

Reviews

The Anglo-Saxons (Ancient Peoples and Places Series). By D. M. Wilson. 6 × 8¼ in. 231 pages, 79 plates, 38 line drawings. London, Thames and Hudson, 1960. Price 30s.

A general introduction to the material culture of the Anglo-Saxons, such as Mr. Wilson has now provided, outlining what is known and drawing together the literary and archaeological evidence, has long been needed. There are now a great many specialist studies of aspects of this subject, but the archaeologists, linguists and historians have too often worked in isolation. The archaeologists, moreover, have largely concentrated on the grave goods of the pagan period, and their controversies have seemed intimidating to the non-specialist and student. Yet recently some of the outstanding problems have been resolved: for example, R. L. S. Bruce-Mitford demonstrated conclusively in a lecture to the Society of Antiquaries in 1954 that the Kentish jewelled brooches of composite form must date to the late sixth and seventh centuries, and not to the late fifth, as Sir Thomas Kendrick once claimed. Similarly, the emphasis of Saxon archaeology has been wholly changed by the excavation of settlement-sites at Yeavinger, Thetford, Old Windsor, Wareham and Cricklade. The results of these excavations may not be published for some time to come, so Wilson's up-to-date résumé of progress will be of great value to all interested in Saxon studies. He has integrated this latest information with the earlier archaeological evidence, the Bayeux Tapestry and the Domesday Survey to provide a straightforward account of the life and social conditions of the Anglo-Saxons from the settlement to the Norman conquest, with sections on agriculture, trade, transport, towns, buildings, tools, weapons and dress, as well as the more usual topics of pagan burials and Christian churches and antiquities.

It is essential in a book of this type not to give definitive answers to questions which are still open, and Wilson has avoided this danger. He has dealt only very briefly with such problems as the meaning, date and extent of Frankish influence in Kent, but puts the case fairly (pp. 43-4). He goes further into the question of the Sutton Hoo cenotaph, but while he casts his vote for Aethelhere (d. 655), he does not force his opinion on his readers. Instead, he has tried to explain in his introduction how typology can be used for relative dating. This explanation, illustrated with Montelius' railway carriages, should help the layman to understand more specialized works, and to come to his own conclusions. The author's discussion of the limitations of typological dating is the most controversial part of his book. There is no doubt that too fine an absolute date has been attached to the radiate-head bow brooches from Chatham Lines, grave 2, but the difficulties in general of converting relative dates into absolute dates are possibly exaggerated by him, at least for the pagan period. The early grave-goods are given a moderately firm date by the date of the invasions, and the polychrome jewellery provides another fixed point less than two centuries later. It is more difficult in the Christian period, and it is useful to have all the dated finds tabulated (p. 20).

One must criticize the use of illustrations of a different scale on the same plate without any indication of their relative size, but the plates are well chosen and their number, made possible by the use of the photogravure technique of reproduction, is remarkable for a book of this price. They help to make this the best introduction to Anglo-Saxon archaeology yet written, and the ideal textbook for university students.

MARGARET SAUNDERS

On the Beginning of Salin's Style I in England (Universitet i Bergen Arbok: Historisk-Antikvarisk rekke, Nr. 3). By Egil Bakka. 9¼ × 7¼ in. 83 pp., 54 text-figures. Bergen, 1959. Price not stated.

This is a valuable analysis of the south Scandinavian elements in the early phases of Anglo-Saxon Style I animal-ornament. It is the outcome of a British Council scholar-

ship, which enabled a specialist on the northern migration period to make a first-hand study of our contemporary material: a rare event in the recent history of Anglo-Saxon archaeology. Detailed stylistic studies of English migration-period ornamental metal-work are equally rare, unfortunately, in the literature of the period, and Bakka's contribution is thus doubly welcome. Not since the work of Sir Thomas Kendrick, in the 1930s, has anything comparable been attempted.

Bakka has limited himself to the late fifth and early sixth centuries—a short phase, but vital for the first developments of Germanic art in England. His main concern is with a small group of square-headed brooches from Kent, and with a number of Kentish exports found in Frankish graves on the continent, which bear animal ornament in an early form of what Salin named Style I. He attributes three of these brooches (from Finglesham grave D3, Bifrons, Kent, grave 41, and Engers, near the Rhine in Hessen) to the hand of a single silversmith whom he calls the Kentish Master. He compares these with a group of brooches from old Danish territory, made apparently in a workshop or related workshops somewhere in that region, in Jutland or perhaps in Seeland. The stylistic affinities between these two groups are very close, and Bakka concludes that the Kentish Master first served his apprenticeship in Denmark, and then came to Kent to pursue his craft and further develop his style and technique, with far-reaching consequences for the future of Style I in England. In assessing the historical importance of this Kentish-Danish connexion, Bakka is rightly cautious; he gives us a timely warning that the immigration of 'not necessarily more than one man, bringing his skill and experience, and nothing more', should not be interpreted as the mass migration of a people. The most he will allow is that a craftsman coming to England from Denmark may have been sent from one kindred people to another, settled already in Kent. The date of the arrival of the Kentish Master, and the consequent impetus for the beginning of Style I in Kent, he places around A.D. 500. In support of this he gives a summary of the chronological bases for the dating of migration-period metal-work both in Scandinavia and England, eschewing the more violently controversial viewpoints expressed in one recent work by a Scandinavian archaeologist (M. B. Mackeprang, *De Nordiske Guldbraketeater* (1952)), and stressing quite properly the importance of the associated England grave-groups for fixing the absolute chronology of the whole migration period. All this is extremely reassuring and satisfactory to the Anglo-Saxon archaeologist.

