

Books

The London Surveys of Ralph Treswell, edited by John Schofield. Publication no. 135 of the London Topographical Society, 1987. 164 pp., 11 colour pl., 57 figs, bibliog., index. £16. Available from Simon Morris, 13 Alma Square, St John's Wood, NW8 9DA.

RALPH TRESWELL, c 1540 to 1616, by trade a Painter-Stainer (he was a Trustee of the Painter-Stainers' Company from 1580), is also known as a map-maker, doing pictorial surveys from 1580 or earlier of estates in the Home Counties and in 1593/4 undertaking work overseas, in Brittany. He was engaged predominantly on such work until 1607.

It is however as a Surveyor that he is best known, for the work commissioned in London by Christ's Hospital and the Clothworkers' Company between 1607 and 1612, and also, at various times, by Christ Church, Oxford, and the Leathersellers' Company. The work required seems to have been the preparation of lease-plans; this entailed the drawing of ground floor and site plans, with textual additions for cellars, uppers floors and tenants' names. All the plans were coloured, eleven being reproduced by Schofield with the rest in black and white.

These surveys were incorporated in the Evidence Book of Christ's Hospital, the Plans Book of the Clothworkers Company, or retained in the case of other clients. Their publication, in one volume, from such diverse sources, is to be commended and enhances the value of the individual plans.

The book opens with a description of Treswell, his work in London and as Surveyor. This is followed by a useful discussion of the surveys as studies of London houses, in which Schofield isolates three main plan-types; of one-room plan, which surprisingly could be five and a half stories high; the second and most numerous type of two-room plan, in which the ground floor is a shop or warehouse with the living room or 'hall' on the first floor. The third type embraces larger houses of diverse forms that may include galleries, the larger medieval 'hall', courtyards, and often gardens which could be ornamental, or laid out as an orchard, or to provide space for tennis or bowls etc.

The individual components of the houses are considered in detail, ranging from Halls and Parlours to Privies and Houses of Office. The hazards of fire in London at that time are seen in Clothworkers' Hall, Mincing Lane, which had two 'gunpowder houses' on the second floor and above that a roof 'to lay faggots in'. These were all above the kitchen which had ovens and chimneys! The

hazards for health also are demonstrated in the proximity of so many privies to wells, both of which were often communal. The Surveys are published as a Gazetteer, each plan being shown (some in colour) supplemented by documentary evidence of its earlier history, or further details of the building or its construction and so on.

Most of the buildings surveyed were destroyed by the Great Fire of 1666 and the rest by later development, and we would know little of them if it were not for the survival of these plans. They represent too a class of building, the framed multi-storey urban house, that has been largely ignored in studies of the English house which look to the larger and wealthier house, or surviving examples of the smaller house in rural areas.

The application of colour conventions in the plans gives evidence on the construction of the buildings which merits further study. It is noted, too, that there are many examples of lines being continued through walls; this is particularly noticeable with back-to-back fireplaces. Bearing in mind the quality of the drawings these must be intentional, probably showing straight joints and therefore building phases. Might it be possible to extend study into the realm of structural analysis to demonstrate development of individual buildings?

How were these plans surveyed and drawn? There is, it is true, a reference to the Digges' books on survey but as all of us who have to survey buildings of many small irregular rooms know, it isn't easy and some thoughts on this would have been welcome.

However, that is a small omission. This book is well produced; a valuable source for the archaeologist, architectural historian, and historian. Valuable too in showing the diversity and richness of life in the city - 56 different trades appear in the buildings as well as small to great houses, with orchards, tennis courts *et al.* John Schofield is to be complimented.

PETER E. LEACH

Medieval and Later Pottery from Aldwark and other sites, by Catherine M. Brooks. The Archaeology of York: Vol. 16 The Pottery, Fascicule 3, *Council for British Archaeology for the York Archaeological Trust*, 1987. 127 pp., 4 pl., bibliog. £8.75.

