



# **barq**

## **BULLETIN**

April 1979  
Vol 6 no.

### **Contents**

## **Bristol Archaeological Research Group**

**C/o City Museum,  
Queens Road,  
Bristol, 8.**

165	Officers & Committee : Membership
166	Editorial
167	Ashton Park : Continuing SAGA by Nicholas Clough
172	Sea Mills by Jim Constant
174	Members' Symposium : Recently Surveyed Buildings in the Bristol Area by John Bryant
176	Archaeology & Schools by Rob Iles
177	Annual General Meeting
179	CBA Group 13 Spring Meeting Bristol. 21 April 1979
180	'And Slowly Answered Arthur from the BARG....' a farewell adress by Dr P J Fowler
190	Recent & Forthcoming Publications
191	Reviews
195	Calendar of Forthcoming Courses, Meetings & Lectures, April - September 1979
	Supplement BARG List of Members 1979

## OFFICERS & COMMITTEE 1979/80

- Chairman: R W Knight, Castle Farm, Marshfield, Chippenham, Wilts.  
Tel. Marshfield 469
- Hon Secretary: J Bryant, 116 Doncaster Rd, Southmead, Bristol BS10 5PZ  
Tel. Bristol 506509
- Hon Membership Secretary: Mrs J Harrison, City Museum, Bristol BS8 1RL
- Hon Secretary for Associate Members: S Reynolds, 12A Royal York Crescent,  
Bristol 8
- Hon Treasurer: J Russell, 3 Priory Avenue, Westbury-on-Trym,  
Bristol BS9 4DA
- Hon Editor (Bulletin): Mrs Deirdre Parker, 159 Cheltenham Road,  
Bristol BS6 5RR Tel. Bristol 46997
- Hon Editor (Special Publications): L V Grinsell, 32 Queens Court ,  
Clifton, Bristol BS8 1ND Tel. Bristol 38147
- Hon Fieldwork Adviser: M W Ponsford, City Museum, Bristol BS8 1RL
- Hon Parish Survey Co-ordinator: Mrs M Campbell, 79 Pembroke Rd,  
Bristol BS8 3DW
- Hon Marketing Officer: Mrs M Gorely, 29 Oakdale Court, Downend,  
Bristol BS16 1DZ

## COMMITTEE

- Elected: J H Drinkwater, 44 Oakdale Court, Downend, Bristol BS16 6DU  
M Dalby, 40 Farley Close, Little Stoke, Bristol  
J M Hunt, 14 Hunters Way, Filton, Bristol BS12 7EW  
Mrs J Williams, 5 Grange Close, North, Westbury-on-Trym,  
Bristol
- Ex Officio: D P Dawson, City Museum, Bristol BS8 1RL  
P J Fowler, Dept of Extra-Mural Studies, The University,  
Bristol  
A J Parker, Dept of Classics & Archaeology, The University,  
Bristol  
N Thomas, City Museum, Bristol BS8 1RL
- Co-opted: Mrs Pauline Belsey, Appleacre, Queen Charlton, Keynsham,  
Bristol (Co-ordinator, Bulletin Production Team)  
R Iles, 46 Shadwell Rd, Bishopston, Bristol

## MEMBERSHIP

Subscriptions for 1979 were due on 1 January. Current rates are:

- £2.00 for members aged 18 and over
- £3.00 for husband and wife
- £1.40 for Senior Citizens and special cases on application
- £0.40 for Associate Members (under 18 years)

Cheques and postal orders should be made payable to Bristol Archaeological Research Group and sent to the Hon Membership Secretary, Mrs Jo Harrison, to whom any changes of address should be notified. Will members who pay annually by Bankers Order on 1 March, please check that they are paying at the correct rates.

## EDITORIAL

Treasure hunting constitutes a very real threat to archaeology in the country, and, as Peter Fowler said in his farewell address to BARG, 'there can be no truck with treasure hunting in principle'. This view is demonstrated in one of the two archaeological Bills before Parliament - on portable antiquities and Treasure Trove. It is also expressed in the text of a formal statement circulated in the January CBA Council meeting, which is probably already familiar to you all. Our regional group of the CBA, Group 13, has organised its Spring meeting around the subject of treasure hunting. This meeting takes place on Saturday 21 April in the School of Chemistry, Bristol University. Further details on p. 179. One of the speakers is the Chairman of a metal detectors club - so all points of view will be aired. Please make every effort to attend.

So the Fowlers are soon departing; as I said in a previous Editorial, their names have almost become synonymous with the archaeology of this region. The list of archaeological achievements in the last 14 years referred to by PJF, if not directly initiated by him, were almost then certainly inspired by him, and his modesty does him credit. One must be careful in writing of retirements or farewells not to make them sound too much like obituaries. So, may we wish him and his family all the best for the future, and the RCHM all the luck they can get! We also extend a welcome to his successor as Extra-Mural Tutor in Archaeology, Mick Aston, who is no stranger to this region, being formerly Archaeologist in the Planning Office of Somerset County Council, and a member of CRAAGS.

Finally, two points - firstly, may I remind members that BARG possesses a library where the publications it receives are held, and this can be viewed by appointment with the staff of the Dept of Archaeology & History at Bristol City Museum (tel 299771 ex 204) 10.00 am - 4.45 pm, Mondays to Saturdays, and in addition 7-9 pm on Thursdays, with the exception of Bank Holidays and certain other dates as advertised. I realise that a previous request for the publications received by BARG to be listed in the Bulletin was never realised, and I will see that this is put into effect in the next issue.

Secondly, future excavations by CRAAGS include West Hill, Uley, Gloucestershire (ST 789996) at the Romano-British Temple complex, from mid August to mid September, where visitors and volunteers are welcome; Wells Cathedral at the medieval chapels adjoining the East Cloister range, and Anglo-Saxon buildings below - visitors and experienced volunteers welcome. 2 April - 29 June. Bristol City Museum's excavation will include a site in the medieval part of Bristol at Tower Hill - further details from Mike Ponsford at the City Museum.

## ASHTON PARK : CONTINUING SAGA

by

Nicolas Clough

The Survey and Archaeology Group in Avon, as described in the December Bulletin, is continuing its work in Ashton Park. The group has two main objectives on this project:- to discern the patterns of past land use in this area, and to produce an accurate instrumental survey of the multi-period earthworks in the Park. These ends can only be achieved after prolonged and careful observation in the field and after thorough documentary research.

The writer has found, among other written resources, that the Smyth Papers, housed in the Bristol City Archives Department, are a particularly rich source of relevant documentary evidence. Of the many features observed in the field some can already be identified from the documents and can be given approximate historical horizons. These include what may be tentatively described as an ancient field system, a series of pronounced strip lynchets, the sites of deserted cottages and disused trackways, a deer park boundary, the site of a deserted farmstead and post-medieval garden boundaries. These earthworks at least are distinguishable from the physical remains of late eighteenth and nineteenth century developments, for which there is clear cartographic and written evidence.

The ancient field system marked on OS maps at grid reference 555725 and sketched by C W Phillips in 1933 (1), comprises the earliest series of earthworks within Ashton Park. Plan I, which the writer has sketched by eye in the field after C W Phillips' original plan, shows the small area of the field system on which the group is currently working. The discussion below will be essentially related to this specific area.

The fields thus planned have several salient characteristics. They are irregular in shape but follow a general NW/SE alignment. The larger fields measure up to 100 x 50 m while the smaller fields are roughly 25 x 50 m. Some of the smallest fields, which resemble actual terraces, may have resulted from the secondary subdivision of larger fields. There is evidence of two pronounced hollows in contemporary use with the fields they bypass. There are, moreover, several small oval shaped hollows (unfortunately not planned because of a genuine risk of unwanted interference), which may possibly be the sites of buildings. Romano-British pottery has been found nearby one of these sites (2).

It will not be possible to make any definitive statement about these fields until a detailed and accurate survey of them is completed. Their appearance poses various questions which as yet may only be answered tentatively and theoretically.

The typology of the Field System is not in itself sufficient evidence to give any sure indication of its date of origin. So called 'Celtic Fields' of this type have been shown to have originated within the wide time bracket of the second millenium BC to the first millenium AD (3). Until a sample of these lynchets is sectioned and material excavated from the ground beneath them, it will only be possible to date them by their association with surface finds and with other adjacent earthworks, most significantly with the multivallate Burwalls Camp. The nineteenth century housing developments and the roads of Rownham Hill have, however, finally removed any physical relationship that may have existed between the fields and the camp. The only remaining indication of such an inter-connection is that one of the



holloways mentioned above would appear to be leading towards the SW side of Burwalls Camp. The Rev H M Scarth's plans of Burwalls (4), after the Rev S Seyer's written description mentions at least four entrances through these ramparts.

Even if some association between the field system and the camp is supposed, there is still no excavated evidence to date either of them. Such evidence is, however, available for the nearby Stokeleigh Camp, which is typologically comparable to Burwalls (6) (7). Admittedly the material was excavated from a series of sondages, which may or may not have yielded representative samples, but the conclusion was that the site was occupied in four phases. The first occupation was not earlier than the latter part of the third century BS and the second phase continued without interruption into a period in which the pottery forms showed a marked Belgic influence, lasting up to the mid-first century AD. The second phase may have overlapped with the earliest occupation at Gatcombe and with the foundation of the port at Sea Mills. The camp was then abandoned until the periods between the mid-third century and early fourth century AD.

That Burwalls Camp was contemporary with Stokeleigh and shared a common development over the centuries is by no means certain, but it does seem probable that these two camps, together with the Clifton Camp which has also yielded Roman material (8), watched over the ford across the River Avon. They possibly lay astride the route that led up from the Avon Basin along Nightingale Valley. If the phases of occupation at Burwalls and at Stokeleigh were at all comparable, then different phases may yet prove to be identifiable within the field system. Those small fields, for example, S of the car park, which appear as regular terraces and of which some contain visible building platforms, may perhaps be the remains of a small settlement of the later phase, when the utilisation of the area had already been extended. Romano-British pottery has been found in molehills nearby this area (9).

