

excavation findings and sets the archaeology in its context. The description of the structures follows, laid out by croft and separate building within the croft. A variety of structures was examined, including the manor house, parts of the church, and the post mill, in addition to the peasant buildings. There follows a gazetteer of sites and findspots throughout the parish of Great Linford, extracted from the SMR. This leads to the chapter on non-pottery finds. These are laid out in functional categories, a way of looking at finds that is becoming more and more common, and leads automatically to a discussion of function. This chapter includes the non-vessel ceramics, the roof tile, floor tile and brick, with other building materials.

There is nothing innovative about the way the pottery chapter is laid out. The small but well stratified group of Saxon vessels from beneath the church gets specialist treatment, from Terry Pearson, in a separate section which includes discussion on fabric, forms and manufacturing techniques. Quantification is by sherd count and this is tabulated for fabrics and forms.

The medieval and post-medieval pottery is reported by one of the directors of the excavation, Dennis Mynard, and restricts itself to the presentation of the ceramic evidence. The methodology is clearly laid out. Quantification was done by minimum vessel, sherd count and weight, although weights were not used for the statistics published in the report. The fact that all quantification used is available in the archive makes this assemblage comprehensive and comparable with other sites.

The assemblage is large (almost 50,000 sherds) and gives a good idea of what the various classes of inhabitant at Great Linford were using throughout the 900 years of settlement. Like most village sites, the excavations did not produce deeply stratified deposits. The dating for the pottery is therefore based on existing knowledge. However, related contexts were combined, and the pottery from these presented as pottery groups.

The pottery report opens with the methodology and goes on to describe the form, decoration and fabric type series. A description of the ceramic wares follows, using both a common name and an alpha-numeric code. For each ware there is some discussion followed by a tabulation of quantities by form and pottery group. Examples of each ware are clearly illustrated. The ware descriptions are in a consistent format, as follows: common name and code; source, if known, and published reference; fabric description; quantity (including a table); discussion of dating; description of forms and decoration. It is stated that the post-medieval wares are well-known and their descriptions are therefore brief. Newcomers to the subject, however, might have been helped by more consistent referencing. This reviewer wished that the post-medieval pottery had been given equal treatment to the Saxon and medieval wares, particularly in view of the good 17th-century group from the manor house.

A description of the individual pottery groups follows the ware descriptions and is followed in turn by a breakdown of the pottery by group. The descriptions of the groups on p. 286 is very welcome by this time, as the first reference to them occurred on p. 249 — better late than never! This section might have been more appropriately positioned at the start of the medieval and post-medieval pottery report. It does, however, make it easy to link the pottery back to the site, something pottery reports often neglect to do. The groups are described in chronological order and quantities of forms within each ware type tabulated for each group. The particularly good group of vessels, already mentioned above, dating to no later than 1670–1680, is described in detail.

There is no discussion of the pottery as it relates to the village as a whole, nor any distributions or analysis of evidence for use. This is one of the largest assemblages in the region and it is a pity that more searching questions, such as those of status or function, were not asked. If they were, and the pottery failed to

answer them, this is not stated. The pottery is limited to being used solely as dating evidence.

All tables are within the text; there are thankfully no microfiches. The pottery is clearly and well illustrated. This reviewer, however, could not understand why different colour conventions had been used for every vessel, with the consequent need for separate keys each time. Why not stick to one colour convention? At least all the pottery illustrations are referred to correctly in the text — unlike the finds chapter where none of the numbers match those in the text! The coin referred to on p. 79 as number 34, for example, is, in fact, a buckle in the illustrations. There can be no excuse for this failure of editing.

The content is let down by editing errors and omissions. The odd typing error (for example 'Raaeren' on page 354) can be forgiven but there are other examples of editorial carelessness which are more serious. The totals in table 23 do not tally and the misaligned totals in table 25 make a nonsense of the vessel count. There are references missing from the bibliography: at least six were noted in the pottery section alone, such as Mynard 1970, Farley 1979 and Mellor 1984. It is hoped that the statement on page 29 'the success of Henry Tudor at Bosworth Field and his accession to the throne as Henry VIII' is a slip of the Roman numeral. These all add up to erratic and less than rigorous editing.

