kilns, producing ‘Derbyshire ware’, which have been located and excavated by Mr. S. O. Kay. Others, such as Potters Baulk in Hilton and Potter Wood in Netherseal await investigation. No doubt some of them are relatively modern, but Potter Somersal (1415) in Sudbury Parish ought to be investigated. So ought the quern factories in Quarndon (a parish in Morleyston and Litchurch Hundred and a hamlet in Calver), the whetstone factory in Whiston and the seventeenth-century Grindlestone Field in Barlow. The medieval evidence for lead mining is curiously meagre, and there are no names indicating alabaster working in the south of the county. Nevertheless, this volume offers remarkably few disappointments to the reader, and they arise from lack of evidence, and not from any shortcoming of the editor. Dr. Cameron and those Derbyshire people who helped him have produced the best contribution so far to the work of the English Place-Name Society.

M. W. BARLEY

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

The following letter has been received from Dr. A. Gasparetto. The editor welcomes the opportunity of publishing his comments and would at the same time like to apologize to him for any apparent misrepresentation of his arguments to which currency was given in the review of which he speaks.

Dear Sir,

I am extremely grateful to you for the lengthy and exhaustive review of my book, Il Vetro di Murano dalle origini ad oggi, which appeared in the last volume of Medieval Archaeology. I would, however, like to reply to two of the points you raise.

1. As regards the origin of the hollow-glass industry in the Lagoons, I did not disclaim the descent of this industry from the Roman one. I only assumed that Venice might have inherited it through the Benedictines, who had kept some of the ancient techniques and practised them in their monasteries (pp. 39-40), especially during the Carolingian and Ottonian periods. In fact, the few literary sources about glass in these periods all belong to the Benedictine world. In other words a continuity existed, in my view, between late Roman and medieval Venetian hollow-glass manufacturing, but it was indirect, not direct, since the Lombard invasion and other economic and social circumstances prevented the practice of a free industry, so that, for some three centuries, the work was carried on more in the cloisters than in the factories.

2. With regard to the common glassware, I certainly did not dismiss it; indeed, I tried to demonstrate, contrary to the accepted opinion, that it constituted at all periods of the Venetian industry the predominant part of the glass produced (pp. 52, 62, 86), so that even the artists of the time never represented any decorated (enamelled) glass in their canvases, but only the simplest table-ware (wine-bottles, goblets, etc., p. 87). This is a very important point, and these paintings provide the only evidence we have for such Gothic Venetian glasses.

I might add that in an article recently published in Cahiers de la Céramique, du Verre et des Arts du Feu, no. 17, I have dealt with the origin of the Venetian industry and the problem of the Gothic Venetian glasses more fully. The Gothic glasses are also discussed in my paper published in the Report of the 5th International Congress of Glass, Munich, 1959, Glastechnische Berichte, xxxii (1959), 38 ff.

Yours faithfully,

Venice, 5 April, 1960.

A. GASPARDETTO.