It may be assumed that there was a network of trackways that served the crucial ford crossing over the River Avon (10). What is sadly not evident in the field is exactly how the line of the route leading up from Nightingale Valley continued. The 1821 Inclosure Award Map shows the path leading up the valley as far as the Park Wall, at which point it seems to fork. It is described in the Award as being 'a footway of the width of six foot, marked with the letter Q, leading Eastwards down through a certain Coombe or Valley, there to an ancient footway leading to the River Avon (11). It is likely that the full extent of this footpath was ancient, as it faithfully follows the natural contours of the valley. Attempts by the writer to find traces of any trackway leading westwards from this point (near the western end of North Road) have proved fruitless. The ground had been disturbed by the modern Abbots Leigh Road, by nineteenth century ploughing within the Park Wall and by the Beech Plantations on the edge of the Estate (12). It is perhaps not entirely coincidental, however, that today the wall is broken by two small gate entrances at the point opposite the fork in the trackway shown in the 1821 Inclosure Map.

Returning to the field system, it is clear from the size of the lynchets, both positive and negative, that these were mostly arable fields. C W Phillips saw an area where turf had been removed, and describes the banks as having formed over piles of small stones cleared to the edge of the fields (13). It may be deduced from this that the fields were divided by low drystone walls. Drystone walls were also a feature of both Burwalls and Stokeleigh Camps (14).

The lynchets of ancient fields cover an extensive area of Ashton Park, but this distribution does not necessarily reflect their original extent. The northernmost edge of the system as shown on the plan, for example, appears to follow the top of the slopes that lead up to the high plateau within the 400' contours. The reason for this may be that the lynchets, formed as they were by the action of the plough, were pronounced on the steep slopes beneath the highest contours, while on the level plateau the banks were slight enough to be erased by the extensive cultivation of the whole of this northern end of the park in the nineteenth century. Evidence for this cultivation is to be found in the Terrier of 1818 (15) and in the Survey and Estate Plan of 1826 (16). The traces of narrow rig ploughing cover much of this area. The virtual non-appearance of the field system towards the NW end of the Park, may well result from the continued cultivation of this area until at least 1865, as is shown on the Estate Plan of that date (17).

It does seem possible that the nineteenth century development of this northern edge of the Park as an agricultural area, was the first significant physical disturbance of this part of the landscape since the abandonment of the ancient fields. In the Saxon period the settlement would appear to have been focused on the valley below. It is not clear how this area was utilised in the Medieval period, though we do know from the documents that parts of the NE end of the parish were alienated from the lords of the manors of Ashton. Alexander d'Alneto granted Burwalls to the Hospital of St Katherine of Bedminster (18) and this generosity was matched in 1331 when Edmund de Lyouns granted to the Abbey of St Augustine's 'all that piece of his pasture in Ayshton lying between the woode of Legh on the one side and a certain place called Burwalls on the other side, stretching to the course of the water of Aven below up to Leghdoune and Ayshtondoune above' (19). The topography of this description is not clear, but it is possible that the part of the field system on the plan may have lain within this pasture.

After the Dissolution these lands were granted to the Smyth family. Further topographical information about the northern edge of the Park comes from a Conveyance of 1749, found by chance folded inside the Numerical Terrier for 1818 (20). It includes a description of Ashton Warren:- 'Ashton Warren extends in width from Rownham to the Wood and Warren of Leigh, in length from the river Avon to a road called Clarcken Coombe on Ashton Hill'. Again the ancient fields on the sketch plan may well have lain within the Warren so described. Certainly the presence of several ancient oak trees in this area would support this suggestion.

Apart from the roads which are shown on the 1765 Estate Map to traverse this area (21), it does seem possible then that the turf in this area remained intact from the time of the abandonment of the fields until the early nineteenth century.

One interesting relationship between the traces of narrow rig ploughing and the ancient field system occurs within the field marked 'A' on the plan. Here Dr P J Fowler has observed that the narrow rig cultivation respected the lynchets of the ancient fields and had been confined within them. The headland of the later cultivation can be seen inside and adjacent to the easternmost lynchet. Since this observation was made, the documents have provided collaborating evidence. Part of this field is drawn on the 1826 Estate Map (22) and is described in both the 1818 Terrier (23) and in the 1826 Survey (24) as a 'Potato plot'.

It is hoped that the foregoing, albeit theoretical, discussion has begun not only to explain how this part of the field system has survived in the way that it has, but also to place these earthworks within a

very broad context. There are many questions still to be answered and probably a greater number still to be asked. By producing an accurate plan of the surviving earthworks in the Park, S.A.G.A. hopes to be able to delineate the extent of the ancient field system, and with the help of documents to distinguish between the ancient features and what may be medieval or post-medieval remains. Such a plan may also help to establish within the ancient field system any areas which may have been settlements, and to distinguish any stratigraphical relationships that may be apparent. With this type of information it may be possible to pinpoint a crucial area where a small excavated section could provide significant dating material.

#### REFERENCES

##### Abbreviations:

PUBSS - Proceedings of the University of Bristol Spelaeological Soc  
PCAC - Proceedings of the Clifton Antiquarian Club  
BCAO - Bristol City Archives Office  
TBGAS - Transactions of the Bristol & Glos. Archaeological Soc

- (1) C W Phillips, Field Work, PUBSS Vol 4, p 145 (1933)
- (2) Op cit, Note 1
- (3) C Taylor, Fields in the English Landscape, p 29 (1975)
- (4) H M Scarth, The Camps on the River At Clifton, Archaeologia 44 (1873)
- (5) Rev S Seyer, Memoirs of Bristol, Vol I, p 60 (1821)
- (6) Dr E K Tratman, Prehistoric Bristol, PUBSS Vol 5, (1946)
- (7) J W Haldane, Excavations at Stokeleigh, PUBSS Vol 14, p 30 (1975)
- (8) C Lloyd Morgan, Notes on Clifton, Burwalls and Stokeleigh Camps, PCAC Vol 5, p 9 (1904)
- (9) Op cit, Note 1
- (10) Op cit, Note 6
- (11) BCAA, Smyth Papers, 1821 Inclosure Award
- (12) BCAA, Smyth Papers 1865 Estate Map AC/PL/126
- (13) Op cit, Note 1
- (14) J W Haldane, Stokeleigh Camp, PUBSS Vol 11, p 31 (1966) and op cit, Note 8
- (15) BCAA, Smyth Papers 1818 Numerial Terrier AC/E/18
- (16) BCAA, Smyth Papers 1826 Estate Map AC/PL/105  
Smyth Papers 1826 Survey AC/E/19
- (17) Op cit, Note 12
- (18) L.J.U. Way, An Account of Leigh Woods, TBGAS Vol 36, p 57 (1933)
- (19) BCAA, Smyth Papers AC/D1
- (20) Op cit, Note 15
- (21) BCAA, Smyth Papers, 1765 Estate Map AC/PL/15
- (22) Op cit, Note 16
- (23) Op cit, Note 15
- (24) Op cit, Note 16



## SEA MILLS

by

Jim Constant

The council housing estate of Sea Mills derives its name from one of the three water mills that once flourished on the River Trym between the mouth of the Trym and its division into the separate streams to Westbury and Henbury below Combe Hill - Combe Mill, Clack Mill and '... all those water mills builded under the one Rouff (sic) commonly called the Sea Mills'.

Why 'Sea Mills'? An Assize record of 1411 gives us '... molend'voc' Semmille', and Chancery proceedings of 1461 and 1485 spell it 'Cee-mulle'. The eighteenth century historians Atkyns and Rudder suddenly produce 'Say Mills', but are they, perhaps, using a Gloucestershire pronunciation as a guide to their spelling? As late as 1616 it was still 'Sea', by which time, as quoted above, they have become plural.

One theory is that here we had a tide mill (the Trym is still tidal for over half a mile from the mouth). I do not know of any evidence for this. An alternative view is that the Avon, wide, swift, and with a great rise and fall of tide, was regarded as virtually the sea, and the epithet was applied to the nearest of the mills.

Supporters of 'Say' claim that the medieval cloth say or saye was made there - this was a fine material made of silk and wool. Authorities consulted on both woollen mills and the wool trade cannot, however, link this cloth with the area. On the other hand, fields close to the Trym between Clack Mill and Combe Mill are called 'Silklands' and 'Bleaching Ground' on the Tithe maps. Further, Ezekiel Wallis, once a mayor and sherriff of Bristol, owned a mill in Stoke Bishop in the mid-seventeenth century; the only mill in Stoke Bishop was the Sea Mills; and in his will Wallis refers to one of his sons as a 'silkman'. Perhaps, then, one should not dismiss the Say theory too lightly.

Whatever kind of mill there was at Sea Mills it seems to have been put out of action as a going concern by the construction of the Sea Mills Docks in the early eighteenth century. If this enterprise had succeeded the lower Trym basin might have become a large scale industrial area by the twentieth century.

Joshua Francklyn, a merchant of Bristol, conceived the idea of widening the Trym for about a quarter of a mile from its mouth to the site of the Sea Mills. Piers, sluices and wharves would turn the river into a floating harbour. Instead of waiting at Pill or Hung Road on the Avon for a suitable tide or expensive tow, vessels could come to the Sea Mills Harbour and remain afloat (at Hung Road they sat on the mud banks at low tide, chains from the rocks preventing them from keeling over). Here they could unload their cargoes which could go on to Bristol by one of two ways. Either they could go overland by horse and cart, or they could go on by river, being towed in a lighter along by the newly constructed towpath - much easier and cheaper than having a loaded boat hauled up river by a hundred or so rowers.

