The Work of the Heckington Lodge of Masons, 1315-1345
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The great Decorated churches of central and southern Lincolnshire have long presented a problem to architectural historians. There are very few documentary sources from which we can gather information as to the date and origin of any particular building, except perhaps Newark and Lincoln Cathedral itself. The enormous variety of window design in a small area defies classification into any logical system, particularly as an individual church can possess several totally different patterns, as in Algarkirk, Holbeach, Spalding or Heydour.¹

The aim of this article is to try to show how the major churches of Newark, Heckington and Sleaford developed from each other as the result of a single lodge of masons working in the area before its dissemination in about 1335 to a variety of minor buildings. To do this we must rely heavily on stylistic considerations supported by a close examination of moulding designs and the few concrete dates available. The value of moulding patterns is only just beginning to be fully appreciated as a means of identifying a particular lodge or master mason: this is because they are capable of almost infinite variety depending on an individual’s style, while keeping within the general evolving trend of the times. To find two identical moulding patterns that are neither known to be by the same lodge nor of a very simple design is extremely difficult, even when underlying local considerations are taken into account. The combination of moulding patterns and other stylistic evidence in one building can thus be particularly revealing and far more helpful than a comparison of window design, planning or sculptural style alone. Window tracery patterns, for instance, are far more frequently copied by a different mason than are the jamb moulding around them. Before we can turn to the school of masons that reached maturity in the chancel of Heckington we must first examine the main precursor for their style which is found over the border in Nottinghamshire.

The south nave aisle of St. Mary Magdalene, Newark is a rarity among fourteenth century churches in England in that it can be dated with some accuracy from surviving documentary sources. In about 1292 Henry of Newark, later Archbishop of York, founded and built a chapel of St. Martha and St. Katherine in Newark churchyard, somewhat to the annoyance of the parishioners.² It did not last long, however, as it had no endowments at this date and on 25 February 1312-13 Archbishop Greenfield licensed its destruction to provide materials for the building of one of the new aisles.³ The identification of this aisle as that on the south is fairly easy, as this is the aisle that faces the market place and town, and because the north nave aisle is clearly of the middle of the fifteenth century, with Perpendicular tracery instead of the south aisle’s early flowing type. We know that building work had already been commenced, or at least envisaged in the near future, at Newark as early as January 1310 when a fabric fund was in existence,⁴ and on 3 August 1315 the altar of St. Mary was consecrated, almost certainly in the south aisle,⁵ implying the completion of this part of the building. Any work that was going on in 1310 or slightly later can be identified with the upper courses of the new west tower which may have been inspired by a similar campaign

Plate I Newark: view of the south nave aisle.
completed at Lincoln in 1311.

The size of the south nave aisle is relatively large (30.7m x 7.6m, 100ft 6in x 24ft 9in) but could easily have been finished in three years, particularly as some materials were already available on the site, and the windows show no signs of having been inserted at a later date. This means that the six south windows and that on the west front are of an extraordinary early date for designs that are fully curvilinear, and very probably predate any other such windows in the country.

The lodge of masons working at Newark in the second decade of the fourteenth century may have been responsible not only for the introduction of flowing tracery in the east of England but also for its immediate dispersal. The influence of the west window of the south aisle at Newark can clearly be demonstrated at the east window of Heckington. Although the former is a six-light window in the formation of 2-2-2 and the latter is a seven-light in the formation of 2-3-3 the structure of the design is the same in each case. Both have an intersecting ogee framework which splits the window head into six compartments with the residual slices next to the arch being filled with a wavy motif. The designs in the main sections only show minor variations between the two windows, despite the fact that they are of an awkward shape in Heckington owing to the rather unsuccessful use of two large ogees over an uneven division of lights. At Newark the system is logical and even; at Heckington it is distorted, imitating the happier solution of the earlier church.

There are other similarities between the exterior of the Newark aisle and the work at Heckington. The sculptural niches on the buttresses and the buttresses themselves are virtually identical with those of Heckington's chancel, the south transept, south porch and at the west end under the tower. Both have the same frieze of monsters and foliated figures under the parapet, and it is typical of the precocious nature of the Newark design that some of the ogees in the niches are in fact nodding, anticipating even those on the Exeter rood screen and bishop's throne of c. 1317. The base course mouldings of the Newark aisle similarly correspond to those of the chancel, transept, south porch and west end of Heckington, all of which are of the same campaign, as we shall see. Both mouldings are made up of almost identical parts and the overall dimensions from the top roll to the lower set-off are, in the case of Heckington 122.5cm (48 1/4 in), and at Newark 122.8cm (48 3/4 in). Even in the internal dimensions they almost exactly correspond. The two bell mouldings that make up the centre of the base courses measure 42.8cm (16 1/4 in) in both cases.

