Notices of Archaeological Publications.


The valley of the Tweed has, at least since the days of Scott, attracted the interest of the archaeologist and the historian, but hitherto that interest has been mainly centred on its mediaeval remains, Berwick, Norham, and Wark, Kelso, Dryburgh, and above all Melrose. But *vixere fortes ante Agamemnona*, and in this magnificently produced volume we have a record of a Roman fortress which in the first and second centuries must have played an important part in the history of Northern Britain, a history which even now we can read only in a fragmentary form, though the Newstead excavations have made it decidedly less fragmentary than it was a few years ago.

It is difficult to exaggerate the importance of the work which Mr. Curie has carried out since the beginning of 1905. He has thrown much additional light on the details of Roman life in a frontier district during an eventful period, when the tide of conquest still surged forward and then came to a standstill: he has unearthed evidence which forms a basis of immense value to workers on other sites, and he has set an example of patient investigation and careful research which those workers will do well to follow. The old days, when the success of an excavation was judged mainly by the number of inscriptions unearthed, when the scientific study of pottery and other small objects was still a thing of the future, are over and done with, and Mr. Curle's book is, if not the first, at any rate one of the most important products of the new era in British archaeology.

But it is the contribution which this work makes to the history of Roman Britain that forms perhaps the most important factor of all. Tacitus has given us an account of Agricola's campaigns, written with the object of enhancing the reputation of his father-in-law and of pleasing the average cultured Roman of his day; but the *Agricola* lacks most of the details for which the modern archaeologist craves. The deficiency can be supplied only by excavation, and Mr. Curle may be congratulated on the amount of matter which he has contributed to what we may call the necessary commentary on, and supplement to the treatise of Tacitus.

The route followed by Agricola in his northern advance has been the subject of much speculation; but recent discoveries make it probable that he reached Carlisle in a.d. 79, worked his way eastwards to Corbridge, and then advanced by the line of the Dere Street (nowadays often called Watling Street), a road which can still be traced as far north as Newstead, where the earliest record of his presence seems to be the "great camp," covering an area of forty-nine acres in the immediate vicinity of the fortress proper. This camp, which was probably occupied for a brief period only by a legionary force, seems to mark a stage in the advance of the invading army, or some portion of it, and no doubt it would be reoccupied
for a short time when troops were withdrawn; but such an encampment would be far too large for a garrison posted here to guard the line of communications during the progress of the campaign, and to hold in submission the territory which that campaign added to the Roman empire. For these two purposes Agricola must have employed a smaller, though still strong garrison, occupying a fortress of appropriate size and more efficiently defended. Hence we find, a little to the west of the "great camp," the fortress proper of Newstead, with which Mr. Curle's book is principally concerned.

The earliest fort, an earthwork enclosing nearly twelve acres, with its gateways at right angles to the line of the ramparts, certainly belongs to the time of Agricola, and is probably the fort constructed to guard the line of communications during the campaign. This was succeeded by a fort more regular in form and somewhat larger in area, defended by a rampart and triple ditches, with clavicula-shaped or overlapping ditches in front of at least three of the gates. These overlapping ditches have produced first-century pottery, and it seems more than probable that this "second phase," as Mr. Curle calls it, represents the fort constructed not long after the campaign of conquest for the purpose of controlling the conquered territory.

It is clear that this fort was subsequently abandoned, and the date of its evacuation is the subject of some controversy. Dr. Macdonald, who contributes the chapter dealing with the coins, puts the date as late as circ. A.D. 115; but though it is rash to differ from so high an authority, we cannot regard his arguments as convincing: they are largely based on the evidence derived from hoards of coins found in various and not too numerous places; and to compare a hoard with a coin-series from a fairly extensive site is to compare two not exactly similar things. In the one case the coins have been carefully collected, in the other they have, as a general rule, been carelessly dropped. Nor is it safe to accept the theory that a hoard is typical of the coins generally current at any particular date, as a hoard may represent the savings of a lifetime.

