Reviews

Historic Towns: Maps and Plans of Towns and Cities in the British Isles, with Historical Commentaries, from earliest Times to 1800, vol. 1. Edited by M. D. Lobel. 16¼ × 12¼ in. 78 pp., 55 maps. Oxford: Lovell Johns, 1969. Price £5 5s.

The British Committee of Historic Towns (which is affiliated to the International Commission for the History of Towns), with Mrs. Lobel as Editor (and also a substantial contributor) and Colonel W. H. Johns (formerly of the Ordnance Survey) as Topographical Mapping Editor, has produced this splendid volume treating eight of the hundred or so towns that are to be dealt with in this survey. The project has arisen from the Commission's decision to ask its members to produce plans, at 1 : 5,000 scale, of certain selected towns as they were in the early 19th century, before the Industrial Revolution altered them. The British section has got off to a flying start; these are the first plans produced by any country. We are more used to working at 1 : 2,500 (25 in. to the mile, although most English towns have plans at 1 : 1,250) and the main working-plans in this volume are at this scale with the plans required by the Commission at 1 : 5,000 at the end.

The admirable historical commentaries that precede the maps make use of primary sources, with full references. In the case of Caernarvon and Salisbury this is not perhaps so difficult, since there has been substantial recent publication on them, but the others must have required more intensive work. The commentaries alone should be an invaluable aid for those interested in the history of the individual towns.

However, it is on its cartography that the volume must be judged. In each case the situation of the town is shown on the first map in relation to Roman roads and to roads from medieval times to 1800. It is a pity that tinting has not been used here to represent relief since they tend to look like modern motoring maps, while the rivers might have been made a little more conspicuous, since they were important in the history of many towns if only as obstacles.[1] The British Isles had been mapped at 25 in. to the mile by 1890, and so, by using earlier maps to remove alterations later than 1800 and to put on features subsequently removed, it has been possible to reconstruct an extremely impressive map of each town 'circa 1800 and with major features in late medieval times'. In addition there are contoured site-plans at 1 : 5,000, plans with medieval street names and administrative divisions in each town. Where there were special features that influenced the early development of a town, such as the Roman town of *Glevum* at Gloucester or the Saxon burh at Hereford, there are separate plans. On the surrounding fields their use either for cultivation, or pasture, or park, or orchard is indicated. The results are astonishing in their clarity and will be of inestimable value to local historians as well as to anyone with a feeling for urban development. Furthermore, as the series builds up, comparisons of town plans throughout the British Isles will be possible, since Ireland, Scotland and Wales fall within the scope of the series.

In his preface Professor Philippe Wolff, President of the Commission, puts forward three reasons for producing the atlas. One is frankly directed towards the practical matter of preservation, by indicating to the interested public where the ancient part of the city worthy of preservation lies. The other two reasons are to study scientifically the towns as living organisms, and to classify different types. We must wait and see if the first objective is achieved. Whether towns can be subjected to biological study seems a little uncertain, but their classification is a very interesting subject. However, there are

[1] 'Quand on étudie dans le passé la génèse des villes on trouve que ce qui a fait éclore la germe, ce qui en a assure le developpement, c'est généralement la presence d'un obstacle': P. Vidal de la Blache, *Principes de geographie humaine* (Paris, 1922), p. 292.

still too few in the first volume to attempt to delimit categories; indeed doing quite the reverse—seeing what such diverse towns have in common—is perhaps more worthwhile.

The only one of the eight towns which had a Roman predecessor was Gloucester, the medieval plan of which was significantly influenced by the earlier streets, although Caernarvon had a Roman site, *Segontium*, close by. All the towns were essentially medieval in origin, although only four were walled and one (Salisbury) had earthern fortifications. Except for Reading the towns were not abbey-dominated, like Bury St. Edmunds or St. Albans, although they had the normal friaries. One or two suffered in the Civil War, particularly Reading, which has extensive defences of the period. The feature that links them most closely is a castle: at Caernarvon the town is almost an appendage of the castle, and there were important royal castles at Gloucester, Hereford and Nottingham, and episcopal castles at Banbury and Glasgow. At Reading there were ephemeral, earthen castles in the 11th and 12th centuries, but at Salisbury, which had no castle, the town owed its existence to one, since quarrels between priests and garrison at Old Sarum in the early 13th century led to the exodus of the former to create the new town in the valley.

All concerned with this project must be warmly congratulated on a fine contribution to a field of scholarship in which this country already enjoys a high reputation; we must sincerely hope that the momentum can be maintained and volumes be published covering all the towns shown on the key map at the beginning of this volume.

M. W. THOMPSON

Canterbury under the Angevin Kings. By William Urry. $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6$ in. xvi + 514 pp., 23 maps in folder. London: Athlone Press, 1967. Price £5 5s.

This is a splendid example of how a suitable body of texts can be presented, cross-examined and made to reconstruct the history and topography of a medieval town. It is done with the skill and knowledge that all students of Canterbury's antiquities have learnt, with so much gratitude, to expect from Dr. Urry. And it comes providentially at a very appropriate time, when scholars are learning to apply documentary and archaeological methods of study to our towns, and none too soon, for the towns are being threatened more seriously than ever before, and town-plans which have hardly been altered since the 12th century are being obliterated.

The documents which form the core of this book consist, first, of a magnificent series of rentals of the urban property of Christ Church Cathedral, made *c.* 1160-1206 (pp. 221–382). These rentals were made for a variety of purposes: one records the acquisitions of a particular prior, Wibert (1153–67); another lists the tenements under monastic obedientiaries who controlled them; another (rental D, *c.* 1200) is particularly valuable, for it not only arranges the tenements topographically by parishes, but gives their precise dimensions, amounting almost to a map in words, a thing that must be very rare for that date. Then there are seventy charters, *c.* 1093–1236 (pp. 385–442), selected from over 500 deeds relating to the Christ Church holdings in the city. And on the basis of all these documents Dr. Urry has provided two series of beautifully drawn maps of the city and its tenements, one *c.* 1166, the other *c.* 1200. All this gives an extraordinarily complete and detailed cross-section of the city, for a period—the 12th century—which is remarkably early. In an introduction of over 200 pages Dr. Urry elaborates the lessons to be drawn from all this, on the holders of land, on borough government, on trades and occupations, on tenures, on the monks and their servants, on the inhabitants of Canterbury, and on its topography and domestic architecture. The information about the citizens of Canterbury and their families is particularly rich, and the index provides us with a *Who's Who* of Canterbury in the age of St. Thomas and his early miracles—a very valuable supplement to the seven volumes of *Materials* in the Rolls series. We have Terric the goldsmith with his great stone house in Burgate,

Wiulph the rich, Master Ferramin the physician, Mainer the scribe; if we found ourselves in 12th-century Canterbury, we should know exactly where to go for a loan, or medical treatment, or a book to be written. When it comes to telling what kind of people lived in the houses of 12th-century Canterbury, Dr. Urry is at his best, and he never lets us forget that we are dealing with real human beings.

The evidence which Dr. Urry has amassed for 12th-century Canterbury invites comparison with the evidence which Dr. H. E. Salter amassed for medieval (and later) Oxford, and the evidence, both archaeological and documentary, which Mr. Martin Biddle and his helpers are amassing for medieval Winchester. Here at Canterbury, as has been mentioned, the outstanding feature is the topographical completeness of the evidence, down to the precise measurements of tenements, concentrated in an early and limited period. This is in contrast to Oxford, where Salter had to use the 1279 survey as his general framework, but at the same time bringing the long history of individual Oxford tenements down to the 19th century, thanks to the enormous combined resources of ex-monastic and college archives; one wonders how far such prolonged and detailed house-histories could be traced at Canterbury. There is a contrast too in the pattern of ownership: at Canterbury, Christ Church owned half the tenements; at Oxford and at Winchester, the ownership was much more mixed. Again there is a contrast in the process of building up sites: at Canterbury there are some interesting examples of the monks collecting tenements to the south of their cemetery specifically to guard against fire (pp. 30–1, 409 ff.), but there seems nothing quite so striking as the wholesale enclosures by New College and Merton at Oxford.