The jamb mouldings of the windows themselves are less clearly linked. The Heckington mouldings make up a distinct group with Seafor, Sibthorpe, Hawton and a number of other churches characterised by the *fleur-de-lys* or triple-filleted roll. The Newark window mouldings, on the other hand, make use of the keeled roll, which is surprisingly rare in Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire in the fourteenth century, being found principally on the Southwell and Lincoln Cathedral screens and on other small scale works in these centres. One of the only mouldings of the Newark type earlier than those of the south aisle is to be found on the Easter sepulchre at Lincoln of about 1296-1300. The pedigree of the Newark mouldings is thus difficult to establish and seems to be of a comparatively early date. The manner in which they developed must have been in the direction of the somewhat later *fleur-de-lys* type of the Heckington group and the atypical moulding of the east window of Hawton, which is itself in the Heckington school and comparatively close, both stylistically and geographically, to Newark.

When we examine the later work at Heckington, however, we are much more firmly in the mainstream of architectural development in south Lincolnshire than we were at the innovatory Newark. The masons of
Heckington drew a great deal from Newark, but they also had a more eclectic attitude and by the time that the chancel was completed they were the centre of a comparatively large school. In order to trace the progress of the Heckington lodge we must first try to establish the dates of the various stages of the construction of the church, and any outside influences on it.

The date of the Heckington chancel is not as difficult to establish as might be supposed. The church was appropriated to Bardney Abbey in 1306 although the benefits of the appropriation did not fall to the abbey until 1344 because 'the expedited letters, exemplification of which is given from the register, could not be found'. This was a critical period in the history of the monastery and Richard de Potesgrave, chaplain to Edward I, was presented to the living by the Crown during the vacancy of the abbey. From the position of his tomb in the chancel it is very likely that the latter was indeed built by Richard de Potesgrave, a conjecture that is supported by a lost inscription. Gervase Holles tells us of this inscription that could be seen in one of the chancel windows and which tantalisingly read: 'Richard de Potesgrave built chancel . . . in MCCXX . . .'. The rest was obliterated even in the seventeenth century, but the furnishings in the chancel show that it was very probably in building in the 1320's.

Both Heckington and Hawton have a splendid combination of Easter sepulchre, sedilia, piscina and founder's tomb in the chancel, which can be seen as the work of the same school. The Hawton chancel was presumably built by Robert de Compton who died in 1330, and, like Richard Potesgrave, was buried in the chancel of his own church. The details of Hawton can hardly be much earlier than c. 1330, and are more probably of the first years of the decade, so Robert might not have seen the completion of his chancel, although it is clear that it must have been sufficiently built to accommodate his tomb. The furnishings of Heckington's chancel however are demonstrably earlier.

The sedilia of Heckington and Hawton have mouldings of a peculiarly wavy section without fillets or keels, and with the frontal square pillar rounded off at the corners by rolls. The comparison is so close that it is not inconceivable that the same pattern book was used, as is the case with the sedilia of Navenby, which is also of this group. Certainly both pieces of sculpture are of the same masons, who seem to have limited themselves to designing such furnishings all over the east of England from c. 1325 to c. 1350, without taking part in the construction of the whole church or chancel. The sedilia of Hawton is on the south side of the chancel isolated from the group of Easter sepulchre, tomb and priest's door, which are all linked under the same foliated string course, and it seems to be of an earlier date. It is flat, with none of the nodding ogees of the Easter sepulchre opposite and with the sculptural ornaments crammed into one plane with the foliage carving and figures relatively undifferentiated. Lawrence Stone dates the sedilia to the 1320's, and a stylistic comparison between it and that at Heckington supports the similarity between their mouldings. The use of pointed gables within vertical buttresses in miniature, the lack of nodding ogees, the cupping in the arches of the seats, the flattened encrustations of sculpture and the relationship between the
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Fig. 1  a. Newark: base course moulding of the south nave aisle; b. Heckington: base course of the chancel and south side of the church; c. Sleaford: base course of the south aisle; d. Newark: jambs of the south nave aisle windows; e. Hawton: jambs of the chancel east window; f. Heckington: exterior arch of the south porch (half only); g. Hawton: pillar of the sedilia; h. Heckington: arch of the tomb of Richard de Potesgrave; i. Heckington: pillar of the sedilia.