Land was leased from the Southwell family, lords of the Kingsweston Manor; the Sea Mills Dock Company was formed, and the Dock opened in 1716, the third wet dock to be built in the kingdom. There were difficulties; Francklyn had to alter his original plan to a considerable extent, to judge from his letter to Edward Southwell in 1711. In particular he had to foot more of the bill than he had anticipated, as

Southwell was not agreeable to paying a large share himself (at this time Kingsweston Manor was being rebuilt - architect Sir John Vanbrugh, no doubt an expensive man to employ!).

An estate map of 1720 makes two points clear. The late eighteenth century surgeon-historian William Barret described the harbour as once being capable of holding 'several score vessels of full sail at all times'. The present harbour, bounded by the great piers at the mouth of the Trym and the remnants of piers beneath the Portway viaduct arch, is obviously too small to fit this description. But the map shows the Trym from its mouth as far upstream as the site of the Sea Mills having a width equal to that of today's harbour. A later estate map of 1771 confirms the picture.

Secondly, the map shows a pier at the mill end of the dock scheme, creating an inner harbour. Francklyn's letter to Southwell says this: 'If a Bason or Wet Dock is made ... there must also be a Drye Dock'. Here then, close to the mill, is Francklyn's dry dock.

The Sea Mills Dock Company had for their engineer John Padmore, famous for his Great Crane in Prince Street and his work with Ralph Allen, at Allen's Combe Down quarries near Bath. Apart from the piers, dry dock, quays and wharves, he was to make provision for mills, mill-houses, engines, warehouses and tenements. The estate map shows, of these, only a group of houses and cottages by the Trym mouth, some of which survived until 1970, presumably built for dock workers.

The map does, however, show the Sea Mills Tavern, built by 1720, lying close to the Sea Mills and described as a house, outhouses and buildings intended for an inn or place of entertainment - mainly, one assumes, for dock workers and ships' crews, since the site was an isolated one. This inn survived into the twentieth century, serving as a dairy in its final phase.

The Sea Mills Dock plan was ambitious - but in the event Bristol merchants were not attracted to it. By 1721 Francklyn was selling some of his shares; by 1728 he was dead and his widow was selling some of hers, too.

Where peaceful trade failed, war succeeded. The War of Austrian Succession (1739-48) brought privateers to the docks which were well suited to the repair and fitting out of such vessels. But stranger uses for the docks were to come.

In 1750 the Sea Mills Whaling Company was formed - an unlikely-sounding enterprise, but in a small way a successful one; two whales were landed at the docks the same year. Later, 'Felix Farley's Bristol Journal' recorded the return from Greenland of the 'Bristol' and the 'Adventurer' with five whales, worth between them some £2,000. Somewhere within the docks area the whales were cut up and the blubber boiled to produce train oil and other commercial products. The isolation of the site must have been a positive advantage!

Then war again - the Seven Years War, 1756-63. Privateering work returned to the docks, and the whaling crews, perhaps understandably, seem to have deserted whaling and the cold, fierce Greenland waters in favour of privateering - no doubt less arduous, more profitable and more glamorous than whaling.

In 1761 the whaling company was wound up, so when the war ended there was nothing left to help the docks to survive as a going concern, and certainly by the 1770's they had silted up. Therein lay a problem

for the shareholders of the Sea Mills Dock Company. In the main they were likely to be descendants of the original shareholders, and since the shares now were worth only a tenth of their initial value and the Company had certain responsibilities the inheritance was more of an obligation than an asset. Under the terms of the original lease of the land for the docks the shareholders were to keep in repair and good order all buildings, cranes and other dock property, and had to maintain the wall between the docks and a Sneyd Park estate and part of a local road crossing the end of the docks. They were quite unable to comply with these terms.

In 1793 the lord of the manor took the shareholders to court to compel a performance of the covenant for the upkeep of the undertakings, surely an action taken with tongue in cheek! Action was ultimately stopped when the shareholders agreed with the lord of the manor to assign back to him all the land together with all the docks, works and undertakings and to be released from their obligations.

So ended the ambitious project which, had it been successful, might have turned the Trym Basin into a kind of mini-Avonmouth industrial centre. Today only the massive piers at the harbour entrance and masonry remnants along one bank and under the Portway viaduct remain to remind us of a Bristol merchant's dream.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### BARG MEMBERS' SYMPOSIUM

The Annual BARG Members's Symposium took place in the City Museum, Bristol on Saturday 20 January, at which the following members spoke:

- |               |   |  |
|---------------|---|--|
| L V Grinsell  | : | The carvings on the chambered cairn of Ty Iltut, Brecon  |
| John Hunt     | : | Stoke Gifford  |
| Mike Ponsford | : | Excavations at Ham Green, 1978 (included reference to the earlier excavations, and to the products of the kilns) |
| James Russell | : | Barr's Court, Oldland  |
| John Bryant   | : | Buildings recently surveyed by Bristol Museum (Dept of Archaeology)  |

I am grateful to John Bryant for the text of his talk:

#### RECENTLY SURVEYED BUILDINGS IN THE BRISTOL AREA

by

John Bryant

Recent work by the Dept of Archaeology of Bristol City Museum has included surveys of standing buildings threatened with demolition or extensive rebuilding. These have included both ecclesiastical and secular buildings, covering a range from the 12th century to the present.

Conversion into flats of a large house at Shirehampton enabled the recording of 15th century features. Surviving features included a fine roof with decorated mid-braces, and a gothic-arched doorway. Demolition of a medieval wall revealed two cinquefoil-headed windows, probably part of a set of such windows. Recesses inside the windows were covered by

painted plasterwork of a possible 16th century date. It is believed that the house, originally I-shaped in plan, was built for the local priest.

Trinity Methodist Church, in Whiteladies Road, Bristol, was photographed internally and externally before demolition. A limited amount of surveying was undertaken in this church of the 1860's. The east wall was decorated by a large mural painting in 5 panels, and this was removed prior to demolition, hopefully to be on display to the public at a later date.

Excavation of the medieval Hospital of St Bartholomew in Lewins Mead was accompanied by extensive surveying of standing buildings, dating from the 12th to the 20th centuries. Two Norman pillars and a later octagonal pillar, several medieval walls, and later elevations associated with schools on the site, were recorded. Efforts are being made to ensure that as many of the surviving structures as possible are incorporated into the new buildings to be erected on the site.

Prior to the commencement of renovation work, buildings at the corner of Host Street and Christmas Steps were extensively surveyed. Most of the buildings were constructed in 1746 on the sites of earlier structures, incorporating some medieval features, including 15th century arches. Three buildings on the site were interconnected, to form a baker's house, shop and bakery. The corner building, contained the baker's shop on the ground floor, with most of the house on the three floors above the shop. Two rooms of the first floor were panelled. At the rear of this building was a smaller, earlier structure of smaller proportions, in use as an extension of the house. Adjacent to the house and shop was the bakery, fronting onto Christmas Steps, and containing the working area on the ground floor and store rooms on upper floors. A brick oven was located at the south end of the bakery, on the ground floor, and this has survived to be incorporated into the planned public house extension.

Survey work has been undertaken at 10 Lower Park Row, prior to possible demolition. The building was constructed in the early 17th century on a site close to the Red Lodge, and is very much a complementary structure to that fine building. It consisted of three stories plus basement and attic storey, arranged in five bays, with a gabled roof in the local style of the period - Stoke Abbey Farm, Stoke Bishop, is the close parallel to this structure as originally built. During the 18th century the house was divided into two dwellings, and further rebuilding in the 19th century involved replacing the gabled roof with a third, brick-built, storey. Originally possessing more than 20 freestone mullioned windows, only one now survives in the building, the remainder renewed in the 18th or 19th centuries, and the original facade defaced. Investigation within the building has revealed that a number of 17th century doors and fireplaces survive, in addition to four small freestone windows.

Extensive building work at 43 Broad Street necessitated urgent and large-scale surveying early in 1979, in what is the best preserved medieval domestic building in central Bristol. Masonry was used for the end walls and a central wall, and for the ground floor walls, but the remainder were of timber-frame construction. One roof of medieval timberwork had survived in addition to timbers elsewhere in the building. The rear room at first floor level had originally possessed an oriel window, overlooking what is now Tailors Court, but this was removed later. Two stories at the rear retained their overhanging jetties,

including associated support brackets, but the equivalent features at the Broad Street side were removed when a brick frontage was constructed in 1825. Despite post-medieval rebuilding involving the rear of the building, the Tailor's Court face of the structure retains a medieval look, and it is hoped that this will be retained after the present rebuilding.

Current trends indicate that further buildings will need to be surveyed in the future. Apart from the interest of these buildings themselves, there is also information to be gained which will aid the understanding of structures uncovered during archaeological excavations. To a large degree, the surveying of standing buildings and the excavation of demolished buildings should go hand-in-hand, since each helps understanding of the other.

\* \* \* \* \*

### ARCHAEOLOGY & SCHOOLS

A Job Creation team has just finished doing archaeological field survey work for Avon County Planning Department. As a sideline to their own fieldwork, the team undertook a short project involving schoolchildren in archaeology and fieldwork, in the Norton Radstock area. There were requests for return visits, but lack of time prevented them. This was a pity because it had obviously been worthwhile and was worth following up. Most teachers have little knowledge of archaeology and even history teachers still equate it only with excavation.

Several teachers have in fact said they would like to carry on, but were uncertain what to do themselves. Obviously local museums provide a very good schools service, arranging visits and lectures. But there are few, if any, resources readily available outside of museums particularly with regard to fieldwork. However an excellent booklet, Peopling Past Landscapes\* has just been published by the CBA, outlining fieldwork techniques used over 12 years in a Northampton Secondary School.

