

REVIEWS

The Dartmoor Reeves: Investigating Prehistoric Land Divisions, Andrew Fleming. Batsford, London 1988, 135 pp. incl. 75 figs., pls. and maps. £14.95.

The author of this attractively produced book is well known in archaeological circles for his work on prehistoric landscapes. This account of the extensive Bronze Age field systems on Dartmoor, giving the results of a study made over fifteen years, has been written with a wider readership in mind. Even so, the author's apology to fellow archaeologists for some of the resultant gaps in subject matter and documentation seems largely unnecessary, as there is much information of interest to all, whatever their background. The narrative, which often employs the first person singular, also manages to capture some of those joys of discovery which compensate for the long, often arduous and sometimes bleak, days spent in field-survey.

It is appropriate that the first chapter commences with a reference to Conan Doyle and the *Hound of the Baskervilles*, as from that point the reader is taken through the logical process of archaeological enquiry to the final reconstructions in a manner worthy of Holmes himself, though here with more modesty and due acknowledgement of the contributions of others. The first five chapters are devoted to historical background relating to the remains of linear boundaries known as reeves and to their subsequent survey in the field. Excavation of such boundaries and a settlement does not arise until chapter six; a welcome illustration of the old adage that time spent in reconnaissance is seldom wasted. The remaining two chapters concern themselves with the place of the reeves in the prehistory of Dartmoor and, finally, in the wider world. In both

of these the general reader will find much of interest in the discussion of the social implications which might be drawn from the remains, delivered here without recourse to technical jargon.

Although the overall format of the volume is more suited to the knapsack than the pocket, the walker on Dartmoor, even if like Dr. Watson he is "no antiquarian", will also find this an invaluable, well illustrated guide to an exciting landscape. To this end some useful suggestions are given by the author in a short appendix.

GEORGE JOBEY

Barry Cunliffe, *Greeks, Romans and Barbarians: Spheres of Interaction*, Batsford, London 1988, xii+243, 76 figures. £19.95.

If the barbarians had not existed, the Greeks and Romans would have had to invent them. The notion of the barbarian, as living in a tribal, non-urban society, and lacking both the rule of law and the olive and the vine, those delights of settled agriculture, helped to define Mediterranean culture to its inhabitants. "Gallic Terror", fear of invasion, was also the bugaboo of generations of Romans and Greeks. Polybius in his histories justified a digression on wars between Romans and Gauls by stating that it would help Greeks find ways of dealing with future incursions. Yet this is only one side of the story. The northern lands were from the earliest times the source of essentials for Mediterranean civilization, above all else of metals and of manpower. In their turn the barbarian aristocracies were attracted to the prestige goods brought by Greek and Roman traders. Indeed, in many ways the Mediterranean was the barbarians'

El Dorado. The invaders of the 4th and 5th centuries A.D. came not to destroy, but to claim a share of the good life.

It is the interaction between these two worlds that is at the centre of Professor Cunliffe's book. He traces the Greek settlement on the South coast of France and the penetration of Greek goods into the Western Hallstatt culture. The reaction of the native communities closest to the settlements and to influence from Etruria and, later, from Rome is well illustrated with summaries of classic sites such as Cayla de Mailhac and Enserune. Then the central chapters of the book deal with the penetration of Gaul by Rome down to the time of Augustus. The picture is completed with a study of Britain and Roman trade beyond the Rhine frontier.

Cunliffe's title, however, promises more than it delivers. First, the book's focus is limited geographically. Cunliffe concentrates on Gaul. Although there are forays into Britain and Germany, Spain hardly gets a look in and because of this, perhaps, the role and influence of Carthage gets only passing mention. Further, Roman trade with Germany and the Baltic is seen largely in terms of relations with the Rhine frontier. The long established Amber route north from Aquileia in N.E. Italy would have provided interesting evidence for Cunliffe's theme (see now Tamas Bezeczy, *Roman Amphorae from the Amber Route in Western Pannonia*, BAR International Series 386, 1987).

Secondly, Cunliffe's chronological limits are curious. The story in Gaul is covered in detail only up to the time of Augustus. This is a pity, because some of the most important developments belong to the subsequent period. For example, in the first century A.D. Southern Gaul began to export its own wine both into Northern Gaul and to compete with the wines of Italy. There was a similar development in the coastal regions of Spain. The consequence was a significant change in the markets and economy of Italy.