There seems to be a distinct gap in the series of bronze coins after about the year A.D. 86, and though it is not disputed that the early occupation continued for a certain time after the recall of Agricola, the evidence does not bear out so late a date as the close of the reign of Trajan. The coins of that emperor seem to have continued in circulation for a considerable period, and specimens in very good condition, particularly denarii, have occurred at Corbridge at levels which may be assigned to the period of Antoninus Pius. It is, of course, inconclusive to compare gold coins with silver or bronze; but still the fact that of a find of 159 gold coins recently found on the Corbridge site, and deposited not earlier than A.D. 159, 47 were minted under Trajan, tends to corroborate the opinion above expressed.

So far as the history of Newstead is concerned, the point is perhaps of small moment, but it gains particular importance as a means of dating the pottery of other sites. At Corbridge, and in other places about the same latitude, "Samian" ware has been found of an early type, though probably later than the Agricola period: this is represented at Newstead, but not, as at Corbridge, in association with the beginnings of the definite second century types, which, if Dr. Macdonald's dating be accepted, must be put
later than the evidence from continental sites suggests. The question must
on our present knowledge be regarded as unsettled, but we are inclined
to place the first evacuation of Newstead at circ. A.D. 100, and to assign the
Corbridge "Samian" of the type mentioned to the reign of Trajan. This,
however, is only an impression, and further excavations at Corbridge and
on other sites may correct it.

In any case we find a period of abandonment, followed by a reoccupation
which may certainly be ascribed to A.D. 140, when Lollius Urbicus carried
Hadrian's frontier northwards and constructed the murus cespiticius of the
northern isthmus; the old site again became a fortress, the ditches over-
lapping three of the gates were filled up, and probably at this date the
earthen rampart was replaced by a stone wall, enclosing an area of nearly
sixteen acres. This extent is striking evidence of the importance of New-
stead, which is by far the largest fort that has yet been discovered in northern
Britain. Legionary encampments, of course, are larger, but they belong
to a different class: elsewhere, both in Scotland and in the north of England,
the ordinary fort seldom exceeds five acres, and the area suggests that
Newstead was garrisoned by a force larger than a cohort of auxiliaries,
especially if we take into account the annexes, which here, as on many
Scottish sites, form a conspicuous feature.

Subsequently the size of the fort was reduced by building a new west
wall, which cut off about a third of the original area, but at a later date this
cross wall was demolished and the original outline restored. Of the date
of these changes there is practically no evidence, but it is not unreasonable
to suppose that the reduction was made during a period of quietude, which
probably followed the successful termination of Lollius Urbicus' campaign,
perhaps the expeditio felicissima of the altar found at Corbridge in 1908.
The re-enlargement may date from the troubles which seem to have
occurred about A.D. 160; at any rate it suggests a time when it became
necessary to keep a stronger force at Newstead, and the date suggested is at
any rate probable, as with the disturbances that occurred in the early years
of Commodus the history of the fortress comes to an end. The coin-series
terminates about the year A.D. 180, and the evidence of other Scottish sites
corroborates this conclusion.

Mr. Curle's detailed and voluminous account of the Newstead exca-
vations covers more ground than it is possible to traverse in an ordinary
review. The rubbish pits and their contents, the helmets, arms, utensils,
and implements discovered, are of first-rate importance, but they must be
studied in the book itself and in the Edinburgh museum. Important as
these things are, they must rank second to the two principal points, the
contribution to history and the evidence afforded by the pottery. The
latter subject is too large to be adequately dealt with in a review, and its
true value is only to be obtained by those who make a thorough study of
Mr. Curle's results. We have not space to deal with details, but we may
point out the real value of the Newstead discoveries. "Samian" we can
date approximately from other sites, mainly continental, but in association
with early "Samian" at Newstead, much pottery of a coarser character
has been found, and thus a standard has been established by which early
wares occurring on other sites may be judged and dated. The study of
such wares is as yet a new field for archaeologists, but Mr. Curle has given
them something definite to refer to, and it is imperative that his book should
be carefully studied by all who are likely to take a leading or even a sub-
ordinate part in any excavations on Roman sites in this country or on the
continent.

