘component’, for the material of a single culture at any one given site, is a regrettable addition to archaeological jargon and it is noticeable that, once defined, this term rarely crops up again in the text.

About half the book is taken up by a discussion of the Neo-Indian epoch from the start of intensive agriculture in c. 1000 B.C. to the breakdown of native culture after the arrival of Europeans, and it is here that the Rouse/Cruxent terminology really shows its advantages. The layman will find some of this section arid reading, but given the nature of the evidence this is unavoidable. The Venezuelan Indians never developed a civilization and often all that remains of them is their pottery — fifty-five separate styles are discussed in eighty pages. Even the many text figures (adequate in quality) and plates (often spoiled by bad lighting, over-reduction and muddy printing) cannot make easy reading of that, but the authors have managed to produce a pattern out of this mass of detail. The major division comes between western Venezuela with its ceremonial objects, maize agriculture and pottery which often looks to Colombia and central America, and the eastern part of the country with manioc as the staple food plant and pottery styles which are eastern in spirit and which spread out to the Caribbean islands. Perhaps the publishers would commission a companion volume on West Indian archaeology.

One of the major contributions of the book is the formulation and use of the concept of series. The authors have appreciated that a pottery style, known only from surface finds or from a few excavated sites, has no great significance in itself. They note that many styles are related and can be grouped into a small number of ‘series’ each of which represents a major cultural tradition and has both extent in time (when one style develops out of another) and in space (when a style extends its range of distribution, or when a single style splits into many local variants). So far so good. This flexibility makes the ‘series’ a useful tool of analysis and one which at once points out the main streams of development. But Rouse and Cruxent would go further and claim that each ‘series’ is ‘indicative of a separate group of Neo-Indians’. Sometimes this is convincing: the intrusive Barrancoid pottery in the lower Orinoco must surely indicate the arrival of new people who split the makers of the Saladoid pottery series into two groups, one of which migrated to the West Indies. Here one sees the people behind the potsherds, but when the ‘Valenciooid series is presumably a degeneration from the Barrancoid series, with the addition of traits from the Arauquinoid series’ this is simply the language of pottery typology. The makers of the Valenciooid series may indeed be a distinct group of Indians but ‘group’ is a vague and ambiguous word. We need to know what sort of a group in a social or an historical sense, but this question cannot yet be answered from the archaeological evidence.

The work concludes with the excavation of the Spanish settlements of Nueva Cadiz and Mauricia and a list of all radiocarbon dates from Venezuela — even those which the authors, for good archaeological reasons, are unwilling to accept. The index is good, and the judicious use of tables and sub-headings make it easy to find one’s way around the book.

**WARWICK BRAY**

The object of this book, a very bold and ambitious one, is clearly indicated by the author in his Introduction, ‘... my main purpose is to demonstrate that the meticulous salvage and reconstruction of man’s past is an activity of supreme importance to humanity — not least because in the collaboration of different individuals it holds the key to general understanding to the proper study of mankind’. Even had the author’s intentions not been so clearly expressed a glance through this book soon tells us that its title and book-jacket are both quite misleading. Although the microscope is mentioned from time to time, this is not a text-book on its use in archaeological research but rather discursive and very personal reflections on collaboration between scientists and archaeologists in what the author calls ‘archaeo-scientific’ work. The first chapter — ‘Background’ — deals with the bringing together of specialists from many branches of learning in both the Arts and the Sciences. In Chapter two, the philosophical background is examined, but R. G. Collingwood, who escapes mention, has done this with much more perception and clarity (An Autobiography (1939)). In Chapters three to seven, direction and purpose become less coherent and this seems largely due to the use of the narrative form. The author discusses the problems he has encountered and the solutions he and others have found. In all this he displays a disarming modesty, as if he would have us believe that he acted merely as a message-boy between archaeologists and scientists and technicians. But the appreciation of the nature of the problems, most of which are highly complex, and then finding the right kind of person to solve them requires a scientist of very rare insight and ability, and although this is indeed far from the author’s intentions, this fact at least emerges with growing clarity. The earnest archaeologist hoping for information about the scientific aspects of his work will however continue to read with increasing exasperation as the author’s lively mind flits from point to point like the proverbial butterfly, without any apparent order or purpose. Nor will he be helped by the rather meagre index and complete lack of footnotes where points could have been expanded and clarified. An alphabetical form of bibliography is given, but there is no distinction between the essential detailed references and the vaguer ones to larger works which can only be intended for readers seeking more general background material and which could more conveniently have been listed under suggestions for further reading.

Remembering that this book is intended for the intelligent layman, the narrative form is clearly meant to hold and captivate and the reader is helped on his way with personal anecdotes and snatches of popular songs. But even this kind of reader may be daunted by some of the obscurities of language and by at least two diagrams (Figs. 2 and 6) which mystify this reviewer. Another (Fig. 8) shows a section without a scale, across a pit, of very odd shape; the meaning of the other part of this illustration (on p. 227) is also perplexing. For the serious and persistent prospector there are many useful nuggets of information and interest to be found but in a subject of this nature it is inevitable that the material becomes out-of-date between writing and publication. There is, for example, no mention of the recently developed gradiometer or the new ultra-sonic cleaning methods. It is doubtful if the author had (at the time of writing) fully appreciated the potentialities of X-ray fluorescent-spectroscopy in the classification of pottery according to production centres and also the increased effectiveness of electrical resistivity methods by data-processing (I. Scollar, ‘Einführung in die Widerstandsmessung’, Bonner Jahrbiicher, 159 (1959), 284–313).

Perhaps for the archaeologist the most important part of this book is in the final chapter where consideration is given to the kind of scientific aid needed in archaeological work. It is unfortunate that the author, maybe because of his official position, does not state his views in a more direct and challenging way. The implications are however quite clear to the discerning reader. There is now quite obviously a very wide gap in the availability of scientific services as between excavations sponsored by the State and those which are not. This gap is only filled here and there where University Departments are brought into collaboration. In his tables for the Chew Valley excavation the author lists 25 different specialist requirements in conservation, identification and special investigation. Put another way, it is the emergency excavations for which the Government takes responsibility which at present receive the full
treatment while those involving pure research have little or no access to these facilities. This means that whereas Mr. Biek, operating within his official range of duty, is able to form an estimate of the scientific potentialities of a State excavation and take steps towards exploring them, most of the independent excavators (i.e. those not employed by the State) have hardly begun to appreciate these possibilities. If the ignorance of the latter has induced any complacency, this book will give a severe jolt, and in doing so may render British Archaeology a notable service. The serious excavator, realizing how much useful evidence he may be losing, will begin to seek similar services but at present there is no organization to cope with any demand of this nature. While the author may hope that this book will create a widespread and deeper understanding of Man's Past, it is clear that his immediate target is the establishment of a Central Scientific Institute for Archaeology the services of which would be available to all. However difficult and muddled this book may be considered by some, it holds within its pages a complete justification for the establishment of such an organization. Most archaeologists should welcome such a move, providing the organization was under University rather than Government control. This book may be useful in bringing scientists and archaeologists into a closer understanding, but whether it will help the intelligent layman towards a greater understanding of archaeology remains to be seen. The book is well produced in an attractive format with some interesting photographs (except for Pl. 18, which seems to be quite unnecessary), but it is doubtful if the two coloured plates justify their expense.