The Canterbury evidence, like that of Oxford and Winchester, will be useful to anyone trying to work out how much any medieval town was deliberately planned, how much the result of spontaneous and gradual growth. Clearly, Canterbury, occupying or reoccupying a Roman site, is very different from a late Anglo-Saxon burh like Oxford or Wallingford, or a post-conquest 'new town', or a monastic borough like Abingdon or Bury St. Edmunds. Among other things, Canterbury, like Oxford, shows the early development of extra-mural suburbs. One thing that does emerge from Dr. Urry's work is that the town-plan and streets and even some tenements at Canterbury can be traced back continuously from the 19th-century Ordnance Survey maps to the 12th century; the break comes, not between medieval and modern, but between Roman and medieval. The medieval street-plan is, then, not the same as the Roman; how and when did it come to be laid out? And when were the tenements that we find in the 12th century laid out?

From an archaeological point of view, one of the most valuable and interesting things here is the evidence about the size and shape of individual tenements. In contrast to the long, narrow tenements, say 200 ft. long by 20 ft. wide, that we find in the High Street at Oxford, at Canterbury the tenements tend rather to be squarish, say 50 to 90 ft. deep by 30 to 70 ft. wide, and some of them as large as 65 by 80 ft. or 70 by 130 ft. (p. 194). This may be so partly because the Canterbury evidence is so early; one would like to know whether these squarish tenements were later divided into strips. On the other hand, I do not think that the long narrow Oxford strips can simply be explained as later subdivisions. There may be a real difference here in the way that the land was laid out in early times.

There is the further question how far these tenements were built on, that is to say, the extent of the actual houses of wood or stone. At Oxford it seems clear that originally only the street-end of the tenement, to a depth of say 40 or 50 ft., was actually built up, the rest being open garden or yard, which was only built over in post-medieval times; the larger houses might be built along the side of a courtyard, as at the Golden Cross. In spite of its narrow streets, a medieval town like Oxford, seen from the air, would have looked rather like a garden suburb. Was Canterbury like this? Here the material evidence of the precise extent and position of the buildings erected on the tenements in the 12th century seems scarce, though there are some traces of cellars, including a

double basement (pp. 192–3); the Eastbridge Hospital (p. 193), though probably not itself a converted house, may perhaps represent a recognized type of house, with a chamber over a vaulted cellar towards the street and a hall at right angles at the back. It seems likely that at Canterbury, as elsewhere, the dwelling-house occupied the street-end of the tenement, but where the tenement was squarish, the broad street front would be occupied by a broad but shallow house of several bays. It may be noted that, whereas on the main streets of Oxford a narrow house often presented a gable-end to the street, in the wider houses of Canterbury, the roof often ran parallel to the street, as can still be seen. There is one reference to several *mansurae* in one plot (p. 228, B. 32), and there is a good deal of evidence about stone houses, though these no doubt were in the minority (pp. 116, 120–1, 135).

Another interesting question is that of the shops, their size, and their relation to the dwelling-houses. Dr. Urry reckons that there were about 200 shops in 1234, and that there were about 80 shops along the N. side of Burgate. As at Oxford, some of the shops were extremely small, about 7 ft. wide (p. 107, 170–1). Most were probably wooden, and perhaps some were booths in front of houses; but there were some stone shops, including one 16 ft. square (p. 436). Were the shops let separately, as lock-up shops, or did they go with the houses above or behind them? In other places we know that there was often a habitable solar above one or more shops. Does the letting of some of the Canterbury tenements on a 'house-and-shop' basis (*de domibus et scoppis*, pp. 35–6, 134, 216) imply that some shops and houses were let together?

Dr. Urry has made such excellent use of the documentary materials available for his chosen period that it seems greedy to ask for more; but one would like to see some further studies supplementing these documents with archaeological data and with later documents, continuing the history of some individual tenements down to modern times, as Salter did at Oxford, and making analogies, for instance, with the evidence from the Brooks area at Winchester. There is probably now only a very limited amount of 12th-century domestic archaeological evidence to be found at Canterbury, but what we need is a systematic architectural survey, with plans, sections and elevations, of all such later medieval and submedieval houses as survive at Canterbury, for instance those bordering Mercery Lane (cf. p. 193). If this were done in the same thorough way that Swiss and German town houses have been studied (e.g., Hans Hübler, *Das Bürgerhaus in Lübeck*), and the cellars of Winchester and Chester have been surveyed, we could learn much more about the houses at Canterbury, at least in the later middle ages, and from this in turn, working back from the known to the comparatively unknown, we might have some useful archaeological data to compare with these 12th-century documents. But for this very substantial first course, we must be truly grateful.

W. A. PANTIN

A History of the Vikings. By Gwyn Jones. $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. xvi + 504 pp., 30 pls., 58 figs., 15 maps. London: Oxford University Press, 1968. Price £3.

When an author lays great emphasis on the complexity of his subject, it is easy for the reader to feel unsympathetic; but surely not when the subject is the history of the Vikings. The literary sources are in so many different languages, and relate to so many separate regional contexts, that a critical assessment of them all would appear to be a superhuman task. The author has to attempt something like a *Weltgeschichte* of a period of some 300 years, without the benefit of the generalizations which would normally be permissible in such writing. This is partly because of the very precise and personal nature of the Old Norse sources. They tell us (or pretend to) exactly what a particular person did in a particular time and place. The narrative may be accepted or rejected, but it is often exceedingly hard to turn it into anything other than what it is. We can only be grateful that Professor Gwyn Jones has had the courage to write this splendid synthesis, without waiting, in his own phrase, for the 'blameless haven of senility'.

The author does not, in fact, confine himself to the Viking age. He begins with the

bronze age, makes the reader aware of the deterioration of life which took place in Scandinavia during the iron age, and sketches the slow re-emergence of wealth which was contemporary with the later Roman Empire. Then follows what Lindqvist aptly named the *Guldålder*, and not the least of the author's achievements is a lucid discussion of the problems associated with Hygelac and the Geats.

Scandinavia emerges slowly and uncertainly into the light of history. Much is recorded; little can be believed. One aspect of the author's technique, and one which is possibly controversial, is that even when he is going to warn us that a particular narrative is unhistorical, he first tells the tale, usually with gusto. A more austere treatment of some of the material would have made the book shorter, but also a good deal less attractive. Perhaps the method which he adopts is really the best. One has only to think of a figure like Olaf Tryggvason to realize how inextricably history and legend can be intermingled; and the historian could convey nothing of the impression which this spectacular figure made on his contemporaries if he confined himself to the few hard facts which are known about him. A quite different book could be written, one which clinically identified the small core of relatively established fact, and let the rest go by. Such a book would be dry and useful, but it would only be read by professional scholars, who would in any case have in their minds the illumination which is provided by saga-material. The author has not set out to write such a book, and it is pointless to criticize him as if he had.

The archaeology of the period is well treated, though the author understandably approaches it with a certain wariness. When a topic is primarily archaeological, the confident stride of his prose gives way to a rather precise placing of the feet. Even so, one of the most useful parts of the book is the second of three excellent chapters which he entitles 'The Scandinavian Community'; it deals largely with trade, and the rather impermanent trading towns—a thoroughly archaeological subject.

Where so much is given, it is greedy to ask for more, but still it is a pity that the earldom of Orkney does not receive fuller treatment. From the time of Earl Sigurd, who was killed at the battle of Clontarf, its history is fairly well known, and within its generally rather narrow sphere it gives us one of the best pictures that we have of a Viking community established abroad, one which succeeding centuries have done remarkably little to alter.

The author writes in a vivid and vigorous style which is admirably suited to his material, though it may offend those whose ideal is a subfusc narrative. All in all this is a most distinguished book, and likely to outlive any amount of correction of detail.

PETER S. GELLING

The Normans and the Norman Conquest. By R. Allen Brown. $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. xii + 292 pp., 2 maps. London: Constable, 1969. Price £2 2s.

The Norman conquest is the inescapable test for all who touch the history of England. It is at once a myth, challenging, protean, agonistic, and a tangible 'archaeological' fact, the great inscutcheon on the landscape, round which even the Industrial Revolution had to run circles. Every historian must rehearse it, even if not publicly, as every tragedian must play Hamlet. As an archaeologist Dr. Brown, like the ancestral Tahirid, is a man of two right hands. Aware from the first page of masks and flexions of his forerunners, he is not ashamed of his own; it is no slave's part and cannot be played naked. A historian must 'demythologize', and Dr. Brown is historical about a myth-shaper such as Freeman, ham-Wagnerian of inordinate wind, but learned just where his successors are not. But is he so detached from Round, competent uncle of the present brood, but last and not least lackeyish of the old country genealogists? It is in his respect for the forms of discipline that he seems Roundian. It is hard to credit that, barring perverse definitions, Round's case that knightly tactics, knightly tenures, and consequently 'feudalism', are a Norman contribution to England, should be seriously

disputed. This contribution England might have escaped, if only because the much-vaunted cavalry won Hastings by a narrow margin. They were soon to become a Frankish *folie de grandeur*, chiefly famous for *losing* battles. But surely, whatever Dr. Brown seems to imply, she would not have escaped the 'Hildebrandine Reformation', which was already in train. Thanks to the Normans it sometimes came literally 'with a vengeance', in the persons of arrogant, upstart technocrats, usually abbots, 'conditioned' against pronouncing the names of saints Dr. Brown calls unpronounceable, but thanks to them also, it could come in the persons of such as Lanfranc, the Italian, who could distinguish degrees of barbarism and subtleties in orderliness, and who championed the liberties of Kent against the insufferable and pre-Hildebrandine Odo.