It is only necessary to add that the book is splendidly illustrated, and its
production has evidently been a labour of love to the author.

R. H. F.

THE ANCIENT MONUMENTS PROTECTION ACTS, 1882 AND 1900.

Before the passing of the Ancient Monuments Act of 1882 there was no
means by which the owner of a monument could make sure of its preserva-
tion. He might be certain that during his lifetime it would suffer no
damage, but he could not bind his successors, or prevent it in later years from
being destroyed or from perishing by neglect.

By the passing of this Act, which is purely voluntary in character,
parliament provided the machinery whereby any owner of a monument,
be it a camp, an abbey, or an example of domestic architecture might,
without losing his property in it, or hampering his successors in any way and
without giving the public any right of access, place it under the protection
of the state, and thereby assure its indestructibility. The Office of Works
was charged with the execution of the Act, and empowered to take such
steps as might be necessary to protect and repair the objects placed in its
care.

The Act provided for an inspector, and the late Lieutenant-General
Pitt Rivers was appointed to the post. During the 'eighties his services
were invaluable, but towards the close of his life he acted mainly in a con-
sultative capacity. Upon his death in 1900 no new appointment was made,
but Mr. James Fitzgerald, I.S.O. of the Office of Works, acted in his stead,
and by 1908 all arrears of inspection had been overtaken, and the work
systematised. The labours of Mr. Fitzgerald were unfortunately brought
to a close by his death in 1909, and for a year the Commissioners were without
an adviser in the difficult and responsible task of inspecting and maintaining
those ancient monuments and historic buildings already in their charge,
and in the still more responsible work of negotiating the acquisition of
monuments and buildings the owners of which desired to transfer the care
of their property to the Office of Works; but in 1910 the Commissioners
were fortunate enough to secure the services of Mr. C. R. Peers, M.A.
Secretary to the Society of Antiquaries, as inspector.

Until the appointment of Mr. Peers the number of monuments in the
charge of the Commissioners was 89. During the first year of Mr. Peers’
inspectorship the number has been raised to 104. This year’s accessions
comprise two sets of standing stones and five dolmens in Anglesey; the
important hut circles on Holyhead Mountain; the Dwarfie Stone in Hoy;
the well-known chambered mound of Maeshowe; the churches of Eynhallow and Pierowall, and the castle of Noltland, Orkney; the Abbot’s Fish House, Meare, Somerset, and part of the earthwork of Skipsea Brough, Yorks. The owners who have placed these monuments under the care of the Office of Works are Lord Boston, Lord Sheffield, Major Fox-Pitt, Mr. T. Middlemore, Col. Balfour, Lord Brougham and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

The valuable services which Mr. Peers has rendered during the first year of his inspectorship are clearly shown in his report, now published as a parliamentary paper (Cd. 5690, price 2½d.). The report contains an account of the work carried out on such of the buildings, etc. under his care, as required it, describing their condition as satisfactory on the whole in spite of the exiguous funds available, which make it difficult to put in practice as thorough a scheme of preservation as could be wished.

The most extensive works appear to have been undertaken at Glasgow cathedral, Holyrood, the Tower of London, Richmond castle and Tynemouth priory.

Beside a complete list of the monuments in the charge of the Office of Works, the report contains a description of those which have been acquired during the year under review, and it is satisfactory to learn that the transference of a considerable number of other monuments, offered to the Commissioners by their owners, is now under consideration.

The administration of the Ancient Monuments Protection Acts is a most important and responsible duty, the adequate performance of which must at all times depend largely on the sympathy and co-operation of the public, and the influence of learned societies, whether national or local, which have for their object the encouragement of historical and antiquarian research, is a most valuable factor in sustaining public interest in the preservation of our national antiquities. It is hoped that in making known as widely as we can the scope of the Acts and the work done under them, we may be able to secure for some of the many historic monuments of the country that permanent protection of which they stand so greatly in need.
A HISTORY OF ARCHITECTURE IN LONDON. By W. H. Godfrey. With a preface by Philip Norman, LL.D. F.S.A. 5½ x 8, xxiv + 390 pp. 250 illustrations, frontispiece and 7 folding maps. London: B. T. Batsford, 1911, 7s. 6d.