Fig. 2  a. Heckington: jambs of the chancel windows; b. Heckington: jambs of the south transept windows; c. Sleaford: jambs of the west window of the south aisle; d. Sleaford: jambs of the windows of the inner north nave aisle; e. Sleaford: jambs of the north transept windows; f. South Kyme: jambs of the south windows; g. Heckington: jambs of the windows of the ante-chancel; h. Horbling: jambs of all flowing windows.
figures and the foliage are practically identical. Clearly the
dates of the Hayton and Heckington sedilias are not far
apart. The Easter sepulchre of Heckington, on the other
hand, appears to be much earlier than its counterpart at
Hayton, where the whole north wall group is presumably
of the early 1330's. In the Heckington piece there are no
goee arches at all, let alone nodding ogees as there are at
Hayton, and the diagonally set wavy buttresses first used
at Heckington are of a similar date to those found on the
great Seal of Edward III of 1327.12

We have already seen how the base courses of the
chancel and other parts of Heckington relate to the south
aisle of Newark, as does the design of the east window and
the west window of the south nave aisle in the
Nottinghamshire church. The east window of Selby Abbey
of about 1330 and the chancel clerestory windows of about
the same date correspond closely to Heckington's east
window and the chancel windows respectively. Similarly,
the wavy parapet of Heckington is of approximately the
same date as that of the chancel at Selby, or slightly earlier.
If Selby is later than Heckington, then the double
mouchetted windows of Patrington in Yorkshire are
probably contemporary and may even provide a precedent
for the Heckington chancel. The suggestion that the
chancel may have been complete by the late 1320's is
strengthened by the fact that in 1328 Richard de Potesgrave
obtained a licence to found a chantry, which was probably
at an altar in the chancel.13

In addition to the chancel Richard de Potesgrave built
other parts of the church which can be picked out by their
distinctive use of the same motifs as the chancel. These
motifs are the base course mouldings and the buttresses
with the characteristic niches (that have a flat ogee under
a straight gable) which are found on the south transept and
under the tower. The south porch (see Plate III) has the
wavy parapet with sculptural details from the chancel
furnishings, and the mouldings of the exterior arch are of
the same type as those of the tomb of Richard de
Potesgrave and the chancel windows. The main south
transept window also has the syncopated arrangement of
lights that characterises the east window of the chancel, but
this time in the formation of 2-2-2. Here the tracery design
is more conservative, with two large encircled quatrefoils
in the top vesica which remind one of a previous phase of
design, more consistent with a date of the early to mid
1320's. The mouldings of the south transept windows are
again not of the fleur-de-lis type but of an earlier wave
design in combination with a ninety degree nick, which is
very common indeed in Lincolnshire. It could be reasoned
that either the master mason had not yet evolved his own
distinctive moulding patterns that he used in the chancel or
on the south porch, or alternatively that two different
masons were involved. The latter argument is perhaps the
more likely because the Heckington chancel is much more
tune with the Newark work than is the earlier transept,
which had the strong advantage of being built while the
Newark design was still fresh. It is true that the building
programme of the chancel seems to have followed on
immediately from the transept, but it is inconceivable that
the details of the earlier part were designed by a mason who
had worked at Newark only a few years before. An
examination of the transept's south window makes this
clear, while the opposite is true in the case of the chancel
details. At the transept the mason seems to have been a
local man inspired by Newark, but in the chancel he surely
had a direct knowledge and a thorough understanding of
the novelty of the Nottingham church.

The north transept and nave seem to be the earliest parts
of Heckington.14 The transept has a continuous undulating
string course which rises and dips to run immediately under
the side windows and that on the north. This string course
and the lower base courses are clearly not of the same
campaign as those of the ante-chancel bay to the east with
which they are dislocated and of a completely different
design. The buttresses are similarly plain and unadorned
by sculptural niches, revealing their early origin of perhaps
late in the second decade of the century or early in the third.
Slightly earlier than this is the nave which has windows of

Plate IV  Seaford: detail of the west face of the south aisle.
The dating of Heckington can thus be established with reasonable clarity from the evidence presented by the two or three documentary sources and from a consideration of the moulding design and other stylistic details. Towards the very end of the 1320's, however, the work ceased and what must have been a fairly sizable lodge broke up. From Heckington the problem is to trace the master's next move, and this seems to have been five miles west to St. Denys at Sleaford.