This is a great pity because, even without the detailed stratified deposits, this is an important assemblage, thoroughly illustrated and presented in a clear, easily understood format. One wonders whether the urgency to bring out this report brought on by the impending demise of the New Town Development Corporation led to a certain haste which might otherwise have allowed more to be done with the pottery. The disappearance of the Milton Keynes Unit and the loss of expertise acquired over 30 years of work in the region, is a tragedy and ought never to have been allowed to happen without wider protest.

Anna Slowikowski

**Stephen Moorhouse and Ian Roberts, *Wrenthorpe Potteries*.** Yorkshire Archaeology 2. 189 pp incl. 91 figs and 29 pls. Price £12.00 plus £2.25 postage.

This is the second in the monograph series produced by the West Yorkshire Archaeology Service. As its title indicates, this is a comprehensive report on the excavation and pottery from part of the extensive pottery-making industry which pre-dated the existing village of Wrenthorpe. The report is divided into seven chapters covering: The Setting, The Excavations, Synthesis and Dating, The Pottery, Other Finds, Environmental Evidence and Appendices. The latter comprise five appendices, of which the first two pertain to the site which is the main subject of this report. The third is a gazetteer of potting evidence at Wrenthorpe and the last two cover additional minor sites in the vicinity of the main excavations: a 16th-century dump from Bunkers Hill and rescue work at Towlerton Lane.

The formation of the village at Wrenthorpe post-dates the pottery industry, and the area is perhaps better known to some as Potovens, from the publications by Peter Brears in the first volume of the *Journal for the Society for Post-Medieval Archaeology* and elsewhere (Brears 1967; 1971; 1983).

Chapter II, The Excavations, describes the eighteen 'phases of potting' in the 16th and 17th centuries. Detailed site and phase plans are augmented by isometric reconstruction drawings of the different phases of kilns.

Chapter IV, The Pottery, by Stephen Moorhouse and Anna

## REVIEWS

Slowikowski (the only chapter to have its authors listed in the contents), comprises pages 89–149 of the volume, but, as should be expected from a report on a pottery production complex, detailed discussion of the pottery and its dating also occurs elsewhere, notably in Chapter III (Synthesis and Dating). The pottery is divided into four main types: Cistercian, Early Yellow, Black wares and Yellow wares, with a fifth category 'Other Types'. This covers slip-decorated wares, industrial vessels, coarse wares and non-Wrenthorpe pottery. The figures follow a similar pattern, though the logic for three Early Yellow ware illustrations in the middle of Cistercian wares in Fig. 58 is not apparent; they could easily have been placed with those from site 3 in Fig. 59. The kiln furniture, mostly saggars and mushroom props, are dealt with as a separate element.

Three-quarters of the sixty-one pages of the pottery section are either illustrations or tables. Most of these come in a block at the end, after the text, and have an extremely generous layout, with a number occupying half a page or less. There does not seem to be a particular reason why the illustrations are not integrated in the text, unless it is that the paper quality is such that the sections show through onto the next page. Several of the figures are charts of the development of forms by ware type, and Fig. 48 shows with excellent clarity the way Yellow wares were stacked and the saggars and mushroom props used. Table 16 is a summary quantification for Site 1 by form and phase, and although the caption says it is for Black wares, Cistercian wares are also included. The quantification used for these and for the six-page Table 18 is vessel count; there is, however, no indication in the pottery quantification on page 110 of whether this is a minimum or maximum vessel count. Tables 19 and 20 show the breakdown of pottery by, respectively: type, phase and context, and by types and forms for Site 2A. The quantification used for these two tables (vessels:sherds) shows with some clarity that most of the vessels were represented by very few sherds; the total estimate is 567 vessels from 826 sherds. It would have been more worthwhile if EVEs had also been used here as comparison.

Chapter V (Other Finds) includes a comprehensive report on the 324 clay tobacco pipe fragments, but the other 'small finds' were very sparse. These include a purpose-made disc, which might have been a kiln separator, two potsherd discs and two solid balls of fired clay. Both of these were glazed, and one was decorated with applied white clay spots.

The detail in this publication is extensive, but it is not a report to 'dip into', as all the information and evidence is rarely given in one place. For instance, the four main ware types each have their own section and an additional sub-section in 'Discussion of the Pottery'. As mentioned above, Chapter III also contains more information on the pottery. Because of this, a greater degree of internal cross-referencing would have been helpful, although in some cases it is quite detailed. For example, Peter Davey, discussing the Lancashire typological links with the Wrenthorpe pipes, refers (page 158) to the discussion in the pottery section of the possibility of one of the Wrenthorpe potters originating from Lancashire.

