NOTICES OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL PUBLICATIONS.

THE ANCIENT CROSS-SHAFTS AT BEWCASTLE AND RUTHWELL, enlarged from the Rede Lecture delivered before the University of Cambridge on 20th May, 1916. By the Right Rev. G. F. Browne, D.D. D.C.L. LL.D. $11\frac{3}{4} \times 9$, x + 92 pp. 3 photogravures and 23 illustrations. Cambridge: University Press, 1916. 7s. 6d. n.

Bishop Forrest Browne's conclusions upon the disputed date of the Bewcastle and Ruthwell crosses will be received with the respect due to the opinion of a singularly competent authority, whose knowledge of the early history of the English church and of monuments of early Christian art in Britain is second to none. Hitherto, the protagonists in the controversy have for the most part subordinated the wider historical view of the case to considerations of aesthetic influences; and, on the part of those who have argued for the twelfth-century date of the crosses, there has been a tendency, to say the least of it, to disregard the local conditions and the true nature of the relations between England and the continent which make it possible that they were produced at the date generally assigned to them. Bishop Browne's contentions on behalf of their early date are strengthened by the emphasis which he lays on these points. His arguments for the artistic development of the Northumbrian kingdom in contact with continental influence are in striking contrast to the view which regards Northumbria in the seventh century as the home of a low form of art, incapable of response to the example set by imported artists, and are set forth with a thorough understanding of European history which cannot be reproached with insular prejudice. While he expressly acknowledges the difficulties which beset the assertion of a positive date for monuments unique in their combination of high artistic quality with the absence of any evidence of local parentage, he has provided a formidable answer to the line of argument which meets these difficulties by leaving the crosses, at a period of general artistic culture, without local descent.

Although the two crosses have certain points in common, the presence of vine-leaf scrolls, runic inscriptions, and a highly developed type of figure-sculpture on both, they have equally remarkable points of difference. The interlaced patterns on the Bewcastle cross show an amenity to local influence which is absent at Ruthwell; and in other respects, the arrangement and details of the figures and the Latin inscriptions in clear and beautiful capitals, the Ruthwell cross belongs to a higher and purer type of art. Even if we allow the fact that the purpose of the crosses was different, that the Bewcastle shaft is a memorial to an individual person, while the cross at Ruthwell marks a site hallowed by the ministrations of early missionaries, the variations between them are so great that they can hardly have been the work of the same persons. While the inscription upon the Bewcastle cross points to a date about A.D. 670 for its erection upon its present site, corresponding evidence for the date of the Ruthwell cross is wanting. Bishop Browne holds that, if the Ruthwell cross was made for erection at Ruthwell, the only period when a cross of the kind, covered with Anglian runes, could have been set up in south-west Scotland, was the period before the death of Ecgfrith

and the end of Anglian domination in those parts in 685 ; but he lays stress upon the local tradition that the cross was brought by sea from elsewhere at an uncertain date. The relative dates of the two monuments are thus obscure, and room is left for suggestion. On the other hand, there can be little doubt that the date indicated at Bewcastle, taken in conjunction with the points of resemblance between the crosses, gives good reason for assuming that the Ruthwell cross is a more developed work of a period of Anglian art whose precise limits need not be defined too narrowly. In Bishop Browne's words, ' It is not too much to say that everything we know in any detail of the history of Northumbria and the Northumbrians, their church work and their script, nearly before and nearly after the year 670, fits in curiously completely with the phenomena of these monuments.'