There is some doubt as to the date of the Decorated work at Sleaford. It is generally reckoned to be of the latter part of the fourteenth century with Hamilton Thompson's date of c. 1360-70 being upheld recently. However, its similarities with a great deal of architectural detail at Heckington suggests not only that some parts (the west work and north transept) were designed and constructed in the late 1320's or early 1330's, but that the man responsible was the Heckington master. When the nave was remodelled the aisles were extended to embrace the old early thirteenth century tower, following the pattern of Newark and Grantham, and their west ends were encrusted with niches and foliage carvings. This work is similar to the sculptural furnishings of the Heckington chancel and south porch (see Plate III), both of which are in the last phase of the church's construction.

The comparison with the porch is extremely interesting. Both have the wavy motif and the flat, seaweed type foliage patterning which a close examination reveals to be almost indistinguishable in design and execution. Flanking this at the upper levels of the western aisle faces of Sleaford are the Heckington type niches, now singularly close in style to those of the Heckington porch. These niches at Sleaford have flat oges like the porch, but at the bottom there is a curious cluster of three niches, only on the south aisle, which have nodding oges after the pattern of a single niche on the north east vestry buttress of Heckington.

The fat buttresses at the corner of the aisle recall those at the west end of the Heckington chancel and the west window of Sleaford's south aisle is, of course, taken straight from the Heckington chancel. The mouldings of this window are a variation on the early ffeur-de-lis type of the Heckington chancel and are very close to the more advanced south porch and chancel furnishings at Heckington. The same stylistic similarities hold true for the south-west aisle windows at Sleaford, and also for those of its inner north aisle. Just as the later Heckington base courses correspond directly with Newark, those of the Sleaford south aisle are close to both these buildings, being made up of the same components and having almost identical overall and internal dimensions. This influence from Heckington and Newark at the earliest parts of the rebuilding of Sleaford is further underlined by a comparison between the south aisle windows of Newark (see Plate I) and the most westerly two of the corresponding aisle at Sleaford. The Sleaford windows are taken straight from the earlier church and the only deviation in design comes from their having a trefoil in the mouchettes of the central vesica instead of a quatrefoil.

If masons released by the completion of the Heckington chancel went to work on the west front of Sleaford, then they also started on the north transept at the same time. Almost all of the piers at Sleaford have polygonal capitals with elaborately moulded arches and continuous hollows with no extra demi-shafts between them. Heckington nave piers, however, are quatrefoil, they have demi-shafts and double chamfered arches with round abaci; the chancel arch to the east of the ante-chancel having a moulded arch reflecting its later date and architectural importance within the church. The only piers and capitals at Sleaford that are not as we might expect are at the west side of the entrance to the north transept, and here they are after the Heckington pattern. This seems to be the earliest work at Sleaford.
perhaps executed straight after Heckington was finished in a transept that tries to emulate those of its neighbour. The similarity is made particularly interesting when we consider that in south and east Lincolnshire there are only three other such combinations — at Boston nave, Leadenham and Helpingham. 18

The small piece of wall with a blind arch extending to the north from the west corner pier of the Sleaford transept and its similarity with those of Heckington’s transepts is well known. It is on this blind arch and on the engaged pier opposite that we find the Heckington type piers and capitals which strongly suggests that the same lodge was responsible. This blind arch is extremely unusual, and interestingly enough the same effect is seen at the transept end of Newark’s south aisle, though here the short piece of wall has no blind arch.

There are, of course, other similarities between Sleaford and Heckington transepts. Both have their transept arches relatively undifferentiated, leading straight off the central nave, and both have very similar base course mouldings. The design of the main window of the Sleaford transept is again of the Newark type and follows on from Heckington’s east window in its construction: it has capitals to the mullions as well as bases, and the larger order have distinct engaged shafts. The arrangement of lights of the Sleaford window reverts to the Newark south aisle plan in being of the formation 2-2-2, but beyond this there is little difference between it and the Heckington east window. The large top vesica is filled with four incongruously old fashioned encircled quatrefoils, for which the most satisfactory precedent happens again to be at Heckington, this time in the south window of the south transept.