THE YORK Archaeological Trust has now published three fascicules of Volume 16 of its 19 volume series in which it presents the results of its excavations and post-excavation studies. Fascicule 1, by Jane Holdsworth, has a clear aim: to present through a series of closed groups the post-Roman

ceramic sequence in York. Fascicule 2 deals with Roman pottery, and this one is the first in which we can see how the fascicule system deals with run-of-the-mill pottery reports. Naturally enough, there is a lot more detail about the York sequence, both as a result of the work reported here and through the general increase in knowledge in the 10 years since Holdsworth's work was published. It therefore represents much work by its author, and has been competently produced (the only omission I noted is that my 1985 review of the London sequence is referred to in the main text but missing from the bibliography). However, the main aim of the work is to present the ceramic evidence from YAT excavations as supporting evidence for the date of the sites.

Dating has been assigned by seriation of the major wares, but there were very few changes in the broad pattern of pottery supply to York during the medieval period. This fact, together with the normal problems of residuality, intrusive sherds, and the small size of most of the assemblages, make many of the conclusions tentative.

Thirty-six pages are taken up with pottery illustrations and descriptive catalogue (of the 'cooking pot; gritty ware' variety). It is not clear whether these illustrations represent a selection of the pottery or all that could be drawn, although to judge by the monotony of the rim forms one would guess the latter to be the case. Sherds thought to have been redeposited in later contexts are also illustrated, following the entries for the appropriate periods. The catalogue also contains a sherd count of unillustrated pottery to common name level.

A further 27 pages contain descriptions of the fabrics and a brief summary of their possible sources and the principal uses of the vessels. Like the London fabric series, these descriptions are no substitute for examination of hand specimens and there are few photographs to aid identification.

The method of publication adopted by YAT means that the topographic implications of the site evidence are discussed elsewhere, together with the section drawings and arguments which demonstrate the stratigraphic sequence. Furthermore, unless, like coins, the value of other finds for dating has been recognised, you have to turn to another fascicule to see what is associated with the pottery. This is inevitable and not particularly worrying. My own reservations about the method are that three separate functions rest uneasily together within this volume and presumably its successors. Newly-identified fabrics will have to be described when recognised, and presumably more precise divisions of the existing series will be made. There is no way around this problem given the fascicule system. An

alternative would be to issue the fabric series as a manual which could be updated periodically, but this would not fit into the concept of publication by fascicule. The main problem is in the illustration and the reasoning behind it. I assume that the feeling is that not enough material exists yet for typologies to be created, and that the evidence should be presented to the readership in the meantime. It may even be felt that the York medieval pottery cannot be fitted into a useful typology. Whatever the reason, I am sure that quite soon market forces themselves will force a modification of the YAT approach. Where is the market for a third fascicule on medieval pottery from York, a quarter of which is a catalogue of sherds all looking very similar to those published in the first two?

ALAN VINCE

The Archaeology of Animals, by Simon J. M. Davis. *B. T. Batsford Ltd.*, 1987. 224 pp., glossary, bibliog., index. £25.95 hardback, £14.95 paperback. *THE ARCHAEOLOGY of Animals* will have three kinds of readers. The interested amateur will find it a readable and interesting general book on what animal remains can tell us about human activity in the past, as it is informally written, superbly illustrated, a good length and a reasonable price. Archaeology students will read it because it is the best – indeed the only comprehensive – introduction to the methods of analysis of animal bones from archaeological sites. For the same reasons, professional archaeologists will find it a useful summary of current knowledge. In addition, though it is intended as a general book and not aimed at experienced archaeozoologists, I have no doubt that they will in fact buy it.

What Davis does is to summarise the most important work on a series of themes under eight headings. They are illustrated with 153 figures and photographs, an average of seven in every ten pages, which makes the book attractive to read.

The most interesting chapters for the general reader are those in the second part of the book, which covers Man's relationship with animals, first as a hunter and then as a herdsman and farmer of domestic stock. Davis starts at the very beginning of human evolution by describing the work done in Africa on early hominids, and whether Man originally evolved as a scavenger before he became a hunter. He also describes the human colonisation of new continents, and there is an interesting section on the question of whether Man was responsible for the extinction of the large mammals at the end of the last Ice Age. The chapters on the origin of domestic animals and 'Later domesticates and the secondary uses of animals' are most firmly rooted in Davis' own work in the Near East.