This paper is in one sense very topical, since the subject of south Scandinavian elements in the first phases of Germanic art in England has recently been receiving attention here. Of course, it has long been accepted that Anglo-Saxon Style I was an insular development of the Scandinavian migration style, and the subject has been touched on continually by Scandinavian scholars from Salin onwards. For the most part, however, the English art of the period has not been given detailed attention, except in part by Sir Thomas Kendrick. With regard to the brooches discussed here, their true origins were for some time obscured by E. T. Leeds's conviction that they were connected with a settlement of Franks in Kent early in the sixth century. No one in this country challenged this theory until quite recently (C. F. C. Hawkes, in *Dark-age Britain* (1956), pp. 91-111). That Leeds himself was seriously thinking about the Danish-Kentish connexion before this time can be seen in some of his post-war papers ('Denmark and Early England,' *Antiq. J.*, xxvi (1946), pp. 27-37; and 'Anglo-Saxon exports: a criticism,' *Antiq. J.*, xxxiii (1953), pp. 208-10). The latter, a short note only, signalled his change of heart about these brooches, which he was by then prepared to call Danish. Just before he died he was writing a paper, which remained unfinished, in which he examined the Danish origin of the early Kentish square-headed brooches in more detail, though even then he was seeing only part of the evidence (*Med. Archaeol.*, I (1957), pp. 5-26). Finally, partly through editing this last paper of Leeds, and partly through my own researches on the key cemeteries of Finglesham and Bifrons, I in my turn was drawn to the subject, with conclusions virtually identical with Bakka's (*Med. Archaeol.*, II (1958), esp. pp. 42-57). Bakka, with his intimate knowledge of the south Scandinavian

material, has been able to carry the argument further than I did, and has, I think, put the existence of direct Danish influence on early sixth-century Kentish art beyond all doubt. This is a significant advance in our knowledge of the period.

Bakka is at his best in this paper when he is bent over the stylistic details of the objects themselves. His analyses of the often very complicated ornament on the brooches he is discussing is patient and masterly. He uses the minutest details of style with loving care to build up his arguments, and at each stage he illustrates his point by excellent line drawings—most of them his own. By this method the artistic personality of the Kentish Master becomes intensely vivid, and it is a refreshing change to have brooches and ornament discussed in terms of individual craftsmen and workshops, and not, in the all too familiar way, as impersonal stylistic abstractions.

Indeed, to turn for a moment to the weaker points in this paper, the Kentish Master has become so alive that in places he has quite run away with Bakka's sense of proportion. For though it is legitimate to attempt to estimate his importance from his known works, of which we can recognize only three with certainty, it is not proper to extend the discussion to include unknown or undiscovered works, as Bakka is inclined to do. This type of thinking is perhaps indicative of over-confidence, and there is, besides, a touch of arrogance in the paper which is displeasing. For it is a period in which there can be little certainty, and we must bear in mind an observation Bakka himself makes, that 'our conclusions will have to be as limited as the material is'.

His style is lively, and in places full of charm. We are lucky that he chose to publish in English, and that his command of the language is adequate for his purpose, but the paper is marred nevertheless by faulty grammar and unidiomatic expressions that could have been eliminated by strict revision. It is a pity that Mrs. Saunders, who had this responsibility, was not a sterner task-mistress. The proof-correction too, is very careless, and the errors which occur on almost every page irritate the eye, as do a number of unnecessary spelling mistakes (e.g. 'Watsum' for Wantsum) Channel, pp. 54, 56). These are trivialities, of course, but they are indicative of a certain carelessness in the presentation of the paper, which is manifest in more important things also. At times the flow of the argument is disturbed by passages where the thought is not properly organized, and there is a tendency to use generalized terms, which, if taken over into the main stream of Anglo-Saxon art-criticism, are confusing and meaningless. For example, if we remove him from the immediate context of this paper, who is this Kentish Master? An examination of Kentish Anglo-Saxon metal-work discloses the work of several master-craftsmen with equal right to this title. Such a one is the maker of the famous Sarre quoit brooch and other distinctive fifth-century metal-work, mentioned by Bakka in his introductory sections, or again, the maker of the even more famous Kingston brooch, and other seventh-century jewellers. Bakka should have been more precise and thoughtful before committing himself in this way.

These marks of over-hasty composition are unfortunate, for this is an important paper, and one which is destined to be a standard work of reference for future students of the period.

S. C. HAWKES

Runes, an introduction. By R. W. V. Elliott. $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. xvi + 124 pp., 24 plates. Manchester University Press, 1959. Price 30s.

Anyone who has taught Old English will have felt the lack of a general introduction in English to the study of runes for the student who cannot read German or the Scandinavian languages, but who wants more than can be gained from encyclopaedia articles, introductory chapters to grammars, etc. This book is intended as such an introduction, being written, its preface says, for the novice, and making no great claim to originality. The author has 'concentrated wherever possible upon what may be regarded as established facts rather than upon speculative theories', and therefore admits 'occasional over-simplification for the sake of clarity and conciseness'.

After an admirably cautious and concise opening chapter on the origin of runic writing the author considers the common Germanic *fupark*, runes in Scandinavia and England, rune-names and the uses to which runes are put, ending up with a long chapter on 'Some English Runic Inscriptions'. The striking thing about this plan is the space (over a third of the text) devoted to the English runes, inscriptions in which are counted—at a generous estimate—in a few hundreds, compared with that given to the Scandinavian runes, which appear in thousands of inscriptions. While this can be commended on the broad grounds that previous handbooks (that of H. Arntz, for example) pay too little attention to the English material, one must admit that Elliott's scheme gives the scanty English inscriptions too much importance. The Scandinavian runes, though clearly and concisely described, are inadequately illustrated. There is insufficient indication of their wealth of material, or of their lateness of survival as a practical script in Scandinavian lands—the latest example in Dr. Bæksted's Icelandic corpus is dated 1878. The account of the Scandinavian inscriptions is split uncomfortably in two, part appearing in the chapter 'Runic Writing in England.' As a result, the Man-Jær runes are illogically cut off from the other Scandinavian rune-types.