The geometry of the Heckington east window and that of Sleaford’s north transept north window are again very close, the overall sizes being 10.36m x 4.87m (34’ x 16’) and 10.56m x 5.48m (34’ 8” x 18’) respectively. The triangle of the traceryed heads is, in Heckington’s case, an equilateral triangle and at Sleaford is an isosceles triangle with the base angles of fifty-nine degrees. 19 It seems clear that the same man designed both.

We have just seen the connection between Sleaford and Newark in terms of window design, and in the earliest work of Sleaford’s transept the connection is continued. The two four-light windows of the east face seem to be a slightly later development of the south nave aisles at Newark and at Sleaford itself. The arches of the lights are pointed instead of rounded, the two main sub-arches are ogee and the larger mouchettes (now with quatrefoils rather than the trefoils of Sleaford’s south aisle) are pinched upwards to the window arch. The main design, however, is the same and the mouldings of these windows are similar, though by no means identical with, the Newark keeled type.

The dating of the Sleaford work is thus considerably simpler than that of Heckington, as there seems to be only one main campaign that can be ascribed to the Heckington master, that of c. 1330. In this period, immediately upon the completion of Heckington, the west work of the nave and the north transept were executed, presumably leaving the transitional nave of the very early thirteenth century untouched until a later campaign of the middle of the fourteenth century. The bases, capitals, tall arcades, arch mouldings and the generous spaciousness of the interior suggest a similar date to Holbeach, for instance, which we know to be after 1340.20

If it is easy to see the connection between Newark, Heckington and Sleaford, then it is more difficult to outline the career of the Heckington lodge after these churches had been constructed. There are no large buildings in the remaining group and identification has to rest on windows, mouldings and the occasional sculptural monument, usually with only one such comparison available in each place. It is difficult to say for certain that the lodge was directly responsible for the group, but certainly there are a number of churches in south and east Lincolnshire that owe a lot to Heckington.

The priory of South Kyme is now a tiny rebuilt fragment of its former self. 21 What does remain are three windows of the south aisle and a part of one nave pier set into the new west wall. The windows come directly from the Heckington chancel scheme and their mouldings are absolutely identical with those of Heckington’s ante-chancel windows except for some minor variation in internal dimensions. The entire measurement from the interior wall to the glass is in both cases 50.16cm (19 1/4”). A similar comparison may be made between the capital of the South Kyme pier and those of the Heckington chancel arch, and the piece of sculpture on the south porch depicting the Coronation of the Virgin seems to be of the same school as the Heckington-Hawton furnishings.

Another church within five miles of Heckington that shows the influence of its chancel windows is Horbling. The north transept and aisle were rebuilt in the Decorated period and, like South Kyme, the north window of the transept follows the pattern set by Heckington, and the aisle windows are simply truncated versions of the same thing. The transept has been lowered to a level below that of the nave roof (though here higher than the chancel, which is still Norman) after the Heckington style and its buttresses, parapet and base mouldings are derived from the same source. The mouldings of the flowing windows are, as we might expect, of the Heckington ante-chancel type; those of the transept being, as in South Kyme, of an almost identical size. 22

The Horbling windows have a slight variation on the standard mouldings of the Heckington clerestory or the ante-chancel which takes the form of a double wave between the ninety degree nick and the interior wall.

Plate VI Sleaford: north window of the north transept.
Surprisingly, this is a very uncommon arrangement and only recurs in three other churches in Lincolnshire: Ewerby, Carlton Scrrop and Old Leake. The north nave aisle of Ewerby has a somewhat tenuous stylistic connection with Heckington as only one window there is fully comparable to the latter’s ante-chancel. This window has mouldings, however, that are once again almost identical to Heckington.

The connection between Ewerby and Carlton Scrrop goes beyond the similarity in mouldings, as the east windows of both churches are of the same pattern: a design that is confined to those churches with the standard variation moulding already described. The window is in the form of four lights with ogee and cusped heads under an intersecting arrangement with a quatrefoil over. The same combination of jamb mouldings and east window design appears, of course, at Old Leake.

If we look at Frampton, nearer to the east coast of Lincolnshire and somewhat isolated from the area around Heckington, we find a church with a new chancel added in the fourteenth century, a common phenomenon in the east of England. In this new chancel there are again the mouldings of the Heckington chancel and ante-chancel windows. There is a ballflower frieze on the exterior of the chancel relating to the tomb of Richard de Potesgrave and there are the usual furnishings—a priests’ door (on both sides), a tomb recess and a sedilia. The mouldings of these furnishings show an affinity to those at Heckington, but an even closer connection with the combination of elements in the Hawton chancel. A Heckington wavy parapet moulding is carved onto the Hawton-type tomb recess.