Graham Webster


The title emphasizes the difference between this book and its more philosophical companion volume, Approach to Archaeology. No-one is better qualified than Dr. Webster to know the kind of information needed by the small amateur groups for whom this book has been written. Because of their limited resources, the principles and methods here described are those of expediency, and are not always desirable from a professional point of view.

An introductory section deals with the organization of archaeology in this country, with details of publications and museums. A chapter on field investigation covers such subjects as geology, agriculture, earthworks, air photography and scientific prospecting. The assertion that excavation is a natural corollary to fieldwork is debatable; but digging methods are fully and fairly discussed. Dr. Webster pleads for planned excavation, the ultimate aim of which is rather baldly described as 'what was done there, when, and by whom' (p. 59). There are excellent diagrams to illustrate this chapter drawn by Mr. Hobley, which are the clearest of this kind so far attempted. A timely caveat is issued against indiscriminate trial trenching, and Dr. Webster, though primarily a Romanist, here and elsewhere gives due weight to methods suitable to prehistoric and medieval sites. In discussing sections through earthworks it is suggested that mechanical trenches might be cut, followed by dressing and study of the sections, and then by the cutting of another trench by hand with foreknowledge of what to expect. This may be suitable for rescue work, but hardly to be condoned in a research operation. It is implied on p. 71 that once it has been decided that it is difficult to distinguish the layers in a cutting 'one has to organize a system of recording which will enable rapid digging to proceed regardless of stratification'. Such a procedure would of course make it unlikely that structures within the bank, or buried surfaces, would be noticed. Dangerous for beginners too is the advice (and Dr. Webster is not alone here) that the art of drawing a section 'lies in knowing what ought to be present'. Open excavation is fully described, and is recognized as the technique likely to be developed in coming years. It is suggested that the method is not suitable where the stratification is well-defined. It is true that open excavation is a necessity where no layers can be distinguished vertically; but how useful it would be, for instance, to see the whole of the surface of a villa destruction level, or to see a barrow reduced layer by layer to its shape at successive stages of its construction.

In the chapter on scientific aids, Dr. Webster wisely emphasizes that scientists are not eagerly waiting to sample excavated material, unless it can be shown that it will contribute
to their own research. Nevertheless, it might inculcate a wrong attitude in the beginner to suggest (p. 109) that the archaeologist considering scientific techniques ‘will hardly wish to test them all at once’. This rather implies that the scientific evidence inherent in any site can be exploited if the excavator so desires; rather, it is a vital part of the information which it is the excavator’s duty to recover as far as he is able, at least in research work. Another facet of this attitude is shown in the suggestion (p. 121) that scientific appendices are not worth publishing ‘unless they can be shown to give evidence for . . .’. Much of the data at present being published cannot be viewed as immediate evidence, but rather as material which may be used at a much later date.

In the final section on publication, a similarly ‘practical’ view is taken, that the reports of Pitt-Rivers are ‘over lavish by modern standards’. The necessity for selection of the evidence is suggested; this may be unavoidable in days of high printing costs and low resources, but is hardly desirable. This chapter is a useful guide to writing a report in all its stages, but two points may be made here. Dr. Webster advocates (p. 135) publishing groups of mixed finds in the appropriate part of the report, rather than in separate sections at the end. For instance the samian is to be described in as many places as it occurs; such arrangement will not be appreciated by anyone wishing to study all samian from that site together. In a time when so many reports are distasteful to the eye because of poorly lettered illustrations it seems a pity to recommend the substitution of printed type for a drawn title, particularly if it leads to the unfortunate result shown on fig. 12 (p. 145), where the scale is also wrong. Examples of drawings of finds are of good quality and well chosen.

Although attention has been concentrated on points about which this reviewer disagrees with Dr. Webster, these are mainly matters of principle, and must not disguise the fact that this is a most readable, objective and dispassionate book, the most useful of its kind since Atkinson’s Field Archaeology, and essential reading for all beginners and many others.

P. A. RAHTZ


Science in Archaeology aims to bring together essays on major aspects of science which impinge upon archaeology. It is meant primarily as a general reader for the guidance of archaeologists. The field covered is broad though not as comprehensive as the editors claim. There are 54 separate chapters arranged in five sections on Dating, Environment, Man, Artifacts and Prospecting. The largest section is Environment with 23 chapters, the shortest is Prospecting with two. Aerial photography and surveying are not included and the final short section deals only with magnetic and resistivity surveys. The other sections have short introductory chapters stressing the problems involved and the relation of these to archaeology as a whole. In his Foreword Professor Clark stresses the dependence of archaeologists upon the modern resources of science and technology if they are fully to interpret the materials with which they deal.