The purpose of this book, as stated by the author in the first words of his preface, is twofold. It has been written both as “a simple, concise and practical guide to the historical styles of architecture, and at the same time to reveal the opportunity which the buildings of London afford for the study of the subject.” Mr. Godfrey is well known as a practical architect, as a lecturer on architecture, and as an active member of the Committee for the Survey of the Memorials of Greater London. He therefore writes with authority, and is well equipped to fulfil his double aim.

The introductory chapter, which contains a brief sketch of the characteristics of Greek, Roman, and Byzantine architecture, down to about A.D. 1000, seems at first sight irrelevant. It is in reality, however, necessary to the proper understanding of the subject. It proves that the Romanesque style was not a spontaneous growth, springing up from a void, as it appears in most histories of Gothic architecture, but a logical development from older styles; and it illustrates the departure from the classic ideals which took place in the middle ages, and the return to them that came with the renaissance. Unhappily the inevitable limitation of space leads the author to assert dogmatically some things that are debatable. He states, for instance, that the connexion between history and architecture is infinitely closer than that between history and literature. If history be a record of facts, this may be granted, but if it is also a record of the tendencies which lead to the facts, we must at least suppress the “infinitely.” Again, he claims roundly that architecture began with the Greeks, and all before was merely building, a questionable distinction, and unnecessary, seeing that he could omit all reference to Egyptian and Assyrian architecture on the ground that it had left no mark on later developments. There seems also some exaggeration in the assertion of the deliberate purpose of Greek art and its self-conscious search for beauty of design and proportion. It is true that Polyclitus had his “canon,” but for the most part the Greek artist, like all artists, produced his masterpiece without conscious reference to the laws of beauty, which were afterwards deduced by commentators from his work. If the statement that the Parthenon was adorned with “the very figures that Pheidias wrought” is to be taken literally, a glance at the sculptures themselves with their differences in style is enough to disprove it, and when Mr. Godfrey says that the entablature “places the quiet but firm limit of the Greek philosophy on the whole design” of the Parthenon, it is difficult to see what he means. Too much has perhaps been made of these few faults, which are entirely concerned with side-issues and do not detract from the very useful exposition of the details of classical architecture which the chapter supplies.
Such an exposition shows the continuity of the growth of architecture from classical to modern times, and makes the chapter the most original and one of the most valuable features of the book.

Each of the remaining chapters, dealing respectively with Romanesque, the three periods of Gothic, Tudor, early, middle, and late renaissance and Georgian periods, is prefaced by a clear and able summary of the national history as it illustrates the architectural, and with a sketch of the popular movements of the period dealt with in the chapter. Then the architectural characteristics of the period are illustrated simply and clearly from examples in or about London. In choosing these examples Mr. Godfrey takes us over a wide field, from Hampton Court to Barking, from Hornsey church to Croydon and Eltham. Each chapter, to add to the practical utility of the book, is headed by a list of the reigns included in the period, and of the buildings discussed, with their dates of erection. A series of seven maps at the end of the book, though in some details slightly out of date, indicates all the buildings treated of in the text, and some omitted from lack of space. Finally, a good index enables the student to follow easily any particular branch of architecture through all the periods.

Not only is the book thus encyclopaedic and useful for reference, but the fluent pen of Mr. Godfrey makes the subject eminently readable and interesting. It is indeed a revelation of an opportunity for studying a national architecture such as cannot be found within the same limits anywhere else in Europe. To take the principal buildings in order of date, the Tower, St. Bartholomew's the Great, the Temple, Southwark cathedral, Westminster Abbey, St. Etheldreda's, St. Helen's Bishopsgate, Westminster Hall and the Guildhall, Henry VII's chapel, Hampton Court, the Whitgift Hospital, the Banqueting Hall, St. Paul's and the City churches, and the later Hampton Court, these have all filled large separate treatises. Very much has gone, but the wealth of what remains is still wonderful. Mr. Godfrey is compelled to compress the account of these and many others into some 350 pages, of which, at a rough computation, quite a third is filled with illustrations, and the result is, as was intended, both a lucid introduction to the study of English architecture and a handy guide to the buildings of London. The reader is impressed with the continuity of the art of building, for the transitions from period to period are well illustrated; and when, after the Gothic period, the author comes to deal with domestic interiors, his treatment of the development of roofs, fireplaces, staircases, and wood panelling is especially commendable.

