

## REVIEWS

to 1mm, 'Kingston-type' to 0.5mm, Cheam to 0.25mm, and 'Tudor Green' with fine or no added temper. Such a simple division must be the method by which most sherds from London excavations are sorted, and will continue to be the best way of sorting Surrey whitewares anywhere else. Even at x 20 magnification however, many sherds will seem intermediate because of the range of variability in the temper grading at different kilns and at different times. The division into three fabric types need not necessarily correspond with three separate 'industries' however, despite 'Kingston-type' being made at Kingston, Cheam-type at Cheam, and 'Coarse Border ware' at Farnborough Hill and elsewhere in the west Surrey/Hampshire district. According to the neutron activation analyses, even two sherds of 'London-type wares' (here again referring to Cheam or Kingston whiteware rather than the major sandy ware of the 11th–13th centuries) were found to be so similar to 'Coarse Border ware' as to... 'suggest that they were manufactured outside the London area' (p. 185), with the implication that this was perhaps in the Border district.

Few whiteware kilns have been excavated, and none were of the first century of production. Documentary and implied evidence from excavated collections suggest that there were probably other whiteware production sites (Clandon, perhaps Staines or Egham, possibly Chertsey, and of course, Bankside), even during the late 14th- to 15th-century floruit of the Kingston and Border kilns. It is still possible that there were 'Kingston-type' producers in the Borders, 'Coarse Border ware' potters close to the Thames and elsewhere other than the Borders, and more 'Cheam ware' kilns at Cheam and perhaps also elsewhere. Whiteware production could have begun in west Surrey with 'Kingston-type' fabric as only a variant of 'Coarse Border-type', and both may have developed from the pale-fired 'Early Surrey wares' and other more grey/brown sandy wares of the district during the second quarter of the 13th century. Outlying potteries could have been established during the late 13th and early 14th century, perhaps even by members of the same families, close-by, or within towns along the Surrey littoral of the Thames and perhaps at other places. The extra costs of clay having to be carted-in would have been more than outweighed by the ready access to the City market.

Despite my disinclination to accept the theory of three separate industries, there is much of great value in this book. It contains the most comprehensive catalogue of medieval Surrey whiteware forms ever published, which should serve as the bedrock for comparative studies for many years to come. Of other aspects such as fabric typology, sources, and dating, the picture may not be as clear-cut as it is perceived to be in London. The City sequence may not, for example, be typical. I am confident that the book will be the stimulus for a renewal of interest in whitewares generally, and I hope that this will include much more fieldwork and a study of documentary sources.

All in all, this is a good read, and well worth the money!

Philip Jones

### **P. Hinton (ed) *Excavations in Southwark 1973–76 Lambeth 1973–79 London and Middx Archaeol Soc and Surrey Archaeol Soc Joint Publication No 3.***

It would have been difficult to find two more extreme approaches to the publication of essentially similar 1970's urban excavations than those adopted by the twin field archaeology departments of the Museum of London. The DUA, excavating within the administrative boundary of the City of London, decided in 1982 to publish its backlog sites and their finds thematically. Previously each site had formed a separate report,

being placed within the Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society if small, and forming a separate monograph if large. The Southwark and Lambeth Archaeological Excavations Committee, subsumed in 1983 into the DGLA, decided to publish its excavations in the order in which they were dug, and in groups within a monograph series. Unlike the DUA, it has stuck with its policy, of which the volume under review is the second fruit. The division between the DUA and DGLA goes even further than their method of publication; location maps for DUA sites normally omit Southwark (except for the southern end of London Bridge), while there is no map within this volume which shows the City. In the Saxon and later periods, however, Southwark and the City were intimately related and it is a fair assumption that the presence of the province's largest defended town immediately to the north was a major factor determining landuse and prosperity in Roman Southwark.

