

NOTICES OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL PUBLICATIONS

ANGLO-SAXON ART TO A.D. 900. By T. D. KENDRICK. London: Methuen & Co., 1938. Pp. xxi, 227; 104 plates and 25 figures in text. 9 in. × 5½ in. Price 25s.

Mr. Kendrick has written a remarkable book. In the following notes I can only hope briefly to indicate its scope and some of the personal reactions of one reader. It is so crowded with fresh and stimulating ideas that at this range, and on this scale, detailed criticism of any but a few of the more familiar points would be as valueless as it would be impertinent.

Mr. Kendrick's dual method of approach is already familiar. It is based upon a minutely objective stylistic analysis coupled with a strongly personal expression of aesthetic values. The latter is secondary but it is naturally this which emerges most clearly at first reading. In the opening sentence we read that 'the early history of art in England . . . is best understood if we regard it as being in the main the recital of a protracted series of conflicts between the mutually irreconcilable principles of the barbaric and the classical aesthetic systems.' There can be no doubt where Mr. Kendrick's sympathies lie. Barbarism wins every time. It is an uncompromising point of view, and the reader can take it or leave it. Mr. Kendrick does not for instance convince me of the 'relentless and implacable Celtic wonder' of the Carlisle head (Pl. IX, 4); and there will probably be others who will remain immune to the 'rebellious beauty' of the Pervica monument (Pl. XI, 1). There is nothing to be gained by arguing that sort of point. But it is worth mentioning, if only for fear that disagreement upon such subjective aesthetic issues may obscure the wealth of objective reasoning which forms the bones of the book.

The two opening chapters on Early British Art and Roman Britain set the stage for what follows. Disagreement upon the aesthetic worth of Romano-British sculpture cannot alter the value of the analysis of the Roman elements which were to play a part in the art of subsequent periods. Particularly attractive is the comparison between the attitude towards pattern displayed by many Romano-British mosaic pavements and that revealed in later Celtic manuscripts. The similarities are striking, and the possibility of an immediate connection is certainly a fruitful subject for further inquiry.

Thanks to Mr. Kendrick, hanging-bowls (chapter iii) are no longer a cause of dissension. With his contention that they are to be regarded almost exclusively as the product of free 'Arthurian' Britain and with the implications of that view as to the social conditions in the conquered Saxon areas, it is still possible to disagree. But no serious student will be found to contend with his brilliant analysis of their essentially native, non-Saxon character, particularly now that he has modified his chronology. In *Antiquity* vi (1932), 183, he maintained that 'many of them had been made and

were in use before the Romans left the country.' We are now faced with the less provocative statement (pp. 50-1) that two plain bowls belong to the fourth or early fifth century, and that of the enamelled bowls some 'are ornamented in a fifth-century style and were probably made not very long after the Roman period was over.' In this guise Mr. Kendrick's thesis may fairly claim to represent the ranks of orthodoxy.

A more controversial field is provided by the Jutish cloisonné jewellery. Here Mr. Kendrick's account is of necessity too concise to carry full conviction. These brooches are, he maintains, the outcome of a tradition already established in Kent in late-Roman times. It seems to be common ground that the ultimate origin of this jewellery-type is to be sought within the bounds of the Roman Empire, probably in types current in the eastern Mediterranean. It is their immediate origin, and hence their chronology, which is at stake. As usual, Mr. Kendrick's technical analysis is masterly. The cloisonné belongs to the same, ultimately 'Danubian Gothic,' school as the sword of Childeric. But since 'no continental piece can be produced that makes any pretensions to being a model for the Kentish jewellers who made the first of our cloisonné brooches,' it follows that they must represent an adaptation of continental technique to the reproduction of provincial Roman designs that were already current in Kent. But what is the case for the fifth century craftsmanship upon which this new technique was grafted? When we come down to brass tacks it seems to rest upon four insignificant little button-brooches, to which a late fourth-century date can, if necessary, be assigned (p. 67, Fig. 13); upon the reappearance of Roman designs, e.g. that of a brooch from Chester (Fig. 12a), upon Kentish jewellery (Fig. 12b and c); and upon the reappearance of certain Roman technical tricks. But the designs are admittedly 'probably eastern Roman' (p. 64) and one can say no more of them than that they seem to have been current in Britain as elsewhere in the late-Roman world. They are certainly not specifically British; nor were the technical tricks in question. The crux of the matter seems to be expressed on p. 71, where Mr. Kendrick is driven to his conclusion by the fact that 'the jewelled disc-brooches which are obviously the earliest have no foreign counterpart at all.' The logic is relentless. But it suggests that the premises may require re-examination. On what does the obviously early quality of these brooches depend? The problem is not here fully discussed; but reference to Mr. Kendrick's original article in *Antiquity* vii (1933), 429-52, shows that it depends upon the typological sequence there established. There is so much that is obviously right in that analysis, that it clearly *ought* all to be right. And yet (to take the instance upon which Mr. Kendrick here lays stress) is it really impossible that the Kingston and Sarre brooches may be roughly contemporary? The difference in quality is obvious enough, especially that of the back-plates (Pl. XXXI, 6 and 7). Yet it cannot be denied that workmanship very similar to that of the back of the Sarre brooch was in fact already long current in Kent