In many ways the least satisfactory section is that on Dating. Oakley in a useful chapter on Analytical Methods of Dating Bones stresses one of the major problems inherent in archaeology — determining the exact context of a particular find. Regrettably in none of the chapters is this problem of how artifacts are buried amply considered, although Cornwall and Schmid in their chapters on Soils and Cave Sediments respectively deal with some aspects of the problem. In spite of the claim to comprehensiveness there are no chapters on weathering, none on Pleistocene Geology as such. As the late Professor Zeuner pointed out repeatedly Palaeolithic dating must depend on the geological context and date of the deposits in which artifacts are found. River terraces, raised beaches, loesses and boulder clays are of prime importance to the Palaeolithic archaeologist. A review of these fields especially in the light of recent work and the application of new techniques by, for example, Fairbridge on sea-level
changes,¹ and a number of American geologists on boulder clays,² would have been of the
greatest value. Nor do changes in land and sea relationships cease to be significant in post-
glacial times as Smith, Hallam and Green have recently pointed out in their studies of Lincoln-
shire and the Wash.³ Equally valuable in a fully comprehensive survey would have been a
chapter on the climatic interpretation of morphological features in such areas as the Middle
East, where, for example, Butzer has indicated the wealth of inference that it may be possible
to derive from morphological and stratigraphical investigations.⁴ Several of the chapters on
dating will almost certainly be unintelligible to the archaeologist who has not some prior
knowledge of physics and nuclear geology. It is regrettable that in the chapter on radio-
carbon dating the opportunity was not taken of again pointing out to archaeologists what radiocarbon dates mean. In spite of Barker’s paper in Antiquity in 1958⁵ dates are still quoted without their attendant standard deviations and chronologies of doubtful
validity are erected on the basis of some five or six dates which seem to fit. Gentner and Lippolt’s chapter on Potassium-Argon dating will be very difficult for most archaeologists
to follow. Here, as in some other chapters, authors seem uncertain about the purpose of their
essays — are they for archaeologists, or for other specialists in their own fields? If for the
latter then the experimental data given are generally inadequate: the potassium-argon chapter
contains a schematic diagram of an apparatus for measuring small amounts of argon, but no
explanatory data! With the difficulties involved in this method of dating and the small number
of results so far published it is perhaps stretching the evidence beyond its limits to claim calmly
that the previously used Milankovich time scale for the Pleistocene is incorrect and that the
four major glacial periods of Emiliiani with the Günz glaciation at about 350,000 years are
probably better (p. 82). Later in the volume Emiliiani, on the basis of deep-sea cores and the
ocean temperatures derived therefrom, suggests a date of perhaps 275,000 for the Günz
(p. 105). His correlation chart with its single Mindel and Riss glaciations would certainly
provoke argument from those continental geologists who have recognized that the earlier
 glaciations, as well as the Würm, are likely to have been multiple. The difficulties have also
been stressed, by Bishop,⁶ for example, of correlating on a geological basis such beds as those
at Olduvai from which material has come for potassium-argon estimates so that any extension
of these estimates beyond their immediate vicinity is fraught with great danger, a point not
stressed sufficiently by Gentner and Lippolt.

To most readers the section on Artifacts is likely to prove more rewarding than that on
dating. Thompson’s chapter on Microscopic Studies of Ancient Metals, for example, describes
clearly the way in which metallographic examinations are carried out, and the information
likely to be derived from them. The chapter by Britton and Richards on Optical Emission
Spectroscopy and the Study of Metallurgy in the European Bronze Age is a good example of
collaboration between archaeologist and scientist in which the techniques and limits of the
analytical method used are made clear. Here, as elsewhere, statistical techniques are basic
to making proper use of the results obtained in laboratory analyses. Unfortunately the section
on Artifacts pays scant attention to the whole field of artifact manufacture and technology
or to the conservation of artifacts after excavation, areas in which the application of scientific
techniques has within recent years been outstandingly successful.

Regrettably many of the contributions in the sections on Environment and Man fail to
break through the usual confines of a scientific note appended to an excavation report, and
discuss the broad implications of the techniques or materials described. Where British material

---

² e.g. Sitler, R. F., ‘Petrology of till from north-eastern Ohio and north-western Pennsylvania’, Jnl. Sedi-
mentary Petrology, xxxiii (1963), 365–379, with references to other recent work.
³ Smith, A. G., ‘The Context of some Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age Remains from Lincolnshire’,
P.P.S., xxiv (1958), 78–84.
⁴ Butzer, K. W., ‘Paleoclimatic Implications of Pleistocene Stratigraphy in the Mediterranean area’, Annals
is discussed the emphasis generally is on prehistoric archaeology although occasional references are made to the use of scientific techniques in the archaeology of later periods, for example, by Shotton in his chapter on Petrology and Ryder on Remains of Fishes and other Aquatic Animals. Too rarely in the book as a whole is it emphasized that added depth and width can be given to our knowledge of the economic life of earlier periods by a fuller application of relatively simple methods of identifying materials and isolating techniques, such as Jope especially has applied to his studies of medieval Britain. There is need too, to apply techniques of environmental study to more recent periods; an intensive campaign to obtain analyses of even pollens and charcoals from Roman and Anglo-Saxon sites might enable us for the first time to make useful comments on the ecology of these periods. A study of the variations in economy and of the distribution of sites in relation to the details of soils and topography could then become meaningful. It is to be hoped that Science in Archaeology will inspire such collaboration between workers in several disciplines as well as making archaeologists aware of the complex resources of science.

Bruce Proudfoot


For a map showing 'Sources of Fine Building Stone in Saxon times, 8th-11th centuries' see Piggott, S., Approach to Archaeology (London, 1959), fig.12.

For a summary of much evidence both archaeological and documentary see now 'The Regional Cultures of Medieval Britain' in Culture and Environment, Essays in Honour of Sir Cyril Fox (London, 1963), 327-350.


The late Professor Zeuner never lacked courage in undertaking large difficult problems. In this volume he has left a characteristic memorial; one which is likely to last for long on account of its range and diversity of information factual and hypothetical. The book is divided into sections. The first three survey general problems of how domestication came about, and how animal physiology reacted to changed conditions. The question of re-establishing wild types through selective back-breeding crops up, but this is even less promising than he has explained for the conditions of true natural environment has long ceased to exist, and cannot be reconstructed. Security of food supply, safety from predators, and relative immobility, have all had profound physiological results. Next follow twenty-four sections on all manner of creatures domestic from the dog to the honey-bee. Section 11, for instance, deals with elephants, and there are nineteen illustrations in this section but all numbered Fig.11 with subnumeration 1 to 19. In the next section, on horses, the numbering begins again Fig.12 : 1 and so on; a most tiresome device in no way improving on normal consecutive numbering throughout the book.

In making such a great initial contribution, as this book does, to the history of domestication, it was impossible that Zeuner should have been equally conversant with the state of research on every animal, nor could he perhaps be equally sympathetic to each kind of beast. The horse comes off badly. Zeuner's nomenclature for post-pleistocene wild-horses is unfortunate. There is no reference to the work of Speed and Ebhardt, nor is Przewalski's horse the same thing as the Mongolian wild-horse, nor should tarpan be ever used except in its original Kirghiz meaning of feral horse, the run-down, subspecific animals of domestic origin that ran loose on the steppes within historic times. Przewalski's horse was not an ancient widespread sub-species, but a type physiologically peculiar to the extreme conditions of the Gobi Desert. It had no qualities suitable for domestication. The common wild-horse of the steppes, whether east or west, was one of the strong-toothed subspecies, freely interbreeding between herds, and capable of considerable variety in appearance. Although quoted on some points, Lundholm's important study of the horse has not been brought to bear in certain essential matters of this kind. In connection with the camel, it may be added that bones of this animal are known from graves in southernmost Russia, and that a cloak of camel hair was
identified in one of the megalithic house-graves at Tsarskaia to the south of the Kuban river. More recently, a kurgan pit-grave at Gurbanesti in Roumania yielded traces of camel hair hangings. All these finds date to about the turn of the third and second millennia B.C. Fig.13:3 shows a short-legged donkey from Connemara, but it is not made clear that, as Estyn Evans has recently reaffirmed, the donkey was introduced into Ireland only as recently as the early part of the 19th century A.D.