In the proof of this hypothesis, he meets the arguments which have been advanced by Professor Cook and the Commendatore Rivoira. Both writers, to whose knowledge he pays a just tribute, regard the crosses as products of twelfth-century art, produced by craftsmen to whom the sculpture of the neighbouring parts of the continent was familiar. Professor Cook, as is well known, has ascribed their erection to David I, king of Scotland, 1124-1153 and finds the motive of their sculptures in such works as the west front of Chartres and the nave of Vezelay. Many of his contentions, and particularly his rash assertions with regard to the general date of the representation of the scenes upon the Ruthwell cross, have been met by other writers, whose evidence Bishop Browne endorses and confirms. His exposure of the weakness of Professor Cook's theories is detailed and trenchant. At best, the attribution of the crosses to the time of David I is little more than an ingenious assumption : in the light of Bishop Browne's criticism, its inconsistencies and deficiencies are clear. The existence of the beautiful fragment of a cross-shaft, now preserved in the ruins of David's abbey-church at Jedburgh, is in itself very slender evidence upon which to found a theory of Davidian origin for it and kindred examples of the vine-leaf scroll pattern. Its connexion with the age of David is now disproved by the fact that a similar fragment has been found built into the rubble core of the twelfth-century piers of the abbey-church tower. This point is only one among many which may well induce the supporters of Professor Cook's theory to reconsider their position. While much gratitude is due to its author for his painstaking researches into the history of the crosses, the soundness of his artistic hypotheses is open to doubt by all who trust the evidence of their eyes. When his historical and palaeographical arguments are examined, the premises from which they start are found to lead to logical conclusions of a character entirely opposed to his own deductions.

Rivoira's less detailed contentions for a twelfth-century date are somewhat more weighty, as coming from one of the chief living authorities upon Romanesque art. Their fundamental error, however, is clearly pointed out in this essay. They assume that the crosses are the product of local workmanship and could not have been executed in Northumbria during the seventh century. An eighth-century date, on the other hand, is granted to the Acca cross, now at Durham ; and as this again is assumed to be a work beyond Northumbrian powers of achievement, it must be attributed to a foreign hand. This argument overlooks the well-known theory that the Bewcastle and Ruthwell crosses are probably themselves the work of

foreign craftsmen working in Northumbria, and that they form a starting-point of Northumbrian artistic development which provided local artists with the scroll-patterns of the Acca and other crosses. A theory which places Bewcastle and Ruthwell at the beginning of an activity in cross-sculpture, followed by a slow but clearly traceable decadence, is surely more reasonable than the theory which would make them isolated masterpieces of twelfth-century craftsmen, with doubtful contemporary analogies and without any influence, such as at that period was inevitable, upon local art. If their figure-sculpture stands by itself, the influence of their scroll patterns and of the chequered and interlaced panels at Bewcastle upon the subsequent art of their neighbourhood and of other parts of England seems undeniable.

Bishop Browne brings together much important evidence to show that monuments remarkable for fine sculpture were not unknown in England before the period of the Danish invasion. The description by William of Malmesbury of the monuments at Glastonbury is a case in point. More important still, as an evidence of the connexion between Italy and England, is the record of the Italian marble altar-slab given by St. Aldhelm to king Ina, and by Ina to the church of Bruton. His central theory, in short, is that the Bewcastle and Ruthwell crosses are the work of foreign artists, probably from the east or strongly under Byzantine influence. Such artists were scattered all over Europe after the conquests of Mohammedanism in the seventh century. The activity of Wilfrith and Benedict Biscop in Northumbria, their well attested employment of foreign artificers, would naturally attract wandering artists to the north of England. Here they left memorials of their presence which were at once in direct succession from the native masterpieces of their art and formed a starting-point for local sculptors, producing on the one hand the vine-scroll carvings exemplified in Acca's cross and numerous Anglian fragments, on the other the 'dragonesque' sculpture which penetrated to the kingdom of Wessex and became a marked feature of Saxon art in that district.

In his introduction Bishop Browne explains that he has arrived at his conclusions without reference to the article contributed by Sir Henry Howorth to *Archaeological Journal*, vol. lxx, 45–64. While Sir Henry's views as to the origin of the crosses are very similar to his own, there is an important relationship on which Bishop Browne lays special emphasis. Sir Henry expressly rejects any direct connexion between the northern crosses and Ravenna. Bishop Browne, on the other hand, pays close attention to the carvings of the ivory chair of Maximianus at Ravenna in their relation to the carvings on the Ruthwell cross and, in the course of his essay, recounts the evidence for the history of the chair, which he believes to be of Egyptian or kindred workmanship, set up in the cathedral church of Ravenna in the sixth century, and restored, after a long absence from the city, by the emperor Otho III in 1001. This excursus is not the least interesting part of the book, which abounds in references to early monuments, such as the two crosses at Sandbach and the cross of Trumwine at Abercorn in West Lothian, of great value for their own sake as well as for the light which they throw upon the main subject. In discussing the Byzantine affinities of the Ruthwell cross, Bishop Browne takes considerable notice of the decrees of the 'Quinisext' council, held at Constantinople in 691, with their insistence upon the orthodox, as opposed to the symbolical, representation of the

figure of our Lord, and maintains that the runic inscriptions from *The Dream of the Rood* were selected with an express reference to contemporary doctrinal conditions.