A few minor criticisms suggest themselves. We should like to see a section of the Roman Wall illustrated, as the only important Roman work left in London. The vestry of All Hallows, built on a bastion, is hardly adequate. In the second chapter, it is a pity that the alternative theories of the origin of the "basilican" church plan are not mentioned. It is quite as likely that the plan was based on that of the halls of private houses or even from the \textit{scholae} of the fraternities of Rome as from the secular \textit{basilica}. There is no obvious advantage in postponing by two chapters the description of the Tower keep. The plan is found on page 29, the description on page 88, and there is no close relation between the Tower and Eltham Palace to justify the position. In the next chapter brevity has compelled the omission of alternative theories of the origin of the pointed arch. It is implied
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that it arose from the intersections of the groined roof. This is probably so, but the beginner should also be told that others have supposed it either an importation from the East, or the result of interlacing Norman arcades. The phrase "a sedilia" also occurs in this chapter. The word sedilia is still the plural of sedile and not yet a collective noun. In dealing with the Decorated style, attention might have been called to the pomp and pageantry of the period, as illustrated in the architecture. Lastly, though Mr. Godfrey shows an admirable appreciation of the best examples of all styles, which is especially necessary in a handbook of this kind, we cannot help thinking his defence of the sham double façade of St. Paul's somewhat lame. Wren, he says, "did not scruple to build for appearance, regarding the building as a monument rather than a purely utilitarian structure." There is no reason why a monument should have false features any more than a utilitarian structure. No word of criticism, moreover, is applied to the clumsily crowded design of the interior of Wren's Fountain Court at Hampton Court, with its circular windows touching the pediments of the windows below, and the ugly double arches of the arcade. Here, however, we are touching on matters of taste, which were best left to individual judgment.

The accuracy of the book in detail is guaranteed by the fact that such experts in all that concerns London as Dr. Philip Norman and Mr. A. W. Clapham as well as the author have read the proofs. Dr. Norman also contributes a preface. The many illustrations, prepared by the Watford Engraving Company, are excellent, as is indeed usual in books published by Mr. Batsford.

Taking the book as a whole, we know of no better practical introduction to the study of English architecture for those who live in London, while there are few who know London so well that they will not find much that is new to them in its pages.

ROME AU TEMPS DE JULIUS II ET DE LEON X, LA COUR PONTIFICALE, LES ARTISTES ET LES GENS DE LETTRES, LA VILLE ET LE PEUPLE, LE SAC DE ROME EN 1527.