The book contains a remarkable range of illustrations not least of animals depicted on ancient coins from the Professor’s own collection in which he took justifiable pride. This is a stimulating if controversial book, a spur to more precise enquiry, but a notable pioneering work.

T. G. E. POWELL


This is a well presented book, well bound and printed and well packed with text figures and colour plates. Coming in a spate of books on Roman art and architecture, it sets out to attract the general reader, but its bibliography should be brought to the notice of the specialist as a useful supplement to Boethius and Brown.

In this first chapter Kahler attempts to define Roman art and introduces his readers to such basic (architectural) ideas as axiality and ‘spacial concept’. A series of valid points is made and illustrated by reference principally to selected temples and arches, theatres and the statue of Augustus from Prima Porta (sic). The problem of what actually constitutes Roman art is tackled, and Kahler states his views, but while he is at pains to show Rome’s debt to Greece, her equally great debt to the Etruscans (especially in architecture) is passed over without comment. Baalbeck and Corinth make their only appearances in this section of the book.

Succeeding chapters take us from Augustus to Constantine, showing the important changes of taste and technique and introducing us to a selection of the principal works of each reign. Less, perhaps, is made of continuity and balanced development than could have been. For example Kahler prefers to stress the individuality rather than the continuity of the great Imperial monumental friezes and reliefs, so that a discussion of the Ara Pacis is followed, eventually, by an account of Titus’ arch and the columns of Trajan and Marcus, but with little or no mention of the Cancelleria friezes or those of Trajan from Rome or the arch at Beneventum. Severus’ arches at Rome and Lepcis (the reliefs from which are in Tripoli and not the Musee Alaoui of Tunis), and the arches of Galerius and Constantine, are described in successive chapters, but the whole subject is hardly brought into perspective or discussed as a continuous development.

Other small points strike the reader. The Flavians, perhaps, fare badly for not only are the Cancelleria reliefs omitted, but also the Forum Pacis and the Colosseum. Much use is made of ‘baroque’ in the chapter on Augustus, while the word is strangely absent from the discussion of Hadrian. The author’s preference for architecture is manifest throughout, but wall painting receives scant treatment, and mosaics not a mention. The Farnesina frescoes are as conspicuously absent as Piazza Armerina or the bronzes of Pompeii and Herculaneum.

This brings one to the crucial weakness of the book. Its title implies a survey of the art of Rome and her Empire; but while metropolitan architecture is admirably covered, one looks in vain for an adequate account of painting, metalwork and glass, inter alia, while, as said, mosaics are omitted completely. The greater the distance from Rome, the more noticeable is this lack. Provincial art, whether native or the result of external influence, is apparently purposely omitted. With the exception of Trier, one looks in vain for an introduction to the great Imperial cities of Spain, Gaul or Africa and their art, and one looks in vain for any mention of Alexandria or Ephesus, Antioch or Dura. Kahler does not seem to realise that the art of these centres (no matter what its origins) constitutes, in fact, the art of Rome’s Empire and deserves discussion along with Trajan’s forum or the column of Marcus.

The bibliography is a mine of information. But, principally citing German works, it will be a closed book to the non-specialist: in eight tightly-packed pages only ten works cited are in
English. No mention is made of the English editions of Nash's *Pictorial Dictionary* or Mrs. Strong's *Roman Sculpture*. The *Journal of Roman Studies* and the Papers of the British School and the American Academy in Rome are omitted, amongst other journals, in favour of one reference each to the *Proceedings of the British Academy* and the *Liverpool Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology*. The problem of bibliographies in translated works is difficult, but an adequate selection of the very valuable material in English could well have been added — and need not have been the length of the appended 'Corrigenda'.

Finally, the translation reads well: the text figures (as opposed to the end map) and ample colour plates are really excellent — they provide by no means the least asset of the book.

C. M. Daniels

**ORDNANCE SURVEY MAP OF HADRIAN'S WALL.** Ordnance Survey, Chessington, 1964. Price 10s. (flat 7s. 6d).

This new map seems at first sight so simple and straightforward that many of its users may not realize that it is a triumph of cartography both in ingenuity of conception and excellence of production. The technical skill involved is revealed when the difficulty of overprinting in colour on an already coloured base is considered. Black is used for visible features of the Wall, red for those known but no longer to be seen, and this is entirely successful. It is not in the least confused by the presentation as well not only of all the detail normally available on the coloured sheets of the 2½-inch series but also a pleasing system of hill-shading. The secret of the success is the use of grey in place of the normal black on the base map.

The base is a reduction from the 2½-inch series which has successfully avoided loss of clarity. It does, however, result (at 2 inches to the mile) in the rather unhappy scale of 1 : 31,680, less convenient for calculation than 1 : 25,000 and failing to conform to any of the regular Ordnance Survey series. This means that anyone wishing to construct for himself corresponding maps for neighbouring areas cannot do so at the same scale without much trouble and expense. This is the more serious in that the present map does not include either the outpost and hinterland forts or the Cumberland coast defences which were a direct continuation of the Wall itself.

Most of the Roman material is represented by conventional symbols placed as near as possible to the actual location of the features, though the user ought perhaps to be warned that there are some sites where a multiplicity of symbols has caused some to be displaced from their strict position. The symbol for the civil settlement at Chesters, for example, has slid westwards. The forts and temporary camps, however, are shown to scale. For this the Ordnance Survey deserves our thanks, for it allows us for the first time to compare the sizes of the different stations at a glance. It also draws attention to the scale and variety of the so-far rather neglected temporary camps and emphasizes their obviously very wide range of purpose. Perhaps this map will encourage detailed study of this interesting element in the system.

An attempt has been made to indicate features of the Wall obliterated by changes within the Roman period. This is highly successful in the case of the turrets obscured by later forts (e.g. at Birdoswald) which are represented as an inset into the block plan of the fort. It is less successful for the Turf Wall and it is doubtful whether the non-expert user will realize that the Turf Wall was not a series of disconnected stretches contemporary with the Stone Wall. A linear symbol representing Stone Wall on top of demolished Turf Wall would have been welcome.

A particularly pleasing feature is the marking of museums containing Roman material. The welcome this deserves can only be tempered with regret that the museums at South Shields and Corbridge are unaccountably omitted. It is possible also to criticize the manner of naming the principal sites. Wherever possible Latin names are given and for the rest the English names by which the sites are commonly known. This means that where an ancient name is given (often in a recently-discovered and rather unfamiliar form) the modern is not. In some cases it is possible with some difficulty to make out the modern name on the base map but in others it is obscured by overprinted detail. This is hardly helpful to the visitor trying to find his way and, in view of the fact that professionals are in general inclined to employ the modern
names, a dubious policy. One cannot help feeling that all major sites should have been labelled clearly with their modern names, with the addition of the Latin if known.

