The Story of Archæology in Britain. By Ronald Jessup. $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$. Pp. 214. 44 photographs. Michael Joseph, 1964. 25*s*.

For those of us who are single-minded in our archæology but who sometimes need relief from heavy, indigestible treatises this is an ideal book for an evening in the armchair or for the bedside. We have had enough books and articles from our consultant editor, Ronald Jessup, to realize that we need have no qualms about his easy style and lucidity. This book flows along as merrily as Tennyson's brook and leaves behind many a curious fact which even the narrow specialist will be pleased to gather.

The chapters are not arranged on a strictly chronological basis but are more like essays. They deal variously with the ways of making archæological discoveries—by chance, by reasoning and on purpose, in the laboratory and in the air, in the museum storage cupboard and by closer study of books, both printed and in manuscript. As an incentive to further work there are given in detail the careers of four pioneers, William Stukeley who literally put Kits Coty on the map, Captain James Douglas of Chatham Lines fame, Charles Roach Smith who was once a mainstay of archæology in Kent, and General Pitt-Rivers for whom it may be claimed that he founded medieval archæology by his excavations at Castle Hill, Folkestone. As we might expect Kent has a more than fair showing throughout the book, especially in the chapter on *Fossil Man* where we have the exciting story of Mr. Marston's adventures at Swanscombe. A chapter on some recent discoveries brings up to date *Recent Archæological Excavations in Britain* (edited by R. L. S. Bruce-Mitford, 1956) and is fittingly rounded off with a county list of well-known field antiquities and of museums which contain archæological material (Quex Park, Birchington, should be added to the Kent list in the second edition).

After enjoying Mr. Jessup's book I find that my only criticisms of it are petty and selfishly committal. I would have liked the author to have given us a good deal more about the Napchester altar (page 133 and *Arch. Cantiana*, lxii 94-5) from his own inside knowledge and to have digressed more on the Roman altars formerly at Higham (now dispersed although two are in Maidstone Museum), on the distribution of Billies and Charlies and on the activities of Flint Jack and Foxy of Chalk whose "goings on" in Aylesford sand pit give me a sinking feeling.

L.R.A.G.

The Anonymous Central Gaulish Potter Known as X-3 and his Connections. By A. P. Detsicas. 10 × 6½. Pp. 73. 16 Plates and 9 Figs. *Collection Latomus*, lxiv, Brussels, 1963. 130 F.

The standard work, *Central Gaulish Potters*, by J. A. Stanfield and Grace Simpson (1958) devotes some six pages, one figure and seven plates (Figs. 120 to 206) to a potter—known variously as X-3, 'le maître aux gladiateurs' and the Anchor Potter—whose main period of activity was *c.* A.D. 100 to 130 and who was a major producer of Trajan-Hadrianic figured samian in Central Gaul. Mr. Detsicas has now dissected X-3 and given us, together with 290 details from his own drawings, an exhaustive treatise on every aspect of the pottery, the schemes of decoration, the exclusive motives and those which others borrowed, places of manufacture, distribution and dating.

But X-3's identity is still unknown and Mr. Detsicas will go no further than to say that 'he may eventually be proved to have been called DRVSVS, a synonymous but quite distinct potter from the Antonine worker'. After all his hard work we hope sincerely that Mr. Detsicas will be the one who eventually names the nameless.

We congratulate the author on this excellent example of British scholarship which has caused him to be given a complete publication in a series which previously had been almost monopolized by Continental scholars. A copy of the book will be kept at Maidstone Museum for the use of students of samian ware.

L.R.A.G.

The Place-Names of Edenbridge. By John Irwin. Pp. 40 + 1 plate and 1 map. Durrant, Edenbridge, 1964, for the Edenbridge and District Historical Society. Price 10*s*.

The Edenbridge Historical Society and Mr. Irwin are to be congratulated on the publication of this useful little monograph but the results should be regarded as suggestive and tentative. Early sources are rare and many of the forms are taken from late transcripts which have not been collated with the originals, a tedious but essential task, especially as there are some clear examples of curious corruptions and confusions. Chittenden, *e.g.*, in 1791 is *Indenden* alias *Chittenden* alias *Chillenden*. The name has been changed from *Ynden* (*c.* 1200) to *Chillindene* (1301) and *Chittenden* (1622). Crockham Hill is first noted in 1801 and is taken as a descendant of Cobbecumbe (1232) which by 1751 had become *Cokeham* which must be the origin of the modern Coakham. Is Crockham really a corruption of this or an entirely different name inadequately recorded? The development of How Green from *Hoke Grene* is unusual but attested by *Howgreene* alias *Hokegreene* (1617). But Howlets (1801), *Huggets* 1742, is surely from a former owner. The Norse derivation given is impossible.

Local patriotism, here as elsewhere, shows a marked disinclination to recognize that many of the minor names are those of former owners and the meaning of their surnames is often a tricky problem. Further, if a place-name is not recorded before the sixteenth century we can only speculate and our guess will probably be wrong. For Chiswell Hall, *e.g.*, it is easy to suggest several possible meanings but not one of them can be proved.

Mr. Irwin disclaims any special qualification beyond that of studious reading of books on place-names. But he misinterprets and misunderstands and, occasionally, has been misled by his authorities. Dwelly Lane and Farm, *e.g.*, he derives from OE *dwelian* 'to lead or go astray' and continues, 'Literally, "the lane which leads astray" ' and takes this as confirmation that Dwelly Lane is pre-Saxon and older even than the Roman road through Edenbridge. But the attribute of 'lane' must have been an adjective, not a verb, and this is OE **dweollīc* 'foolish, erring, heretical,' hardly a name for a lane. All it means is 'the lane leading to Dwelly Farm' and here the editors of *The Place-names of Surrey* have led him astray. They failed to notice that all their earliest forms were surnames, the name of the family living here, *Dwelly*, a nickname 'foolish', a surname found also in 1210 in Wiltshire and in 1327 in Somerset. They interpreted the 1279 *Dueleye* as a compound of *lēah* rather than of *ēg* and were unable to explain the compound.

We cannot deal in detail with Mr. Irwin's criticisms of previous explanations of the names of the denns. But Broxham needs reconsideration. Shernden is a common place-name, from *scearn* 'dung, mud' and refers to the nature of the ground not to the effect of the pigs. Lindhurst is only one of numerous place-names containing OE *lind* 'lime-tree' and the Saxons would not have had a name for a tree they had never seen.

Our comments have inevitably had to take the form of criticism—we want to get the truth. But this does not detract from the industry and persistence with which the task has been pursued. There is much useful and valuable information here, but material is late and scanty. There must be more available and we hope the work will be continued in an effort to fill in the gaps. As it stands, the monograph will serve as a useful pattern for other local societies, an example we hope some will follow, for there is much local information only they can supply.

P. H. Reaney.

Open Fields and Partible Inheritance on a Kent Manor. By Alan R. H. Baker. Reprinted from *The Economic History Review*, Second Series, Vol. xviii, No. 1. 1964.

The manor studied is that of Gillingham. Refer back to note on page 210 of our last volume, lxxviii, 1963.