Dr. Brown is just to the Old English monarchy as of Carolingian type, preserved by kings of an energy like Charles Martel's, not part of his 'emergent West', that centrifugal society of opportunity and autonomy which has analogies in the American West. The backcloth is well defined; the implications are less necessary. Normandy, we learn, lent itself to administrative innovations, as did England, but small states are not seminal in themselves; the important conditions seem rather to be proper towns and a settled, rather than a peripatetic, seat of government. England was precocious in the first and approaching the second; Normandy, we learn, was rapidly catching up. Since urban studies have made the greatest recent contribution to early medieval history and archaeology in England, and in Germany, we should like to know more of Normandy in this respect. Again, the monarchy of the 1050s was not that of Aethelstan. In the eyes of Eadweard *Basileus* it was still a small empire rather than a large *Kleinstaat*, but it was changing, if with uncertain direction or leadership, and the assimilation seems to have been to the Lotharingian or west German pattern. The latest pre-conquest buildings are neither 'Saxon' nor 'Norman', but sometimes, like Wulfric's rotunda, have Lotharingian parallels. Who was to know that the future lay with the Isle of France, and that a Francized, even Normanized, lord of Lower Lotharingia would become the symbolic champion of Christendom?

In any case, the Conqueror's host was mixed. One became a 'Frank' to work the gests of God, as one becomes a cultural American, more by choice than birth. Both sides probably wished the trauma would soon heal, though some cautery was needed after Hastings. The twenty-year revolution reflected in Domesday was not intended, nor, from the burgess viewpoint, as complete as might appear. And to the civil south the Norman conquest was much less grievous and destructive than the Danish. Consider 'unconquered' Kent, ignoring the fabrication about exacting terms from the Conqueror. The men of Kent submitted before London was surrounded; afterwards they intrigued with Eustace of Boulogne, and learned, with little pain, that it was hopeless. The land was *conquesta*, taken over, but not *victa*. The *turris fracta* of their submission was, I suggest, and could plead from etymology, the Bredenstone. William of Poitiers's English geography is very vague, and surely they came to meet the Conqueror near Dover, not he to them. Consider also the burgesses of Exeter, treated with clemency after their siege, who actually co-operated in the reduction of the far west. Such actions, on either side, were politic but not supine. The sources of infection that soured the reign after 1068 were neither Norman nor English in any general sense. First came the perennial trouble-spots of the middle ages, the Welsh marches and, above all, Northumbria, neither then, nor long afterwards, nor perhaps even yet, really part of England, but a conquered province. Remember the councils of Wales, *and* the north. The (southern) Englishmen, who laid Maine waste *for* the Conqueror in 1073, must have formed a large proportion of the great host that harried the north, with as little compunction as when their descendants were to sack Drogheda. Secondly, the very sons and godsons of the Conqueror, and the Normanized Northumbrian, Waltheof, and behind all, the *Rex Francorum* himself. Which side are 'we' on?

Dr. Brown says much of the physical legacy of the conquest. Of the major churches we must remember that most parts of Christendom had such a 'great rebuilding' in

Romanesque dress, but not all at exactly the same time. Was it the failure of the intended synthesis, or a spirituality born of disillusionment, or mere economics, that delayed it in England, effectively to the late 1070s and the two following decades, almost a generation after Normandy, when the Frankish manner had become international? Of course, he says much more of castles, the longest section in the index save 'England' and 'Normandy' themselves. His fundamental plea, that the castle in England is completely Norman, is, in these terms, beyond dispute. But it is still a matter of definition: a castle is a *castellum*. What was a *castrum*? Was Pevensey, as they found it, a *castrum*? And when did it acquire a *turris* or a *castellum*? Is a *burh*, a siege-worthy *burh* like Exeter a *castrum*? If it is true, as Dr. Brown too readily concludes, that at Dover the *burh* was the iron-age hill-fort, separated from its administrative concomitant, the *port* which was certainly on the estuary and walled after a fashion, and if we take the *Carmen* at face value, then the *burh* was a *castrum*, and the hill-fort had gates with keys. Or were they just ceremonial keys? The *castrum* contained houses. The hill-fort on archaeological evidence surely did not contain many—perhaps a few round the church. But I still wonder whether we are not concerned with a defensible *port* after all. The point about a *castellum* is surely that it is relatively diminutive, and contains something for a *dominium*, not for 'all the folk'.

After castles, one would like to know more of naval affairs. Why was the successor to Alfred's fleet and Cnut's so ineffective, and William's so good? Why, in the last analysis, was England conquered simply because she had not command of the sea? Were the portsmen disaffected? Or already on William's side? They lost no privileges, and had a will of their own. Some had certainly gone with Tostig, and, earlier, a bargain with what became the Cinque Ports had been the chief precondition of Godwin's triumphant return. My suspicion is that Harold was not their man and had offended them. But that is no cause for belittling the 'unlikely patriot'. In the literary and artistic tradition of both sides, as displayed on the Tapestry and reaching back to the memories of those that knew him, and part of the essence of the myth, Harold is a very presentable hero—a flawed, tragic hero, whose one recorded miasma, to be expiated by a hero's death, is the violation of an oath not of his own seeking. Like his adversary, who would not meanly blacken him as Henry VII did to another usurper, he was *généreux*, of (Danish) royal blood, which he honoured by recovering the body of his royal Danish cousin, murdered by Harold's own brother. A schismatic hero, almost perhaps, a pagan hero, against a consecrated hero, but both belong more to the Viking age than to the 'emergent West'.

S. E. RIGOLD

Manx Archaeological Survey, 1st–5th Reports (5 vols. as one, 2nd impression). By P. M. C. Kermode. *6th Report* (84 pp., 19 pls.). By J. R. Bruce. Douglas: The Manx Museum, 1966. Price together £5.

The Manx archaeological survey was founded in 1908 under the enthusiastic patronage of the lieutenant-governor of the Isle of Man, Lord Raglan. Its immediate aim was to record the antiquities of the Isle of Man and more particularly the keeills and early Christian burial-grounds which were then much threatened by agriculture. The first five reports for the sheadings of Glenfaba, Michael, Ayre, Garff and Middle appeared between 1908 and 1935 and, being long out of print, are here republished by the Manx Museum and National Trust. The sixth report, which describes the keeills and cemeteries of the sheading of Rushen, has now been completed by Mr. J. R. Bruce and is published for the first time.

Philip Kermode, who wrote the first five reports, was an extraordinarily energetic and enthusiastic scholar. His work on Manx antiquities led to the foundation of the Manx Museum and to the publication in 1907 of his monumental work, *Manx Crosses*. But these were but the peaks of an achievement which also included the foundation of the Isle of Man Natural History and Archaeological Society and the publication with (Sir) William Herdman of *Manks Antiquities*, which is still an invaluable topographical

guide to the antiquities of the island. Although well known in archaeological circles—publishing papers in *The Saga Book of the Viking Society*, *Archaeologia Cambrensis* and in *The Antiquaries Journal*, and corresponding over many years, for example, with W. G. Collingwood, Sir Arthur Keith and R. A. S. Macalister—Kermode never received the official recognition due to a man of his scholarly stature: he was not, for example, a fellow of the Society of Antiquaries, although he was their local secretary for years, but the University of Liverpool awarded him an honorary M.A. At the very end of his life (he died in 1932) he was honoured by the Icelandic government, who decorated him with the Order of the Falcon. His praises are sung in Man and Scandinavia but not in England. His five reports stand the test of time; they contain completely factual information and are still of use.