In general, and in particular in his chapters on rune-names and the uses of runes, Elliott is very interested in their magico-ritualistic values, in runes used 'to invoke higher powers'. Here, in the reviewer's opinion, he leaves established facts for speculative theories, without making clear how controversial his subject is, or giving Bæksted's important *Målruner og Trolldruner* the attention it deserves. In his attempts to find magic or ritualistic significance in runes over a wide range of dates Elliott is led to make some questionable statements. We are twice told that Tacitus's *notae* (used in lot-casting) were 'undoubtedly' runes, but no reason is given for this freedom from doubt, which is not shared, for instance, by Bæksted. Use of runes in the Falstone double inscription (in runic and Latin scripts) is regarded as 'sound insurance policy'—the runes having a magic purpose though the inscription is Christian. But Falstone is quite near Lindisfarne, where double inscriptions also appear. In 698 the Lindisfarne monks made for the body of St. Cuthbert an inscribed coffin, some texts being in Latin, others in runic script. Are we to believe that the runes here, used for the Christ monogram, were also 'sound insurance policy'? Or were they, like Falstone, traditional usage on funeral furniture? Here is an approach—possibly a fruitful one—which Elliott does not consider. Elsewhere in his search for rune magic he is led to find mythological meanings in apparently ordinary rune-names like *rad* ('perhaps to be associated with the belief that after death the soul had to take a long journey'), and *gyfu* ('may originally have denoted gifts or sacrifices offered to the gods'). This attitude accounts too for his assertion that ON *purs* is an earlier name than OE *þorn*, since *purs* can more readily be fitted to a mythological scheme.

In the field of English inscriptions Elliott's reliance on 'established facts' is least justifiable. The English texts have never been adequately gathered or studied, and 'established facts' are hard to come by, the 'establishing' often having been done by scholars who were not runologists, runologists who were not scholars and scholarly runologists with no special knowledge of the English field. Reliance on published material may lead to the repetition of old errors and half-truths. Elliott's section on English inscriptions, then, though containing some excellent passages, like the new interpretation of the Chessel Down text, and some good general accounts of inscriptions, has many statements that can be disputed, and many arguments seemingly based on inadequate documentation. To give specific examples. The *scanomodu solidus* is given to England 'on account of the shape of the *a*-rune.' Yet the same 'a' form is found on the *hada solidus* and the Westeremden B staff, both accepted by Elliott as Frisian, while the representation of the reflex of Germanic *au* (in **skau-*) by 'a' suggests Frisian origin. The 'pada' coins are given to Bede's Peada of Mercia, with no mention of the fact that many modern numismatists would date them no earlier than 680, too late for Bede's king. The traditional reading *ræhebul* for the Sandwich inscription goes unquestioned,

though this *h* form—like sans serif N—is unique in west Germanic inscriptions, even Vadstena ‘h’, cited by Elliott, not being a true parallel. Alternative readings of this rune, as ‘s’ (cf. the similar, reversed, form in Franks Casket ‘gisl’) or Latin N, are not considered, and the apparent preservation of intervocalic *h* is used to date the Sandwich stone. The Brunswick Casket has three mentions, with no note of Dr. Fink’s thesis that the plate bearing the runes is not original and may even be quite modern. Elliott claims no marks of division in the Ruthwell Dream of the Rood, but makes no comment on the undoubted existence at present of small points midway on the line after ‘almezttig’ and *k̅yning̅*’, each point at the end of the first poetic line of its section.

There is the occasional error of fact—the new transom of the Ruthwell Cross was added in 1823, not in 1802 when the fragments were assembled in the manse garden—and the occasional error of method—the Franks Casket transliteration is treated as an original text when Elliott claims as a linguistic point of interest ‘the characteristically Anglian use of *æ*,’ for *i*-mutated *ō*. But the Franks Casket uses, not *æ*, but the rune *æpel*, *epel*, which by virtue of its name, represents *i*-mutated *ō*, whatever form this may take in the different Old English dialects. Objections can be made to some of the transliterations. Thornhill A, line 2 is shown as beginning ‘rht’, these runes inked in on plate xv, which illustrates the stone. Yet neither ‘r’ nor ‘h’ can be certainly found there, while the two visible stems are very far apart for ‘h’ as D. H. Haigh noted in 1877. The Overchurch inscription is transliterated ‘folce arærdon bec(un); biddaþ fo(r)e æþelmu(n)de., though a more valid form would be ‘folcæarærdonbec—| [.] biddaþfoteæþelmu(n)—’, since there is no punctuation or word division, nor do we know what endings *becn* or *Æþelmu(n)d* had, or whether the imperative verb was *biddaþ* or *gebiddaþ*. Elliott’s transcript does not indicate that his ‘(r)’ is a substitution for an erroneous ‘t’, a sign of carelessness in the rune-master which might explain the presence of the puzzling ‘æ’ of ‘folcæ’ (wrongly given as ‘e’).

A careful re-thinking of the English material might have led Elliott to question some traditional generalizations repeated in the book. Mention is made, for example, of the thirty-three letter *futhorc* ‘in use’ in Northumbria. But what is meant by ‘in use’? Of thirty-three manuscript runes three, ‘q’, manuscript *gear*, ‘st’ (save doubtfully in a Frisian text), are not found in inscriptions, while one epigraphical rune, ‘k’, is not given in manuscripts. Surely there is need here to distinguish between epigraphical and manuscript traditions, the two not necessarily coinciding.