Throughout the book the central preoccupation is with trade. That, I suppose, is understandable from an archaeologist, since the

most obvious indications of links between the regions are the objects which were exchanged between them. But one of the most important of signs of social interaction was the spread of Roman citizenship, and the eventual participation of local aristocracies in the government of the Empire. Our understanding of this depends very much on epigraphy, a whole category of evidence which Cunliffe scarcely notices. He does detail some of the significant social changes which contact with Greece and Rome brought; but even here makes great claims for the primacy of trade as a creator of social structures (he is not alone in this). For example, he assumes that the chieftain society of Hallstatt D in central Europe was actually created by the trade in prestige goods from the Mediterranean. "The social system was entirely dependent upon the regular supply of luxury goods" (p. 32) is a wild assertion (for one thing it exaggerates the quantity of such imports), and in any case it could be argued, more plausibly to my mind, that the development of a chieftain-led society came first and subsequently created among the aristocracies the market for luxury imports.

One of the most startling examples of the penetration of Gaul from the Mediterranean is evidenced by the thousands of amphorae, carrying wine from estates down the West coast of Italy, which found their way into Gaul during the first century B.C. (a trade which may have accounted for 40 million amphorae over the period according to A Tchernia's brilliant *Le Vin de l'Italie Romaine*). A chapter is devoted by Cunliffe to the effects of the Gallic love of wine on the economy of Italy; its failings are illustrative of the book as a whole. In subjects in which Cunliffe is not an expert, he is very dependent on his secondary sources and sometimes he is not up-to-date. His picture of the Italian economy is basically that presented by Keith Hopkins, *Conquerors and Slaves*. The result is exaggerated and distorted. Cunliffe is too ready to generalise about the Italian economy. He naturally concentrates on the excavation of the villa of Settefinestre near Cosa, the most detailed study of a Roman villa yet made. But Set-

tefinestre is not necessarily typical of Italy. Indeed the survey of the territory around Cosa has shown that while in a narrow coastal strip near the port estates developed to meet the demands of the foreign wine market, only a few miles inland the traditional peasant economy was unchanged. A similar picture is emerging further south from surveys in Northern Campania. Great though the Gallic market for wine might seem, it affected only the agriculture of coastal Italy.

This book derives from a lecture course in Oxford. It looks as though they were good lectures. Cunliffe provided his students with an explanatory model (a version of the familiar "core-periphery" model with a nod towards "gateway communities" and "central-place theory"), lots of good examples and summaries of current research. But the book also rambles, as lecturers are wont to do. Cunliffe is too easily diverted into unnecessary and rather dated discussions of such problems as the causes of Greek colonisation and the collapse of the Roman Republic. Nevertheless, it is clearly-written and well-produced with numerous maps and plans and can certainly be recommended as an introduction to a fascinating topic. If this review has been rather critical, it is because an interesting book could have been so much better.

JEREMY PATERSON

L. Allason-Jones and M. C. Bishop, *Excavations at Roman Corbridge: the Hoard, Historical Buildings and Monuments* Commission for England, 1988, 117 pp. £16.00.

The discovery of the Corbridge hoard in 1964 revolutionized the study of Roman armour of the *lorica segmentata* type, shown as standard wear for legionaries on Trajan's Column. The Corbridge armour, the most notable feature of the hoard, was the basis of reconstructions displayed in 1969 at the Cardiff Congress of Roman Frontier Studies and was studied by H. Russell Robinson in *The Armour of Imperial Rome*, published in 1975. An interim report appeared in this journal in

1968 (AA⁴, 46, 115–126) but only in the volume under review is the hoard now fully published. The authors are to be congratulated, as are all the people who have been involved since the discovery. Any criticism of the long delay, which is certainly not their responsibility, must be tempered by the realization of the unique problems posed by a find of such complexity with its special demands on resources of people, expertise, and money.

The heart of the report is the catalogue of finds, which include not only the armour but weapons, tools, a pulley-block, a lamp, gaming counters, papyrus and textiles, as well as pieces of the box in which the hoard was placed. The main illustrations used are meticulous drawings by Miriam Daniels, and these combined with the catalogue entries will form the basis for all future discussion. For the untechnically minded the introduction, and sections on the chest, armour, other finds and textiles are of great interest, not least the early correspondence between Russell Robinson and Charles Daniels.