Are there any BARG members who are also teachers and have experience in doing archaeology in schools? If there are, would they please contact me and anybody else who thinks this is worth pursuing. I think it is particularly important that archaeology should be considered in planning environmental studies as well as being thought of as adjunct to history at the end of a term.

Rob Iles  
Avon County Planning Department                      Bristol 290777 ex 530

\* Peopling Past Landscapes by John M Steane & Brian F Dix  
Price £2.00 - available from :  
post free                      Council for British Archaeology  
   112 Kennington Road  
   London SE11 6RE  
99pp 50 figs  
(containing 30  
photographs)

\* \* \* \* \*

Congratulations to John Griffin, Curator of Social & Agricultural History at the City Museum, for being awarded a Churchill Travelling Fellowship to study 'the interpretation of archaeological Bristol-related material in the USA'.

## ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

The seventeenth Annual General Meeting of the Bristol Archaeological Research Group was held on Saturday 24 February 1979 at the City Museum, Bristol. It was attended by 44 members. In the business part of the meeting, the minutes of the previous AGM held on 25 February 1978 were read and agreed. Reports by the Officers for the year 1978/79 are summarised as follows :

### OFFICERS' REPORTS

Hon Treasurer: The retiring Treasurer, Arthur Selway, presented the accounts and stock sheet for the year. Some expenses were not taken account of, being claimed after the end of the year. The balance sheet was adopted and is circulated with this Bulletin.

Hon Secretary: Mr Bryant gave a list of the publications received during the year. A list of the lectures given during 1978/79 was also given. There had been problems with distribution of the Bulletin, but steps were being taken to prevent the problem arising again.

Hon Membership Secretary: Caroline Gait, the retiring Secretary, reported that there had been 36 new members, including 11 Associates. Two members had resigned, and one member had died.

Hon Secretary for Associate Members: Mrs Williams gave a list of the excursions and lectures that had been arranged during 1978 for Associates. These had concentrated on local places of interest. Several people had helped with organising Thursday nights. She regretted that members younger than 16 could not excavate due to insurance reasons. Mrs Williams announced her resignation.

Hon Editor (Bulletin): Three A4 size Bulletins, with an average 26 pages each had been produced during the year. Mrs Parker thanked contributors to the Bulletin, including Mr Grinsell, who had produced the lists of recent and forthcoming publications. Mrs Belsey and the members of the Bulletin production team were also thanked.

Hon Editor (Special Publications): Mr Grinsell reported that progress on Field Guide 3A had not been as good as had been hoped. As currently envisaged, it would be written by Mrs Fowler, with Messrs Dawson, Grinsell and Ponsford, and Mrs Neale. At least a third of the text was in first draft. The text would hopefully be completed by April, with the Guide to be published before the next AGM. The cover design would be based on a photograph of the Saxon church at Bradford-on-Avon.

Hon Fieldwork Advisor: Mr Ponsford apologised for not playing a full part in BARG activities in 1978. He reported on work by the City Museum at Ham Green and Narrow Quay. Members had been involved in excavations at Stoke Gifford and Barr's Court. Two archaeological Bills were currently being processed by Parliament. There was discussion about the two Bills before Parliament, and about treasure-hunting. Dr Fowler suggested that individual members write to their MP in support of the archaeological Bills.

The Chairman thanked the retiring Officers, especially Mr Selway, and the ordinary members of the Committee for the work that they had done.

Three motions were proposed and were all carried unanimously. These were: (1) That the posts of Vice-Chairman and Marketing Officer be created. (2) That these two posts, together with the Hon Membership Secretary, be included in the Officers of the Committee; (due to an oversight in the past, the Hon Membership Secretary's post had never formally been included in the Committee) and (3) The numbers of the Committee be increased from 17 to 20 to include these new changes.

BRISTOL ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH GROUP

Receipts and Payments Account for the year ended 31st December 1978

<u>1977</u>		<u>1978</u>		<u>1977</u>	<u>Subscriptions</u>		<u>1978</u>
<u>£</u>		<u>£</u>		<u>£</u>			<u>£</u>
				13	Arrears	3	
37	Postage & Telephone	36		349	Current	301	
36	Stationery & Printing	32	392	<u>30</u>	Advance	<u>2</u>	306
24	Subscriptions	29					
18	Insurance	20			<u>Sales of Field Guides</u>		
52	Meetings Expenses	21			No. 1	17	
130	Bulletin Expenses	44		12	No. 2	45	
23	P.S.U.	18		44	No. 3	17	
14	Bank Charges	-		9	No. 4	2	
<u>1</u>	Sundries	<u>34</u>		<u>1</u>	Mendip	<u>21</u>	102
335		234	95	<u>29</u>	Sundries		11
<u>190</u>	Excess of receipts over payment	<u>233</u>	<u>38</u>		Interest on Deposit a/c		<u>48</u>
525		467	525				467
<u>    </u>		<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>				<u>    </u>

STATEMENT OF ACCOUNT

841	Balance General A/c	1031	245	Cash at Bank	430
	1st Jan 1978				
	and excess of				
<u>190</u>	Receipts over payments	<u>233</u>	<u>786</u>	Deposit Account	<u>834</u>
<u>1031</u>		<u>1264</u>	<u>1031</u>		<u>1264</u>
<u>    </u>		<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>		<u>    </u>

I have examined the above Receipts and Payments Account and Statement of Account as at 31st December 1978 and found them to be in agreement with the books and vouchers presented to me, but I have not seen the membership records for 1978.

Signed: P. Twentyman 22<sup>nd</sup> February 1979  
P. Twentyman, F.C.A. Hon. Auditor

The Officers and Committee of BARG were then elected and are as listed on p. 165. There were no nominations for the post of Vice-Chairman or Hon Auditor.

Following tea, Dr Peter Fowler gave a talk entitled 'And Slowly Answered Arthur from the BARG ...' (which is produced on p. 180). Upon the conclusion of Dr Fowler's talk, the Chairman made a presentation to Dr & Mrs Fowler on behalf of the members, in recognition of their services to local archaeology and to BARG in particular.

\* \* \* \* \*

### C B A GROUP 13

SPRING MEETING

SATURDAY 21 APRIL 1979

to be held in

The School of Chemistry, Lecture Theatre 2, Bristol University

2.00 pm BUSINESS MEETING

3.00 pm A FORUM ON TREASURE HUNTING, METAL DETECTING, & ARCHAEOLOGY

Speakers will include:

Mr Nicholas Thomas, Director, City Museum, Bristol

Mr Simon Timms, Conservation Section, Planning Department,  
Devon County Council

Mr C J Kellow, Chairman, Avon Folk Centre, Metal Detectors Club

The meeting will be chaired by Susan Pearce, Chairman of CBA  
Group 13

4.00 pm TEA

4.30 pm GENERAL DISCUSSION ON TREASURE HUNTING  
Speakers will be available to answer questions.

5.30 pm MEETING CLOSES

Approx.

It is hoped that this forum will provide an opportunity for a reasoned debate of the important issues relating to Treasure Hunting and Archaeology. The official CBA view, the legal position, and the point of view of those who use Metal Detectors will all be covered.

ADMISSION 30p including Tea

Everyone welcome after the business meeting.

\* \* \* \* \*

### BARG ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

Mr Stephen Reynolds who has just taken over the post of Hon Secretary for Associates is still trying to put together a future programme. His present ideas include a one-day visit to Lichfield Cathedral, Tamworth Castle and the Roman site at Wall. He also hopes to organise a visit to the Roman Baths at Bath and the American Museum also at Bath. He is also interested in the prospect of making visits to some of the Bristol Coin Fairs held on Saturday afternoons. If these ideas appeal to you, please contact Mr Reynolds at the City Museum.

\*\* Now fixed for 26 May - see Calendar for details.



'AND SLOWLY ANSWERED ARTHUR FROM THE BARG .....' (1)

by

Peter Fowler

My title was stored away years ago against the day when, through the tripartite nature of our electoral processes, it came to my turn to give the Chairman's Address. Since it need no longer be kept for that eventuality, I dragged it out, never dreaming that the unhappy necessity of our Treasurer's retirement today would lend it a particular appositeness. The line of course comes from Tennyson, and it is worth reminding ourselves how that turgid versifier proceeded (2).

My words here are personal, partly serious, inevitably-retrospective, but with forward-looking implications in the spirit, I hope, of the Committee's invitation for a last verbal fling before leaving Bristol and entering that bastion of the Establishment, Fortress House (3). This being a privileged occasion, with no subsequent questions, I have delved deep into the recesses of the English poetic tradition for appropriate quotations.

Obviously, a question very much in my mind now is 'Has it all been worthwhile, my 14 years at Bristol?'. Everyone would have his own answer to that, and I neither seek it nor give my own; but, less subjectively, one can at least ask 'What has happened since 1965; how is 1979 different from the archaeological situation of the Bristol area in the mid-1960s?'. The achievements and changes are so many in fact that it would be tedious to list them all, but just reflect on a selection. On the plus side, think of the organisational changes. We created a regional archaeological unit, CRAAGS, with a full-time director, in our case of immense capabilities; and, for our new County, more or less coinciding with BARG's area of direct interest, the Avon Archaeological Council. The growth of the Advisory Committee for the Historic Environment in Avon, on which you and all other archaeologists in the county are represented, stems directly from our initiative in forming a federal county body, and I hope this advice-giving and -taking machinery meets the needs of the County Council as it develops what bid fair to be enlightened policies in this field. Certainly I leave that Committee with regret because it is actually doing something and in the field of public archaeology.