The select bibliography is a useful one, though one regrets the inclusion of G. Stephens’s *Old-Northern Runic Monuments* without a note for the novice that this work is often fanciful and is generally unreliable both runologically and linguistically. The photographs vary greatly in quality. Of those new to the reviewer, some, the Sandwich stone for example, are excellent, others, the Bewcastle Cross for instance, are poor. Clearer definition of the inscription is desirable in some cases, as those of the Beonna coin (the reverse of this coin is interchanged with that of the Eðilberht-Lul coin on plate v), and the Thornhill C stone. Finally, one must protest against the use of Stephens’s tendentious illustration of the worn Falstone ‘hogback’ and against the tracing-in of the runes on the picture of the Thornhill B stone, the inscription of which is clear enough to appear without retouching.

In short, this book is uneven in quality. It contains much of value and is consistently readable, yet the type of weakness indicated above means that it can be recommended to the novice only with some reservation.

R. I. PAGE

The Vikings. By J. Brøndsted. 7¼ × 4¼ in. 320 pp., 24 plates. Harmondsworth, Pelican Books, 1960. Price 5s.

Die Wikinger. By Eric Graf Oxenstierna. 10½ × 7¼ in. 270 pp., 96 plates (8 in colour). Stuttgart: Kohlhammer Verlag, 1959. Price 36 DM.

There are few subjects which are so coherent, yet offer such variety, as the study of the Viking age. Its remains are spread over a great stretch of northern Europe, from Kiev

to Ireland, and to the threshold of the New World in Greenland, but they retain, at least for a time, a uniformity which can only be paralleled in the remains of the Roman Empire. The period is illuminated by saga and given some precision by history, but it is far from being so fully historical that the archaeologist's contribution is confined to details. If its study has been comparatively neglected in this country, it is probably because of the very dispersion of the material, and the lack of a good general guide to it combining history with archaeology.

These two books will go far towards supplying the need. They treat much the same material, but in different ways, and to some extent they complement each other. Where Brøndsted is generally detached and objective, Oxenstierna is enthusiastic and exclamatory; and whereas the former presents his material in a clear and systematic fashion, the latter weaves his into a more generalized portrait of the history and culture of the period. Both have had to condense their account from a great wealth of literary and archaeological material, and both, in their different ways, have been successful.

Brøndsted is put at a severe disadvantage by the form in which his book appears. It may seem ungrateful to complain when so much is offered at so low a price, but the fact remains that the quantity of illustrations is meagre, and quite insufficient to give the non-specialist reader an adequate idea of the material under discussion. No one, for instance, who is not already familiar with the works in question, will be able to follow the chapter on art at all closely; and time and time again one wonders just what mental picture the author's words will conjure up in most readers' minds. His book begins with just over 100 pages of historical summary, well arranged, very conservative in tone, and as clear as such a summary can be. But it is inevitably rather complex, and some readers might have been given a better insight into the history of the period by greater concentration on selected characteristic episodes. The next 100 pages deal largely with archaeological material, and the last three chapters discuss Viking ideas and religion.

For many this book will be an introduction and guide to a whole new field of historical and archaeological interest. One of the best chapters gives at least an outline of information not only about the trading centres like Haithabu and Birka—among the most interesting sites of all medieval archaeology—but also about the fortresses like Trelleborg, which are as exciting and unexpected in their context as is Stonehenge in the British bronze age. It would be inappropriate to take the author to task for not substantiating his views in a work designed as a popular introduction, but a few individual points may be mentioned. He is unnecessarily vague about the significance of the English word 'hundred' (p. 242); the strong possibility that the Bayeux tapestry was embroidered in England might have been mentioned on p. 208; the house supposed to be that of Erik the Red at Brattahlid can hardly be his if, as is stated in *Eiríks Saga Rauða*, his wife's church was built '*eigi allnær húsunum*' (p. 81); and when, on p. 76, an Irish chronicler is quoted as saying that Ireland was penetrated by Norwegian influences in the middle of the tenth century, it might have been mentioned that traces of this influence were extremely rare at Lagore crannog, less than twenty miles from Dublin.

Points like this are bound to arise when an author attempts to summarize so much information for the general reader, and they do not alter the favourable impression made by the book as a whole. The writing is never dull and contains some memorable sentences: 'What the temple was to the Greeks,' we read, 'the ship was to the Vikings, the expression of their natures in harmonious pattern.' The translation is at times a little imprecise about archaeological expressions, and this results in a few dark sayings, such as that which attributes to Trelleborg 'streets of paved wood'; but in general it reads very well. One can only express the wish that the text may some day be published with the illustrations it deserves.

It is the illustrations which first attract attention in Oxenstierna's book. They are numerous, and the quality of those in black and white almost uniformly good. Some of those in colour are very striking, but a few of them serve as reminders that colour is not necessarily the best way of rendering detail in metal-work. There are, as well, many

invaluable line-drawings in the text. The author is less concerned with individual topics than with the presentation of a convincing portrait of the period as a whole, in which the detail is woven incidentally into a general exposition. He is skilful in his selection of material, and has a sure eye for the significant incident and the dramatic situation. At times the reader may feel that the drama is a little over-stressed, and could better have been left to speak for itself; but on the whole the care which the author has taken with arrangement and composition is well rewarded. He is particularly good on the activities of the Swedes in Russia, and he has a striking chapter on the women of the Viking age. The result is a book which is very well worth reading for the general story which it conveys, even if it is less useful than Brøndsted's for consulting on individual points of interest. Like Brøndsted, the author shows occasional imprecision when dealing with the British Isles; for instance, having remarked that of all the Viking colonies only the Isle of Man has retained its laws to the present day, he adds curiously that this could only happen among 'traditionsgebundene Engländer'. But much may be forgiven an author who writes with such vividness and enthusiasm. An English edition of the book would surely be worth while.