Three questions that lie beyond basic identification and interpretation are raised and answers attempted: first, the purpose of the bringing together of the hoard and its deposition; here it seems reasonably clear that the hoard is the result of a careful tidying-up operation, with a late decision to leave it behind. The second, the date of deposition, is less clear, as the date proposed, between 122 and 138, is in its turn dependent on the acceptance of the chest being deposited at the end of period 2 (c. 122) or 3 rather than at the end of 1b (c. 103), and presumably of a proposed new end date for Corbridge period 3 of 138 rather than c. 125, to be set forth in the main excavation report, currently in press. This date is of course of crucial importance in placing the Corbridge armour in its correct chronological context. The authors had a difficult problem here, as they were duty bound to put the find in its archaeological context, but that context cannot be judged apart from the main report. On the third question, who wore the armour they show admirable caution,

though their final decision to accept the hoard as suggesting the presence of legionaries on the basis of the presence of *pila* and catapult bolt heads misses the point that the paper by Valerie Maxfield that they cite shows that *pila* may be as untrustworthy evidence as *lorica segmentata* for the presence of legionaries, and ignores their own point earlier that catapult bolt heads may be javelin heads. The only safe conclusion seems to be that finds of arms and armour are rarely certain guides to the nature of the units stationed in forts.

BRIAN DOBSON

Alison Harle Easson, *Central and East Gaulish Mould-Decorated Samian Ware in the Royal Ontario Museum. A Catalogue*, 49 pages, 111 line drawings, 2 half-tones, indexes and concordances, Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto, 1988. Available from Royal Ontario Museum, Publication Service, 100 Queen's Park, Toronto, Canada M5S 2C6. Price \$16.95.

This publication describes and illustrates, with admirable clarity and detail, the ninety fragments of Central Gaulish and twenty-one fragments of East Gaulish mould-decorated samian ware in the collections of the Royal Ontario Museum.

Most of the collection came from London and was obtained from G. F. Lawrence who acquired it from construction sites in the City. As a result, since some of the ROM's collection comes from the same findspots as those of the Museum of London and the British Museum, fragments of the same vessel can appear in more than one of the three museums.

The bipartite organisation of the catalogue follows the customary division of production centres into Central and East Gaulish, and each half is further broken down by individual centre. Of those in Central Gaul only Les Martres de Veyre and Lezoux are represented in the collection. For East Gaul the list is longer: Lavoye, La Madeleine, Chémery-Faulquemont and Mittelbronn (Saturninus-

Satto), Trier, Rheinzabern and Westerndorf.

Each catalogue entry presents its information in four standard blocks: firstly, there are details of vessel form, provenance, and fabric; secondly, a general description of the decorative scheme; thirdly, a detailed list of decorative details with references to the standard *corpora* and finally, a discussion of style, attribution and date. To judge from the references in many of the entries, the author has taken a great deal of time and trouble to visit museum collections and talk to other specialists.

The illustrations are clear and unfussy. The concordances and indexes at the end of the volume appear to be exhaustive. The concordances are to ROM catalogue numbers and to the major figure-type *corpora* of Oswald, Déchelette, Ricken and Fischer, and Rogers; the indexes are by donors, collections and sources, provenances, and joining fragments from other London museums.

So much for the details. In simply publishing this information the volume would be valuable enough. Where I think it gives that little bit extra is in the short introductions to the two main sections of the catalogue and in the introduction to the whole volume. Here it would have been tempting but totally inappropriate to launch into a detailed history of samian ware; instead the author opts for balance by providing just the right kind and number of signposts for those of the uninitiated who pick up the volume out of curiosity and find themselves wanting to know more.

JOHN DORE

C. O'Brien, L. Bown, S. Dixon and R. Nicholson. *The Origins of the Newcastle Quayside*. The Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle upon Tyne, Monograph 3, 174 pages, 52 text figures, £25.