At county level, we have also seen the emergence of a Gloucestershire Committee for Archaeology, by-passing (or should it be complementing?) the archaeological responsibilities of the old-established county society (the Council of which has the distinction, sadly for me, of being the only body I have ever resigned from on a matter of principle); and the re-emergence from its post-Gray blues of the Somerset ANHS, once again, through its archaeological committee, taking an effective interest in the county's archaeology. All three counties form the topographical unit of the DoE's Archaeological Area Advisory Committee, which, apart from having to think increasingly carefully about the allocation of public monies for archaeology in the region, has at least done one useful thing in bringing together Planning and archaeological interests for the first seminal meeting of what it is hoped will be a continuing series. Meanwhile, of course, a similar Committee has been advising on Wessex, and now that area too is to have its regional archaeological unit, pinching one of our CRAAGS staff to direct it (4).

Also at county level, a totally new phenomenon, the 'county archaeologist', has appeared under different titles. Devon, Dorset, Wiltshire, Somerset and Avon have all produced variants of the post but, sadly and unforgivably in my view, not Gloucestershire. The National Trust too, through its Wessex Committee (which includes Avon), has been employing a full-time archaeologist for the last 3 years, and, having recently seen the results of his fieldwork and appraisals of the Trust's properties, I am bound to say that I am more than ever convinced of the strategic importance of the cultural resource which in most cases just happens to be on Trust land. I can but hope that the Trust will itself accept this as a fact of life and recognise that it needs continuous, professional advice on the management of what is a most significant part of the national heritage. In the same field, personally I have been most encouraged by the development under the new National Park Officer of an archaeological dimension in the management of Exmoor. This and other facets of 'public archaeology' are so far beginnings rather than solid achievements, but they were inconceivable in the backward-looking archaeological complacency of the mid-60s.

Locally, we have seen fission as well as fusion under the 'umbrella' committees. The North Avon Archaeological Society has emerged from the ad hocery of M5 salvage, while BARG itself has spawned a Parish Survey Unit (PSU), an Action Group for Bristol Archaeology (AGBA), and the Development Observation Group (DOG) (5). And of course there is now a parallel local organisation for treasure-hunting interests, preying on precisely the same resources and goodwill that we have regarded as our own. The failure of all of us, and me in particular as one in a position to influence affairs from my University base in Adult Education, - our failure to recognise and capture what has clearly been a latent, active popular interest in archaeology far beyond our most optimistic expectations is a very serious failure indeed. Of course, there can be no truck with treasure-hunting in principle, but many of the individuals now tinkering around on the Downs and at Blaise Castle were, perhaps still are, potential BARG members, potential extra-mural students. Archaeology cannot compromise with treasure-hunting but, in view of our failure by our discipline, perhaps we have a duty to it now to try and wean the fallen from their seductive pastime into the paths of archaeological righteousness.

We have had other failures too. Personally, I am sorry that the potential of the CBA Regional Group has not been realised, particularly after we so carefully built CRAAGS into its constitution precisely to give local societies a say in the directions the new Government-financed 'rescue archaeology' took. Similarly, I am very disappointed that virtually none of that money has gone to responsible local societies: the opportunities were there, as I spelt out at CBA meetings and elsewhere, but they have not been taken primarily, as far as I can see, through hubris and an unwillingness to play the bureaucratic game which, however distasteful, is a necessary condition of the allocation of public money.

Among other disappointments or failures, may I just specify three. Undoubtedly the most serious, at national level, has been the failure to achieve any new legislation, apart from the nugatory Field Monuments Act of 1972. I know that two Bills are before Parliament at the moment, one dealing with Ancient Monuments and the new concept, legally speaking, of Archaeological Areas, the other with portable antiquities. Neither can come too soon if the country's archaeological heritage is to reach the end of this century in reasonable repair; but it probably indicates

that we have not made the impact we should have in national affairs that the fate of both Bills, introduced at the fag end of a Government, now depends on political factors which have nothing to do with the merits of cultural conservation.

Conservation of another kind - of objects in laboratories for museum storage or display, - is another failure. Here no progress seems to have been made at all in resolving the purely bureaucratic problem of with which Government Department, DES or DoE, the responsibility for post-excavation conservation rests. It may not be too critical a matter here for the moment, thanks to our Area Museum Council and the facilities at Bristol City Museum, but overall it is growing in seriousness, and one cannot view the long-term life of masses of archaeological material with much confidence. As a rider, I would add that we have a long way to go too in organising the permanent archive of our field records, every bit as important as the material we traditionally dig up. My third disappointment, rather than failure, is that we do not yet have a professional archaeological Institute, but events now in train should rectify that in the near future.

Keeping now to the region, what have been the real achievements as distinct from organisational changes since the mid-60s? Let me select three. In the field, undoubtedly the most significant advance has been the emergence of the Somerset Levels Project, a project of international significance the absence of which was of great concern to me in my early years here. There remain many problems, of course, not least those, again, of conservation in the field as water levels are lowered and subsequently in dealing with organic material preserved precisely because it has been water-logged for 2,000 years or more; but at least the resources in the field are now coping reasonably adequately in archaeological terms under admirable direction, whatever one may feel about the medium-term fate of the Levels themselves. Secondly - and I hope I may say this since my role was but one shared with hundreds of others, - I must believe that the archaeological response to the M5 motorway was worthwhile, even though the final judgement rests with posterity after the appearance of the Somerset report to set beside those now completed for Gloucestershire. Worthwhile or not academically, it was certainly a saga of physical achievement which I am proud to have shared with so many worthwhile people, not least the hard core of BARG's active membership.

The third significant achievement I have seen in my years here is the development of urban archaeology. When I came, sundry excavation in towns had of course already taken place or were proceeding in a desultory sort of way, but there were no urban archaeological posts and no intellectual grasp of the concepts or techniques we now subsume in the phrase 'urban archaeology'. Maybe this region has not and cannot produce its Winchester or its York, but the steady accretion of knowledge about our towns over the last decade by topographical analysis, excavation and some limited documentary research (notably that in Bristol) has surely been again, valuable in its own right. Whether, relatively, it is adequate to recompense for all that has been lost both above and below ground, or to palliate the mind for the visual horrors or replacement which now daily assail it (again, notably in Bristol, though Tewkesbury, Gloucester, Bath, Keynsham and Yeovil immediately also come to mind with worthy rivals), is a moot point. That we have learnt anything at all is, however, progress when I think of the situation in 1965, and a mute tribute to the national lead provided by the CBA and Maurice Barley throughout the '60s.

Those three major themes apart, there have of course also been many other achievements and advances, in the field, conceptually, and technically. Without there being an overall strategy, for example, hill-forts have continued to stimulate attention. In my years here, Norton Fitzwarren, South Cadbury, Cadbury Congresbury, Bathampton, Brean Down, Bury Wood, Colerne, Uleybury, Leckhampton and Crickley Hill have all been excavated in part, and the academic returns have been rewarding, not least for periods outside the Early Iron Age. Others, like Cadbury Tickenham and Blaise Castle, continue to produce material other than from controlled excavations, while I would confess that at this very moment I am reluctantly responsible for a little sondage, following a detailed survey, at Burwalls in advance of University development.

There have too been other notable excavations which really have advanced our understanding. I would instance Catsgore and Gatcombe, and would perhaps be forgiven for hoping that BARG's long co-operation with the Extra-Mural Dept at Butcombe might eventually fall into this category lower down the social scale. Those three sites happen to be of the Roman period, centuries which continue to attract much attention while other periods relatively languish. Still, for prehistory, we have the Westbury Fissure and the current excavations near Priddy and, after the decade of concentrated work on the immediate post-Roman period from Cheddar to Cadbury Congresbury, we have subsequently seen a development of excavations and fieldwork in town as well as country relating primarily to medieval and recent times. Indeed, in many respects it would be fairer to say that the archaeology of the recent past, masquerading as 'Industrial Archaeology', was the first of the significant developments to emerge after my arrival and of course particularly here in the Bristol area under the aegis of Angus Buchanan, Neil Gossons and our sister organisation, B.I.A.S.

That development has continued over the years and one can pick out similar, long-term trends, important but not dramatic in the way of single excavations. The commitment to Parish Checklists, for example, guided by our only Frances Neale (6), is a brave one, and the right policy in the long run, despite the unglamorous nature of much of the work and the schizophrenia that the concept seems to induce among avocational archaeologists(7).

The idea behind the Parish Checklists was of course imported from Cornwall, emerging as a rational, positive response in the wake of our unpreparedness for the M5. It has since developed too in both Gloucestershire and Somerset. Coming from work in two counties, Dorset and Wiltshire, where a basic record was already available, I found the absence of accessible basic data about the Bristol region a considerable shock. The Archaeological Review was very much born of this shock, and certainly it captured in print much that would otherwise probably have never surfaced. If pressed, I would confess to believing that editing it has been the most useful contribution of my years here, particularly as (not 'even though') it is now defunct. It had served its purpose in showing just how much information, collectively significant, was continuously coming to light, information which at the time was not being printed in the Gloucestershire and Somerset journals. That all the county journals in the region are now publishing this information I regard as a consequence of the success of Arch. Rev., not of its demise. My only regret is that, for the time being, the idea of a

regional academic journal has been lost. I think there is a need for such and that its effect would be stimulating, not least in countering the intellectual myopia occasionally manifest in a county-based archaeology. Particularly is the need there with the development of one of the successes of recent years, county Sites & Monuments Records. Although primarily for Planning purposes, these are of considerable academic import, as yet largely unrealised; but just because our data is increasingly being organised on a county basis for non-archaeological administrative reasons, so does the need grow consciously to think within other academic constructs. Hence my belief, incidentally, that despite the trauma of CRAAGS' creation, basically we got it right.