These criticisms are only minor reflections on a magnificent production which reflects great credit on all concerned and is of major importance for everyone interested in Hadrian’s Wall and its region.

Peter Salway


The title of this book promised well, though it seemed a formidable task to encompass within a single volume the many centuries during which Celtic-speaking peoples inhabited these islands. Mrs. Chadwick has, however, elected to concentrate on the period ‘between the departure of the Romans and the establishment of the Saxon kingdoms’, a decision which should perhaps have been made clear in the title. This is not, therefore, a complete history of the Celtic peoples of Britain; nor does it even cover all those Celtic-speaking areas of Britain in the ‘Dark Ages’.

Mrs. Chadwick had, of course, to take account of the already successful The Celts by T. G. E. Powell and of the brilliant Early Christian Ireland by M. and L. de Paor in this same series. In a sense, therefore, Celtic Britain was shorn of its ancestral background and of its most illuminated area. It suffers particularly in that trying to interpret the ‘Dark Ages’ with only brief reference to Ireland is rather like trying to appreciate the reign of George III with only passing mention of the American scene. Although the author states her intentions, she has not really defined the area she seeks to elucidate. The cover map well illustrates the confusion: it omits Northern Scotland, Southern Wales, and the whole of Cornwall, to say nothing of the remainder of Celtic Britain which, it can at least be argued, did not become ‘Saxon’ overnight. No doubt such omissions can be justified — perhaps they may have been or are to be included in other volumes of the series — but nowhere are they explained.

As had been anticipated, Mrs. Chadwick discusses the literary and historical evidence with skill, learning and sympathy. It is most helpful to have so much information about the organization and laws of early Welsh society gathered in one chapter; and another, on the surviving Celtic literature, is a good summary with tempting extracts from some poems. Literary sources are also used to illustrate what little is known of the economic life of the times though the author might perhaps have supplemented it with archaeological evidence.

This introduces one of the main weaknesses of the book. There are failings in drawing together the different types of relevant evidence, and particularly in using the, by now substantial, body of archaeological evidence. The discussion of settlement types, structures and material equipment of the Celtic peoples, for example, well illustrates this. There are also curious disparities. The current work on imported wares, for example, particularly the Mediterranean pottery which is altering our knowledge of and constructing a chronological framework for the entire Celtic Early Christian province, receives one paragraph. The metal-work is barely mentioned except for two hoards, St. Ninian’s Isle and Trewhiddle, neither of which is really representative of the period under discussion. Similar criticism can be made of the handling of the artistic material. In the chapter on ‘Art’ for example, eight pages are devoted to inscribed stone monuments, the remaining seventeen to Pictish art.

The system of referencing and Notes to Chapters is clumsy and difficult to use. At least three bookmarks are required if each chapter is to be studied as the author apparently intended. The plates, on the other hand, are well-chosen, and the standard of reproduction better than in some of the other books in this series. Indeed, a glance through the plates gives a good impression of what Celtic Dark Age Britain really means. It is a pity that the line drawings are not up to the same standard, the relevance of some, notably figs. 4 and 16, being difficult to appreciate.

Celtic Britain is an interesting and, in many ways, a very personal view of one of the most contentious and little known or understood periods of our history. One can see here the growing difficulties of writing a comprehensive account of the Celtic areas of Britain in the Early Christian Period, a task demanding not only wide knowledge of several subjects but
also an understanding of the use of distinct sorts of evidence. One can also see some disadvantages in a general account based on certain parts of the whole only, when far-flung contacts and local mobility were characteristics of the age.

Elizabeth Fowler


The ‘westwork’ of Corvey in Westphalia is one of the most important surviving monuments of Carolingian architecture. This careful and up-to-date survey, checked in conjunction with the recent work of conservation, establishes the original form of the building erected in 884 and its relation to the earlier church of 844, which no longer exists. The detailed reconstruction of the missing parts of the ‘westwork’ is based on a careful examination of the structural details and of the surviving but displaced 9th-century fragments. Though some points remain uncertain, the main lines of the reconstruction are clearly and convincingly set out. The results are illustrated with an excellent series of plans, elevations and perspective drawings. The reconstruction of the destroyed church of 844 is necessarily studied in less detail, but it has proved possible to provide a restored plan, together with a schematic section and drawings. The church, which had an elaborate cruciform annexe at the east end, provides an example of the low chapel *retro sanctos*, which is also represented in the surviving drawing of Centula (St. Riquier).

The carefully established reconstruction of the whole 9th-century arrangement leads Kreusch to the conclusion that the generally accepted comparison with the Carolingian Palatine Chapel at Aachen is erroneous and that the central compartment of the west gallery on the third stage can never have held the Imperial throne. Instead he compares the whole ‘westwork’ with the western gallery at Centula. The Carolingian church of Centula (built c. 800) has long vanished but the detailed Ordinance of Abbot Angilbert shews that the western gallery was used liturgically by the community. Kreusch convincingly argues that the same was true of Corvey and that the upper gallery on the third stage was occupied by the choir, a conclusion borne out by the survival of musical notation scratched on the fresh plaster of the walls.

All students of Carolingian architecture and liturgy will be grateful for this careful study. Readers in this country will only regret that it was not possible to include more illustrations of the existing building, as earlier accounts — particularly that of Effman — are not easily available here.

C. A. Ralegh Radford


The proposition that medieval art was in form quite largely conditioned by what the artists had seen on stage, in mysteries and pageants, is an old and accepted one. For France, Male in 1904 went so far as to regard a major proportion of miniatures, paintings, glass and carvings as exact representations of the contemporary theatre. In England the late Dr. W. L. Hildburgh, in his pioneer study of the theme in relation to English alabaster carvings, regarded the effect upon the other arts of church furnishing as relatively slight, or non-proven through the inadequacy of the surviving material.

In the present work Miss Anderson, who has already devoted several books to detailed study of church art and iconography, goes through the whole field of English ecclesiastical imagery of the Middle Ages, and brings together the evidence for dramatic influences. A good case is made out for accepting certain important series, and notably the carved vauling bosses of Norwich Cathedral, as direct representations of local cycles of plays, while many oddities of iconography, found here and there in paintings or stained glass, are plausibly explained on the same basis. Incidentally, though the didactic purpose of church art is accepted, it is implicit in Miss Anderson’s study of the Norwich bosses that their details could never normally have been seen; and anyone who has attempted to study with the naked eye such a
work as the east window of York Minster must wonder whether didactic intentions really played any substantial part in the design of work for the greater churches.