Of the seven chapters the two last deal with the runes of the inscriptions and their philological difficulties, notably with the disputed reference to Caedmon at Ruthwell, and with the personality of Alchfrith, to whose memory the cross at Bewcastle was erected. On both these points Bishop Browne writes with confidence and the detailed knowledge of one who has left no part of the subject unexplored. The thoroughness with which he has covered the whole ground is the outstanding feature of his essay. While he is uniformly courteous to his opponents, he deals faithfully with them; and his dissection of their theories is a model of controversial scholarship. If the attack upon the seventh-century origin of the crosses has done nothing else, it has brought into the field a defender well armed at all points, whose essay will be reckoned the classical work upon the subject considered from the widest point of view. The illustrations form an appendix to the book and include four fine photogravures of the chair of Maximianus and fourteen other photographs. There are also a few cuts in the text, illustrating the inscriptions on the crosses and forms of runes.

A. H. T.

THE POTTERY FOUND AT SILCHESTER: A descriptive account of the pottery recovered during the excavations on the site of the Romano-British city of Calleva Atrebatum at Silchester, Hants, and deposited in the Reading Museum. By THOMAS MAY, F.S.A. (Scot.). 11×8, xvii+319 pp. with 88 plates. Reading: E. Poynder and Son. 1916. 25s.

This fine volume with its large type, stout paper and modest cover, owes its publication to the Corporation of Reading. But the contents are due to the ungrudging and voluntary labour of one who has brought special qualifications to his task. For, in addition to a thorough theoretical knowledge of his subject, Mr. May has studied the making of different wares at modern manufactories. He has also visited most of the Romano-British sites and museums. Finally, in drawing, describing and classifying, he has gained invaluable experience by his monograph on the York Museum pottery and by his drawings in the Reports of Corstopitum (1911), Wroxeter (1912) and Hengistbury Head. His knowledge gained at the last-named site is constantly evident in the present work, and it enables him to trace many forms back to their pre-Roman prototypes. Special features are the list of authorities, the glossary, the nine tables of standard proportions and the rubbings from decorated bowls.

Among the plates Mr. May's pottery-sections are of course the outstanding feature. He has drawn over two hundred and fifty vessels, mostly to the scale of 1 : 2, and their sharp outlines produce a very decided impression upon the eye. The ten plates of rubbings too have justified the experiment. Only the photographs are by comparison less satisfactory, but sigillata and other glazed wares are always difficult subjects for the camera. Many

would appear to have been taken with a full front, instead of with a side light.

The amount of research work requisite for dating the various shapes may be realised when it is borne in mind that, with the exception of a few local groups (pl. lxxvi–lxxix), no conclusions are derivable from the site itself. Every piece has to be dated by comparison with similar examples found on datable sites. This has made Mr. May's work far more arduous than that conducted at such places as Corbridge, Newstead or Wroxeter. On the other hand, it is the only large town-site as yet completely excavated. Therefore the huge mass of pottery forms, to quote Mr. May, 'a very uniform and complete series,' covering the first four centuries of our era. Especially useful for reference are the Silchester types of late date. It is so much commoner to find the earlier (first and second century) forms figured and described.

Several questions of interest are suggested by this collection. There seems to be no doubt that Calleva was existing prior to the Roman conquest as the tribal centre of the Atrebates. Were Roman wares imported into the town at a pre-Claudian date, or are the pre-Claudian types merely survivals? The amount of Arretine ware, of Belgic terra nigra ('Black Samian') and the number of Haltern types seem to justify the theory that Roman trade preceded the legionary.