"Rome in the time of Julius II and Leo X" is a title which calls up to the imagination of the experienced and therefore not too sanguine reader a kind of book which, in England at least, is already more than sufficiently represented. But when he reads further, and finds that the author is M. Rodocanachi, he knows that his gloomy anticipations will not be fulfilled. He knows that he will find a quarto, vast indeed, but not too heavy, in any sense of the word; plentifully but not extravagantly illustrated; liberally equipped with footnotes, which he need not read unless he is in the mood for them, but which, when he is in the mood, are often excellent reading; a great storehouse of anecdote and information, not ultra-scientific, not so rigidly classified as to oppress him with the system, but capitally indexed for reference; in fact, a popular French book of the good type. To the maker of popular English books, of another type, on the Italian renaissance, M. Rodocanachi's works must be invaluable. It is surprising that his monograph on Castel Sant' Angelo, which was noticed
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The present subject is one which attracts by the external splendour of the life of the time. But it is a splendour which often resembles the iridescence of corruption, and certainly lacks the substance which was present below the surface in Medicean Florence, in Augustan Rome, or in Periclean Athens. The impression left on the mind, after reading such an able presentation of the facts as M. Rodocanachi has given us, is just that which, to every thoughtful student of the Italian renaissance, has long been a commonplace; to wit, that Rome, in spite of all the efforts of the more intelligent of the popes, never became a real intellectual centre. This can hardly have been due to its position as the religious focus of Christendom; for religion is only inimical to art and science when it takes the guise of pietism or dogmatism, and no one can pretend that in the Rome of the period concerned the minds of men were unduly fettered by restrictions of the sort that such extreme forms of religion are wont to impose. More probably the cause of the mediocrity of the Rome of the renaissance is to be found in its too close connexion with its ancient predecessor. It never shook off the domination of antiquity, like the other great centres of the renaissance, which drew their inspiration from the ancients but never became their slaves. Rome can hardly produce a single native artist or man of letters of any note; and that cannot be merely because the competition of immigrants from other places was so severe that natives had not a fair chance of distinguishing themselves. However this may be, the result of this lack of intellectual character in Rome is that the whole of its culture at its most brilliant phase has an artificiality, an unreality that, with all their affectations, the courts of Florence, Milan or Ferrara, not to mention Venice, do not betray. It may be that we judge Rome more severely because we expect more of it; but we feel that only in Rome could an affair such as that of Longolius have been conducted in quite so portentously futile a way. Longolius came to Rome in 1517 with a reputation as a man of letters. His enemies discovered that seven years earlier he had in a public oration spoken disrespectfully of ancient Rome! They nearly made the city too hot to hold him; but an apologia which he delivered created such enthusiasm among his admirers, that one of them injudiciously proposed to give him the citizenship. An extraordinary war of disputations and caricatures broke out. The pope made him a count palatine and protonotary apostolic (though the papal treasurer forgot to pay his salary), but the populace raged furiously against him, and finally he had to fly the city. The tedious squabble went on, with all the absurd appeals to antique forms which delighted the antiquaries of the time. Owing to the death of his bitterest adversary, he was at last, in 1520, enabled to obtain the diploma which he coveted. But (shrewd blow!) the same honour was given to one of his opponents. Even after his death people quarrelled over him. To crown his follies, he had become a convert to "Ciceronianism." Erasmus, who had accordingly pilloried him, was fiercely attacked by Dolet. All this may be read in M. Rodocanachi's book; it is not exhilarating, but he has done well to tell the story, so characteristic of the time and place. Characteristic also is Lorenzo Strozzi's banquet (p. 234), where the guests were received in a half-lit room hung with black, and adorned with skulls, cross-bones and skeletons, inspiring fears which were with
difficulty dispelled, even when the death’s-heads proved to contain roast pheasants, and the bones, sausages. Sanuto reported the whole affair (there was much more of it than we have told here) to his government, as though Mr. Bryce should report the latest American freak dinner to Downing Street. Characteristic too of the superstition of the time, though of this Rome had no monopoly, is the story (p. 339) of the devil that could not be exorcised, because the lunatic into whom he desired to transfer himself squatted in a holy-water basin.

It may honestly be said that this book is better adapted than any other for giving a notion of the period to the modern reader. There may be strata of Roman life to which it does not penetrate; the life of the religious or of the poor, apart from festivals and ceremonies, for instance. On the other hand one may read about the condition of the Jews, or what was the fashion in dress or in furniture or amusements, or a hundred other things.

This said, we may perhaps be permitted to make a few minor criticisms. The choice of the illustrations is not always quite happy. Thus one or two of the dreary portraits from the Uffizi-Pitti passage, which have small iconographic value, might have been omitted. Of cardinal Ascanio Sforza there is at least one good medal that would have served. Of the medals which are illustrated, some, such as that of Paul II with the boar-hunt on the reverse, are in no way contemporary with the persons represented.