Similarly at the west end of the church and at the north-east are windows reminiscent of the Hawton chancel, which must have been inserted at about the same time. Since its construction the chancel end wall has been moved west, proven by the truncated sedilia, so we do not know if an Easter sepulchre was originally intended. In other words we have at Frampton a church in which the influence of Heckington and Hawton both combined, these being churches that were in any case closely connected with one another.

The influence of Heckington was undoubtedly very strong in south and east Lincolnshire from about 1325 to 1345, when the last work on the churches just described must have been completed. In addition to the examples given here there are many churches in the area that have details that would be inexplicable if it were not for the presence of Heckington, among them numbering the south transept window of Algarkirk, the steeples of Silk Willoughby and Caythorpe or the nave of Helpringham. It is difficult to say whether members of the actual Heckington lodge were engaged at Horbling, Ewerby or Frampton, or whether the magnetic influence of such a large and important building was enough to inspire local masons. Heckington was in any case the centre of a great deal of building work in the region, and the church was almost certainly the product of the same lodge and master mason who constructed the earlier parts of fourteenth century Seaford. There are enough similarities between Newark and Heckington to support the position of the former as the precursor of Heckington in particular, and of flowing tracery in general. The mouldings and tracery design would further suggest that the mason of Heckington and Seaford was trained there or even in charge of the work.
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The most important contribution to the study of history made by this book is that it is another reminder that most of the people who have lived in the world have been ordinary and poor: a fact which is not traditionally much reflected in historical writing. Dr. Tobias also reminds us, incidentally, that local sources can be exploited much more than they are, in respect of the subjects of this book.

The story of the evolution of the police is very interestingly written; how, for example, the notion of the one-man rural police ‘station’ first arose. In the same way, the role of the eighteenth century magistrate, with several of its facets now disappeared, is very readable.

In his introduction, the author makes several claims for the originality of his book, such as his modification of the view that the parish watches were ‘inefficient old men’. He also claims that the book draws the story of crime and punishment into a coherent whole. The second of these claims is true, in that he discusses crime, criminals, police and punishment. But a good deal of the material, outside of certain aspects of policing are, I fear, very commonplace. The accounts of well-known criminals are very pedestrian, and the assessment of the late Victorian prison system still draws too heavily upon the prejudices of the 1870s.

This is, especially for lay readers, a readable book, but it is not the best which Dr. Tobias has written.

J. E. THOMAS
NOTTINGHAM

MARITIME ARCHAEOLOGY by Keith Muckelroy, x + 270pp., illus., Cambridge University Press, 1978, £4.95 paper, £16.00 hard covers.

This book aims to define the scope and potential of a new sub-discipline, maritime archaeology: ‘the scientific study of the material remains of man and his activities on the sea’. Underwater fieldwork being one of the subject’s main attributes, the book is largely concerned with underwater sites. It is divided into two parts. The first four chapters review the development of maritime archaeology and examine some of the constraints imposed by the underwater environment. Some recent work is discussed to highlight the contribution already made by maritime archaeology to studies of the development of the sea. The second part is devoted to the analysis of the site of an unrealized potential is clearly shown. Part Two entitled ‘Towards a theory of maritime archaeology’, deals with the various factors affecting wreck sites and with the application of statistical methods to sea bed distributions. From the evidence of the wreck site the maritime archaeologist must aim to reconstruct the maritime culture that produced the ship. The author emphasizes that the archaeological, historical and ethnological evidence are complementary in working towards this goal.

In its insistence that future work must be problem-oriented, the book is to be welcomed at a time when underwater sites are increasingly threatened by — often misguided — treasure seekers.

In the concluding chapter the author states that maritime archaeology is a labour intensive subject and acknowledges the part that the dedicated amateur must play. This is a book that will appeal to the amateur with a keen interest in maritime studies as well as to the professional and equally both will gain from the extensive bibliography.

The book is well produced and the author’s fluent style makes for ease of reading (although some may falter over the section on the application of statistical methods). All in all, the book succeeds in its aims and is to be recommended.

Book Reviews
CRIME AND POLICE IN ENGLAND 1700-1900 by J. J. Tobias, 194pp., Gill and Macmillan, 1979, £10.00.

G. T. DENFORD
GREENWICH