Mr. Bruce, who has written the sixth report, knew Kermode and had seen him at work; he has modelled his entries on those of his predecessor and has done it extremely well. Each chapel or burial-ground is described critically and in detail. Thirty-nine keeills have been recognized in the sheading of Rushen, of which only eight can now be seen on the ground. To this can be added a number of burial-sites of the cist- or lintel-grave type. All the sites—including the dubious ones—are discussed as thoroughly as the evidence allows and much new material is thus brought to light. Only occasionally are there grounds for criticism, as in the description of Malew churchyard. There is no doubt, as Mr. Bruce says, that this is the site of an early burial-ground; lintel graves are well documented and the Viking stone cross adds weight to the supposition. One of the most remarkable features of this churchyard (and one that is not illustrated or mentioned in the survey) is that its present wall forms, where there are no modern additions and where it is delimited by a bend in the road, a distinct third of the circumference of a circle. This may be an example of the circular churchyard well documented elsewhere in the Celtic west, where it is usually taken, rightly or wrongly, as indicative of an early Christian date. (My favourite example is Govan, where the line of the original wall is maintained by a magnificent 12-ft. brick wall which I believe originally kept the Glaswegians out of their tram depot.)

Mr. Bruce concludes his survey with a few pages of summary which correct certain of Kermode's assumptions made unacceptable in the course of the fifty years since the first reports appeared. Following Marstrander and Megaw, Bruce points out quite correctly that many of the existing monuments may not represent the masonry of an original keeill, although the site itself may be pre-Norse. He also points out that a lintel grave is only generally indicative of the proximity of a keeill. He discusses the dating of the graves, pointing to Balladoole for proven pre-Viking lintel graves and to a 19th-century example at Keill Pharick. He relates the keeills to the treens, tending to the 'keeill per treen hypothesis' developed by Marstrander in his paper 'Treen og Keeill'. Finally, he points out the sad fact that little excavation has been done on these sites; I trust that it will not be too long before a complete keeill site, with its graves, wall and chapel, is completely and competently excavated.

May we congratulate Mr. Bruce on an extremely workmanlike production, and the Manx Museum and National Trust on their initiative in producing such an attractive publication?

DAVID M. WILSON

The Domesday Geography of South-West England. Edited by H. C. Darby and R. Welldon Finn. 9½ × 6½ in. xiii + 469 pp., 95 maps. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967. Price £6 6s.

The Domesday Geography of South-West England is the fifth and last of the regional studies before Professor Darby's sixth and final volume summarizing the geographical factors in the great Domesday inquest. This volume follows the standardized layout familiar to the readers of the earlier volumes. County by county the settlements and their distribution, their geld assessment, the number of ploughlands and plough teams,

population densities, land values, the extent of woodland, meadow and pasture, the existence of mills, churches and urban life, numbers of livestock, markets, vineyards and the survival of customary dues, are plotted, together with their geographical and geological background on a total of ninety-five maps. The visual impact of these distribution-maps has great force, but since the formula is standard for each of the counties in the region there is a great deal of repetition in the introductory descriptions. This practice, while reducing literary appeal, has the advantage of allowing each county chapter to be read independently.

The south-western counties are those of Wiltshire, Dorset, Somerset, Devon and Cornwall. This grouping is especially interesting since for much of the region there are two versions of the Domesday descriptions. Besides what is known as the Exchequer Domesday there is the more detailed Exeter text for comparison. In addition there are auxiliary texts, mostly associated with the *liber Exoniensis*, which amplify our knowledge of various land holdings and assist in the identification of some of the place-names. Because the Exeter entries are more detailed they have been followed in this analysis. An appendix compares the Exeter and Exchequer versions and lists a table of differences between the two texts. The Exeter version distinguishes the hidage of the demesne land from that of the villagers more fully and, most important, lists the demesne livestock. When plotted in map form this shows how large the sheep population was in the south-west, comparing well with the four eastern counties whose statistics of demesne livestock are also available. It reinforces the view that sheep were an important element in the economy in the late 11th century and no doubt in the Anglo-Saxon kingdom.

This particular group of counties is also interesting for the contrast which is posed between the English counties of Wiltshire and Dorset in the east, and the Celtic lands in the far west. The middle ground of east Devon and Somerset west of the River Parrett provides a mixture of the two cultures with the English pattern swamping the older habits. This survey brings home the distinctions between the two societies: the differing patterns of land holding, systems of measurement and taxation, social organization and methods of agriculture. It has already been suggested that the deficiency of plough teams to available plough lands in 94 per cent. of the Cornish entries suggests the existence of infield and outfield cultivation. The extraordinarily high proportion of serfs in Cornwall and west Devon and the comparatively low numbers of villeins points to an entirely different system of social organization. The absence of mills in Cornwall and west Devon as opposed to the great number listed for other counties shows that the domestic economy differed too. It points to the continuation of the handmill in the iron-age tradition. These differences are clearly brought out in the distribution-maps. They also show a fact of perhaps greater importance, that elements of Celtic survival were more numerous and more widespread than we should otherwise have expected.

The strength and weakness of this book and of its predecessors is that it is based solely on the geographical elements. Little use is made of other contemporary historical documents or of the results of archaeology. To explain the existence of hamlets and isolated farms in west Somerset as opposed to nucleated villages simply in terms of terrain is not giving the whole story. The surviving Celtic pattern must have had its influence too. The lack of five-hide units west of the Parrett bears this out. Difficulties too arise in plotting the Domesday place-names on a map and equating them with modern names. 60 per cent. of Devon Domesday names and 80 per cent. of Cornish names are not represented by modern parish names. The archaeologist needs to use caution in applying a Domesday manor to what may now be an isolated farmhouse. Dr. Ravenhill, who contributes the chapter on Cornwall, suggests that some of the very large manors, such as Pawton, indicate the existence of nucleated villages. This is perhaps too simple and unlikely an explanation. These Cornish exceptions probably derive their size from their having been once compact estates belonging to the king, or, as in the case of Pawton, to monasteries of Celtic origin.

The Domesday geographies are invaluable to archaeologist and historian alike.

Their maps are highly stimulating and will suggest many new lines of research. They should be seen, however, as being complementary to the introductions to the Domesday texts in the Victoria County Histories. The geography can then be balanced by the historical analysis of the details of land holdings and of the men who held the land.

A. D. SAUNDERS

Rheinische Ausgrabungen, I: *Beiträge zur Archäologie des Mittelalters* (Beihefte der Bonner Jahrbücher, XXVIII). 10½ × 7 in. 280 pp., 97 figs., 29 plates (one in colour). Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 1968. Price DM 78.

The *Beihefte der Bonner Jahrbücher* that have several times been reviewed in this Journal constitute part of the record of intense archaeological excavation that has been proceeding on medieval sites in the Rhineland since the war. The main subjects of the research have been *Kirche und Burg* (the title of an exhibition held in the Rheinisches Landesmuseum in Bonn in 1962 and commemorated in a fine publication): of the twelve articles in this number the first seven are concerned with the excavations by A. Herrnbrodt at the low-lying castle site of Haus Meer, Büderich, Düsseldorf, the eighth with identification of plant remains from human excrement in late medieval latrine-pits at Neuss, and the last four with the excavation of earlier foundations within existing churches in order to elucidate their building histories.

The site at Büderich, described by M. Müller-Wille, recalls that excavated by Dr. Herrnbrodt at Husterknupp some years earlier: a flat settlement of rectangular wooden houses had been buried by soil to form a defensive mound. At Husterknupp the mound can certainly be called a motte, but at Büderich the low mound was thrown up, as much perhaps to form a dry platform above the flood waters of the neighbouring Rhine, as to serve a military purpose. Indeed the depth of deposit recalls the upcast found in some English moated sites of the 13th century, with which comparison would be closer were it not that the date, a little after 1100, was a century earlier. The stave-built houses, employing tongue-and-groove carpentry, of the earlier stage, were the most noteworthy discovery of the excavation and allowed a valuable discussion of stave construction in northern Europe in early medieval times (pp. 35–41). A comprehensive study of animal bones was made (unusual on a medieval site) which provided Dr. Clason with an opportunity to draw up an interesting table (opposite p. 106), recording details of identifications of medieval animal bones over much of Europe. Valuable information emerges from this: the slight significance of game in medieval diet and the overriding importance of cattle, sheep or goat and pig in that order. We shall have to have more data before the fluctuating ratios of these can be convincingly explained. The next article which analyses the plant remains from faeces in late medieval latrine-pits at Neuss is a sharp reminder that vegetable matter, not meat, was the main constituent of medieval food.