(e.g. portions of the Lullingstone bowl); and the comparison which is drawn (Fig. 12) between the Chester brooch and the Sarre brooch becomes singularly inept if the latter has to be put at the end of a long evolutionary series. Mr. Kendrick has a formidable case. But it rests upon a typological scheme that has never fully been put before us, for his original article in *Antiquity* (vii, 1933, 429-52) was self-confessedly only the *prolegomena* to the subject. Until the stylistic case has been set out in all its completeness (a task obviously out of all proportion to the scope of the present book) Mr. Kendrick would himself, I am sure, agree that the last word has yet to be said.

I have ventured to point out at length some possible grounds of disagreement with one section of Mr. Kendrick's book, not so much because this particular point is fundamental to his thesis as because it does suggest one of the reasons why the author so often seems to find it necessary to range himself against the muddle-headed ranks of 'academic archaeology.' Abstract discussion on method cannot hope to be profitable, for it is rarely a simple question of black or white, of a choice between two opposed ways of approach; rather it is one of emphasis, of the amount of weight to be given in a particular instance to each of the possibly conflicting lines of reasoning. It would be as manifestly ludicrous to say that Mr. Kendrick disregards archaeological evidence, *i.e.* the evidence of closed finds, of distribution, etc., upon which the 'academic archaeologist' may be presumed to rely, as it would be to suggest that the latter gentleman is unaware of the value of Mr. Kendrick's stylistic and typological analysis. Nevertheless one wonders how far either side (if two sides there must be) is entitled to disregard the other. To take a familiar example. The Bewcastle cross used to be dated to c. 670-80 on the (*per se*) not unreasonable ground that to that period belonged the persons whose names are inscribed upon it; while the so-called 'Acca' cross at Hexham was ascribed to Bishop Acca, and hence dated c. 740, on what must be admitted to be intrinsically far less cogent evidence (Kendrick, p. 134, note 2). W. G. Collingwood (*Northumbrian Crosses of the Pre-Norman Age*: cf. *Antiquity* vi (1932), 35-54), while accepting the identification of the Acca cross, objected to that of the Bewcastle cross on stylistic grounds as a hundred years too early. Mr. Kendrick, in similar vein, assigns the Bewcastle cross, on the grounds of manuscript analogies, to a date c. 700. Now Mr. Kendrick, is the person best qualified to judge on such a matter, and I do not for a moment question his dating. But it would have been a concession to frail followers to give somewhere in the text a hint that this dating does in fact involve the abandonment of one of the few solid landmarks which we once thought we possessed, the more so when we find a few pages later orthodoxy raising its head triumphant in vindication of the dating ascribed to the Acca cross. The orthodox may often have a poor case. But in the past, over the hanging-bowls and to some extent over the Kentish jewellery, Mr. Kendrick has shown himself prepared to meet them on their own ground. On matters so controversial it might well in fairness to the reader have been

made more clear how far the chronology proposed is rooted in common ground, and how far it relies simply upon the internal coherence of an elaborate and often very convincing evolutionary scheme.

One further point. Mr. Kendrick himself calls attention to the complexity of the problem of the crosses and eschews the task of examining their chronology and stylistic interrelation until the completion of the much-needed survey, of which he himself is the inspiration and author. This must be regarded as an introduction to the study; and it is no doubt the demands of clarity and concision which invest it with a certainty of statement that is sometimes a little surprising. Yet, even granted that Mr. Kendrick has moved far from that vision of ordered simplicity of development which inspired W. G. Collingwood, nevertheless there is implicit in his approach the notion that the crosses do contain within themselves the story of an orderly, if complex, development, and that upon this internal evidence their history can be solved.