Students will find the first two chapters most useful. After a very brief summary of some of the problems of bone modification by man, dogs and natural causes, the question of what bones you identify and count and why is discussed. There is a now huge literature on this for the specialist, and a detailed review of it all would be out of place in a general book, but a few more references here would have been useful to students starting on a study of animal bones, for whom this book will otherwise be a *vade mecum*. Methods of ageing and sexing are also covered and the chapter on 'What are bones and teeth?' is an admirable summary.

One of the greatest contributions which animal bone analysis can make to archaeological interpretation is in identifying the season of use of sites, and chapter four is devoted to this. Davis lists the different kinds of remains which can provide seasonal evidence: migratory species; tooth eruption and bone maturation; incremental tissue, such as mollusc shells, fish bones and otoliths, and dental cementum; and tooth wear. He then describes a few key studies which between them illustrate these points. The last chapter, 'Britain: a zoo-archaeological case study', is most directly relevant to readers of *the London Archaeologist*, especially the second part which deals with animal bones from towns, and gives many examples from Philip Armitage's work in London.

The only serious criticism of this book is that the problems of human butchery and other taphonomic processes which affect bones are not covered in nearly enough detail. Evidence of butchery, of whether or not bones were broken up for extraction of marrow and grease, and of gnawing of bones by dogs and other carnivores is an integral part of the animal bone studies. There is little consideration too of context variation, important for all sites, and quite crucial for urban excavations. Animal remains are not themselves cultural objects, so cannot contribute information about the people who deposited them without the information provided by their context and their taphonomy.

However, this is the only real shortcoming of the book. Until now there has been no book which could serve as an introduction to archaeological studies based on animal remains. I have been teaching animal bones to Extra-mural Department students in London for eight years, and this has been the first year that I have been able to recommend unreservedly one book for preliminary reading.

DALE SERJEANTSON

The Tithe Award: Twickenham in 1845, by T. H. R. Cashmore. *Borough of Twickenham Local History Society* 1980. 30 pp., 5 illus. and maps. 75p.

THIS INFORMATIVE booklet starts by giving an excellent resumé about tithes. Most of us know that a tithe is the 'gift' of a tenth part of (mainly) agricultural produce to the Church, but this paper gives much useful information which is applicable generally.

The second part gives a glimpse into the locality some 135 years ago, and outlines the changes, largely wrought through the evolution of transport. This is a welcome addition to the growing number of such works, all of which should be encouraged, but this is a good example to emulate.

The Manor House, Twickenham, by A. C. B. Urwin. *Borough of Twickenham Local History Society* 1987. 40 pp., 7 maps, 2 pl., 1 plan. £2.00.

THE AUTHOR states that 'this paper has taken many years to complete' and one can readily understand why. There are 1½ pages for the bibliography, many requiring much study to obtain the information required. The result is a very interesting account of the Manor House, its owners and occupants with reference to the Manor of Twickenham from very early times, the first chapter relates to the years 704 to 1446 A.D. the year of the first explicit reference to Twickenham Manor.

A very interesting and worthwhile publication, well worth its modest price.

MARSDEN ANDERSON

Fieldwork for archaeologists and local historians, by Anthony Brown. *B. T. Batsford Ltd.*, 1987. 159pp, 76 figs., index, bibliog. £12.95.

BATSFORD BOOKS are rapidly building themselves an enviable reputation for fine archaeological textbooks. This new title follows closely on the heels of works by Tim Darvill and Martin Jones, and as with those books, such is the quality of production that the budding fieldworker will soon be forced into a difficult decision; whether to leave this book resplendent on his coffee table, or whether to put it to more practical use and take it into the field.

In this book Anthony Brown, a tutor in the University of Leicester's Department of Adult Education, sets out to describe in detail the methods by which the amateur archaeologist with only limited resources can make a worthwhile contribution to the archaeological and historical record by means of fieldwork. Separate chapters deal with fieldwalking, the recording and interpretation of earthworks and the use of maps and documents in field research. There is also an introductory section which discusses the possible strategies for a fieldwork project, and the book ends with a list of useful addresses and an excellent list of the kinds of monuments which are likely to be encountered and bibliographic refer-

ences for their identification. Every chapter includes many extremely well illustrated examples.