Again, Mr. May speaks of the 'five centuries of Roman supremacy in South Britain' and suggests that the town only died out 'by gradual desertion and decay,' but it is questionable whether he has produced sufficient proof from his interpretation of the pottery. True, he labels various forms as 'fifth-century ware' or as 'in use throughout the fifth century,' but it will be noticed that they also occur in the latter part of the previous century.

A few points inviting criticism may be noticed. The list of authorities (pp. xi–xiii) seems rather arbitrarily compiled. So many are omitted though referred to in the text. Among German publications, for instance, where is Hettner's *Fuhrer durch das Prov. Mus. in Trier*; and why are four *O.R.L.* volumes mentioned to the exclusion of several others? The same may be said of English museum catalogues (only that of Cirencester is given), of reports of excavations, e.g. by Pitt-Rivers, Salzmann and Artis, and of various other works, notably the *Victoria County Histories*.

In the glossary, the saltire (p. xv) should not be limited to the first century A.D. It also occurs in the first part of the second century.

In the introduction, p. 5, note*, the passage occurs: 'The oldest existing human remains, the mummified Egyptians of the earliest dynastic period, are preserved in bitumen.' There are three misstatements here. Firstly, the mummified Egyptians are not the oldest human remains, either in Egypt or elsewhere; secondly, mummification was not adopted before the third dynasty; thirdly, bitumen was not used for that purpose until nearly the Ptolemaic period. It is only fair to add that this does not affect the argument.

On p. 124, type 89 (last line), 'Constantine II' is a mistake for Valens, judging by the date, A.D. 364–378.

Among the plates, the sequence of the types is broken, nos. 193–202 on pl. lxvi being inserted between types 140 and 141.

On p. 154, the description of pl. lxvi is headed 'types 193–199,' instead of '193–202.'

The excellent size of the figures numbering the types up to no. 104 is discontinued in nos. 105–162 and 193–202, where the figures are quite trying to any but the best sight.

A detailed account of the potters' marks with references fills eighty-seven pages or more than a quarter of the entire printed matter. In addition, they are all drawn in facsimile, with the exception of those on plain sigillata of which only a selection is given. In fact, Mr. May has made this one of the most important and useful sections.

It is noticeable that the products of the sigillata potteries of eastern Gaul and the Rhine have not reached Silchester in the same quantities as those from further south. Only a few decorated fragments from those parts can be identified, in plates xxiv, xxvii and xxviii. Rheinzabern plain ware may be said to be quite scarce. Of the special Ludowici shapes only five types (nos. 33, 34, 35, 37 and 45) are noted, and the examples of these cannot exceed a dozen. So too with the potters' marks: hardly one tenth of those on plain sigillata comes from Rheinzabern.

In this long list the references are generally very complete and the omissions conspicuously few.

GENITOR and IVSTI·MA should be noted as belonging to the Pudding Pan Rock list. The former probably worked at Lezoux (*C.I.L.* xiii, 10010, 960 d). Ludowici's stamps of Dagodubnus, Junius, Maximinus, Modestus and Primus are not mentioned. All but the first perhaps are the names of Rheinzabern potters. For MEÐÐICVS there are no references but *C.I.L.* There were probably two potters of this name:—(1) South Gallic, Flavian, but not before A.D. 80 (Ritterling, *Hofheim*, p. 250); (2) Rheinzabern (*Lud.* iii, 44, iv, 42). Folzer (p. 54) dismisses Knorr's suggestion (Rottweil, p. 10) that the latter also worked at Trier. VIRTECISSA must be identical with the VERTECISSA of *C.I.L.* xiii, 10010, 2017 and Walters M 2193, of whom a fragmentary stamp was found at Wroxeter (*Report*, 1913, no. 217). The unique stamp IVLI · VIRINS · FECIX should surely read IVLI · VIRIΛIS · FELIX. Among the Belgic ware stamps, no. 4 BITVOVO is a misprint for BITO AVO (*C.I.L.* xiii, 10010, 316), no. 12 INNIO and no 16 TΛOR are probably ANNIO and TΛOB (*C.I.L.* xiii, 10010, 1920).

