

heeft hij nodig om bevolkingsgrootte en dergelijke te berekenen. Ik vat zijn resultaten zo beknopt mogelijk samen. De nederzetting te Rijswijk was er een van Cananefaten, die we wel degelijk moeten onderscheiden van de Bataven. Vroeger spraken we over Canninefaten, maar de schrijver heeft goede redenen voor zijn nieuwe spelling. Een collega van mij veronderstelde, dat zij Amsterdams dialect spraken, maar dat is uiteraard een onwetenschappelijk geintje. Deze Cananefaten bewoonden het gebied tussen Oude Rijn, Noordzee, de Maasmond Helinium en de onbewoonbare laagvenen in het binnenland en zij zullen zeker enige duizenden mensen sterk geweest zijn. Het grootste aantal, waartoe de statistische berekeningen van de heer Bloemers hen brengen, is 16.500 in de tweede eeuw, maar met andere uitgangspunten wordt dat getal veel kleiner. In ieder geval was het voor de Cananefaten mogelijk aan hulptroepen een ala (= 480 man) of zelfs wel een cohort (= 960 man) te leveren. De belangrijkste plaats was Arentsburg (Forum Hadriani) met in de tweede eeuw minstens duizend inwoners. De nederzetting te Rijswijk was daarbij vergeleken maar een armzalig boerengehucht, met aanvankelijk één, op het eind van de eerste eeuw twee en tenslotte drie boerderijen. De huizen gingen niet lang mee, gemiddeld zo'n dertig jaar, zodat de heer Bloemers drieëntwintig afzonderlijke huisplattegronden kan onderscheiden. Bij de drie boerderijen in de tweede eeuw behoorde overigens ook een klein tempeltje, zo moet althans naar zijn inzicht een gebouwtje met een porticus geïnterpreteerd worden.

Dit is een rijk, een knap en vooral een wetenschappelijk boek. Men moet natuurlijk wel de grondslagen aanvaarden die de heer Bloemers voor zijn berekeningen heeft gebruikt. Hij werkt bijvoorbeeld met fictieve geboorte- en sterftecijfers voor zijn demografische berekeningen en die kan hij op geen enkele manier verifiëren, want er is geen grafveld bij de nederzetting gevonden, slechts vier afzonderlijke begravingen. Maar voorlopig is er niets tegen om die uitgangspunten te accepteren en op deze manier heeft hij een mooi concreet beeld kunnen ontwerpen van een kleine nederzetting, wier wel en wee hij uitstekend weet te correleren met wat er bekend is van de grotere geschiedenis in deze streken. Ik het diepgaand respect voor deze prestatie.

H.P.H. Jansen

*Algemene geschiedenis der Nederlanden, IV, Middeleeuwen* (Haarlem: Fibula-van Dis-hoeck, 1980, 499 blz., f143,-, ISBN90228 38005).

It certainly is an exceptional honour for a foreign reviewer to be invited to pass judgement on a volume of the new *General history of the Low Countries*. But the present reviewer's recognition of this does not blind him to the quite extraordinary difficulties confronting any reviewer of a work of this kind. It is like trying to review an entire library; how can one say anything coherent in a few pages about a collection of essays by thirty-five different scholars? Is it fair or desirable to consider this one volume apart from its fellows? Especially when almost everything it contains is a mere part or section of something else?

To begin with the enterprise as a whole. We are talking about Volume IV of the new fifteen-volume *Algemene geschiedenis* which is now being published in order to update or, better, replace, the twelve-volume work of the same title published in 1949-1958. So a first important question arises: is 'Mark II' any improvement on 'Mark I'? It is certainly bigger, but is it also better? The similarities are striking. In both, history is sliced in the same way geographically. Thus both versions include Belgium, so that they are not exactly 'national' histories, but yet they clearly reflect the same vogue for multi-volume, multi-author, nicely-produced and lavishly illustrated national histories which has been sweeping

Europe since the Second World War and which is exemplified by the current Spanish and Italian histories. Is there not, too, a suspicion of linguistic nationalism here? Why else should contributions in French have been translated into Dutch? In any event, both Mark I and Mark II of this history were designed in the first place by Dutch speakers for Dutch speakers.

So much for geography. But chronologically, too, the cake of history is sliced in the same way in both versions. We are still confronted with the centuries-old (and increasingly meaningless?) division of medieval, modern and contemporary. Within the medieval period we now have a late medieval slice (the volume presently under review) from 1300 or 1384 until 1482 or 1520, instead of one extending, in Mark I, from 1305 to 1477. But Mark II does have important dissimilarities from its predecessor when it comes to slicing history by subjects. For whereas Mark I was predominantly 'straight' history, apart from seventy pages at the end on intellectual and religious life, Mark II has 140 pages on this, well over 100 pages on socio-economic history and forty pages on institutions. What is left of 'straight' history has now become 'political'. Thus history as it once was has been withered away — completely reduced into what seem to be regarded as its component parts.