These are two very civilized and interesting works, and when we have read them we should recall what Yeats wrote, referring to textual critics:

'Lord, what would they say
Did their Catullus walk that way?'

The cap fits most of us who study the Viking age.

PETER S. GELLING

Archaeology in the U.S.S.R. By Alexander Mongait. 10½ × 8½ in. 429 pp., 207 illustrations (including maps). Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1959. Price 45s.

Work of the Novgorod Archaeological Expedition, I and II (in Russian). Edited by A. V. Artsikhovskiy and B. A. Kolchin. Materials and Researches on the Archaeology of the U.S.S.R., Nos. 55 and 65. 8 × 10½ in. 250 pp. and 364 pp., numerous plans and illustrations. Moscow: Institute of the History of Material Culture of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., 1956 and 1959. Price 37s. 6d. (vol. II, vol. I out of print).

Medieval archaeologists have played a very prominent part in Soviet archaeology in the last few years. The first text-book on archaeology in the Soviet Union by Artsikhovskiy appeared in 1954 and the Russian edition of Mongait's *Archaeology in the U.S.S.R.* appeared in the next year. Mongait, who is best known for his work at the medieval town of Old Ryazan, is also the leading Soviet exponent of archaeological theory. The English edition of his work is a fairly close translation with slight variations in the text and illustrations.

Although the book is produced in a westernized format, the method of illustration, as well as the virulent Marxism of the text, are general characteristics of Soviet work and need no special comment, although they may come as a surprise to English readers. It is described as a popular scientific book, but condenses an enormous amount of information into a single volume. A long list of references accompanies each chapter, and a sort of gazetteer of sites, which are marked on maps at the end of the book, will be extremely useful to the English reader. After an interesting introductory chapter dealing with archaeology in Russia before and since the Revolution the next seven chapters deal with periods and areas outside the interests of our Society.

Chapter 9 is concerned with the antecedents of Kiev Russia and also with non-urban medieval sites. The map on p. 317 showing the distribution of urnfields of the last century B.C. and early centuries A.D. to the north of the Black Sea reflects great credit on the energy of Soviet workers. Whether these urnfield-people derive from the Lausitz culture on the one hand, and were Slavs in speech who form the population of Kiev Russia on the other, is more controversial. At all events there is no better candidate. As Mongait stresses, it is the intervening gap between these and the earliest documentary

sources that needs filling. The description of the hill-forts and barrows excavated to the north and east is of great interest, although it is misleading to mark the urnfields on the same map (p. 323), for they must be earlier. The part played by the Vikings in the formation of the Kiev state has given offence to Russian nationalism since the eighteenth century. Mongait flings himself against the 'Normanists' with gusto. Surely the documentary sources give a reasonably clear picture? It may be of interest that a sword like the one illustrated on p. 333 is of local manufacture, but the fact that it is a Viking type is of greater interest than whether a Slav or Viking actually wielded it.

Medieval archaeology in Russia is very largely urban archaeology. Mongait gives a very valuable summary of urban work in chapter 10. Broadly speaking the interest of the southern towns is that, as they were sacked by the Tartars in the mid-thirteenth century, a good part of the remains have been left undisturbed since the onslaught. In the northern towns the main interest is that waterlogged conditions have led to the survival of a wide range of organic material. Novgorod is the most spectacular example of this.

The two volumes dealing with Soviet excavations at Novgorod from 1951 onwards are a demonstration of archaeological skill of a very high order and record one of the most outstanding excavations carried out in Europe. The site of the excavation was on the junction of the former Main and Serf Streets as they were before the re-planning of the town by Catharine the Great, at a point where earlier work had indicated that it was sufficiently wet for organic material to survive. The work was on a large scale with electric skips for removing spoil (some 450 people worked on the site in 1951-54). The results of the first four years' work were published with great alacrity in 1956, while a further volume dealing with small finds and other aspects of the work appeared in 1959. Work continues and interim reports appear regularly in *Sovetskaya Arkheologiya*. The birch bark documents which are one of the main discoveries are being published separately in a series of monographs by Artsikhovskiy, several of which have already appeared. He is the general director of the excavations, although Kolchin is in immediate charge of the work.

The two streets consisted of planks forming a continuous platform laid across two poles lying along the axis of the street. As with the huts at Glastonbury, the roads intermittently became too waterlogged for use, and were replaced by laying an exactly similar road on top of the earlier one. As a result the excavators found no less than 28 roads one on top of another, the uppermost being badly preserved owing to penetration by the air. The datable associated finds, which consist of coins in the make-up of the lowest roads and lead seals in that of the middle and upper roads, have allowed the sequence to be dated with precision (table on p. 133 of vol. 1). It is clear that the roads were replaced at fairly regular intervals of about 25 years. Several hundred log houses were associated with them; these and countless small finds can therefore be dated with precision from the mid-tenth to mid-sixteenth centuries. The sequence thus established is unrivalled elsewhere and owing to the far-flung trade connexions of Novgorod has an importance for most of northern Europe.

The English reader using the volumes will find that the layers (*yarusi*) or streets are numbered from the top downwards, 1-28, the Latin numerals representing the century. Most of the finds are set out in tables showing their occurrence in each layer; it does not require much Russian to use these. The reviewers have thought it wisest simply to run briefly through the various chapters by the Russian specialists indicating what seems to be of especial interest to the English reader.