Though the references to other British sites are fairly complete, over a score of Corbridge stamps and sixteen from Wroxeter (1912 and 1913 Reports) are omitted. Further, twelve Niederbieber stamps are ignored.

Thirty stamps on mortaria and fifty-three on amphorae seem to be rather a small record for nineteen years' digging, when compared with the fifty-three and forty-one respectively found during three years at Wroxeter. There are six omissions to references to the two first Wroxeter reports. For the amphora stamps F·SCIMNIANO (nos. 40–41) the Niederbieber parallel should be noticed as affording an approximate date, namely A.D 190–260.

The proofs must have been carefully revised, for there are very few slips or printers' errors. Of the latter there are seven in the list of authorities among the German titles. It may be of value to note the few following slips: p. 92, type 34 resembles Ludowici's TI' not TI (which is

Drag. type 79); p. 93, (first line) 35 = 35 Drag.; p. 174, type 175 is an imitation of Drag. 24/25, not 23/24; p. 255, SACIROF stamp, second line: A.D. 181–180 should read A.D. 161–180.

In conclusion, it must be remembered that this is only the first of the long-looked-for special reports on the small finds of the Silchester collection in the Reading Museum. After this splendid start on Mr. May's part archaeologists will now look forward to further publications dealing with the coins, metal, bone, glass, stone and other portable objects found on this site.

A. G. K. H.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ENGLISH BUILDING CONSTRUCTION. By C. F. Innocent. $8\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$, xiv+294 pp. 73 illustrations. Cambridge: University Press. 1916. 10s. 6d. n.

It is a little over nineteen years since Mr. S. O. Addy's *The Evolution of the English House* called attention to the archaeological interest of the old cottages and other humble buildings which survive in large numbers throughout the rural districts of England. The originality and value of that work, in spite of its highly disputable, though ably maintained, ecclesiological theories, have been recognised by all students of the origin of the English house-plan; and it is natural that the author of the book before us should name Mr. Addy foremost of those to whom he is indebted for advice and information. Mr. Innocent's investigations, the fruits of which first appeared in a series of articles in *The Building News*, have lain for the most part in the south-west Yorkshire district which provided Mr. Addy with many of his examples and has been a source of inspiration to more than one good archaeologist. He has confined himself exclusively to the simplest developments of early building which bear no relation to the succession of 'styles' familiar to the architectural antiquary, and to those traditional materials and methods of construction which, in the hands of generations of local workmen, were the natural offspring of local conditions of soil and climate.

Although the book is contributed to a Technical series and might therefore be expected to be a manual for the modern builder, it is wholly preoccupied with the past. There can be no better teacher of the history of his art and the crafts which have ministered to it than an architect endowed with the historical sense; and the builder will learn much from Mr. Innocent. On the other hand, Mr. Innocent is fully alive to the break in historical continuity which is the consequence of changed industrial conditions. Economic and artistic development are irreconcilable; revivals of local craftsmanship, however desirable they may be in theory, are sporadic efforts which cannot contend in the long run against the pressure of modern tendencies. On this point Mr. Innocent is clear and precise. 'Civilisation,' he says, 'has moved forward on the road of Progress, and in so doing has left Art forlorn by the wayside'; and his conclusion is that 'the value of old buildings as works of art does not lie so much in their suitability for

reproduction as in their power for inspiration, in the intangible principles which were given expression in the different materials and workmanship, whose story in England has been partly told in this book.' This is cold comfort, not merely for the antiquarian revivalist, but for those as well who are seeking, with more enlightenment, to bridge over the gulf of aesthetic apathy that separates us from the final age of English art; but the general truth of the statement is undeniable.