It soon becomes apparent that Mr Brown is writing from a position of experience; the book is crammed with sensible, practical advice. He quickly and continually makes the point that the most successful fieldworker is someone who knows back-to-front their particular piece of country and has learnt through long experience how to locate and identify sites.

One can make few criticisms of this book; perhaps it draws too many of its examples from the Midlands, at the expense of more marginal areas such as the uplands, which have their own very particular problems. Also, by gearing the book so definitely towards the amateur fieldworker, a number of very relevant methods of field survey, such as aerial photography and geophysical survey, receive less attention than they deserve. However, the most depressing element to this excellently presented and highly recommended book is that it reminds those of us tied to urban London just how many valuable means of research and discovery are lost to us. It is a great tragedy that the prehistoric and much of the early historic past of Greater London will remain lost because the very methods described so fluently in this book are unuseable in urban conditions.

HEDLEY SWAIN

Archaeology and language, by Colin Renfrew. *Jonathan Cape Ltd.*, 1987. 346 pp., 14 pl., 45 figs., bibliog., index. £16.00.

IN HIS LATEST book Colin Renfrew sets himself the task of finding a new and plausible explanation for the present-day distribution of Indo-European languages. He draws his evidence from both archaeology and linguistics, and suggests ways in which the two types of evidence can be correlated. The book covers a vast range of subjects and a geographic area which embraces Anatolia, Europe, India and central Asia, with incidental excursions into Africa and Polynesia. The early chapters deal with previous attempts to explain the spread of Indo-European languages in a lucid and highly stimulating way. The description of linguistic techniques such as the construction of a proto-lexicon and dating by glotto-chronology are extremely useful for the non-specialist, and the critiques trenchant and convincing.

The author then reaches the nub of his argument, which is to suggest that the Indo-European languages spread, together with the practice of agriculture, from a heartland in Eastern Anatolia. The whole edifice rests on the speculation that the language spoken by these pioneering farmers was proto-Indo-European. There will be many who feel that it is not permissible to make assumptions about

the language used by non-literate groups of people who lived more than eight thousand years ago, and that for this fundamental reason the whole edifice collapses. Renfrew is, of course, aware of this attitude and states specifically that his basic assumption is "sheer hypothesis". In addition, the arguments which he offers as support for his hypothesis will not be universally accepted. They rest partly on deductions made from the fact that one of the first known languages from eastern Anatolia, Hittite, does belong to the Indo-European group; extrapolation from this suggests to Renfrew that the language of the earliest farmers from the area at sites such as Chatal Hüyük, was a related proto-Indo-European language. (The possibility that the Hittites were themselves incomers to the area, rather than lineal descendants of the early farmers, is rejected out of hand.) If one accepts this shaky premise, the description of the spread of agriculture and the language associated with it, to Greece and thence to the rest of Europe, has a satisfactory internal cohesion to the non-specialist.

The explanation for the presence of Indo-European languages in Iran and India is less satisfactory. Diffusion is suggested eastwards from the Anatolian heartland to northern Iran, Turkmenia, and thence to the North-West Frontier, although, as the author points out, evidence coming out from current excavations at Mehrgahr suggests that this may be a separate and independent centre of domestication. If indigenous development of agriculture can be proved, then the link between the introduction of farming and the spread of this language group is broken, and Renfrew's second suggestion of the spread in the third millennium together with a group of mounted nomads is the only one to be considered.

Another query is raised by the failure of the proposed model to incorporate the early centre of domestication in the Levant. Why did this nuclear area, which may be as early as that around Chatal, fail to have the same linguistic impact as its Anatolian counterpart? There is no suggestion that anything but a Semitic language was spoken here, and possibly a non-Semitic, non-Indo-European one in the other postulated nuclear area on the Zagros flanks.

Criticisms such as those levelled above do little to detract from the scale of Professor's Renfrew's achievement. The book is extremely well written, highly readable and conveys a vivid impression of the pleasure the author must have derived from writing it. His scholarship is impressive, his enthusiasm infectious and he has done his colleagues a great service by providing them with new food for thought and a topic of debate for many years to come.

HARRIET CRAWFORD