While it is, perhaps, legitimate for each field unit to ignore the presence of its twin, their publications must allow other workers to make comparisons. While I am not qualified to judge, I suspect that this is not true for the Roman pottery published here. Medieval and later pottery specialists are therefore extremely lucky that Clive Orton has made every attempt to make the pottery data published here compatible with that from the City. He has abandoned the fabric system used in the first volume of SLAEC excavation reports and adopted that used by the DUA. A short alpha-numeric code is used to denote a particular ware or fabric and this is used throughout the text, tables and figures, as well as the computer-based archive. There are minor differences in usage, such as the use of COLS for Cologne Stoneware in this report and KOLN in the DUA (where COLS denotes Colchester Slipped ware) and some inconsistency with codes within the volume. SWSG is the DUA code for English White Saltglazed Stoneware but in Southwark is Samian Ware South Gaulish. Coarse London-type ware is LOND C in the summary on p. 295 and description on p. 296 but LOND COAR on p. 349 (and, now, LCOAR in the DUA). Shelly/Sandy ware is SSW on pages 295 and 296 but SAND/SHEL on page 349. Cologne stoneware is COLS in the summary and COL on page 355. The codes used on Fig 126 to denote the glaze colour of Border wares: BORDY for yellow-glazed; BORDG for green-glazed, are not explained, nor are they used on Fig 130 which includes four Border ware vessels. Nevertheless, it is doubtful whether any user would be seriously confused by these inconsistencies and since the full common name is given in Orton's report each time a ware code is used it might have been less obtrusive to keep the use of the codes to a minimum there.

The advantage of the coding system becomes clear when one turns to the site report section, since a complete list of wares present in every stratified context has been presented in tabular form. Since the codes are mnemonic there is no need to constantly turn back to the pottery report to remind oneself of the identity of a code. The editors could undoubtedly have reduced space by opting for lists in micro-type as opposed to the type-set tables which they use, but the tables are clear and easy to use and understand. There are codes used in the site report section tables, such as RRES, MRES, LCGR, EMSH, STAM, FTGW and STAR, which do not occur within Orton's pottery report. Most of these are probably self explanatory. It is also strange that instead of producing one long dating table for each major period on a site they are separated arbitrarily and surrounded by blocks of text. In some cases this seems to have been done because only certain contexts had biological data to be tabulated, thus allowing a wider table for the other contexts. In other cases there is no apparent logic, except to break up the text. Contexts from the same pit occur in different tables, which are arranged by context number rather than interpretative group, feature or stratigraphic sequence. You cannot therefore

easily see the introduction of fabrics in a sequence or compare pit fills.

Despite these minor quibbles, the volume succeeds reasonably well by its own standards. It presents sufficient information to allow almost every interpretative decision to be checked. The absence of full quantified data for the run-of-the-mill contexts is no great loss, since the groups are likely to have been too small for any statistics to be significant but it is important to know whether a ware is present as a single sherd amongst a much earlier assemblage or whether it is dominant. A sherd count or an indication of the approximate size of the assemblage would have been useful. The same applies to the absence of information on forms. Most of the time there would have been little significant information but now and again the presence of a particular form or range of forms might have aided interpretation. Nevertheless, one cannot complain about omissions when so much of the basic data has been made available. Discussion of the medieval pottery sequence is brief, but this is because the data from these sites adds little or nothing to what is known of pottery sources and their dating in the London area. It is clear that there were no groups of medieval pottery which were large enough or 'clean' enough for a quantitative comparison with City assemblages to be made. Where large associated groups were present, in the post-medieval period, they have been quantified by ware and form and compared with City data. Quantitative differences between contemporary groups from Aldgate and Southwark were noted but there is too little data available to allow those differences to be interpreted. The value of this work will only become clear when many more assemblages have been analysed using the same terminology and methodology. The question which must be asked, however, is whether the results of these excavations justify the expense of their publication in this format. The editor himself admits that this is an experiment and calls for comments and criticisms (p. 4). Although the format is one of the most extreme examples of full publication to have emerged in urban archaeology for many years Hinton considers the level of detail restricted for reasons of economy! It would be interesting to see what would have been the result of an unlimited budget (or a 7,000 context DUA site). With the present level of detail, if it were not for the fact that members of LAMAS and SAS received the volume free, one cannot imagine that this 500 page volume would have had any market outside of those involved in the excavation of Southwark and Lambeth.