The last four articles are studies of church building history, the main one dealing with St. Quirin's at Neuss. They have to be considered against the background of churches in the Rhineland generally, a subject that rather falls outside the purview of the English medievalist. Normally the development has been one of continuous growth from a simple cell westwards, to form a large nave, transepts and westwork. Although the relative chronology is usually clear the absolute chronology is often very elusive, so that the crucial matter of the addition of the cloister is difficult to pin down in terms of years. At Trier there is evidence of continuous Christian usage from the 4th century A.D., and at Neuss, where a 3rd-century cemetery lying over the earlier settlement of *Novaesium* was followed by a 4th-century apsidal building directed northwards, there is a strong hint of a place of worship on the site of the cathedral from late Roman times. There can be little doubt that detailed examination of earlier foundations of churches, so characteristic of post-war Rhenish archaeology, is a method of study that would repay use in this country (as indeed we have already seen at Wharram Percy and Winchester).

M. W. THOMPSON

Les Fortifications de terre et les origines féodales dans le Cinglais. By M. Fixot. 10½ × 8 in. 123 pp., 27 plates, 24 figs. Caen: Centre de recherches archéologiques médiévales, 1968. No price stated.

The Cinglais lies south of Caen and north-west of Falaise, between the middle Orne valley and that of its tributary, the Laize. In shape it is roughly triangular, 20 km. along each side, with the northern apex cut off from the southern uplands by a belt of forest. M. Fixot describes the geography of the region, and demonstrates the archaeological evidence that the Gallo-Roman occupation was confined to the lowlands, although a number of later burial-sites indicate a penetration of the forest barrier. He supplements this with several toponymic maps, and suggests that the large number of place-names ending in *-ière* or *-erie* indicate Scandinavian colonization of a region hitherto sparsely populated.

A grant of Charles the Bald of the *villa* of Fontenay is the earliest mention of the area as a *centena*, and the author suggests that the region was divided between four Frankish domains (Fontenay, Cintheaux, Cingal and Thury). He points to the curious position of the parish church at Cintheaux, situated at an ancient cross-roads at the meeting-point of four parishes, and suggests that the siting of the earthwork fortifications principally on the forest margins indicates an erosion of ducal authority by new colonization about 1000 A.D. This was certainly a disturbed, migratory period, and ducal authority was at a low ebb until the battle of Val ès Dunes, fought a few miles north-east of the Cinglais. But this can be over-emphasized; Val ès Dunes marked a turning-point, but not the end of the road, and much of the ducal authority had been abandoned voluntarily in the region. Richard II had given his wife twenty-seven *villae* in the Cinglais as part of her marriage-portion (mainly in the south-west but extending as far north-east as Cintheaux), and Raoul d'Ivry had given two *villae* in the north to the cathedral at Bayeux, also within a very few years of 1000 A.D. M. Fixot mentions one immigrant in particular, Radulfus Senex from Anjou, the founder of the house of Taisson. This reminds us of Mrs. E. S. Armitage's tentative conclusion that both *mottes* and stone castles came from Anjou in the 10th century, but when, and in what form, the castle first reached the Cinglais remains uncertain.

In this small area there are five stone castles, twenty other mottes (seven having vanished except for their names) and thirteen *enceintes*, ranging from promontory forts downward. Even ignoring the *enceintes*, the mottes are as dense here as anywhere on the Welsh border. M. Fixot says there is an even denser concentration farther west, but practically none to the east—it is a pity that his distribution-map is not extended beyond the Cinglais to show this. The topography of each site is described, but the mottes are poorly illustrated: two rough sketch-plans of Fontenay-le-Marmion and Grimbosq, and photographs showing either a relatively low mound under the walls of farm buildings, or a tree-obscured 'something'.

We are given excellent plans of six of the seven smaller *enceintes*, which occur in two groups, near Falaise and in the frontier-forest. Three are oval (Urville being divided into a subrectangular enclosure with a 'hornwork'—hardly a bailey). One is square with a 'crater' ring-work—an unfinished motte?—occupying one quarter, another is rectangular, and the last is pentagonal with an ear-shaped bailey on one side and a long embankment on the other, running parallel with a stream. La Pommeraye (Château Ganne) is not described, although it is the best *enceinte* of all. M. Fixot discovered a motte near by, and the proximity of this and other pairs of earthworks may indicate siegeworks or resiting, rather than a single intensive phase of colonization. Indeed the neglected stone castles themselves have early features: the diaphragm arches of the Château Ganne gatehouse resemble those of Exeter, and parts of Falaise have been claimed to be as early. There is room here for further research.

Two of the *enceinte* plans show excavated features that are not described in the text; the simultaneous publication of the excavations in *Annals de Normandie* (XVIII, pp. 211–375) contains some surprises. The simple oval *enceinte* at Bretteville-sur-Laize was

occupied from the 12th century onwards, whereas the more complex site at Urville seems to have had a short lifetime around 1100. Finally, the splendid photograph of the Tournbeu *donjon*, if an anachronism in this book, shows a most unusual building detail. Some of the ashlar bands are not laid flat, but in regular sine-wave courses.

D. F. RENN

Medieval Archaeology in England: A Guide to the Historical Sources. By Colin Platt. Pinhorn's Handbooks, no. 5. $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ in. 32 pp. Shalfleet Manor, Isle of Wight: Pinhorns, 1969. Price 12s.

If archaeology be the study of the past from surviving material remains then surely, by definition, its sources are material remains and the subtitle of this pamphlet would appear to contradict its title. Might one then say: *A Guide to the Historical Aids*? The author is a lecturer in history and no doubt used the expression advisedly. Perhaps then our definition is wrong? The subject is fraught with such interest that it deserves a little more attention.

It is very rare to find a man who combines an ability to handle primary medieval written sources with an understanding and appreciation of architectural remains. One need only mention the name of the late Professor Hamilton Thompson who enjoyed both gifts to a high degree to appreciate how rare is such a combination. It is indeed one of the misfortunes of medieval archaeology that the temperament that produces one seems often to exclude the other. The fact is seen most clearly in those guide-books of the Ministry of Public Building and Works in which the historical section is written by an outside, often distinguished, historian, while the descriptive section has been written by an archaeologist from the Ministry. The historian might say that he could not understand the remains, or that they told him nothing that he did not know already, or, more significantly, that he could not reconcile what his documents said with what he saw on the ground.

When we read a novel, a poem or a newspaper we create in our mind's eye a set of images evoked by the printed word; it would indeed be impossible to follow the sequence unless we did so. The closer the picture in our mind resembles that intended by the author the better we understand him. Such after all is what we are trying to do with a chronicle, or a Pipe Roll, although the barriers are very much greater. If we have only the written source our imagination can have free play, but in the material remains there is a check, control and sometimes even supplementary information; they bring us down to earth so to speak. We can avoid serious anachronism, as, for instance, in not seeing a stone keep each time Orderic Vitalis refers to a castle. The life of Abbot Samson is better understood through an acquaintance with arrangements in Benedictine monasteries of the time and in particular with those at Bury St. Edmunds. One can contrast the images evoked by reading the Paston letters (the ruins of Caistor Castle and the numerous 15th-century houses that have survived) with the curious feeling of weightlessness induced by reading the Old English Chronicle where the text can be related to nothing tangible (except perhaps by numismatists!). That archivists themselves recognize this fact is suggested by the catalogue for the Centenary Exhibition of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts (*Manuscripts and Men*, London, 1969), which is illustrated by eight plates: four portraits, a seal, an iron-works, a castle, and flute, fork and spoon of Sir John Franklin.

The Ministry's guide-books may help again to illustrate a point. Some years ago a distinguished historian was invited to write a guide-book to Conisbrough Castle, Yorkshire, but he declined, explaining (it is alleged) that there was too little written evidence surviving to make it possible. The rich manuscript material that survives, for example, in Duchy of Lancaster records for Pickering Castle or in the Bishop of Winchester's Pipe Rolls for Farnham (I confine myself to my own experience) and allows us to infuse life into the ruins, is quite lacking for Conisbrough. Work on the

former is intellectually far more satisfying, but it would be quite wrong to think that the absence of documentary sources for the magnificent keep at Conisbrough leaves us helpless and unable to say anything useful about it. By comparisons and analogies we can fit the keep into a category and date it by its architectural detail. Forming categories and making comparisons is, after all, how archaeology works. In the earlier periods it has to stand largely alone, but from the 12th and 13th centuries a large body of written evidence survives, and the next task is to actively associate the documents with the material remains, often a very tricky and baffling operation. If we are not to commit some major howler, as for instance to apply our 15th-century building accounts to a 12th-century keep, the sequence must be archaeology first and documents second.