Let me just instance two other undramatic but significant advances. Without wishing to impinge on the politics of museums, let us welcome the great improvements in our own City Museum, especially in publication and in the basement. Whether we have to thank the diplomacy of the Director who got his priorities right (8) or the winsome ways of his staff (9), I know not; but we would all gladly acknowledge the achievements, and admit the central place of the museum in our work. More importantly, we can anticipate its value for our successors a century hence.

The other area of achievement, and I say this advisedly in the light of a plethora of criticism, is in the field of publication. Of course it is a huge problem, to which many of us are contributory, and we have neither grasped the opportunities nor yet produced the long-term solution. I shall not embarrass either those present or absent by naming major defaulters on this occasion ... for many of us the long watches of the conscience-stricken night are private purgatory enough (10), .... but let us minimally note the achievements and the progress. Chew Valley Lake is out, possibly the most pregnant sentence I could utter here. The Royal Commission's slightly offbeat volume on the Cotswolds is out, a monument in large part to monuments largely departed; but nevertheless a tour de force. The VCH volumes for Gloucestershire, Somerset and Wiltshire build regularly along the library shelves. All these represent the scholarship of a generation, the publications that will last, and we are fortunate to be so provided. Who would have dreamt in 1965 that we would also have urban surveys of all four of our nearest counties? Or on a less ambitious scale, that we would have the enormous range of books, booklets, pamphlets and periodicals that now adorn the bookstall downstairs and indeed in most museums? The prescience of our Editor (Special Publications) 15 and more years ago, in launching BARG into the forefront of what has subsequently become a flood, can now be appreciated. Newly restored in retirement to that role (11), he has not altered his high standards one iota and meanwhile feeds the flood with a torrent of his own. We all know that archaeology can never be the same after our Grand Old Man; now woe betide numismatics, folklore and sepulchralia at large. And to think I had the nerve to publish his bibliography up to 1971 (12)! - he must have doubled it since he stopped working. I hope it is appropriate to acknowledge here our recent loss with the death of 'Tratty' (Professor E K Tratman), another remarkable man who both published and fieldworked to the last.

There have been other losses, and other failures too. I have failed, for example, to produce surveyed archaeological plans in the manner that I had intended, though fortunately now, from our first group of successful Extra-Mural Certificate students, some have emerged not only willing but technically capable of carrying out such survey. I am sure that this sort of productive work, going hand in hand with

checklisting and sites and monuments recording, rather than itsy-bitsy excavations, is the way forward for societies like BARG. And survey can also help in conservation; excavation by its very nature is destructive. Indeed the cynic could well point to the BARG policy documents that awaited my arrival here and ask 'What has all the digging since 1965 added to knowledge?'. If you look at the problems outlined there, you would have to agree that the answer can only be 'Precious Little'. Most of those Grinsellian questions remain unanswered eg about Bronze Age settlements and the late Iron Age in this region. Surely, unless you believe that the prime functions of archaeology are entertainment and personal fun, the response henceforth must be to concentrate such excavation resources as exist, and to concentrate them in trying to learn what we want to know. A lot of archaeology's results so far have been a lottery. In a subject which surely, in the last resort, rests on an appeal to the mind and not the 'Ooo-golly' gasp of the touchingly innocent, is it not reasonable to look for a more reasonable way of proceeding?

It has not been possible to touch on whole areas of the archaeological spectrum which have enlivened my years here. There is, for example, the world of ideas and theory, perhaps not consciously in our thoughts every-day but certainly influencing not only our actions but also the way we think about them. I have tried through the Extra-Mural archaeology programme at least to provide the opportunity for people to hear about ideas, experiences and results elsewhere; for, curiously, not everything is generated hereabouts. While the 'bread-and-butter' courses, spreading the good word from the tip of Portland Bill to the banks of Shakespeare's Avon, and from the further reaches of the Doone country across the Plain to tempestuous Tidworth, are essential educationally as well as archaeologically, obviously the intellectual kicks have come from the special weekends and the day schools with BARG and a host of other co-operating organisations. Overall, I suppose my Programmes have been weak on theory, but there is a limit to the effort one can put into arranging events which people will not come to! This is of course both the challenge and the frustration of adult education: one may think one knows what is best for people but people can, and do, think otherwise! Nevertheless, I have been happy to push out some particular boats, especially those on a co-operative basis: the weekends on early farming and with the Classics Department on the Roman West Country (13) and, as part of a regular development, on various aspects of 'wet' archaeology with my colleagues David Blackman and Toby Parker. But, as a teacher rather than administrator, the real satisfaction is to see the individuals first known as mere names on a register add skill, knowledge and discipline to their initial keenness in at least turning up, and finally emerge as reputable archaeologists, publishing their own research. I hope I leave with friends; I am glad that some friends have become colleagues (14).

I shall only be leaving physically, Mr Chairman; this region and its archaeology are now part of my psyche. At least I have stayed longer than Alan Warhurst, Max Hebditch, Barry Culinffe, Keith Branigan and David Blackman, a distinguished list of those whom, in my time, have moved from Bristol to 'higher' things. I hope 14 years disqualifies me from the charge of opportunism; and that the next 14 years will bring as much opportunity. Among my memories .... and I could give a really funny paper if I started on those .... will be Castle Farm Marshfield, and the welcome always shown to all of us there by you and your family. Actually, with all this leisure-thing catching up on us, I think you are on to a good ideal (15). Possibly the Dick Knight Folk Leisure Farms Ltd. might have a spare, part-time peaked cap for a superannuated pseudo-Civil Servant

in 20 years time ? Meanwhile, I trust you will give as warm a welcome to my successor, Mick Aston, as you gave to me in '65. As Arthur actually answered from the barge:

'The old order changeth, yielding place to new' and quite right too .....

### Footnotes

- (1) An abbreviated version of a flippant paper given at the BARG AGM on the 24 February 1979, after which the author was agreeably surprised to be given a farewell present by BARG members. I would like to thank the Group not only for this kind gesture but also for its support in many matters since 1965. No offence is intended by any of the following, and I trust none will be taken: some of it seemed quite funny on the day and, rather against my better judgement, I have acceded to editorial pressure.

(2)

#### MORE TO ARTHUR

And slowly answered Arthur from the barge:  
'I must retire before I grow too large.  
For ten long years I've held the Treasury  
- I must retire 'ere it's the death of me'.  
Then quickly strode the Castle-owning Knight  
Across his Cotswold fields fast as he might  
and seized he Arthur in his grateful arms:  
'Well done, old chap, you have us nobly served.  
From duty, bills and sums thou has not swerved.  
Peace now, find thee a Lady of Shalott,  
Then to ourselves return - and come-alot.

- (3) On 1 May the author takes up the post of Secretary to the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments (England), the address of which, shared with the separate Ancient Monuments and Historic Buildings Inspectorate of the Dept of the Environment, is Fortress House, 23 Savile Row, London W1X 1AB

- (4) Dr Ann Ellison, from 1 May 1979. Dr Roger Leech, also one of CRAAGS' first appointments, has now been appointed Director of the new Unit for NW England.

(5)

#### DOG BITES MAN

Mad DOGS and Barg members  
Go out in the weekend rain;  
Glad dogs and retrievers  
Are on the scent again.  
  
They trot along the pipeline trench  
And mark their territories;  
A pea-stick here, a lamp-post there,  
Or bark on nearby trees.  
  
In Bristol its a good ideal  
To watch the service trenches  
Cut through the layers that roads seal  
And 'neath municipal benches  
The only flaw in this ideal  
Is that the finds have scant appeal.

They seek it here, they seek it  
there,  
In urban soil and from the air,  
The evidence of heretofore,  
The scruffy scraps of days of  
yore.  
Your days, their days, holidays,  
yesterdays,  
They truffle through, all out  
of breath,  
Lighting ways of dusty death:  
Fools ? - maybe, but thereby  
hangs a tale:  
Without a past, communities  
will fail.  
A bit of past, once bitten, we  
must log,  
Lest rabid fools make the tale  
wag the dog.

(6)

IF KUBLA KHAN, SO CAN I

On Winscombe Hill did Frances Neale  
A stately parish list decree  
Where Yeo the sacred river ran  
Through caverns measured by Tratman  
Down to the Severn Sea.  
So twice five miles of fertile ground  
With shrub-counted hedges were girdled round  
And pastures ridged and furrowed near sites of long-lost mills  
And miscellaneous earthworks in the scrub;  
And here were forests ancient as the hills;  
But what the hell it means - aye, there's the rub.

(7)

THE AMATEUR'S DILEMMA

There is something essentially boring  
About Parish Checklist recording  
When all we really want to do is dig,

- NOT nomothetically add to the sum of human knowledge on a  
processual basis through pursuance of a problem-orientated research  
strategy designed to examine the hierarchies of a probability  
sampling program structured interfacially with an inductive cultural  
resource management response providing adequate lead-time for the  
generation of socio-economic models tested within the parameters of  
a computer-based anthropogenic paradigm deriving from a palaeo-  
ecosystematic data-base embracing the conservation ethic as part  
of a public service

- All of which we suspect is rather infra-dig.

Oh good, I've found another bit of Roman pot.  
My diggings are a lovesome thing, God wot ?

(8)

THE CURATOR

Little Nick Thomas  
Sat on his bottom  
Eating his sherds, but why ?  
'I'm solving the problem  
Of where to store them  
There's enough here to eat till I die'.

(9)

THE SYSTEM

A damsel with a dulcimer  
In a museum once I saw  
It was an esoteric maid  
Who through the basement door did fade,  
Sighing 'Busy, see y' tomorra'.