In view of the scanty literature (this is the first English book dealing with the subject), it seems a pity that the ecclesiastical stage was considered almost in isolation. Additional evidence could have been found in the field of secular and popular representations, the more relevant in that the distinctions between Pagan, Christian and secular were in the Middle Ages never very clear. What is badly needed is a modern treatment of the whole subject dealt with, admittedly not from this particular iconographical standpoint, as long ago as 1823 by William Hone, in his *Ancient Mysteries Described*, where the plays based on the Apocryphal New Testament, the Boy-Bishop, and other features of medieval popular religion are rightly treated in conjunction with early engravings, the Lord Mayor’s Show, the Guildhall Giants, and the Puppet Show. (The likeness of the Turkish Karagoz to our Punch gives a salutary warning against adopting an exclusively Western framework of reference.)

On a point of detail Miss Anderson gives a mistaken impression in stating (p. 37) that ‘even the most complete of our surviving Jesse windows has suffered some disturbance of its original order’, for though the east window of Winchester College Chapel now contains glass of 1822, this is demonstrably a precise copy of the original work of 1393 in its recorded order. The complete arrangement of a large Jesse, possibly the unique survivor in this sense, is thus preserved.

The illustrations provide a large and well-chosen series of cogent examples, but the effect is sadly marred by frequently inadequate blockmaking and bad inking, which detract from an otherwise attractively produced book. For the present day, however, the price is low and should attract many purchasers to a valuable and thought-provoking essay.

JOHN H. HARVEY


There are very few people who can produce a work like this. Mr. Oman happily combines deep knowledge and love of his subject with a sense of style that enables him, be it by art or instinct, to impart to the reader, in a few short but fascinating chapters, an appreciable amount of that love and the illusion, at least, of some of the knowledge. We read his pages, look at his pictures and find ourselves, at the end, with sufficient understanding of the subject to read the whole work straight through again and enjoy it all the more.

Sir Trenchard Cox, in a brief foreword, has reminded us that those elaborate little silver ships were not commonly used in England — a fact which justifies Mr. Oman’s use of the French name *nef* to denote the type, and the booklet itself tells expressively how they were used, where they were made, what examples yet remain in churches or museums, and how far they may be taken as illustrations of the naval architecture of the Middle Ages. We are shown the silver ship marking the place of honour at a nobleman’s dinner-table, as did the Great Salt at an English meal, we see it in ecclesiastical settings as a reliquary or a votive offering, generally commemorating escape from peril at sea, and we are given a swift and fleeting glimpse of the debased form in which it continued as late as the 17th century. No more than nine early examples are known, and those nine are here described and illustrated in detail, from Archbishop Pedro Tenorio’s late 14th-century ship-reliquary at Toledo to the French *nef* of about 1530 that formed part of the Franks bequest to the British Museum. Particularly detailed consideration is rightly given to the Burghley *nef*, which through the generous help of the Goldsmiths’ Company and the National Art-Collections Fund is now housed in Mr. Oman’s own Department at South Kensington. The quality of the photographs, and of the half-tone plates made from them, is excellent throughout. Polished metal, especially precious metal, is the photographer’s bane at the best of times, but the difficulties have been triumphantly surmounted here.

The final section — they are too short, perhaps to be called chapters — treats of *nefs* as ship models, and shows the relation of some of the specimens to known types of early
vessel, generally old-fashioned, if not actually obsolete, by the date of manufacture of the nef itself. Of outstanding interest, in this regard, is the Oxford drawing of a ‘krack’, reproduced as Fig. 15. Comparison of this with the Schlüsselfelder nef shown in Pls. XV to XVII shows some highly illuminating parallels. The gun mounted in the mizentop, the tackle hoisting up sacks — not of lime, surely, but of powder and shot for this artillery — the grapnel with its final ring that enables it to be slung from the bowsprit in readiness for sudden release when it overhangs the enemy’s bulwarks, all these are common to nef and drawing alike, and each one seems to complement the other in giving us a lively picture of the art of sea-warfare at the end of the Middle Ages. In this year of Christopher Marlowe’s quatercentenary one may most appropriately take a phrase from his Jew of Malta and say that Mr. Oman, in this monograph, has given us ‘infinite riches in a little room’.

MARTIN HOLMES


This is a pioneer work. It is the first detailed attempt to relate every aspect of English art during this period to the general social, economic and political history of the country. The work already done on Elizabethan pageantry by Frances Yates and Roy Strong has shown how illuminating this kind of approach can be. Mr. Mercer deserves the honour due to a pioneer. He has written a book that makes one think, and that made me at any rate very conscious of my deficiencies as an all-round Elizabethan scholar. Yet much of it I found stimulating rather than convincing. There were times when I doubted the accuracy of his social analysis; there were times when I found it hard to believe in the connection he traced between a particular artistic characteristic and a particular social situation.

One of the central themes of the book can, I hope not unfairly, be paraphrased as follows. There were two classes in Tudor and early Stuart England; the courtiers, the servants of the new Tudor absolute state or centralized monarchy, and the non-courtiers, the gentry, merchants and so on, who for the most part supported the government but were not intimately connected with it. The former are seen as the agents by whom the Renaissance style was introduced and spread, the absolute state being a Renaissance conception and Renaissance art its natural form of expression. The courtiers are also seen as to a considerable extent the slaves of the system which they served, and which compelled them to live and build at a very high level of magnificence, or else to lose their place in the race for offices and emoluments. In contrast, the smaller gentry, merchants and so on who were not tied up with the state machinery were able to build for convenience rather than show, and were less concerned to acquire and display their knowledge of the fashionable Renaissance style.

Much of this thesis is convincing and interesting. There is certainly a contrast between courtier and non-courtier houses in the period; there is often a straining for effect in the former that is lacking in the latter; and one of the best things in the book is the analysis of the H-shaped house as the ideal answer to the particular needs of the courtier-class. But the thesis runs into difficulties when the author, after careful discussion of the development of the courtier-house, reaches the inescapable conclusion that it expresses ‘the almost total victory of native needs in building over every Renaissance canon of design and ornament but that of symmetry’. It is not easy to make this fit in with the absolute-state/courtier/Renaissance correlation. And it leads to unconvincing analyses, such as that the courtier-class ‘were attempting to obtain a classic air from essentially native buildings ... using such non-classical elements as towers and crenellations in an attempt to obtain a symmetrical and classical effect’. I do not believe that this was the attitude behind these great Elizabethan and Jacobean houses, with their dramatic massings and romantic skylines. Nor do I believe that Mr. Mercer believes it; and elsewhere in the book he has sensible and illuminating things to say about the self-identification of the new aristocracy with the feudal past, the influence upon style of anti-Catholic and therefore anti-Italian feeling, and the compromise and conservatism expressed in the Elizabethan regime.
Yet whether one interprets it as imposing a classical or an anti-classical discipline, the theme of state-dominated art is not a convincing one in late 16th and early 17th century England. Above all, how can architecture be said to be state-dominated in a period when the state itself built, relatively speaking, nothing of importance? Nor am I convinced by Mr. Mercer’s interpretation of Elizabethan painting, with the life-size portraits expressing ‘a public art in which the glorification of the individual as a servant of the State and monarch destroyed all individuality’ and the miniatures, in contrast, resulting from ‘a reaction against the shifting atmosphere of the absolute State’. Mr. Mercer exaggerates the contrast between the two types; there is for instance a kind of poetry of line and pattern in the best Elizabethan life-size portraits that they share with the miniatures. Nonetheless there is of course a contrast, but this can to a considerable extent be explained by the contrast in function between pictures designed for show and pictures designed for privacy. Moreover, if any art-form in Elizabethan England can be said to be the product of ‘state-dominated art’ it is surely the portrait-miniature, which was patronized to such an extent by the Queen and her court that it became as inevitable for the ambitious man to have his portrait painted by Hilliard as it was to build himself a magnificent house.