Is this a valid premise? Mere doubt is not enough, and a parallel instance may be instructive. There was in the Visigothic kingdom of south-west France in the late fifth and early sixth century, a period of little over 50 or 60 years, a flourishing school of sculpture, of which portions of over 120 sarcophagi are known (see the paper forthcoming in *Archaeologia* for 1938; the dating rests upon a combination of historical, archaeological and stylistic facts). Like the English crosses this sculpture, though it contains local elements, has no local precursor; nor was the style imported ready-made from abroad. It must represent the reaction of local talent to a stimulus from without, which in the absence of any external evidence can be presumed to have taken the form of the arrival at the Visigothic court of craftsmen from such centres as Marseilles, whence are derived some of the motifs and stylistic tricks current in this Visigothic sculpture. Now it has been argued of the English crosses (W. G. Collingwood, *Antiquity* vi (1932), 36) that they are costly works, that they must therefore have been rare, and that in consequence we are justified in treating the surviving specimens as pretty fairly representative of the output of the age. If that is so our contention falls to the ground, for nobody will deny that it is obviously illogical to treat each cross as a *lusus naturae* uninfluenced by its fellows. But if the surviving crosses are neither sufficiently numerous nor fully representative, interpretation can only acquire a logicity at the expense of ignoring the hundred and one incalculable chances which may have governed the production of each monument. Like the English crosses the Visigothic sarcophagi are costly works and the surviving fragments might with equal reason be regarded as fully representative. So in fact, broadly speaking, they are, for these sarcophagi are in general far more uniform even than the crosses. But in small details, e.g. in the naturalism of the foliage, in the quality of the scroll-work, in the classicism or barbarism of the figure style (some at any rate of the criteria upon which Mr. Kendrick's analysis is based), there is a considerable diversity. The

figure-style ranges from a barbarism, that would delight Mr. Kendrick's heart, as on the sarcophagus at Loudun (Le Blant, *Les Sarcophages chrétiens de la Gaule*, Pl. XXIII) to the debased but unmistakable classicism of that from Castelnau-de-Guers (Le Blant, *op. cit.*, Pl. XXXII). So too it is possible to construct the most satisfying armchair typologies to account for the development of such Visigothic motifs as the vine-scroll and the acanthus-scroll. And yet a sarcophagus at Bordeaux will carry an 'early' vine-scroll side by side with a developed acanthus-form, while a similar one at Toulouse has a 'late' vine-scroll and an 'early' acanthus. Typology is here in fact demonstrably a blunt weapon. Even when it can be successfully applied in detail, one is left with the uncomfortable feeling that the discovery of a fresh sarcophagus might so easily knock down the whole edifice. The fact is that we simply do not, and never shall, know whether sculptor A had just been visiting his aunt in Bordeaux, whether B was rather taken with the little bit of old carving sticking out of the town-wall, whether C was feeling out of sorts and had too many orders to finish by Christmas.

This is not to question the value of typology and of stylistic analysis both for preliminary classification and for indicating broad lines of development. That is self-evident. But how finely can they be used? We are not likely, as W. G. Collingwood rather charmingly remarked in this connection, to find many fresh early crosses. But safe in that comfortable assurance, can we really claim for our stylistic analysis such certainty of aim that we can say of Bewcastle 'This cannot be 680: it must be 700'? I am sorry to revert to Bewcastle, but it is after all an object of which we have all heard; and it is upon Mr. Kendrick's treatment of such things that we are bound to form an opinion of those sections where we can only humbly follow his guidance. For upon the subsequent development of sculpture and upon the astonishing art revealed in the manuscripts Mr. Kendrick speaks with such learning and has so much to say that is new and stimulating, that any commentary would be quite beyond the capacities of the reviewer, who can only record the dizzy admiration with which he panted, pursuing, to the final page. Mr. Kendrick has indeed given us a great deal to think about.

The plates (which are numbered in Arabic figures in the text, in Roman at the end of the book—an irritating arrangement to those who anyway always have to count the X's) are a great deal clearer than at first they appear. For their quantity and for the skill with which they have been chosen there can only be admiration. The 'Gourdon pattern' (*sic*, p. 71) was I am sure only inserted to avoid disappointing the reviewer, who must be allowed to show he has read the book. A brief bibliography, e.g. of the author's own previous articles on the subject, would have saved the reader a good deal of hunting in foot-notes.