No one, however reluctant he may be to mourn with Mr. Innocent at the grave-side of national art, will fail to recognise his sympathy with that art in its least sophisticated forms. One of the chief merits of this clearly-written succession of chapters, which, starting with the earliest types of dwelling-construction, proceeds through timber-building to the various methods of walling, flooring and roofing, and thence to the minor subjects of doors, windows and chimneys, is the author's painstaking research in the literature of his theme. His notes on the terminology of materials, tools and processes, although not exhaustive, are accurate and helpful. His chapter upon the carpenter is rather insufficient as regards that important person himself, and deals at more length with his tools and the quality of his timber; but it emphasises in an excellent paragraph the thoroughly practical nature of the mediaeval craftsman, which we are prone to forget in our admiration of the finished results of his handicraft. It is somewhat to be regretted that the restriction of his subject to the treatment of inexpensive and easily obtained material forbade more than passing references to the use of brick and lead in the middle ages: what little he has to say on these points makes us wish for more. His interest in elementary forms of construction, however, seems to have been pursued to the neglect of the great masterpieces of mediaeval architecture. Otherwise, he must have recognised that the object of the arches beneath the triforium roofs at Durham was not to carry the wooden roofs (p. 71), but to abut the high vaults.

The book is clearly printed and illustrated upon that clammy and malodorous paper which is a drawback apparently inseparable from the reproduction of process-blocks. We notice a few errors, 'Firstsaule,' 'Hochsaule' (p. 18), should be 'Firstsaule,' 'Hochsaule.' *Cheveux de frise* (p. 22) is not the plural of *cheval de frise*, and implies a wrong interpretation of the term. In the phrase *de tabulis lignis levigatisque* (p. 108), *lignis* is an obvious misprint for *ligneis*. Out of a large number of names of places, a few are wrongly given. Chilborn (p. iii) should be Chibburn. The first word of Fenny Bentley (p. 126) is not usually spelt Ffenny. Great Cotes, Lincolnshire (p. 135) is more familiar to-day as Great Coates. Skirlaugh (p. 141) is not in Leicestershire. Speen Abbey (p. 150) is unknown among religious houses: the place meant is, no doubt, Shene priory. The reference, however, is to a document which mentions Shene, but does not concern the priory, and the mistake seems to be due to Mr. Innocent's reliance on second-hand authority. Sometimes the modern name of a place might be given instead of an old form. Crakehore (p. 33) is now spelt Cracoe; the wood of Aclay (p. 36) was at Aycliffe, near Darlington. In quoting Welsh names, Mr. Innocent once or twice, as in 'Pontrhydd-fendigaid' (p. 69), is uncertain about his consonants; but this is a failing which he shares with many Englishmen, and we can easily forgive a wrongly

reduplicated *d* to one who has introduced us, with the aid of more than one inviting photographic print, to the remote Yorkshire hamlet with the inimitable name of Wigtwizzle.

A. H. T.

THE RELATION OF SCULPTURE TO ARCHITECTURE. By T. P. Bennett, A.R.I.B.A. Cambridge: University Press. 1916. 15s. n.

Although Mr. Bennett's book contains a brief chapter upon the history of sculpture in relation to its architectural setting, his interest in the past is somewhat perfunctory, and his paragraphs upon the mediaeval period are a singularly commonplace tribute to an age in which, at its highest point, sculpture grew freely out of architecture as its most natural and noblest meod of expression. But, as he reminds us in his introduction, the sculptor-mason is no longer with us. The architect and the sculptor have drifted apart; we have become accustomed to watch the most incongruous exhibitions of their arts in juxtaposition without surprise or alarm; and, where sculpture and architecture are in conflict, there are probably ninety-nine people interested in the sculpture for its own sake, irrespective of its actual merit, to one who realises the contradiction between it and its surroundings. At a time, however, when large monumental schemes and the town-planning movement, with its necessary questions as to the treatment of large open spaces, are on the increase, the problem which Mr. Bennett discusses is likely to force itself more upon the public attention. Such undertakings as the Victoria memorial in London and the group of new public buildings at Cardiff are signs of our growing disposition to compete with foreign countries, far more alert to their opportunities than ourselves; and the most unobservant among us cannot but be conscious of the discrepancy between their effect and that of the mean discordancies with which, for nearly a century past, we have been too easily satisfied.

