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situation; the result is that crises are prominent, especially after 1350, painting a picture of disturbance and war — familiar but misleading. Unfortunately, this picture is allowed to dictate the whole chronology of the site. The pottery is all attributed to the 13th and earlier 14th century, reinforcing the picture of later decline and in spite of recent findings at Dublin or Trim. This focus on the period before 1350 affects the chronology of the buildings, with the assertion (p 189) that the earlier 13th century was likely to see more building because that was when the Priory was receiving donations; as opposed to later when the endowments were organised and producing income. It is clear that there was a lot of building, from a tower south of the choir interpreted as lodging for the Prior, to ranges south of the cloister, which took place later. The general treatment of the buildings is weak. Interestingly, the excavations found the remains of an earlier church, later expanded to the east, west and south. Sadly, the evidence for this — itself a major discovery — is not brought together and the plan of it is small and sketchy. The story of the western extension of the church, a NW tower, the cloister and its W range is, from a glance at the plan, complex but the wall-junctions are neither illustrated nor discussed. There is a considerable amount of building preserved to first-floor level; but there are no plans of these upper levels. The most glaring omission is a discussion of the towers of the ‘Prior’s vill’, the enclosure south of the precinct, with no plans of their floors. They are simply dismissed as military in function, when the monastic precinct lay unprotected to the west. The enclosure is a puzzle, but should be seen far more in the context of an expansion of the town, with urban towers. There are, therefore, problems to this nicely produced volume which is somewhat limited in spite of its length; nonetheless it is still a report to be greatly welcomed.

TOM MCNEILL


This book describes the data recorded from 2750 skeletons of people buried in the cemetery associated with St Peter’s church, Barton-upon-Humber. It complements nicely the account of the excavation and analysis of the nearby early-Anglo-Saxon necropolis of Castledyke South (G Drinkall & M Foreman, The Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Castledyke South, Barton-upon-Humber, Sheffield, 1998). St Peter’s cemetery was excavated between 1978 and 1984 with subsequent analysis being undertaken by Dr Juliet Rogers. Following her untimely death in 2001, her great friend and colleague, Tony Waldron, took on the task of bringing Roger’s work to publication. This was a monumental challenge and for this Tony Waldron must be congratulated. This site is of great importance for human bioarchaeologists, from a global perspective, providing analysis of the largest sample of skeletal remains outside London from an archaeological context. Such sample sizes provide a much more realistic view of the people they represent.

The book starts with ‘An Appreciation’ for Juliet, documenting her life in medicine, and then in human bioarchaeology, along with an account of the activities of a ‘woman of many parts’, plus a list of Juliet’s publications. Two background chapters then frame the church and its setting, and the burial archaeology. ‘Burial Archaeology’ details the orientation and depth of the graves, grave markers, bone condition, grave ‘furniture’, and the cemetery chronology (complete with detailed plans of the graves in each phase); this allows the reader to contextualise later chapters considering the analysis of the skeletal remains. Chapter 3 (‘Assemblage’) describes the number of...
individuals analysed, divided into phases dating from Phase E (AD 950–1150) to Phase A (1700–1855), along with the condition of the skeletal material (completeness of the skeletons); there were eight skeletons who could be ‘named’, all dying in the early half of the 19th century. Being able to assign graves closely to phases is fairly unique in burial archaeology but allows the consideration of changes to the biological profile of the buried population through time. Age at death and sex of each individual skeleton analysed are presented, although specific methods used to assign ages and sexes are not given (eg skeletons were aged ‘using standard methods and employing as many criteria as were available’ — p 35). In the Notes for the Chapter some general references for ageing methods are given but it would have been helpful if the specific methods used had been properly referenced.

Chapter 4 (‘Physical Characteristics of the Assemblage’) considers achieved height (stature), the rate of growth of the children at Barton, and three indices derived from measurements of the skull, femur and tibia. It would have been interesting to compare data at Barton with heights from other medieval cemeteries to observe any differences. Chapter 5 considers the frequency of some of the ‘Non-metric characteristics’ (or normal variations in the appearance) of the bones of the skeleton; again some comparative analysis would have been welcomed. Chapters 6–14 describe the evidence for disease in the skeletons, with 6 and 7 covering the joint diseases — a field of expertise for both Rogers and Waldron. There is great variation in how bioarchaeologists record osteoarthritis (OA) of joints and present the data, with Rogers and Waldron preferring a more conservative approach (which I indeed favour) as opposed to those who, one fears, over-record frequency. As such, comparing data between sites can be very tricky if the methods used differ. Furthermore, linking joint disease with specific occupations has become common in bioarchaeology, a trend that Waldron has rightly warned is dangerous (see his Counting the Dead. The Epidemiology of Skeletal Populations, New York, 1994).