On re-reading these notes I realise that I have stressed criticism of a few points at the expense of the praise and admiration which the book as a whole is bound to evoke. For even where it is possible to differ with Mr. Kendrick, one is painfully aware that such

difference is only possible because of the work that he has done, here and previously. He has produced a fine book, one for which we owe him a deep debt of gratitude; we shall await impatiently the successor he has promised us.

J. B. W. P.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE PREHISTORIC SOCIETY for 1938 (January-July). Edited by J. G. D. CLARK, M.A., Ph.D., F.S.A. Price to non-members, 10s.

This volume fully attains the standard we have learnt to expect of the Prehistoric Society. Its 230 pages are packed with authoritative material, and indeed were members of the Society treated to the Proceedings only they would still have full value for their subscriptions. The volume contains nine papers, of which all but the first deal entirely with British archaeology. Dr. Dorothy Garrod's Presidential Address to Section H of the British Association two years ago is here printed in full and amplified. She reviews the discoveries made in the Upper Palaeolithic in recent years, in Europe, Russia, and Africa, to which her own work at Mount Carmel and other sites in Palestine are noteworthy additions.

Dr. Cecil Curwen publishes a summary of his numerous papers on the early development of agriculture in Britain. The paper is divided into two parts, dealing respectively with the pastoral stage and the stage of settled villages. For the former we have the evidence of Neolithic and Bronze Age cereals found in Britain, the forms of flint sickles and sickle-flints, querns, and, less certainly, corn-plots. Dr. Curwen thinks that the nomadism of the pastoral stage, beginning in the Neolithic period, reached its maximum in the Middle Bronze Age. The primitive little corn-plots were the only form of cultivation, and they imply the absence of the plough. Wheat is the only known British Neolithic cereal, and there is no evidence of barley until the Middle Bronze Age. The stage of settled villages begins with the Late Bronze Age immigrants, who introduced the Celtic field system, with the use of the two-ox plough and some kind of rotation of crops. This system was normal in the Iron Age and persisted throughout the Roman period. The many Iron Age sites excavated have yielded barley, oats, rye and beans in addition to wheat. Iron sickles are frequent on habitation sites and vary greatly in size and pattern. The saddle quern continues in use throughout the Iron Age, while the rotary quern was introduced into Britain about 100 B.C. Two Sussex sites of the Late Bronze Age—Plumpton Plain and New Barn Down—are the earliest known settlements having a Celtic field-system. Small iron 'shoes' suitable for a light two-ox plough belong to the pre-Belgic and non-Belgic cultures. With the Belgae came the heavy wheeled plough, making strip-cultivation possible.

Mr. Stuart Piggott provides a *pièce de résistance* with 55 pages on the Early Bronze Age in Wessex. The monograph is illustrated with his own excellent drawings, and he brings together the great

wealth of available material to demonstrate his thesis of yet another prehistoric invasion of Britain. The immigrants this time are the aristocratic bearers of a rich culture from Brittany, and they arrived towards the close of the Beaker period. The culture retained its individuality and dominance in Wessex until the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age; the period 1700-1400 B.C. is suggested for its duration. In the appendices to the paper one slip may be noticed, among the handled bowls—the numbers 3 and 4 on Fig. 23 should be transposed.

Mr. W. F. Grimes describes his excavation of a round barrow at Llanbeddian, Glamorgan. The bronze axe with incipient side flanges found in the primary burial gives a date about the 'turn' of the Early and Middle Bronze Ages, and both it and the associated flint arrowheads point to a connection with Brittany. The barrow was surrounded by a circular revetment of stone-walling, which is well shown by photographs. From these latter one may indeed appreciate the meticulous cleaning-up to which Mr. Grimes and his colleagues must have addressed themselves before the camera did its work.

The Morven Institute is fortunate in having had the opportunity of excavating an undisturbed burial chamber in the Lanhill long barrow, near Chippenham. Nine individuals, probably belonging to three generations of one family, were represented by the skeletal material, and Messrs. Keiller and Piggott, from a careful study of the disposition of the remains, are able to show that the burials were made successively. The detailed report on the skeletons is by Dr. A. J. E. Cave, who finds them to be of 'Mediterranean' stock; they are therefore normal long barrow folk, and their occurrence without admixture of a Beaker element suggests that the devolution of the long barrow plan was far advanced before the arrival of the new invaders in Wiltshire. A minor osteological point may be noted. Skeleton No. 6 shows unilateral sacralization of the last lumbar vertebra, which 'appears to have been wholly symptomless.' It may be pointed out, however, that in certain quarters this condition is now regarded as a contributory cause of lumbago and sciatica.