This is a well presented account of excavations undertaken by the Archaeological Unit for North East England on the bank of the River Tyne at Newcastle. The dig was com-

pleted in 1985 and this report has been produced with commendable promptitude. In a number of ways the contents of this volume belie its appearance; this is not a complete account of the origins of Newcastle's quayside, as is demonstrated by the fact that the authorial team has gone on to investigate adjoining areas not included here. What this monograph does provide is a well-researched account of the results of excavation in an area which, although it did contain evidence for the thirteenth century and later development of the quayside, also provides a wealth of information on subsequent commercial activities and structures; not all of which are accorded equal prominence in the report.

The project director, Colm O'Brien, undertook very thorough advance examination of the waterfront area in order to assess the archaeological potential of the area. He was able to identify the uncellared area off Queen Street as the site at which to concentrate excavation. Here the first structures took the form of a riverside wall from which piers led into the river, but shortly afterwards the area between the piers was infilled to create a quayside which survives in recognizable form today. The discovery of a late twelfth century pottery kiln on Dog Bank, above the Queen Street site, indicates early industrial activity as well as providing useful chronological evidence for the quayside building. The absence of vessels from this kiln is taken, no doubt correctly, to indicate that the quayside structures are somewhat later, most probably a development contained within the thirteenth century.

The infilling of the area alongside the river was followed by the construction of substantial stone buildings; a long narrow structure between Fenwick's Enry and Plummer Chare proved to have walls surviving to a height of 2 metres amongst the deep build-up of rubbish and debris. It contained a number of ovens and other industrial features and continued in use, in one form or another, until the seventeenth century. No evidence was found for the use of the numerous ovens contained within the various phases of this long-lived building, but more could have been made in drawing

comparisons between this building and its features and similar structures from quayside and other urban areas in medieval towns elsewhere. It would appear that these are very much a development of the fourteenth century and the accumulated evidence from excavations now surely offers the opportunity for a more general appraisal of the evidence for industrial and economic regeneration at this period. The small area excavated on Dog Bank provided insubstantial evidence for industrial use from the beginning of the thirteenth century, a medieval pottery kiln providing an archaeomagnetic date of 1160 plus or minus 60 years. The discovery of this kiln is particularly fortunate, since it provides a provenance and date for an early medieval pottery in a region where such information is notably absent.

By comparison with other medieval urban assemblages, this excavation produced little in the way of coins, brooches and other valuable artefacts, a factor, no doubt, of the industrial use to which the area was put. Particularly valuable is the assemblage of pottery, including the kiln material; Lucy Bown is the author of this expertly presented report. Widespread trade with the Low Countries is evidenced, and the products of the Scarborough potteries also feature large in this assemblage. Here, as elsewhere, a revised dating for this material is suggested. There is more French medieval pottery than has been found in excavations at Hartlepool, and the small quantity of pottery from the Tees Valley also suggests a trading pattern somewhat different from that seen at the Durham port. The waterlogged conditions of the quay ensured the preservation of fragments of caulking and other textiles, as well as leather and a few wooden objects, all reported upon in exemplary detail. Assemblages of animal and bird bone, as well as plant remains, had been deposited as rubbish, whilst doubt remains as to whether the fish bones are evidence for the fishing industry of the quayside or a more general reflection of diet in the city. The uncertain provenance makes this material much less useful as evidence, whilst its lengthy presentation is for this reason

somewhat surprising. This leads to the more general point, perhaps already hinted at; it is a matter of surprise to find this report so lavishly presented. Those accustomed to the on occasion, Byzantine, publication policies of the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission will, I think, be astonished to find extended letterpress tabulations and a generally uncluttered appearance which extends to allow the publishers gratitude to sponsor to occupy an otherwise blank page.* Well it

*Blank leaves are common in bound publications. The number of pages afforded by the folded sheets of paper needed to take text and illustrations rarely equals, and if unequal must exceed, the number actually occupied by matter.—*Editor*

might!

In conclusion, there is much valuable information in this monograph; it is an attractive volume which has been well produced and punctiliously edited. This reviewer would have preferred to see attention spread more evenly across the various excavated features, as well as a less uncritical presentation of some of the finds assemblages. In making these criticisms the unpleasant and arduous conditions of quayside excavation are also recalled; Colm O'Brien and his co-authors are to be congratulated on producing a valuable contribution to the corpus of published evidence for quayside and urban development in our region.

BLAISE VYNER