Medieval archaeology then—like the Russian verb—has two aspects: field or museum technique on the one hand, and the active association of written sources with the material remains on the other. It is in this sense that Dr. Platt uses the phrase historical sources. In the Middle East the field-worker will have an epigraphist to read his cuneiform tablets; medieval documents are much easier to read and in an ideal situation the same person would cover both aspects. It is then to the archaeologist who would like to master the written sources for himself that Dr. Platt's booklet is addressed. He leads him through the vast manuscript material at the Public Record Office and the British Museum and tells him of the voluminous published sources that exist. There is an extensive bibliography of very useful works, particularly of early county histories. If one might make one point on the Pitt-Rivers sketch-books (p. 6); the first two refer to journeys in Brittany and France and not to those in this country; the remainder, after his appointment as Inspector on 1 January 1883 necessarily deal almost exclusively with prehistoric monuments, so their value for medieval archaeologists is decidedly slender.

Perhaps not many medieval archaeologists will be led to the original sources as a result of the publication of this pamphlet, but it was still worth doing. The congratulations that we must offer its compiler can hardly be extended to its publishers since the price demanded for it is two or three times as much as a 32-page, unillustrated pamphlet ought to cost.

M. W. THOMPSON

Sylloge of Coins of the British Isles: Ulster Museum, Belfast, 1, *Anglo-Irish Coins: John–Edward III.* By M. Dolley and W. Seaby. 10 × 7¼ in. lvii + 33 pp., 16 pls. London: Oxford University Press and Spink and Sons, for the British Academy and the Ulster Museum, 1968. Price £2 10s.

The Irish coin-collection of the Ulster Museum, which is to be syllogized in three parts, was deliberately and recently formed to fit the status of a quasi-national museum, and eirenically supplemented by a splendid permanent loan from the National Museum of Ireland, which is included in this fascicule. Basically it is the Irish section of the great Carlyon-Britton collection, formed over two generations. With scholars of the calibre of Mr. Dolley and Mr. Seaby to hand, this publication is especially welcome, since the study of Irish coinage is at last emerging from a sleep matched only in fairyland: there has been no general work on it for well over a hundred years.

The pattern of Irish coinage is characteristic and, *sub specie aeternitatis*, depressing; it is quite different from the Scottish, which begins late, on the flood of Anglo-Norman advance, progressively diverges from the English model, fights back with the tenacity of the legendary spider, until it is finally submerged. The Irish, on the other hand, begins earlier, three times runs down to a complete standstill, and after an interval starts again, each time on a 'foreign' model, but inheriting something from the previous phase. It is inescapably colonial and engineered to Ireland's disadvantage, whose real *pecunia* remains her *pecua*. The first phase is the 'Hiberno-Norse' coinage, beginning well, around 1000 A.D., and as far as technique goes, in utter ruin by the early 12th century. But the debasement, or rather reduction, though it ended at about half the

value of Sterling, was not excessive by pan-European standards. The coinage began once more, not when Henry II first 'took over' the privateering conquest, in 1171, but around 1185, when John, the disappointing 'son of his right hand', entered upon his new lordship. John de Courcy, the last of the privateer chiefs, also issued a private coinage. These are not represented in the Ulster Museum but illustrated from examples in the National Museum, which gives this book an added utility. That John's next coinages, in the 1190s, are relatively common owes much to one hoard, the source of the great permanent loan. Now all these early coinages are called 'halfpence', in this book as elsewhere, and so they are by English standards. But they were struck for solely Irish use and surely by Irish reckoning they are pence, of a lower but more general standard, which the Irish had remembered from the latter days of the Hiberno-Norse coinage.

Here begins the most formative and, for a time, the most successful phase of the Anglo-Irish settlement. It weakens in the 14th century, and the coinage ceases apparently in 1302, with a tiny resuscitation, in 1339. Thereafter, but for another minute issue, there is no Irish coinage until Edward IV, forefather of the Tudors in this as in many other things. The coinage he begins is second-rate and frankly a coinage of exploitation. This is beyond the fascicule under review, but during the 'great' period that it covers the Irish coinage has a dual personality, like the lordship itself. There are the so-called halfpence, which formed the coinage of Ireland, or at least of the Irish, and, from the remarkably businesslike and successful visit of John, the best foreign king Ireland ever had, there are the Sterling pence, for foreign trade and for remittance to England. The Sterling coinage was sporadic and never very extensive, but the coins find their way not only into English treasures but as far as Sterling pence penetrated abroad, and like the English sterlings they were much imitated. The Irish pence are John's only ones in his own name. The dies came from England, as they did under Henry III and Edward I, and are as good as the English—better perhaps in the case of some of Edward's, which show an unconventional version of the crowned head, narrow and heavy-jawed, which may have an element of portraiture—a punch rejected because it was too lifelike.

The long introduction contains a full discussion of hoards. Those from Ireland contain few Irish pence, sometimes none, but often many English. Their distribution merits discussion. Ulster has more than its share.

S. E. RIGOLD

A Catalogue of Misericords in Great Britain. By G. L. Remnant, with an essay on their iconography by M. D. Anderson. $6\frac{1}{4} \times 9\frac{1}{2}$ in., xl + 221 pp., 41 pls. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969. Price £3 3s.

Because of their position, misericords are one of the least observed of medieval fittings in our churches. They are known to exist and the lip service of admiration is payed to them but there, due largely to the entirely meritorious work of the lady embroiderers the matter stops. The enthusiast is seldom sufficiently strong to wrestle with the massive cushions bearing the badges of past worthies which ease the latter ends of their successors. Only occasionally as at St. Laurence, Ludlow, are the seats turned up to view.

If as a result of Mr. Remnant's book there are to be fewer cushioned and more up-turned seats this will be a justification in itself. However, it does more than this. It fills a serious gap in the information available on this type of medieval woodwork, both where to find it and how to understand it. The clarity and comprehensiveness of lists and index coupled with an excellent essay on the iconography of misericords make this an essential addition to any list of standard reference works on our medieval churches.

It is a little disappointing to find that Mr. Remnant accepts without question the traditional explanation for the reason for misericords: that they were to provide an unstable resting-place to ease the rigours of the offices. It is not beyond reason to suggest that in their present form they arose from the insatiable desire of medieval craftsmen to

decorate everything within reach. If the arms of the stalls were intended to provide a resting place for the elbows of their occupants then from a practical point the seat had to be hinged. Anyone who has suffered the agonies of long choral services in Victorian stalls of quasi-medieval design and fixed seats will know that the position produced is one of extreme discomfort. On the other hand nothing looks more depressing than a row of tipped-up seats. They cry out for decoration, and it is a cry that few medieval carvers could have heard unheeded. That we are still no nearer knowing the method adopted in controlling the design of a set of misericords is an irritation but a minor one. It would be interesting to know if the iconography were laid down by the patron or chosen by the master-designer of the stalls—but far more interesting would be some knowledge of the carvers of individual seats.

The quality of work varies greatly, that of most being competent run-of-the-mill work, which, if more of it had survived, would have run the risk of becoming boring. As social documents they are invaluable but as works of art the generality do not rise much above the level of Staffordshire chimney-ornaments—in a sense their 19th-century counterparts. But in a small number the quality is of a remarkable standard: whoever carved 'the flight of Alexander' at Wells (1, *b*) was an artist of considerable calibre; the shepherd at Winchester College, which strangely Mr. Remnant does not illustrate, bears the mark of a profound and sympathetic caricaturist; and the exquisite wolf at Faversham (13, *c*), if it had been carved in ivory or marble, could be in any of the great collections.

The photographs which make up the last section of the book are an excellent selection but the arrangement is somewhat idiosyncratic: pls. 17 to 48 are arranged in the alphabetical order of English counties, followed by Scotland, Ireland and Wales—a long awaited recognition that medieval work in the sister kingdoms and principality is part of the same tradition as that in England—but pls. 1 to 16 are in no obvious sequence. Whether they are in order of importance, artistic merit, or personal preference is not made clear, which is a pity, as it is the one personal note in an otherwise scrupulously impersonal book.

H. GORDON SLADE

An Inventory of Historical Monuments in the County of Cambridge, 1, *West Cambridgeshire*. By the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments. $8\frac{1}{2} \times 10\frac{3}{4}$ in. lxix + 256 pp. 144 pl. (some in colour), many line drawings (not numbered), map in pocket. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1968. Price £6 6s.