(10)

PONS BRIGSTOWE

Oh Mike, my friend, where art thou now ?  
Whooping it up in the Landogger Trow ?  
No, he's hard at his backlog task  
- You shouldn't really need to ask.  
10,000 words flow from his pen,  
The Intro. to The Castle;  
Yet 10,000 more and then  
10,000 more Cleo to dazzle



The sherds are typed and so's the draft,  
The draughtings penned on permatrace;  
Mike soldiers on towards that shaft  
Of light to which he's turned his face.  
At the end of a tunnel is that ray,  
Sometimes it seems no nearer:  
There's Westbury, the Temple and grey Greyfriars  
To conquer before it gets clearer.

So let's help Mike before we dig more;  
We owe it to Mike and the City.  
We need that record,  
It's part of our past.  
Unpublished, it's only a pity.

Well, cheer up, Mike, there will be an end,  
Hopefully 'ere you're round the bend.  
We're on your side in our confident trust,  
But write it all up you damn well must.  
Oh Mike, my friend, where art thou now?  
Definitely not in the Landogger Trow.

(11)

#### THE GOM OF BARG

The grizzled Grinsell grundled in his den:  
'I am their Special Editor again.  
I'll range the region leder hosen clad  
- Booksellers and tea-ladies will be glad.  
I'll take Publications Special in my stride  
And check tumultic barrows in BARG's Guide.

But would that learned scribes all wrote like me  
In numbers and thin columns, vertically.  
Then BARG booklets would appear on time  
And not all the words would be words of mine'.

(12) Archaeology and the Landscape (John Baker, 1972), 250-56.

(13) H C Bowen & P J Fowler (eds), Early Land Allotment (British Archaeological Report 48, Oxford, 1978). (In Bulletin, Vol 6, No 3, p53 (Winter 1977), these proceedings were wrongly anticipated as about to appear in a CBA Research Report).  
K Branigan & P J Fowler (eds), The Roman West Country (David & Charles, Newton Abbot, 1976).

(14a)

#### BRAINSTORM

Little Johnny Drinkwater  
Did what he knew he didn't oughta.  
In the depths of Cotswold winter,  
He went out, a private flinter.  
He's knackered now, a knockneed knapper,  
With knapsack full of a flint scatter.  
He bashed it into lithic batter  
- Then blithely said 'I do feel better'.

(14b)

#### TWO IS A MINIMUM NUMBER

Anne's on the flints, Bob's on the bones,  
Busily ignoring patient doctoral 'phones.  
'We must get more practice, for this practice we've lost,  
But we've pushed the frontiers of knowledge back,  
So let's not count the cost.  
13 years on Butcombe, 5 on the M5,

continued/

It really is a marvel, that we're still alive.  
Never mind, he'll soon be gone, then we can relax,  
And play with our museum on the River Axe'.  
Skeletons for him, for her sharp little stones,  
Anne's on the flints, Bob's on the bones.

(15)

CASTLE FARM

Mary's up the turret,  
Dick's along the byre,  
Fluffing up the folksiness  
Of butter churns and wire.

But they are still real farmers  
Behind the Jotul stoves  
And crowds of summer visitors,  
It's still first of their loves.

The folk display is passing fine  
- Crocks, crucks and crafty share;  
'To Castle Farm' creaks roadside sign  
- Come, folks, and share what's there.

Now Dick he goes out ploughing,  
With eyes as keen as birds';  
He staggers back  
With a gurt big sack  
Of Romano-British sherds.

He's built up a collection  
Of interest and charm;  
The ancients speak  
For every week  
They've lived at Castle Farm

They liked it there,  
So do the Knights.  
Continuity is the theme;  
There's very much more to Castle Farm,  
Than at first glance might seem.

Dick also goes a-mummin,  
But the kids call Mary 'Mum'.  
Is then Mary husbandman  
While mummin' keeps Dick mum ?

'Salt of the earth' is a hackneyed phrase,  
But it surely here applies.  
We can but wish them happy days,  
Cash crops and Folk Supplies.

We've all spent summer days there,  
Evenings in dusk twilights;  
History there begins to dawn,  
All through the Knights.

## RECENT & FORTHCOMING PUBLICATIONS

### Recent:

#### (i) Periodicals

Antiquity, March 1979, includes in the Editorial yet another discussion of the problem of visitor erosion at Stonehenge to which Avebury is now added. A paper by J A Campbell and others on 'Radiocarbon dates for the (South) Cadbury massacre' (pp 31-8) shows that radiocarbon dating cannot add precision to a date believed on historical grounds to be between AD 45 and 61, but goes on to give a revealing account of possible sources of error in other radiocarbon dates.

Current Archaeology, no 64, December 1978, includes (pp 156-9) an article on 'Cider making equipment' by Stanley Baldock, dealing mainly with the West Country from 1700 onwards. No. 65, February 1979, contains (p 190) an article by James Dyer on 'Stonehenge and the Tourist' prompted by the difficulty of reconciling the needs of the average visitor and those of the student and serious archaeologist.

Somerset Archaeology & Natural History, vol 121 for 1977 (1978), includes R H Leech, 'Late Iron Age and Romano-British briquetage sites at ... Badgworth' (89-96) suggesting association of some at least with salt production; a note by M W Ponsford on 'an exotic jug from North Petherton' (32-3 and fig 9, no 55) related to Cl3-14 products from the Bristol kilns; a paper by Cdr E H D Williams and R G Gilson on 'Base crucks in Somerset' (55-66) describes the Glastonbury Abbey barn and the priory of St John at Wells; and M Aston, 'Somerset Archaeology 1976' (107-28), arranges finds in chronological order including those from the mesolithic site at Priddy, a beaker from Bone Hole, Cheddar, and a map and list of deserted medieval settlements in Somerset. Finds from South Avon are listed separately by Rob Iles.

#### (ii) Other publications

Coles, J M & Harding, A E The Bronze Age in Europe, 1979, xviii + 581 pages, 24 plates, 190 figs in text, numerous tables and maps. Methuen & Co Ltd. Price £9.95 paperback. It is not usual to notice general works in these notes, but this is of such outstanding importance that it cannot be excluded. Dr Coles was tutor in archaeology to H R H Prince Charles, is a former President of the Somerset Archaeological & Natural History Society, and has for several years been carrying out excavations of great importance on the timber trackways in the Somerset Levels. Among the most valuable features of the book are the tables of radiocarbon dates for Bronze Age sites in different parts of Europe.

Archaeology in the National Trust. In addition to their leaflet on Brean Down, Somerset, noticed in the last Bulletin, the Trust have now published similar leaflet guides to Burrow Mump (Somerset); Cadbury Camp, Tickenham (Avon); + Little Solsbury (Avon); and Whitesheet Hill (Wiltshire) near Stourhead, as well as of other sites more remote from the BARG sphere of influence. They are anonymous but believed to be by D W R Thackray, archaeologist at their Wessex Regional Office at Stourton. They cost a few pence each and are designed to fit into a folder, and are obtainable at National Trust offices and at certain museums and other suitable outlets. They are of course authoritative and well illustrated.

### Forthcoming:

It is understood that the definitive report by P A Rahtz on The Cheddar Palaces is to be published in the British Archaeological Reports series about July.

## REVIEWS

John S Moore (ed), Avon Local History Handbook, xi + 188 pp., Chichester, Sussex, Phillimore, 1979, £2.50

During the last decade local history groups have sprung up in many parts of what is now the County of Avon. To help co-ordinate the work of these societies - numbering over 40 to date - the Avon Local History Association was formed in 1975. The present handbook is published under the auspices of the Association and edited by its President, who is Lecturer in Economic History at Bristol University. There can be little doubt that it will, as the publishers claim, become 'a virtual necessity for local historians within the county and neighbouring areas'. It should prove almost equally valuable to the growing number of archaeologists, both amateurs and professionals, who are having to undertake their own documentary research in preparation for fieldwork or excavation.

The greater part of the handbook, which is some 200 pages in length, is taken up by twelve short chapters written partly by the Editor and partly by other professional historians such as Dr J H Bettey, Dr Robert Dunning and Prof Walter Minchinton. The first of these, written by Mr Moore and Dr Bettey and entitled 'Local History: Ends and Means', provides an introduction to the subject that is both encouraging and challenging. The local historian is warned that he must not allow himself to become a 'mere antiquarian', 'hoarding facts as squirrels hoard nuts, but without the squirrels' eminently practical purpose'; he must be organised in his approach, ask the right questions, and work towards producing a balanced picture of past life in his chosen community. Sound advice is given on the practical aspects of historical research, stress being naturally placed on the assistance available to beginners from the A.L.H.A. The remaining chapters 'Industry' (R A Buchanan), 'Agriculture' (G Davis & J S Moore), 'Education' (R B Hope), 'Church and Chapel' (R W Dunning) and 'Leisure and Recreation' (J H Bettey), are dealt in greater depth, as the chapter headings imply. On the whole, the various authors succeed to a remarkable degree in presenting a mass of detailed information in a lucid and readable fashion. Typical of this are Mr Moore's own sections on population history (Chapter 3) and standards of living (Chapter 7) in which he gives a clear account of the statistical techniques, such as 'family reconstitution', which are becoming an increasingly important part of the local historian's stock-in-trade.

Another important aspect of local history today, and one in which the subject overlaps to a considerable extent with archaeology, is the increasing use made of topographical and architectural evidence. It comes as no surprise, therefore, that Chapter 2 of the handbook should be devoted to 'The Rural and Urban Landscape'. Unfortunately this chapter, which is contributed by a geographer, John Haddon, seems to me one of the least successful in the book; while some useful suggestions are made for further study, one feels that Mr Haddon's analysis of the man-made landscape is couched too much in terms of aesthetics, lacking the depth and rigour that one would expect of a field archaeologist or landscape historian. The archaeological reader will probably find more stimulus elsewhere in the book, for example from Mr Moore's section on vernacular architecture (pp. 56-60) or Dr Dunning's comments on evidence for early Christianity in the area (pp. 77-78).