Elsewhere Mr. Mercer has an interesting discussion on the influence of Protestantism on English art of the period. It is a pity that he did not elaborate on this for a careful and thorough analysis of Elizabethan England as a protestant and nationalist state, which it undoubtedly was, would be more illuminating from the point of view of its artistic development than expressing everything in terms of the absolute state, which is a more dangerous and doubtful concept to apply.

There are times when Mr. Mercer’s eagerness to prove or illustrate a point makes him careless about the quality of his evidence. For instance, as example of successful use of chimneys he quotes the composite chimneys at Hatfield and the arced stacks at Lilford; yet it is arguable that in their present form they date from the 18th and 19th, rather than the 17th centuries. The centrally-entered hall at Sutton Place, quoted as an example of ‘Renaissance canons of designs over-riding tradition’ is almost certainly the result of much later alterations. The Gate of Honour at Gonville and Caius is not the result of a reversion to quattrocento art inspired by Catholic sympathies: it is based on one of the triumphal arches built to celebrate Philip II’s entry into Antwerp in 1549, and is one of the most advanced classical buildings put up in England in the 16th century. To explain the similarity between ceilings at Little Strickland Hall (early 17th-century) and the mid 16th-century Chapel Royal at St. James’s it is not necessary to posit ‘a minor revival of the less exuberant motifs imported in the early 16th century’: both derive from a design given by Serlio, who was constantly drawn on for ornament during the whole period dealt with in the book. The reason why Raleigh, Howard and Fleetwood did not use the H or 4-H plan for their houses at Sherborne, Lulworth and Wootton is not, I think, because their builders were (which is any way doubtful) ‘indifferent to or excluded from the court’, but far more probably because they were building what were called at the time ‘lodges’, rather than houses on the grand scale. The lodge was a distinct and typical product of the age, of which numerous examples survive, the majority built by people who were very far from being ‘excluded from the court’.

These and similar rather unconvincing points are the result of a tendency to get bees in the bonnet, which considerably vitiates the value of the book. This is a pity, because it contains much that is valuable, and being written (with perhaps slightly over-belligerent self-consciousness) outside the art-historical rut, has the advantage of continually making one think again, and reconsider accepted ideas. Moreover it has the value of comprehensiveness, for it covers the whole sweep of architecture, painting and sculpture, with an interesting chapter on interior decoration. The wide scope of the illustrations, backed by the discussion in the text, does, for instance bring out very forcibly the Elizabethan genius for pattern, a quality not usually sufficiently emphasized, but which appears prominently in, for instance, façade architecture, wall painting, plasterwork, embroideries and portraits of the period.

M. GIROUARD

To all who take an intelligent interest in their surroundings, who like to know why mere inanimate buildings so often partake of the nature of human beings, wearing different aspects, being in or out of humour with their neighbours, good or bad mixers, retiring or ostentatious, this work is surely dedicated. Into its pages is distilled the essence, perhaps one might say the elixir, which makes English buildings what they are. Mundane facts, it is true, of limestones, sandstones, granite, slate, marble and flint, of bricks and mortar and all that goes to make the exterior of a building — but written and illustrated in a way calculated to inspire the reader, wherever he may be, with a feeling for and understanding of the character of the old, and not so old, buildings around him.

This is surely a standard work, and as such the writer does not fear to use technical language, but he has taken pains to produce a book that is not only erudite but readable and one which no-one should find dull or unrewarding. Very few footnotes have been used and their absence causes the reader to trust the author in his many factual statements without having the means of verifying them; but with a responsible writer that trust need not be misplaced and the omission is remedied to some extent by the inclusion of a useful bibliography. This section could, however, have been improved, visually, by listing the items in each section in alphabetical or in at least some sort of order, and, factually, by careful checking, which would have shewn that the Victoria County Histories are not published by H.M. Stationery Office. Two useful pamphlets which have appeared since the book was published may be noted here: they are the Building Research Station Digests (2nd ser., 45-6 (1964)) on 'Design and Appearance' which deal with the differential weathering of building materials and are an important addition to the literature on the appearance of buildings.

Nearly half the text is devoted, necessarily, to building stones but timber, brick, the unbaked earths, the metals, glass, and the various roofing and rendering materials all find a place. Little adverse criticism of the contents is called for although occasionally the writer's opinions on Victorian or 'Modern' architecture obtrude themselves unpleasantly on the tranquility of the printed page. To take the chapter on brickwork as an example — the earlier bricks are described as of 'every shade . . . from orange-pink and salmon . . . to the glowing crimson of a summer sunset, and beyond, through port-wine red to those deep plum and mulberry shades which hover on the brink of purple'; less eloquently the latter-day bricks are 'screaming red', 'lobster or tomato-red' or 'pasty-faced', but one feels that here prejudice has gone too far and surely someone must come forward to defend the rich primary redness of Mr. Clifton Taylor's hated 'Accrington bloods'. Brick bonding is a feature which merits more than the single page devoted to it and although nine bonds are named there are yet others, notably a whole series of 'rat-trap' bonds to which no reference is made here or in Nathaniel Lloyd's History of English Brickwork; in these some or all the bricks are laid on edge to give courses 4\(\frac{1}{2}\) in. deep — they are found particularly in the extreme south of England and have not yet received the attention they deserve. On the dating of header bond Mr. Clifton Taylor is wrong in confining it to the Georgian period; it was also much used, surprisingly enough, in the neighbourhood of Manchester in the late 19th century.