Had the pre-war rate of publication been maintained there would by now be three or four counties each covered by three or four volumes of the Inventory, like those for Herefordshire and Essex. As we know, partly because of new commitments, partly because of the extraordinary development of archaeology the original purpose of the Commission has been, not quite perhaps abandoned, but rather tacitly assumed to be unattainable. This is disappointing, if unavoidable, since the main use of the Inventory was clearly intended at its inception to be a work of reference. There has, of course, been almost ample compensation since each volume is now such a minute and detailed study and such a close reflection of the state of archaeological opinion at the time of its publication that it can stand on its own. The volume under review that follows the two for the city of Cambridge and is the first for the county is a good example of this. We are not told when work started on it but we may suspect that it was ten or so years ago. The mind boggles at the amount of painstaking labour that has gone into it, both by Dr. Eden and his full-time staff and, perhaps even more deserving, by the unpaid Commissioners concerned with the volume.

The volume treats thirty-seven parishes lying west of Cambridge but, although this includes Rupert Brooke's Grantchester, it has to be confessed that the area is not a very exciting one. It is mainly a region of intractable boulder clay too far south to have the use of the fine freestones of Huntingdonshire and Northamptonshire; the churches are

sometimes interesting but rarely outstanding. The area's chief claim to distinction is its two great country houses, Wimpole and Madingley halls. The Commission has therefore made a virtue of necessity and concentrated attention on field-systems, timber houses, moats and much else of great interest to the medieval archaeologist.

The pre-enclosure fields have been studied in great detail. All the parishes had open fields, nine have pre-enclosure maps, three terriers, and at most others traces of ridge-and-furrow survive. The ridge is the 'land' or 'selion' and the ridge-and-furrow is normally 7 to 9 yd. wide. Such is part of a great mass of observations made in the area; as more Commission volumes appear our knowledge of early fields should be transformed. The detailed recording of these traces of earlier cultivation, as for example in the map of Eltisley on p. 96 or of Caxton on p. 43, as well as the beautiful reproductions in colour of estate maps (pls. 28–9), must earn the highest commendation and praise.

On pages xlv and following Dr. Eden has set out a new classification for the timber-framed houses of the area: types A–D being medieval open halls and types H–S mainly two-storied post-medieval buildings. The letters E, F and G have been left out in case it is necessary to add new types to the first four. It will be very interesting to see how this classification stands the test of time; for my own part I find it very useful to clear my head by seeing things set out in categories. Those of us who are a little ill at ease with vernacular architecture always hunger for some sort of classification. The medieval archaeologist is only concerned with categories A–D since the rest are post-medieval. It is remarkable how a hall open to the roof was clung to right through the middle ages and the insertion of a first floor, rather like the Reformation with which it was often contemporary, ushered in a new era. I suppose the hall with undercroft, more characteristic of the early middle ages although in use throughout (cf. South Wingfield Manor, Derbyshire), would be regarded by Dr. Eden as a variant of his type B.

The area is devoid of monastic remains and contains the site of but one castle; as we might expect on the boulder clay the most numerous earthworks are moats. Indelibly etched on this reviewer's memory are rescue excavations on supposed 'homestead' moats done for the Ministry at Cherry Holt, near Grantham, and Epperstone, near Nottingham (*Rep. Pap. Lincs. Archit. and Archaeol. Soc.* (1957), pp. 72–82). In neither case did the central island contain any trace of building and the first, to judge by the clay pipes found in it, had been dug in *c.* 1700. Gervase Markham in the numerous editions of his many hack works of late Tudor and early Stuart times (*Farewell to Husbandry*, *The English Housewife*, and so on) advocated digging moats to ornament orchards and gardens. A very different writer was J. Mortimer, an experienced Essex farmer, whose book, *The Whole Art of Husbandry; Or the Way of Managing and Improving Land*, ran to six editions in the 18th century and was translated into Swedish. The book is a serious one, evidently widely read at the time and still held in esteem. He has advice to offer on ponds (2 ed. (1708), pp. 224–8). The water should be 6 ft. deep. The mud from the bottom is useful for marling ' . . . but as 'tis much more chargeable and troublesome to get out in boggy and springy bottoms, where you cannot cart it; so shall I advise that all ponds made in such places should be made like Moats, and not broad ponds, that so when ever you have a mind to empty them, the Workmen may at one or two throws at the most be able to cast the Mud out on the Banks, for the Price of which Sort of Work, every pole-square of Mud that is twelve inches deep is worth Sixpence a Pole to fling out where it may be done at one throw; but where two is required 'tis worth Twelve pence a Pole', etc. It is worth quoting this verbatim since the very simple economic motive for making a pond moat-shaped is not always grasped. No doubt this motive operated well before the 18th century.

A moat might be dug then: *a*, to defend a house (the normal origin); *b*, to decorate the perimeter of a garden or orchard; and *c*, as a pond for fish or watering stock. The Royal Commission recognize two classes of moat (pp. lxi–lxvi), homestead and garden. The first type is further subdivided according to whether it is single or multiple, its shape and the area it encloses. 'It is certain that most homestead moats were at one time

occupied by farmsteads . . . ' (p. lxvii), so we are assured, no doubt rightly. Where the building has vanished and is not shown on an earlier map one cannot of course be certain without excavation. 'Most' is not quite the same thing as 'all' and it will be interesting to see if a third class has to be introduced in future volumes; perhaps the reviewer's sufferings will not have been in vain!

There are many other aspects of the volume that deserve mention, some of them beyond the reviewer's competence, such as the ecclesiology. Village morphology is an interesting subject but a treacherous garden path if followed too far. All the evidence suggests that the settlement of this boulder clay area was mainly a medieval achievement; there is very slender evidence for prehistoric or Roman occupation. There has been a much greater use of historical sources in recent volumes, in this one in particular, which makes a fuller and better record.

The work, illustrations and text, must receive our unstinted admiration, but may I conclude with two mild criticisms? The Ministry guide-books have had dual scales, metric and English, for many years, and the nation is about to adopt metric measures. Traditional measures are important when dealing with traditional features like open fields but could not the Commission use a dual scale? Secondly, should the royal warrant and verbiage at the front, a little embarrassing in 1968 and surely a deterrent to a prospective purchaser, be kept in this form? The Commission is charged with recording historical monuments, not dressing up to look like one!

M. W. THOMPSON

Coins and Archaeology. By L. R. Laing. $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. xvi + 336 pp., 28 pls., 44 figs., 16 maps. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1969. Price £3.

'Coins and Archaeology' has been the title of more than one essay, notably that by B. H. St. J. O'Neil, on the uses and limitations of coin evidence in field-studies and excavations. Both words now have a catch-penny ring, and the production of this book is attractive, though the drawings are often dreadful. The language is slovenly and cliché-ridden for a writer who has presumably had a classical training: on one page a 'theory' is a 'process' and a 'problem' is a 'fact', in a well-meaning attempt to make statistics easy. This excursus typifies the construction of the book, which is a concatenation of loosely connected notes, some elementary, some abstruse, not all showing a mastery of their special themes, but all, cumulatively, tending to obscure the underlying thesis. In short, it is an immature book, directed not so much to 'the archaeologist, professional or amateur' but to the young and omnivorous, who will find much that is unfamiliar or recondite, and more or less relevant to Mr. Laing's special subjects, which are the iron-age coinages of Gaul and Britain and certain aspects of Roman coinage. Here he is a reliable, if rambling, guide; elsewhere he is not reliable, and more often because he is uncritical than because he is uninformed. This may sound ungenerous from one whose several articles Mr. Laing so faithfully retails, but I would rather he could distinguish the speculative and controversial parts of these from the reasonably secure and could see that certain other scholars may change their minds, so that their earlier and later views are not to be cited on the same footing. The troublesome dating of Merovingian coins, and consequently of Sutton Hoo and Crondall, is a case in point.

It is absurd to claim that the recent Winchester excavations have produced more Saxon coins than all other excavations in England put together: Richborough alone produced twenty-four, of which at least fifteen came from controlled digging, and Hamwih is far richer than Winchester. Medieval sites, even deserted medieval villages, often yield more than 'one or two' coins, and silver was not conspicuously scarcer than in the Roman period—far otherwise in the latest middle ages. It is the '*aes*' coinage that is missing. Debasement, rapid or restrained, was familiar enough in medieval Europe, and no coinage except Sterling was anything like as stable as the pre-Severan denarius. Medieval manipulation of money was much more sophisticated than Roman. Early

medieval, not least Anglo-Saxon, coin-legends are of primary historical importance. The study of English medieval coinage is long and creditable, but hardly in advance of Germany and Scandinavia, nor of English architectural studies, which are surely 'medieval archaeology'. A mountainous labour to produce 'a date nearer 415' instead of 410 for the end of Roman administration hardly belongs to 'Coins and medieval Britain'. The occurrence of coins in the names of the eastern emperors in 6th-century Britain is not 'Byzantine influence', since all coins, imitative or archetypal, were then 'Byzantine' in this minimal sense, But the 'Cross on Steps' derives from a *western* coinage in the name of Justin II, not from Heraclius, forty years later. The muddled account of the Anglo-Saxon gold coinage has been mentioned, and unsatisfactory summaries of several wide historical and numismatic issues follow, with no mention of more narrowly archaeological issues save the occasional association of coins with pots. There is not a word of medieval jettons, with their international distribution and great stratigraphic utility. There is not a word in this context about length of circulation, distribution of cut coins and fractional denominations, though Venetian *soldini*, which passed in England as 'Galley halfpence' get over a page because they have been the subject of a recent study. Finally, to move to France and to the post-medieval period, it is not true that milled coinage ceased between 1585 and 1640: in the interval the mill was used for copper instead of silver.