The final portion of the handbook consists of two extensive bibliographies occupying a total of 73 pages. The first, dealing with published books and articles, contains separate sections for each of the preceding chapters; it covers both general works and specialised local studies, many of which appear in journals unfamiliar to the average amateur historian. While invaluable to the advanced student, one suspects that

this massive compilation, which is presented in a rather cramped and indigestible format, may prove somewhat intimidating to the beginner. The second bibliography, covering primary sources, provides concise details of the main archive groups relating to Avon in the Somerset, Gloucestershire and Bath Record Offices, together with information on the smaller collections to be found in local museums and reference libraries. Advice is given on the facilities for study offered by the various record-holding institutions. Used in conjunction with the existing guide to the Bristol Record Office this final section allows the historian to see almost at a glance what records are likely to be locally available for the area he is studying. It forms a worthy conclusion to a thoroughly commendable publication which should do much to promote systematic historical research in the Avon area.

James Russell

Stover, Leon E & Kraig, Bruce. Stonehenge : the Indo-European Heritage, 1978, 212 + xiii, profusely illustrated, 4to. Nelson-Hall, Chicago, clothbound, \$19.55, paperback, \$9.95

Leon Stover, professor of anthropology at Illinois Institute of Technology, is already known to readers of Stonehenge literature as joint author (with Harry Harrison) of Stonehenge, a novel dramatising Stonehenge and the 'Wessex Culture' (1972; paperback reprint by Sphere Books, London 1977). For the present book Stover is joined by the associate professor of History at Roosevelt University, Chicago, who has had archaeological experience in Britain.

Addressed primarily to the American audience, the book contains errors which would not impress English readers (eg 'Stukeley places Stonehenge in Roman times, in 460 BC', p 8) and still less Scottish readers (eg 'in Northern Britain (Lancashire and Yorkshire)', p 46). Chapter 1, 'History of ideas about Stonehenge, develops the theme that each generation tends to interpret the monument in the light of its own concepts: The Romans of Inigo Jones; the Druids of John Aubrey and William Stukeley; and so on down to the celestial observatory and eclipse computer of Gerald Hawkins, which they rightly consider as going too far. They note (p 6) that Charles II's presentation copy of Chorea Gigantum (1663), by his physician Walter Charleton, bound in red morocco and embossed with the double-crowned C on both sides, is in the British Library. Chapters 2 & 3 (pp 13-81) survey European prehistory with Stonehenge as the centrepiece. Chapter 4, 'The stones of Stonehenge', deals more particularly with the matter in hand, but they have not properly understood Kellaway's theory of the glacial transport of the bluestones from Presely (pp 3, 94) and fail to note that it is rejected by many geologists as well as prehistorians; and their acceptance of recent theories of the provenance of the sarsens is equally uncritical (pp 94-6). They confuse axe-heads of jadeite, greenstone, and other materials (pp 94, 112). Their Early Bronze Age prehistory is shaky. Incense-cups are not always of the grape-cup type (p 73), and discbarrows do not cover females with head to south and looking to the west, since they in fact almost always cover cremations with objects of female adornment (p 116). Their European prehistory derives heavily from the writings of Prof. Marija Gimbutas of Los Angeles University, following whose Indo-European views they neatly explain resemblances between Stonehenge III and the Mycenaean cultures on the basis of a common Indo-European heritage (p 39). The book is extremely well illustrated by photographs by Hans Schaal and reproductions of early woodcuts and other figures. Of five imaginative drawings by David Alexovich, one (pp 176-7) shows the stones painted with art motifs ranging from Irish passage-grave art through the Scandinavian Bronze Age to pictures of the giant

of Cerne Abbas in Dorset; for good measure models of bulls and Minoan horns-of-consecration have been placed on the lintels.

In their bibliography, which includes several items published as recently as 1976, it is strange that American authors should include Piggott's 'Sources of Geoffrey of Monmouth: the Stonehenge story' (1941) and yet omit the equally able paper by Laura Hibbard Loomis, 'Geoffrey of Monmouth and Stonehenge' (Publications of Modern Language Institute of America, 45 (1930), 400-15), which has indeed been overlooked by all but one of the writers on Stonehenge, - this reviewer.

L V Grinsell

Keith Muckelroy, Maritime Archaeology, x + 270pp., Cambridge University Press (New Studies in Archaeology), 1978 £4.95 paperback (hard cover also available).

'In seeking towards a theoretical framework for the new sub-discipline of maritime archaeology, the present discussion has proceeded through a hierarchy of levels of investigation ...' (p 246). Keith Muckelroy leaves the reader in no doubt that his book is intended to establish maritime archaeology among the New Elect of specialisms approved in 'that hothouse of academic archaeology, the Department of Archaeology at Cambridge University' (p ix). The second half of the book is explicitly theoretical, and includes lengthy discussions (in chapter 5) of statistical and systems methods of interpreting underwater sites. Although this chapter is important and interesting, the author is more than once carried away with numerical zeal, as on pp 161-2, where a table of figures is printed in full, and then summarized in a diagram: in a book which, the publishers assert, will appeal 'to anyone interested in our maritime past', such thoroughness is unbalanced.

Muckelroy is much concerned with definitions: maritime archaeology is, in summary, 'the scientific study of the material remains of man and his activities on the sea'. For 'scientific', one might better use terms such as 'systematic' or 'methodical', but these have been cornered by the New Archaeologists for more specific use! Curiously, Muckelroy thinks that 'maritime' is a broader term than 'nautical' archaeology, which, he says, is concerned only with ships and their equipment; after the first few pages, the book in fact concentrates almost entirely with ships - a single section on harbours (pp 75-85) deals only with the ancient Mediterranean, and another, on anchors (pp 146-9) could well have been given more extensive treatment. In fact, a clearer idea of the book's subject emerges in chapter 7, where maritime culture is seen to comprise nautical technology, naval warfare and maritime trade, and shipboard societies (p 230). This really is the nub of the matter: viewed in this way, one can see how Muckelroy's 1978 view is completely different to the attitude of say, George Bass in 'Archaeology under Water' (1966), where underwater archaeology is regarded as differing from its landbased parent only in techniques.

Muckelroy is in fact mostly concerned with underwater sites. His second chapter, on underwater conditions, is excellent; the problems and advantages of underwater sites are well explained. Chapters 3 & 4, on the contribution of underwater archaeology up till now, and what it may contribute in the future, are likewise clear and interesting; the author's wide experience on British projects comes into play here. Chapter 5, on the other hand, with its technical discussion of analytical techniques, is disappointing, and Chapter 6, on 'the

archaeology of ships', repeats much that is said elsewhere. There is a first-class bibliography, and a usable index.

The reviewer was especially interested in Muckelroy's treatment of classical shipwrecks, and read the book, from this point of view, with mixed reactions. The accounts of classical ships and trade in chapter 3 are quite full and reliable, given the scope of the book; however, it is disappointing that in chapter 5, where he discusses what happens to a ship after it is wrecked, and how archaeologists can study the process, Muckelroy draws mostly on North Atlantic examples. A search of the references revealed that, in fact, several relevant Mediterranean sites were not mentioned at all: sites of interest for wreck processes and interpretation of artefact distributions include the Roman wrecks of Chrétienne C (France) and Mellieha (Malta), while, for the history of shipbuilding, the Roman wreck at Monaco and the three Etruscan wrecks in France at least merit a mention. One has the impression that Muckelroy has not taken much trouble with non-English sources; much important work, not mentioned by him, has been reported in Gallia and other French journals, and the French excavators of the late Roman ship at Port Vendres would not agree with his view (p 61) that the Kyrenia ship is the only hull which has been lifted and conserved. Reliance, indeed, on secondhand (often American) sources has led to errors: an indefensible theory, set out on p 62, about the shape of Roman hulls, was demolished by Pomey (1973; cited in Muckelroy's references), who should also have been credited with the debunking of the supposed distinction between Greek and Roman shipbuilding practices (pp 63-4). The discussion of trade in metals and amphoras (pp 72-3) contains several mistakes; the Porticello ship (p 71) is not 6th but 4th century BC, and need not have been engaged merely in 'coasting trade'.

To bring the discussion nearer home, what will the west-country reader find in the book? Of the relationship between ships, seamen and port towns, whether economically, industrially, or even as elements in the landscape, there is little here; of quays, docks, shipyards or sea walls in post-classical Europe, nothing at all. The importance of surviving traditions as a key to understanding archaeological remains is a distinctive characteristic of maritime archaeology, but Muckelroy's discussion (pp 233-242) is jejune, and over-weighted towards Scandinavia. Several British sites are described in the book, and there is much valuable material not yet published elsewhere (notably on the Mary Rose excavation); unfortunately, the discovery of Bronze Age wrecks at Dover and Salcombe (both, in fact, being investigated by Muckelroy) came too late for mention.

The possible relationships of human beings with water must be infinite in variety. In our area, one sees specialized, maritime communities of pilots or fishermen; mixed communities (like Bristol) involved in both terrestrial and maritime commerce, industry or warfare; communities on the Levels which take seasonal flooding for granted, and where the same carpenter built both flatners and coffins. Classification is obviously an aid to clear thinking, but it may conceal important subtleties in the way people actually behave.

The reviewer thanks Mrs Grinsell and the Editor for the opportunity to write this appraisal of 'Maritime Archaeology', and his students for their helpful comments. The number of criticisms which have been made are in themselves an indication of the importance of this book; it has a deep knowledge of the subject, and a broad view of its problems, which break new ground. The publishers, too, must be congratulated on its attractive appearance and excellent illustrations, at a price which, by current standards, is an extraordinary bargain.

A J Parker