However, it is noted that a large proportion of young adults had OA at Barton, which Waldron suggests might indicate people starting strenuous activities at an early age; because the burials had been phased at Barton it was possible to see that OA generally increased in the post-medieval period. Rheumatoid arthritis, psoriatic arthritis, Reiter’s Syndrome, gout, bunions and ankylosing spondylitis are all described, and unique preservation of calcified arteries in an adult male with psoriatic arthritis reported. Chapter 8 describes evidence for infectious disease, and includes both those infections caused by an organism that cannot be specifically identified (non-specific) and also specific infections. Relatively little evidence emerges of infection but tuberculosis, with a number of people with wasted bones (possibly caused by poliomyelitis leading to paralysis of limbs). Other non-specific inflammatory changes on bones at Barton include the ribs (lung infection) and the sinuses (sinusitis) plus individuals with infected degenerated joints (septic arthritis). Despite leprosy and syphilis being present in England and Scotland at the time of the creation of the cemetery at Barton, there was no skeletal evidence for these.

Chapter 9 describes trauma evidence. We learn fractures occurred more in females and increased from the earlier to later period. The data include the observation that over 150 people had 186 fractures, ribs were the most frequently fractured bone, eight adults (one female) and two juveniles sustained skull fractures (all healed), six people had dislocated joints, nearly 50 skeletons had spondylolysis, and 160 people had Schmorl’s nodes. Metabolic disease evidence (osteoporosis, vitamin D deficiency, and Paget’s disease — 15 people) is presented in Chapter 10. Surprisingly, osteoporosis was diagnosed on ‘the subjective feel or appearance of the bones’ (p 95) which, because of changes to bone structure/weight as a result of post-mortem damage, is generally considered an inaccurate reflection of osteoporosis. Chapter 11 reflects the evidence for
the bone-forming diseases, especially Diffuse Idiopathic Skeletal Hyperostosis (DISH) which has been found in a higher frequency in monastic populations in England, and is associated today with older males, diabetes and obesity. Forty-one people were affected (32 males). Tumours, a rarity in the study of human remains, are considered in Chapter 12 and both benign and malignant tumours are recorded; as with other analyses of cemetery samples, there were few people who suffered. Chapter 13 includes pathological conditions under the headings of congenital and developmental, while the short Chapter 14 describes dental disease, noting that almost 40% of people at Barton had caries and nearly two-thirds had lost teeth ante-mortem.

Chapter 15 analyses the parish records associated with St Peter’s and the neighbouring St Mary’s church which lacks, unlike St Peter’s, intrusive archaeological intervention. Baptisms and burial data were compared with the skeletal data. Unfortunately, the final concluding chapter is less than a page long but provides a few key findings. It concludes that the Barton population lived in a ‘stable environment . . . [were] adequately nourished, and their toll of disease was unremarkable’ (p 129). However, Waldron cautions the conclusions with the problems inherent in any analysis of skeletal remains. Appendix 1 gives publications that have resulted from the skeletal analysis and Appendix 2 provides a useful tabulated summary of the skeletons analysed.

Bringing together data collected by another researcher is admirable, but there can be limitations to what can be achieved, as seen in this book. I left feeling disappointed that such a large assemblage had so little written about it; more comparative analysis would have helped, and better (and more) referencing/acknowledgement of relevant published literature. The figures of pathological lesions are often of poor quality, although the graphical representations of data work well. However, the real value of this book is that the data on the skeletons are now published and the report will provide a basis from which other researchers will be able to develop research ideas that can be tackled by further work on this important skeletal sample, which is fortunately curated for that future research.

CHARLOTTE ROBERTS


It is over 50 years since excavation started at Wharram Percy and the results of the pioneering excavation of this site, encompassing over 30 archaeological seasons, have been published in a series of monographs, the latest volume of which Wharram XI which focuses on the late-Saxon to post-medieval churchyard. The volume contains a detailed phase-by-phase discussion of the excavation between 1962 and 1973 of the different parts of the churchyard, combined which specialised reports on the finds including human bone, pottery and the small finds. The volume has been designed to complement the 1987 Wharram III volume on the church. Although 20 years separate the two publications, this has in many ways been beneficial, allowing both use of analytical techniques which were unavailable in the 1980s and also the reconsideration and reinterpretation of some of the material discussed in the earlier volume III. The downside is that many of those who instigated and were closely linked with the project are no longer here to see the results of their labour, and the volume is prefaced by fond recollections of the late Maurice Beresford.
Barton-upon-Humber or Barton is a town and civil parish in the North Lincolnshire district, in the county of Lincolnshire, England. Barton is on the south bank of the Humber Estuary and is at the southern end of the Humber Bridge. The Viking Way starts near the bridge.[2]. Transport connections. St Peter's Church has a Saxon tower. An Anglo-Saxon inhumation cemetery at Castledyke South, in use from the late 5th or early 6th century until the late 7th century, was investigated and partially excavated 1975-90: the skeletal remains of 227 individuals were identified, including one who had undergone (and survived) trepanning.[10] The church was reopened in May 2007 as a resource for medical research.