Mr. Ward Perkins' description of a late Iron Age site at Crayford may be welcomed not only on its own very evident merits but as dealing with a period not often represented in recent volumes of the Society. The site was discovered during building operations, and detailed observation was impossible, but a large amount of material was rescued. The coarser wares are largely of Iron Age A derivation but they appear to be contemporary with a small group of Belgic wares. Mr. Perkins discusses at length two distinctive forms of decorated pottery, which he classifies as South-eastern Iron Age B—an omphalos bowl and a squat pedestal vessel. His contention that these are intrusive types of the last half-century before the Roman Conquest rather than evolutions from earlier Iron Age types in Sussex, might, as he remarks, be modified by further discoveries of non-Belgic material in Kent and Essex. The paper is illustrated with some 70 drawings of pottery—a most useful corpus from a

region in which such quantities of published material have hitherto been rare. Mr. Perkins departs from a well-established ceramographic convention by making daring restorations in firm line in his drawings; No. 6 on Fig. 5, No. 1 on Fig. 6, No. 1 on Fig. 7 are cases in point, where the missing portions might rather have been indicated in broken line, in the usual way. The iron object, No. 3 on Fig. 1, is the tip of a plough-share, not of a coulter.

Mrs. Piggott is to be congratulated on having been able to recover a great deal of evidence from the necessarily hasty excavation of a Middle Bronze Age barrow at Latch Farm, Christchurch, Hants. In the southern half of the barrow was a large Late Bronze Age urnfield, including seventy burials with pots, which are nearly all illustrated. Distribution maps of globular urns and of barrel and bucket urns in Wessex are appended, and serve to show that 'Southampton Water appears to have been of quite secondary importance as a port of entry' for the Deverel-Rimbury people. The plan of the barrow (Fig. 1) is reproduced on rather a small scale, so that the stippling of the mound and the numbers of the burials are somewhat smudgy.

Mrs. Clifford describes her excavation of the Nympsfield long barrow, also the neighbouring round cairn, with its curious boat-shaped chamber, known as the Soldier's Grave.

The volume terminates with the usual notes on current prehistory. These include an enlarged re-publication of the plan of the Neolithic house recently excavated on Haldon, Devon, by Dr. E. H. Willock—the first such structure to be discovered in these islands.

F. C.

AN INTRODUCTION TO FRENCH CHURCH ARCHITECTURE.
By ARTHUR GARDNER. Cambridge University Press, 1938. Pp. viii + 86
(8 in. by 5½ in.), 258 plates. Price 18s.

Mr. Arthur Gardner has produced a simple and attractive handbook to French medieval architecture which will be of the greatest service to those whose enthusiasm of these matters is not accompanied by a very wide knowledge of architecture. The author has set forth clearly and concisely the main lines of development and the main characteristics of each phase and wisely abstains from entering into those controversial matters which would be largely unintelligible to the general reader.

The main attraction of the book is the splendid series of photographs, from the author's own negatives, each one of which is accompanied by an explanatory note, pointing out the chief features illustrated. These are collected at the end of the volume and form an admirable annotated album of French medieval architecture. French sculpture, of which Mr. Gardner has made a special study, is not dealt with in this book except in so far as it forms part of the architectural design. We can thoroughly recommend the volume to all interested in medieval architecture.

A. W. C.

SHAKESPEARIAN COSTUME FOR STAGE AND SCREEN. By F. M. KELLY. Crown 4to. Black, 1938. Pp. vi + 132; plates 9, figs. 93. Price 8s. 6d.

Mr. Kelly's knowledge of period costume is like Sam Weller's knowledge of London—extensive and peculiar. He has designed it as an artist, lectured on it as a scholar, worn it as an actor and studied its construction with the leading Continental authority on medieval tailoring. The result is that, to all intents and purposes, it has ceased to be 'period costume' and has become 'clothes' whenever he writes of it. That, *inter alia*, is why his latest book is so interesting to the ordinary reader, apart from its undoubted usefulness to actor, producer and costumier alike. Other writers have given us full and detailed accounts of what was worn between 1560 and 1620, as we can see from the bibliographies on pages 59 and 125, but Mr. Kelly tells us who wore it, and why, and in what circumstances. In so doing, he gives an idea of the immense variety of sixteenth-century styles—a variety unrealised by those who think of everyone indiscriminately as wearing 'stock Elizabethan' doublet and hose. We begin to know the Englishman of that day a great deal better when we are told a little of his personal tastes and fashions in dress, and understand how much of it was intended for use, and not for needless ornament. The extravagances made familiar to us by so many writers are here relegated to their proper place—the Court, and the backs of fashionable young men—and we are reminded of simpler habits to be seen here and there, the cassock or leather 'arming-doublet' of the soldier in undress, or the old-fashioned gown and flat black bonnet retained by the professional man.