All save the last of these strictures derive from one chapter, but there are more general weaknesses which suggest that outside his special period Mr. Laing listens too much to the voice of the mere collector. It is not important, nay it is impossible within strict terms, to distinguish between pence of Edward I and of Edward II, as such, but it is important to work out the date of issue as narrowly as possible, and to estimate the time of circulation before loss. The margin of error and subjectivity of judgement on this last point is great, but in the result it is more important than the *precise* date of issue. Many single finds are far below 'collectable' condition, and to suggest that descriptions should use the dealer's jargon of 'almost extremely fine', and so on, would lead to the absurdity of 'almost extremely mediocre'. And yet, in the first paragraph, Mr. Laing appreciates that 'numismatics may be said to be a branch of archaeology', and truly the more it is so regarded the healthier it will be, saving always the study of coin-inscriptions, which is a branch of (documentary) history. Starting from this sound base, the book is disappointing in its medieval section, even as a digest of theses that are archaeological in the widest sense. It is often equally naïve when it touches early Greek coinage. It falls off because it attempts too much. This is not the fault of youth as such (the great Raymond Serrure began his brief and astonishing career in his teens) but of over-haste to reach hard covers.

S. E. RIGOLD

Atlas over Borups Agre 1000–1200 e. Kr. (Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, Commission for Research on the History of Agricultural Implements and Field Structures, publication no. 1). Edited by A. Steensberg. 10½ × 8½ in. 114 pp. (including summaries in English, German, French and Russian), 19 text illustrations, 96 plans. Copenhagen: Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, 1968. Price Kr. 100.

Two rather awkwardly-shaped, limply-bound volumes contain the first definitive report of an almost incredibly detailed and painstaking piece of field-research which surely presses the admirable, scholarly yet empirical, Danish tradition in things archaeo-agricultural almost to its limits. In concept and execution, it is without peer in British medieval archaeology.

Borup Ris consists of a morainic landscape with alternating sand, clay and gravel, sloping gently north from a plateau to the southern shores of Tystrup Lake. It is not obviously an important archaeological area—even the ridge-and-furrow is not exactly eye-catching—and indeed the value of the immense amount of work put in here will to

a large extent depend on how typical, rather than how exceptional, the area is. About half the area investigated is now wooded, but the southern part is rather damp pasture. Field-work has concentrated on a rough rectangle of land bounded by the lake and a modern road to north and south respectively, and by two streams to west and east. About half the estimated original 200 hectares (*c.* 4,900 acres) of early medieval fields have been mapped, first by a levelled survey involving *c.* 60,000 measurements and then by plotting, on a 5 m. grid, *c.* 1,000,000 stones of 10 cm. diameter or more which occurred in the soil down to a maximum depth of 30 cm. below the present surface. This basic ground survey, to which is linked trial excavation of the fields, three farms, a water-mill and a 'cenotaph' mound, pollen analytical work, a carbon-14 dating programme and documentary research, is still continuing. This first report covers the 1952–67 work, which was supported by the Carlsberg Foundation (British brewers, please note) and the Ministry of Labour to the tune of some £26,000. Though the editor does not say so, in the process half a generation of Danish (and other) students of archaeology and related subjects have been exposed to the Steensberg approach in the field, an aspect of this remarkable project which may yet prove to be one of the most significant.

These two volumes claim to be an objective statement of the evidence, primarily of the fields as defined by the sub-surface stones. Little assessment is attempted. The *Atlas* is therefore crucial: it contains 96 sheets at a scale of 1 : 400 reduced from an original scale of 1 : 250, each sheet representing 1 hectare. A key map at a scale of 1 : 2,000 fits inside the back cover and must be one of the most staggering archaeological documents ever produced. Enlightenment on its implications must be awaited with impatience. We are told that the probing for stones on which it is based was not everywhere equally effective, and this is indeed apparent. Nor is the relationship between stones and furrows (shown by lines) everywhere clear. The fields have not produced lynchets and the fact that the ridge-and-furrow runs across the contours is not in itself sufficient explanation of their absence. The technique of ploughing, the time involved, and the type of plough used are other relevant factors. The suggestion is that an ard, not a wheel-plough, was used. The fields are seen as part of the arable of the ten to fifteen farms originally in the area within a context of colonization of marginal or uncleared land *c.* A.D. 1000, a process reversed with the abandonment of the settlements *c.* 1200. 15th-century cultivation in ridge-and-furrow of the deserted fields and farms has not helped elucidate the earlier patterns which themselves lie over prehistoric features including fields.

Inevitably, judgement must be reserved on this research feat until the scholars who have conceived and carried it out tell us what they think it means and whether they think it has been worth while within the context of Scandinavian agrarian archaeology —thinking about this within a British framework nasty bits of jargon like 'cost-effectiveness' come to mind. The technical accomplishment at Borup cannot be doubted, particularly as its practitioners are clearly aware of the methodological limitations, and it was probably inevitable that, sooner or later, survey in this detail would be done somewhere. Doubtless we are missing information from our medieval field-systems by not probing them at least 100 times in each 5 m. square but, if the resources were available for their proper study, we would do well to ask whether this sort of survey would be the most effective way of advancing knowledge. It probably is true, nevertheless, that our splendid air-photographs and early maps, so often apparently clear in their demonstration of detail of settlement and field-system, are blinding us to less obvious facets of earlier history. One of the hopes expressed here is that others will imitate the technique elsewhere. Though several so-called research projects which could more profitably be directed into this field immediately come to mind, we should, perhaps, before commitment, wait and see whether the results from Borup are commensurate with the effort that has gone into their production. The implications of the answer, whether 'yes' or 'no', are daunting.

P. J. FOWLER

The following have also been received:

Drawing Archaeological Finds for Publication. By Constant Brodribb. $8\frac{3}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ in. 52 pp., 32 figs. London: John Baker, 1970. Price 15s.

Two Churches, England and Italy in the Thirteenth Century. By Robert Brentano. $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. xvi + 327 pp., 19 pls. Princeton: Princeton University Press (Oxford University Press), 1969. Price 104s. 6d.

Life in the Age of Charlemagne. By Peter Munz. $8\frac{1}{4} \times 6$ in. xiv + 168 pp., numerous illustrations. London: Batsford, 1969. Price 30s.

The Names of Towns and Cities in Britain. Compiled by Margaret Gelling, W. F. H. Nicolaisen and Melville Richards. $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ in. 215 pp. London: Batsford, 1970. Price 50s.

Ligarzas. Edited by Antonio Ubieto Arteta. $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ in. 254 pp. Valencia: La Universidad (Facultad de Filosofia y Letras), 1968. No price stated.

Redundant Churches Fund, First Annual Report, 1969. $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6$ in. 11 pp., illustrated covers. London: Faith Press, 1970. Price 1s. 'It will be our aim so to use our resources that no church of architectural or historic interest is lost for financial reasons' (pp. 5–6). The booklet includes forms for donations, bankers' orders and covenants for those wishing to support the members of the Fund in their noble but daunting task.

Kongers havn og handels sete. By Asbjørn E. Herteig. 9 × 6 in. 224 pp., 67 pls., many text figs. Oslo: H. A. Aschehoug & Co., 1970. No price stated. A popular account of the excavations at Bergen (cf. *Med. Archaeol.*, III (1959), 177–86).

Hinchingbrooke House, Huntingdonshire. By Philip G. M. Dickinson. $9\frac{3}{4} \times 7$ in. 40 pp., illustrated. Huntingdon: Governors of Hinchingbrooke School, 1970. No price stated. The author has skilfully disentangled the plan of the medieval nunnery, much of the fabric of which was incorporated into the later buildings.