The first volume contains seven chapters. In the general introductory chapter by Artsikhovskiy the summary of the archaeological evidence for extensive trade on pp. 26-29 is of especial interest. The second chapter is a masterly account by Kolchin of the excavation with plans of every street and its associated houses. The third chapter deals with the lead seals upon which the absolute chronology depends. There was no native coinage at Novgorod throughout the period, but in the lowest streets there were a few

foreign coins (German, Frisian, Anglo-Saxon, Byzantine), and, most important of all, a hoard of 871 Central Asian coins (371 legible) associated with street 27. These range from A.D. 772 to 972, mainly within the last 30 years of that period. This hoard, which gives a firm date of c.975 for the base of the sequence, is described in chapter 4. The next chapter deals with the complicated system of wooden drains and pipes leading to wooden-lined sumps, used to combat the ever-present problem of standing water. The final chapter deals with the coarse pottery, classified on rim forms into eight types with sub-variants (p. 228 and table on p. 234). The study should provide the English archaeologist with a salutary lesson on the insensitivity of medieval coarse wares as a basis of dating!

The first four chapters of the second volume are of fundamental importance to the museum worker and student of medieval small finds. The first chapter by Kolchin deals with the great mass of iron objects. After describing methods of iron-working he discusses the various tools: axes (table on p. 30), adzes, saws, hammers, knives (1,444 examples, valuable table on p. 50), shears and scissors, drills, sickles and scythes, fish-hooks, locks and keys (tables on pp. 87, 94), and various other objects including buckles (important table on p. 103), and ring-headed pins. The following chapter deals with weapons: swords, daggers, spearheads, battle-axes, maces, an engraved wooden shield, bows and arrows, arrowheads (145 examples), quivers, pieces of plate armour, and various objects connected with riding (bits, spurs, stirrups, and so on). The excavators found about 6,500 objects of footwear and these together with other leather objects (such as sheaths and cases), are described in the third chapter. The chapter dealing with brooches and other jewellery (pendants, bracelets, bangles and finger-rings), is of especial interest.

The fifth chapter of the second volume deals with buildings associated with the streets. There were 525 of these (up to 1955), which with one exception were built of wood (spruce and pine), normally of horizontal logs interlocking at the corners. The majority of these were small square storehouses and workshops, but some 200 dwellings usually containing an oven or stove were uncovered. These were single and very rarely two-storied (table on p. 279), and contained one, two or sometimes three rooms. A short chapter describes the seals discovered in 1955, and the volume concludes with a chapter on medieval agriculture at Novgorod, based on analysis of large quantities of grain found in different levels and the seeds of the weeds of cultivation mixed with this. The principal fact is that winter rye, absent in the tenth century, appears in the eleventh century and becomes by far the predominant cereal from the twelfth to fourteenth centuries, when the quantity of all cereals falls off sharply. The author's main thesis, a very interesting one, is that the cultivation of winter rye from c. 1000 onwards in the forest zone of Russia is to be associated with the adoption and growth of a settled rotational agriculture, an early stage of the classical three- and two-field system of open-field agriculture.

In forthcoming volumes the thousands of wooden objects, the imported Kiev and 'Golden Horde' pottery, the other coins and so on remain to be described. It is to be hoped that there will be a general index in volume iii or iv. Meanwhile it is clear that no medieval archaeologist can afford to neglect what is quite evidently a landmark in his subject.

W. L. GOODMAN; M. W. THOMPSON

The Normans in Canterbury. By W. Urry. 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ × 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ in. 20 pp. Canterbury: Canterbury Archaeological Society, 1959. Price 2s. 6d.

Dr. Urry writes with an intimate topographical knowledge of Canterbury, such as gives the works of old local antiquaries an authority that products of *phrontisteria* in Illinois, or even Bloomsbury, may lack. One is never certain whether the field archaeologist has bothered to look over into the next field, nor whether the documentary researcher knows (*connait*) what he is talking about. This short paper is the digest of a lecture read to the Anglo-French Historical Conference at Caen in 1957, but it is to some degree a

by-product of his invaluable (I speak as one who has used it), but yet unpublished thesis, *Early Rentals and Charters relating to the Borough of Canterbury*, and it shows the same insight and precision.

The greater part concerns the heavy dominion of Odo and his henchmen. That the Men of Kent, having made a politic submission, should suffer this tonsured viking seems unfair. But they had their *revanche*: Odo was a pre-Hildebrandine phenomenon; his strength, like Stigand's, lay in his own holdings, not in the Church, of which he was so poor a *minister*; with Lanfranc's championship of the Kentish liberties, comes that lasting, almost Guelfish, loyalty to the see of Canterbury (*not* to the greater monasteries), that showed itself again on behalf of St. Thomas. Odo fell, but his followers remained. Several of them—Wadard, Vitalis—are individually depicted on the Bayeux Tapestry, which was almost certainly made for Odo, perhaps at Canterbury; collectively they are the *pueri* whom he rallied at Hastings with his club. Their deeds and tenures are now, for the first time, traced for several generations, and in particular, the burghal appendages of their manors.

After Odo, Kent was never a land for magnates or depressed villeins. Only one great baronial family, de Clare, themselves originally tenants of Odo, had any considerable holdings there. But among the lesser men we see Odo's roaring boys and their sons, civilized by the *disciplina* of the (ecclesiastical) metropolis and the *amoenitas* of this most Frankish part of England.