An entertaining chapter is devoted to the 'nice conduct' of period costume, and is followed by some notes on individual plays of Shakespeare. The Histories, and the Greek and Roman plays, are lightly touched upon, with cross-references to suitable sources of information, but the plays that require Elizabethan setting are discussed in greater detail. Of particular interest are the notes on *Othello* and *Much Ado About Nothing*. Mr. Kelly's reasons for showing Othello as a negro in European costume, not as a 'tawny Moor,' are eminently convincing, and in discussing the other play he puts forward the interesting suggestion that a comedy set in Messina, and containing 'Don John, the Prince's bastard brother' as a character, must have turned the thoughts of a contemporary audience towards the Holy League and Don John of Austria, and that it may, therefore, be legitimately costumed after the Spanish fashion as regards its princely characters. It is perhaps to be regretted that his notes on *The Merchant of Venice* make no mention of the distinctive dress of Venetian citizens and Venetian Jews as described by Fynes Moryson, and more careful proof-reading would have amended an erroneous statement about Mr. Winkle's fancy-dress, but these are minor points in a work at once useful and entertaining.

M. R. H.

THE SHELDONS. By E. A. B. BARNARD, M.A., F.S.A., F.R.Hist.S.
Cambridge University Press, 1936. Crown 8vo. Pp. xii + 140; ten
plates. Price 7s. 6d.

The name of Sheldon is inseparably associated with the earliest English tapestry-loom, and this little book has been compiled in memory of the late Mr. Rees Price, who devoted so much of his time and energy to research concerning the history of the Sheldon family. A brief account of some fifteenth-century Sheldons leads on to the story of that William Sheldon who established the Warwickshire tapestry-loom in the days of Elizabeth, and thence we follow the fortunes and alliances of Ralph, Edward and another William, till we reach the 'Great Sheldon' of the seventeenth century, who became a noted collector of books, coins and manuscripts, was temporarily arrested in the 'Popish Plot' scare of 1678, and was buried with some pomp in 1684 at Beoley, where he lies under the epitaph 'Quondam Radulphus Sheldon, nunc cinis, pulvis, nihil.' He was childless, and his estate passed to the son of a cousin.

The second part of the book treats of the Worcestershire branch of the family, notably that Captain William Sheldon who had four wives and approximately fifteen children, was made a Gentleman Pensioner and Deputy-Governor of Guernsey, and died there, deep in debt, in 1680. It draws a rather depressing picture of the state of things in the Services under Charles II. Again and again the Deputy-Governor reports his urgent need of money to supply his troops with the necessary stores and pay, entries here and there show that he has had to advance sums out of his own pocket, and the list of his assets at his death, including some silver and pewter plate, kitchen utensils, bedding and linen, a sword and swordbelt, three trunks and 'One Old Hatt,' shows little enough to balance liabilities of over seven thousand pounds.

Mr. Barnard has filled his pages with facts and references, but the result is, perhaps, a surfeit of information about the minor alliances and estates of people in whom it is difficult to take a real interest. There is little about the tapestry which has made the Sheldons famous, though that little is particularly interesting, as when Mr. Barnard points out, in Chapter III, how the two remaining pieces of a tapestry map of the West Country commemorate the marriage of William Sheldon's son Ralph to Anne Throckmorton of Coughton Court. The various members of the family are presented to us without much information, and the names of their wives, children and estates help but little to bring them to life. The most vivid chapter in the book is that dealing with the chapel and vault of the family in Beoley Church. Mr. Barnard is now writing of his own experience, and the chapter ends with the official report of the draining and repairing of the vault and chapel, a much-needed piece of work carried out largely through the efforts of Mr. Barnard himself, Dr. John Humphreys and Mr. Rees Price, who have fully earned the gratitude of all who strive to keep our old buildings from decay.

M. R. H.