There are other small but important differences between the two versions of *the Algemene geschiedenis* which add up to a significant improvement. The illustrations are much more numerous and more relevant; indeed they constitute a remarkable feature of this volume at least. The bibliographical and reference material is also fuller in the new version, which is furnished with an invaluable alphabetical list of works cited in the notes, not provided in Mark I. The annotated bibliography in Mark II is also substantially fuller, but, alas, gone is the inclusion of a brief review of the source material. Indeed, little or no notice is taken of sources throughout the volume.

Who are the authors of this great enterprise? One gets the impression that every competent Dutch-speaking historian is at work on some part of it and that participation may confer substantial prestige on the contributor. But it is a serious shortcoming, at least for the foreign reader (if such there be), that no information is provided in Volume IV about the various authors, some of whom may be mere names to him. A handful of these scholars are veterans who also wrote parts of Mark I - for example J. Lejeune (but now unfortunately deceased) and A.G. Jongkees. A host of newcomers have replaced other veterans of Mark I. Thus the names of Bartier, Niermeyer, Van Werveke, Jansma and Jappe Alberts have gone, and new ones appear of a younger (or not so young) generation of scholars: Van Rompaey, Van Herwaarden, Blockmans, Jansen, Weiler. If any one University appears to predominate in Volume IV it is Ghent: half of the six-man editorial team are currently professors at that university.

The shortcomings of a work of this kind are only too apparent, but this volume does have positive and valuable features besides the excellent illustrations already mentioned. First and foremost, it does mention, or refer to, virtually everything that is known about the Low Countries in the late middle ages. In this respect it defines and maps out the existing state of knowledge. Secondly, it attains overall a very high Standard of scholarly accuracy. And, thirdly, it is admirably set out as a reference work, especially for the modern literature and for persons (index of persons only).

Many of the contributors to this volume seem to write under the shadow of the economic depression or (to use the popular and even more highly-coloured word) crisis which historians keep telling us affected the whole of Europe in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Yet much of the contents speaks eloquently in the other direction: new methods in agriculture, the evolution of a single powerful and centralized political unit, namely the Burgun-

dian state, a general flourishing of representative and other institutions, new concentrations of wealth, and, to cap all, a remarkable surge of activity in the arts and in religious and intellectual life. In the face of all this, one wonders if there really was a depression in this area in the late middle ages.

It would be invidious and foolish to try to appraise the individual contributions to a composite work of this kind in detail in a single review, but a few brief remarks may not come amiss. The opening section, on agriculture, which is interesting but tantalizingly brief and generalized, is followed by a discussion of demography and social change. This is a judicious and well-presented review of the available evidence; it is new and of considerable value. The section on trade and industry which follows it suffers from a certain compression evidently due to lack of allotted space, and this is even more apparent in the chapter on finances, which indeed, especially on public finance, it driven towards superficiality. But this is made up for in part by the invaluable dozen pages on ships and the fishery which follow. On the Burgundian state, subject of several different contributions, we have concise up-to-date expositions of the existing state of knowledge; nothing very new here. On the other hand the accounts of developments in law, and of representative institutions, bring together material which is not so well known in a new way.

Much of the rest of the volume is more a question of logging facts than describing historical developments. This is due to the very nature of the work. What else can one do with a few pages on painting, a few on music, on tapestry, sculpture and so on? The work tends to become a mere catalogue. And inevitably the same is even truer of the part dealing with the political history of the various states or principalities, ten in all, which sooner or later, in one way or another, were swallowed up into the Burgundian state. Each has a few pages allowed to it, for a hundred years of history.

The volume ends with a quite full section on church and religious life which exemplifies the problems of a work of this kind. Unlike Mark I of the *Algemene geschiedenis*, whose third volume devoted thirty pages to this subject all by the same hand, in Mark II the seventy pages allotted have been contributed by six different authors. One short but notable contribution to an earlier part of the book deserves mention, the chapter on the production and dissemination of books, including printed books.

In sum, this is a well-conceived and worth-while project, and Volume IV will surely not be found to lag behind the others in any important respect. Its publishers, editors and contributors all deserve congratulation and will earn the thanks of future generations of users and readers. That is, until someone dreams up Mark III of the *Algemene geschiedenis*.

Richard Vaughan

C.H.A. Broos, e.a., ed., *Nederlands kunsthistorisch jaarboek. Lucas van Leyden. Studies*, XXIX (Haarlem: Fibula-Van Dishoeck, 1979, viii + 528 blz., ill., f150,-, ISBN 90 228 4432 3).

Het Nederlands kunsthistorisch jaarboek voor het jaar 1978 is geheel gewijd aan Lucas van Leyden, in aansluiting op de twee belangrijke tentoonstellingen uit dat jaar, respectievelijk gewijd aan het grafisch werk (Rijksprentenkabinet) en het 'Laatste Oordeel' (Lakenhal), en de verschijning van een nieuwe monografie over de kunstenaar van de hand van Rik Vos. Het werd ook wel weer eens tijd om het werk van Lucas van Leyden letterlijk en figuurlijk onder de loep te nemen, en dat is ook precies wat een team van kunsthistorici en restaurateurs in de zeven studies van dit jaarboek heeft gedaan. De bijdragen zijn van uit-