I offer one criticism. A clumsily worded endorsement of a charter recites the foundation of two churches by Vitalis's family and the endowment of another, St. Lawrence, which acquired an Augustinian priory in 1137. But the church itself, as in so many other cases, may well have been older, and loosely incorporated as a 'minster'. Since much circumstantial evidence suggests that it became almost impossible to found a new parish, after some date quite early in the twelfth century, I prefer an interpretation, equally agreeable to the text, which gives all the endowments to Vitalis and a son, to Dr. Urry's which gives them to a son and a grandson.

Of greater interest to the material archaeologist is the account of a disastrous voyage, authorized by (the same?) Vitalis, with stone from Caen to Canterbury. Dr. Urry wisely avoids seeing Norman mastery in every piece of mature Romanesque building, but there is no doubt of it in Canterbury in this generation.

S. E. RIGOLD

The Making of the Broads. A reconsideration of their origin in the light of new evidence. Royal Geographical Soc. Research Series: no. 3. By J. M. Lambert, J. N. Jennings, C. T. Smith, Charles Green and J. N. Hutchinson, with a preface by H. Godwin. 10 × 7½ in. viii + 153 pp., 7 plates, 63 figs. London: Royal Geographical Society and John Murray, 1960. Price 25s.

The theories hitherto put forward to explain the unique character of the Norfolk Broads have begun with the assumption that they are of natural origin—the result, it seemed most likely, of a marine transgression in Romano-British times. A suggestion was made as long ago as 1834, however, that Barton Broad might be the work of man; yet not until now has the truth of this unorthodox and, at first sight, unlikely theory been proved beyond doubt. We now discover that the basins of all these extensive tracts of water were dug out by hand. They are, in fact, vast flooded pits from which some 900 million cubic feet of peat were extracted in medieval times.

We owe this discovery to a splendid piece of team-work that has involved a botanist, a physiographer, and historical geographer, an archaeologist and a civil engineer in a long programme of detailed research. Stratigraphical data, for example, have been slowly accumulated from the analysis of over 2,000 bores sunk by hand in the Broadland mud.

After a period of such close and prolonged observation, *The Making of the Broads*

itself might easily have become bogged down, in less sensitive hands, by a mass of technical particulars. Instead, however, the different kinds of evidence are unfolded concisely and intelligibly and are skilfully woven into an absorbing study of the interaction of man and his changing environment. The sweep of the narrative is rarely impeded by insistence on details or by the succession of one contributor by another. Sixty or more beautifully-produced maps, sections and diagrams and a small group of expressive air-photographs play a notable part in compressing the evidence.

The true nature of the Broads began to emerge when closely-spaced peat-borings revealed that, in addition to their often rectilinear boundaries, the Broads have well-defined, rectangular profiles beneath the accumulations of organic mud and vegetation. Their floors lie horizontally some 8-12 feet below the present land-surface. Their sides are usually vertical or stepped and undoubtedly represent former working-faces. They also contain steep-sided peninsulas and islands of solid deposits which are occasionally visible from the surface or from the air. Tithe award maps have shown that these baulks of uncut peat coincide with the alignment of old property boundaries and it thus appears that the baulks were left by peat-diggers to mark the divisions between turbary-holdings.

It has also been deduced from both stratigraphical and historical evidence that, presumably after a period of surface exploration, the pits were excavated largely beyond the flange of estuarine clay deposited in the Romano-British marine transgression—in those places, in fact, where the deep, more combustible, brushwood peat, and not the surface *phragmites* peat, could be easily dug.

Historical evidence has not confirmed the existence of any broad before 1315, but there is ample written proof that turf-cutting was a well-established Broadland industry long before that date. Somewhat slender archaeological and place-name evidence supports the suggestion that Viking settlers began the excavations about A.D. 900. At all events, references to turbary in the register of St. Benet's abbey indicate that by the twelfth century turf-production had become widespread and economically important in response to the demands of the most densely-populated area of Britain.

Tithe records and manorial accounts show that during the thirteenth and early-fourteenth centuries, the industry reached a productive scale that was so large and continuous that the creation of the great cavities of the broads by hand-methods at once becomes feasible. Thus, at South Walsham, the average yearly sale between 1268 and 1296 of 180,000 turves at the manor alone would have consumed $2\frac{1}{2}$ acres of turf to a depth of 10 ft.; and the 400,000 turves used in the kitchens of Norwich cathedral priory in 1316 indicate the enormous demand for peat.

The records also show a marked decline in the industry in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. By 1399, for example, turf was no longer being sold at the South Walsham turbaries, and about the same time Norwich cathedral priory ceased to rely entirely on peat for its fuel. The decline was accompanied by a change in the method of extracting peat, from cutting at a working-face to the use of dredges and dydles for scooping out fen from which turves were subsequently moulded. The changes suggest a struggle to continue production in the face of the problems presented by standing water. At the same time, the description of many areas begins to change from 'turbary' to 'water and marsh' and fisheries appear where there had formerly been active turbaries.

Archaeological evidence has disclosed the reasons for these changed conditions. Excavations in and near the river estuary at Great Yarmouth have provided clear evidence of a marine regression in Saxo-Norman times that was sufficient both to remove the waterlogged conditions that formerly prevailed in the area and to prevent the river-valleys from being seriously flooded for at least four centuries. In the late-thirteenth century, when peat-production was at its maximum, the land stood some 13 ft. higher in relation to the sea than it does now.

A series of distribution-studies has also shown that the river-valleys and the coastal areas of Flegg and Lothingland were very sparsely occupied until the Viking settlements of the ninth century. The area, in fact, became densely populated (as the Domesday

statistics confirm) at a time when the Broadland valley-peats were comparatively well-drained and available for extraction.

The evidence from excavations goes on to show that a phase of rapid land-submergence began in the late-thirteenth century and to confirm that the great floods recorded in 1287 probably marked the beginning of the deterioration of the natural drainage which eventually brought peat-digging to an end and the Broads into existence by the slow flooding of the basins.