One of the disconcerting features of this report is the frequent reference made to the limited nature of the evidence, and problems caused by this. Despite this, the level of detail available is impressive, and we can only wonder what would have resulted if the whole area had been available for excavation. As the report states, the nature of the evidence obtained has done little to improve the dating of the different wares under discussion, but it will be of benefit to those in Yorkshire and the north who are trying to source their Cistercian and Yellow wares.

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

**Brears, P.** 1967, 'Excavations at Potovens, near Wakefield', *Post-Medieval Archaeol* 1, 3–43.

**Brears, P. C. D.** 1971, 'The Pottery' in K. S. Bartlett, 'Excavations in Potovens, near Wakefield 1968', *Post-Medieval Archaeol* 5, 16–31.

**Brears, P. C. D.** 1983, 'Post-medieval Pottery' in P. Mayes and L. A. S. Butler, *Sandal Castle Excavations 1964–1973*.

Sarah Jennings

**D. Piton (ed) *Travaux du Groupe de Recherches et d'Études sur la Céramique dans le Nord — Pas-de-Calais. Actes du Colloque d'Outreau (10–12 Avril 1992), La Céramique du V<sup>ème</sup> au X<sup>ème</sup> Siècle dans l'Europe du Nord-Ouest***, Nord-Ouest-Archéologie Hors-série 1993. 432 pp., numerous figures and plates. ISSN 0900-9559. Price 350 F. Francs.

The first colloquium of the Groupe de Recherches et d'Études sur La Céramique (G.R.E.C.) dans le Nord — Pas-de-Calais, held in Lille in 1988, looked at medieval and post-medieval pottery in the north of France. The conference organised at Outreau had a wider brief, being concerned with 5th- to 10th-century pottery in north-west Europe (see *Medieval Ceramics* 16, 76–77).

The scope and quality of this second special paper of the G.R.E.C., which mainly comprises the conference proceedings, are admirably embodied in the attractive cover photograph showing a 4th-century pot from Arras, a 7th-century burnished jar from Berles-au-Bois and a 9th-century spouted jar from Carvin. Twenty-three papers are presented (nineteen in French and four in English); consequently this review cannot do justice to all contributions. In being selective, the reviewer has not created a short list, but rather singled out papers which reflect the scope of the publication.

The title of this volume is a little misleading, as it not only includes the Outreau proceedings, but also the works of the Group. The first paper (by C. Dherent) is a guide to the different archive sources available for the history of pottery or faience in France, divided into archives of the 'Ancien Régime', of the revolutionary period, of the period 1800–1940, and of the post-1940 period. There is also an account (by G. Blicek) of the faience factory founded at Fives-Lille by Gustave De Bruyn in 1862, which includes reproductions of illustrations from the original catalogues. Its faience was widely marketed, and by its peak in 1914 it was employing 400 workers; the post-war years, however, saw strikes and competition, and it ceased production in 1950.

The other contributions cover pottery from a wide area. There are regional surveys of ceramics from northern Gaul/France (Tuffreau Libre, Bayard), the Vosges/Black Forest (Châtelet), southern Champagne (Georges-Leroy and Lenoble), the département of Aisne (Bayard and Thouvenot), and southern Normandy and western Brittany (Couanon, Dufournier, Fichet de Clairfontaine, Flambard-Héricher, Lorren and Pilet), England (Vince), Kent (Macpherson-Grant), Belgium (Hollevoet), the Netherlands (Verhoeven, Van Es and Verwers). The recent evidence from particular consumer sites also features: Saint Denis (Meyer-Rodrigues and Lefèvre), Maastricht (Dijkman), Quentovic (Worthington), London (Blackmore), and York (Mainman). The production sites are those of the kilns at Maastricht (Dijkman) and in the Forest of La Londe near Rouen (Roy), the latter relevant to any reconsideration of imports to the south coast of England.

It is pleasing to see coverage of the period preceding the theme of the colloquium in two valuable reviews which will also be of interest to Roman pottery specialists. Tuffreau Libre looks at