The photographs, over 200 of which are crammed into 63 pages, include many of whole buildings and more close-up views of the materials under discussion would have been desirable. The photography is, on the whole, good, or at least competent, but the arrangement is distinctly poor with gutters of varying width (e.g. p. 257) and on p. 267 two interlocking L-shaped photographs, allowable perhaps on those picture postcards where five views are displayed for the price of one, but not from a publisher with the reputation of Batsfords — please, never again! The absence of plate numbers and the grouping of captions on facing pages both add to the difficulty of using the plates, which for this reason are the least satisfactory part of the book. It is unfortunate that, on being referred to an illustration of Little Moreton Hall as an example of a timber building with exposed and decorated timbers in the cove of the jetty, the reader is confronted with a detail of a part of the building in which the cove is entirely of plaster with 19th-century painted decoration.

Mr. Clifton Taylor states that this is his first and his last book; without wishing on him
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a repetition of the burden that the writing of such a detailed and well-informed book must entail, his readers will have good cause for congratulating him on a first rate ‘first attempt’.

C. F. STELL


This part of the Parish of St. James is perhaps the most significant part of London to those primarily interested in the domestic architecture of the early 18th century. For not only was it in this part of the town that fashionable expansion was most active in the 1720’s and 1730’s, but the area contains the whole of Burlington’s London estate and, of course, his own house. It is ironical that the only piece of Burlington’s own architecture now surviving in the district under review is a pilaster-strip some 2 ft. 6 in. wide which was freakishly spared, as though by the capricious effects of bomb-blast, in the wholesale rebuilding of Old Burlington Street.

Among the notable buildings covered by these volumes are of course Burlington House itself, Uxbridge or Queensberry House by Leoni (which survives after a fashion), the famous house for Field-Marshal Wade, its neighbour No. 30 Old Burlington Street (also by Burlington), Melbourne House (now Albany) by Chambers, Wyatt’s legendary Pantheon in Oxford Street (and, once again, what a loss that must have been!), Nash’s Quadrant and its successor by Blomfield, Pennethorne’s London University building which now houses the Civil Service Commissioners, Norman Shaw’s Piccadilly Hotel, and a small structure probably better known to more people the world over than any of these, the Shaftesbury Memorial Fountain.

Before Burlington or Nash appeared upon the scene, the area was divided into ‘closes’ or fields of which the very names, except for Windmill Field and Swallow Close, have perished from the memory. Gelding Close, it is true, is just recognisable to those versed in the well-nigh universal practice of genteelising names, as Golden Square: and the history of this development, as of the rest of West Soho, illustrates most aptly how a difference of character in the status of the original developers can persist in the form of a startling contrast of atmosphere until the present day.

It will not, I hope, be thought invidious to canvass some of the reasons which make these altogether admirable volumes of the London Survey so much more palatable than those of the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments. It is not to be supposed that there is any measurable difference in ability or scholarship between the staffs engaged in these two great undertakings. The editorial direction is in both cases firm and consistent.

What makes the London Survey so much more worthwhile in at least one reader’s opinion can be stated in one word: freedom. Freedom on the one hand to treat vanished buildings, both textually and graphically, with the same minuteness as those still standing; and on the other hand to embark on value-judgements and social and historical references on a much wider scale than is yet permitted to the Commission’s staff. By sticking to the Commission’s slightly relaxed but still unduly rigid rubrics, many occasions of sin are avoided, and a certain exhaustiveness is ensured which it would be ungrateful to call exhausting. Conversely, the application of the London Survey’s present principles calls for the deployment of literary gifts, a ‘central’ critical viewpoint, and great discretion in the determination of relevance. It is pleasant to be able to record the opinion that in these volumes this policy is triumphantly justified. If the de-Stalinisation of the Royal Commission could be allowed to proceed a little further in this direction, there would be a welcome gain in grace and, we may dare to be assured, no perceptible loss in scholarship.

MAURICE CRAIG


The two volumes on Norfolk in Prof. Pevsner’s Buildings of England are by his own admission ‘the biggest county job I have had to do so far’. Combined they run to about
670 effective pages of text (allowing for the fact that you get the 58-page introduction twice), an heroic output. As the foreword says 'Norfolk is little researched into'; much of the text is evidently based on personal inspection, which makes the achievement even more remarkable.

Prof. Pevsner is thus something of a Hercules. There is more than a dash, too, of Mercury in his make-up. The best of his on-the-spot judgements have a quicksilver audacity — as that on the battlements on the S. porch of Cley church (BE 23, 114) 'as fantastic as if the donors had been the Reyes Catolicos' (one gets the feeling in reverse in Seville — happening across that oh-so-English-looking dog-tooth and stiff-leaf on the W. front of some back-street church). For years the town of Holt has meant to me a generous spring on a hilltop (the hundred meeting place, no doubt), an interesting market-town plan and one or two attractive façades dating from after the fire of 1708. Now I think of it at least as much for E. S. Prior's Home Place (BE 23, 168), something I would never have found for myself, or, worse, have found and failed to appreciate. There are many such tit-bits in these two books and very toothsome most of them prove to be (with the required grain of salt), once they have been placed so appetisingly on your plate.

If you are a reviewer with an intimate knowledge of part of the terrain, it ought to be easy to fault work like this on account of some error or omission. To my mind it would be in a real sense uncritical to do so, particularly as the standard of literal accuracy, all things considered, is commendable. What matters is not whether here or there some detail is demonstrably false, but whether, in a much broader sense, the contribution made by the Buildings of 'England series to our enlightenment is all that could be expected of it.

And here it is easy to have misgivings, especially where larger buildings or complexes with an involved history are concerned. The Buildings of England may be intended to be more than mere guide-books, but it is surely not unfair to subject them to the sort of test that any good guide-book should have to pass. There are no doubt compelling technical reasons for the absence of plans and other diagrams in the text. The drawback could to an extent be offset by workmanlike descriptions, but often is not. Thus three pages about Raynham Hall (BE 24, 148) are such a medley of fancy pediments and art-historical asides that the ordinary requirements of the average reader are lost sight of. If I were going to Raynham for the first time I would rather have much less about Inigo Jones — perhaps just where, if at all, evidence for his participation is to be found; and the necessary reference alongside the allusions to 'Mr. John Harris'.

King's Lynn (BE 24, 220) is an example of rather a different kind. Here, as at Holt, my preconceptions were outraged, but to less good effect: 'a delightful little town, predominantly of Georgian brick' indeed! The danger is, someone whose opinion has practical weight may be persuaded that 'the churches, the two guildhalls, and a few houses' are all that is left of 'Lynn's mediaeval greatness'. Prof. Pevsner is not to be blamed if his formidable learning and industry and his almost boyish freedom from scholarly inhibitions have made him both authoritative and popular, but the triumph is not without its dangers. In my mind's ear I can hear those bulldozers starting up. Might not a more cautious note have been appropriate, at least until someone has really got at the facts?

All the same I shall certainly go on buying or borrowing the Buildings of England and being by turns exasperated and grateful, as long as Prof. Pevsner can stand the pace. Prosit!

Peter Eden