The subject falls naturally into two divisions. There is the case in which sculpture is frankly a decorative adjunct to architecture, and the case of public monuments in which the use of sculpture is an object of first importance. In this second case, however, the architectural effect of the placing of the monument and of the union between the sculptured figure or group and its supports is a main condition of complete success. Architecture is still the dominating factor, and the sculptor must work in harmony with the architect and in subordination to his views. This is illustrated at length by Mr. Bennett, with constant reference to his excellent series of photographic pictures and his admirably clear plans of sites, drawn by himself, the chief details of which can be taken in at a glance. The divisions of his argument are indicated by in-set summaries of the subject of each paragraph or series of paragraphs, reference to which is facilitated by a not always accurate index. He writes with considerable lucidity, but we sometimes feel that his aesthetic sensibility is in advance of his power of expression. This, however, is a defect common to many creative artists who put their theories into print, and Mr. Bennett practises the art which he preaches.

Satisfaction to the eye alone is not enough. Some readers will probably think that Mr. Bennett is fastidiously exacting in his demands for the complete intellectual fitness of the monument to its position. In answer to his facile argument that the statue of Richard I is out of harmony with the associations of Old Palace Yard it may be pleaded that, if his strict principles were carried to their logical conclusions, this memorial of an absentee monarch, who occupies, rightly or wrongly, an abiding place in the highest traditions of the national spirit, would be exiled from London altogether to the comparative seclusion of Dover or Sandwich. It seems to us that there is a place for this symbol of royal force among the monuments of the central site of national history, and that Mr. Bennett has overlooked the fact that the memories of the palace of Westminster are not exclusively connected with the development of modern democracy. But his main contention is a salutary reminder of the Vitruvian maxim which requires of the artist a discipline 'condecorata et abundans eruditionibus variis et pluribus,' and should be a warning against the selection of sites for monuments without regard to the subject and the thoughts which, to do it full justice, its surroundings should stimulate. His remarks on the more restricted topics of the suitability of monumental design to its subjects, the union of various materials in a monument, and the treatment, for example, of the equestrian monument or the bust in relation to its pedestal, are thoughtful and illuminating; and most of his readers will turn with curiosity to his discussion of columns and of that most hazardous of all forms, the triumphal arch, and to his criticisms of those monumental lay-outs which are the most obvious fields for the proper correlation of architecture and sculpture. It seems to us that the conspicuous examples of these last which he illustrates achieve their undoubtedly imposing effect, for the most part, by mere bigness and pretentiousness. Taken by itself, the great monument at Coblenz has its fine points, and we can understand that the Prussian traveller, as he approaches it by water, feels a certain kindling of the spirit at the presence of so huge a symbol of the Prussian hegemony upon its almost unequalled site. But in features where Mr. Bennett discovers masterly strength we are inclined to see a force which is merely masterful; and actually a more signal example of the usurpation of a site at the expense of its surroundings and historical traditions could not be cited. This is unwittingly disclosed by the photographs given in the text. The monument is a *parvenu* intruding upon the ancient town which lies hidden behind its interfering bulk; while the spires of the Castorskirche, peeping timidly up behind it, offer a mild rebuke to the assertiveness of mere colossal force which does its best to efface the impressions of an old and genial civilisation. But Mr. Bennett is a thorough modernist with catholic tastes; and, if we cannot altogether forgive his evident want of sympathy with mediaeval art, we may at least do justice to his distrust of excessive ornament and his preference of bold solidity to effeminate excess of detail, merely remarking that his love of severe refinement, which is well expressed in his own design for the monument of a great scholar, is not wholly in keeping with his sympathy for the harsh massiveness, with its total lack of grace and feeling, which is the prevailing feature of the monuments of modern German imperialism. We could wish that his sense of the fitness of things had led to a more systematic naming of his illustrations. Such hybrid forms as

'Alexandre III Bridge,' 'Kaiser Frederick,' 'Frederick de Merode,' and, more conspicuous, 'Park Monceau' and 'Column de Congrès' should be avoided, as well as definite mistakes, such as 'Logetta' for Loggetta and 'Quinten' for Quentin Matsys. Prince 'Amodeus' of Savoy seems to be a confusion of a Christian name habitual to that ancient family with the certainly not Christian name of a supernatural character in the Book of Tobit. These errors also appear in the text.

A. H. T.