B. W. SPENCER

Map of Great Britain, circa A.D. 1360, known as the Gough Map. Facsimile in two sheets $25\frac{1}{2} \times 23\frac{1}{2}$ in. in seven colours and gold, printed by collotype. Introductory booklet by E. J. S. Parsons, 38 pp. Bodleian Library and Royal Geographical Society, Oxford, 1958. Price £2 10s. od. (postage extra).

It has long been recognized that the ancient map of Great Britain, left by will to the Bodleian Library by Richard Gough in 1809, is the most important item in the early cartography of this country and the effective ancestor of all subsequent maps of the area. Nothing certain is known of its history before 5 May, 1758, when a previous owner, Thomas Martin, exhibited it to the Society of Antiquaries, and at the sale following his death in 1778 it passed to Gough for half-a-crown! But it is suspected that it came to Martin from Peter le Neve, Norroy King-at-Arms, whose connexion with government offices may have made it possible for him to acquire it. For this was certainly an official map, and possibly the sole survivor of a number, made for consultation by officials and the planning of journeys.

It is drawn on two skins of vellum sewn together, and its condition shows that it has had much use. There are several old repairs, but no significant details are missing. For some part of its life it has been nailed to a board, and wear on the lower part of the map suggests that it has often been spread on a table and leaned upon by users, so that many names have been made indecipherable or rubbed right off.

The map may be dated on internal evidence to the period 1350-70. Water features are in green, the land is shown light brown, and the various forms of building symbols denoting places are picked out by their roofs being coloured red. Its scale is about 1/1,000,000 or 16 miles to the inch, and Great Britain is shown with the west to the bottom of the map and the north to the left. The wear referred to above is thus distributed over the west of England, Wales, and western Scotland. For England and, to a lesser extent, Wales, the map is remarkably accurate both as to outline and proportion, and it is so superior to any of its known predecessors that it must mark a new departure in medieval cartography. It can owe nothing to Ptolemy, nor does its scale and interior accuracy seem to derive from portolan charts, though the quality of much of the coast detail between the Wash and the Exe suggests reliance on some form of sea chart.

How then, was this result achieved? There is no evidence that any form of triangulation or calculation of latitude has been used, and the clue to the compiler's success must lie in the fact that the map is always best where there is a road framework. An accurate knowledge of road distances and directions could be applied for this purpose, and the frequent journeys made in connexion with public business would create this.

The physical features which receive best treatment are rivers. A considerable knowledge of their courses and relationships to each other is shown, and it may be suggested that this owed something to the frequent use of water transport in the middle ages. High ground receives more summary treatment, and the Pennine Chain is ignored.

Some attempt has been made to classify towns by different groupings of buildings used as symbols, and it is notable that a number of groups of towns have been accurately plotted both in their internal and general relationships to each other.

Hadrian's Wall is shown correctly except that it is not carried beyond the Eden at Carlisle to end on the Solway. Many roads are shown in England and Wales south of the Wall, and it is here that the map is such an advance on its predecessors. Their

courses are shown conventionally straight radiating out from London with some important cross-country roads, principally in the west and along the south coast. Distances are shown in Roman numerals which refer to a unit of distance of some ten or eleven furlongs. Sir Frank Stenton has contributed a valuable note on the treatment of roads (taken from his article on the road system of medieval England published in the *Economic History Review* for 1936).

The conception of a national system of roads radiating from London is implicit in the map, and five main roads are shown (London to Exeter and west into Cornwall; London to Bristol; London to St. David's; London to Carlisle; and another road to Carlisle via Stamford, Doncaster, Boroughbridge, Appleby, and Penrith). There are also numerous secondary roads branching from them, though in the case of these and the main five there are many divergences from the modern line. Local systems of roads also radiate from Lincoln and York. All the distances shown by numerals between points are consistently less than those which obtain today measured by the mile of 1,760 yards, and it is suggested that the figures on the Gough map are nothing more definite than rough popular estimates of distance. It is a curious fact that in the late seventeenth century the computed mileages given in Ogilby's *Britannia* are often identical with these of the mid-fourteenth century.

The delineation of Scotland is very inferior to that of England and Wales. It is drawn as an elongated, straight-sided, near-rectangular projection from England and, as might be expected, it is only in the south and east parts of the country that there is some real appreciation of the main features. The north, west, and the islands are little understood, though the mountainous character of the whole is indicated. Among the places shown many are castles, but there are a few major towns which, surprisingly, bear a fairly accurate relationship to each other in spite of the distorted shape given to the country as a whole. No attempt is made to show roads, though there are some indications of bridges and ferries.

Some embellishments occur in the North Sea off Scotland in the form of drawings. One shows three large fish, and the other a shipwreck scene placed between Orkney and Norway. The attempts to identify the latter with known events may or may not be sound, but no one seems to have noticed that the two objects described here as rafts on one of which a man is escaping are, in fact, wool bales, a very likely cargo at the time.

The reproduction is in two sheets with a slight overlap between Humber and Tyne. They are a splendid piece of collotype printing and really deserve the description facsimile. To aid in their interpretation four transparent overlays are provided. Two are concerned with showing the names on the originals in modern type where they occur, and two give the modern outline at 1/1,000,000 scale with names to enable the degree of congruence or divergence between the ancient and modern versions to be seen at a glance. Inevitably a production which consists of six sheets, two of paper and four of plastic, is not too easy to handle, but this is the only practical way in which this excellent result may be achieved.

All concerned with this production must be congratulated on a notable contribution to the early history of British cartography.

C. W. PHILLIPS