Three or four pieces of work within the volume are of sufficient interest to have warranted a separate publication, and amongst these would certainly be Orton's work on Mark Browns Wharf. For the rest, it is difficult to marry the disparate collection of partial data collected at random from these Southwark sites with the revelation of the history of the settlements of Southwark and Lambeth promised by Harvey Sheldon in the foreword. This is not to say that the thematic publications of the DUA are the answer to Southwark's problem.

Many sites excavated in the City do not even have a published plan of the excavated area in relation to the modern streets, nor any but the briefest published summary of their results. Future DUA site reports will contain reports very similar to those used here, although they will be published in microfiche. Hinton, however, is right to claim that microfiche is inconvenient to consult. Unlike his book, it can neither be read on the train nor, without considerable difficulty, in bed. My own solution would be to use micro-type to publish site and finds descriptions and to summarise briefly the stratigraphic sequence and finds. The new annual report of the DUA should make an ideal format for disseminating basic information on what sites have been excavated and an outline of their results. However, if it were to be the final place of publication it should not be annual but merely publish summaries of sites at intervals and only after

post-excavation analysis has been completed.

It is clear, in conclusion, that both the DUA and DGLA have something to learn from each other's approach to publication. The basic data from sites such as these is required by workers who cannot visit the Museum of London archive and it should be made available in print. However, most people would be satisfied with less detail than is published here and probably with a drop in the quality of production. In return for these savings, perhaps, the publication of exceptional or novel material could be more lavish. To give just one example, colour photographs are the best way to portray decorated tin-glazed wares, especially where more than two colours are used on a vessel. Perhaps, with the projected amalgamation of the two units within the Museum of London, we will in future see a common policy towards publications and the methodology and terminology used within them.

Alan Vince

**H. Lüdtké, 'Die Keramik von Hollingstedt'. Neumünster, *Hollingstedt-Untersuchungen zum Nordseehafen von Haithabu/Schleswig, Neue Ausgrabungen in Haithabu Bericht 25*, 9-82.** Karl Wachholz Verlag, 1987 74 pp., 6 plates, 27 figs., 2 tables. ISBN 3 529 01925 9. Price: DM 50.

For many years researchers have postulated a transit connection between the North Sea and the Baltic via the river Schlei from the east and the westward river systems of the Eiden and Treene. The 9th-12th-century centre at Haithabu formed a pivotal point between Dorestad and Birka, and such a route between Treene and Schlei would have both shortened the sea route and avoided the dangers of the Jutland coast. It has been suggested that Haithabu's North Sea port was at Hollingstedt, on the east bank of the Treene approximately 22 km from Haithabu. This volume is devoted to four analyses of the evidence relating to this hypothesis — Lüdtké on the pottery (the subject of this review), Dagmar Unverhau on the catographic evidence, Dietrich Hoffmann on the geology of the area, and Reinhard Zölitz and Uwe Heinrich on settlement prospection by phosphate analysis.

The pottery from Hollingstedt falls into four main retrieval groups: from Jankuhn's small excavation in 1932; those from the three sites examined in 1933 (Jankuhn 1937); finds dredged from the river Treene, and stray finds from around the village. The quantities from each of these groups are uneven: 49% from the dredging, 46% from surface finds, and only 3% and 2% from the 1933 and 1932 excavations respectively (total 8411 sherds, 100 kg.).

Lüdtké has quantified all the material by weight and sherd count within these groups, according to fabric type: soft greyware, hard greyware, glazed red earthenware, Badorf ware, Pingsdorf ware, yellow earthenware, Paffrath ware, Andenne ware, shell-tempered ware, near-stoneware, stoneware, and miscellaneous wares. This classification follows the Schleswig-Holstein '*Rahmenterminologie*' (Erdmann et al 1984), which concentrates on hardness using a scale based on Moh, and coarseness of inclusions — unknown, very fine (less than 0.2mm.), fine (0.2-0.63 mm.), medium (0.63-2.00mm.) and coarse (2mm.+).

Local pottery is described first, starting with the soft greyware: low fired, with coarse to medium/fine inclusions, and dark grey and black to brown colour (often uneven). Globular pots predominate, and manufacture in the Hollingstedt-Haithabu-Schleswig area is postulated (the only kiln so far discovered is at Schleswig 'Am Ohr', dated to the 12th century). Comparison is made with the relative chronology of the Schild