While we are concerned with such matters of detail, we may note that there is no evidence that the name of the goldsmith Caradosso Foppa was Ambrogio; that Cellini’s silly story about the origin of the name “Caradosso,” a name which is found in the Foppa family as early as 1430, might now be ignored, except in editions of the autobiography; that, unless M. Rodocanachi has chronological evidence of an entirely new kind, Julius cannot (p. 88) have worn Caradosso’s tiara in 1503, since it was apparently not begun until 1510; finally that a fine coloured drawing of this tiara, made by Bartoli and Grisoni, is in the British Museum,1 and gives a much better idea of the work than Vertue’s engraving. We may note also that on p. 47 it is implied that Bembo wore a beard until some time before 1537, and none after, whereas the exact opposite was the case. Bembo’s beard is of some interest, because it was a subject of correspondence between him and Cellini, and is a point in deciding the authorship of the well-known medal. But flaws like this can be detected by any specialist in a book which deals with such a mass of minutiae as the one before us; we mention them only because we know M. Rodocanachi will be pleased to get them right. They detract but little from the pleasure that his book gives in reading. It is, however, necessary to point out that the Latin quotations have sometimes suffered sadly at the hands of the printer. The little poem by Adrian of Corneto on p. 388, for instance, is murdered in the most gruesome way.

English readers will enjoy the information that when Henry VIII presented the pope with lead and tin, ostensibly for the roof of St. Peter’s, although Sanuto speaks significantly of a more warlike destination, Julius showed that he knew our king by sending him a present of parmesan cheeses and wine.

G. F. Hill.

1 Published by Father Thurston in The Dolphin, 1903, and The Burlington Magazine, 1905.
THE ARTS AND CRAFTS OF OUR TEUTONIC FOREFATHERS, being the
\(5\frac{1}{4} \times 8\), viii + 252 pp. 22 maps and 130 illustrations. London and Edinburgh:
T. N. Foulis, 1910. 5s. n.

The lectures which form the basis of Professor Baldwin Brown’s volume
were delivered before the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland in the spring
of 1910. The aim of the writer is briefly that of affording “a general view
of the artistic activity of the Teutonic peoples during the eventful period
in which they overthrew the Roman empire of the West and began to
found the political system of the modern world.”

At the outset it should be borne in mind how vast and fundamental a
difference subsists between the arts in question and our own. “In olden
days art was not, as in modern times, a luxury, a mere adjunct to life, but
was the expression of national and religious feeling, and as such was closely
related to the activity of peoples in the practical and the intellectual spheres.”

It needs no argument to show how inapplicable the above description
would be to present-day art, which is little better than a branch of com-
merce, whereas, according to William Morris’s definition, it ought to be
“the expression of man’s joy in labour.”

The development of Teutonic art is too complex and obscure to be
followed without a survey of historical geography into the migrations,
conquests, and settlements of the period. The third and fourth sections
of the book are accordingly devoted to this phase of the subject, elucidated
by a series of twenty-two specially devised sketch maps. In spite of such
assistance, however, the utmost caution has to be exercised, lest a too hasty
inference be drawn from the occurrence of some particular object, or class
of objects, in a given locality. They may be indigenous products, or, on the
contrary, they may be in fact “wanderers,” i.e. alien to the neighbourhood
in which they are discovered. The rationale of the case is as follows: An
extern body attacks a stronghold and is repelled, perhaps again and again.
The arms taken from the aggressor in defeat, so far from being adopted by
the native victor, are regarded with detestation by him and devoted to
anathema. Such is the earlier stage. In course of time, if the foe is per-
sistent enough, he conquers in the end, and from invader turns settler.
Then, and not till then, do his arts become implanted in the soil; and it
entirely depends on the extent and completeness of the predominance of
the new element whether the older native arts of the place are superseded
altogether, or whether they only take fresh motifs and characteristics from
the conqueror. In other words, a particular object may occur from either
of two causes diametrically opposite; it may represent the spoils of defeat,
or be a token of triumphant occupation. Such is a fair sample of the many
pitfalls that beset the study of the arts of a remote past; and more particu-
larly in a period of transition, like that which Professor Baldwin Brown
has chosen to treat of in the work under notice.

There are of course certain broad distinctions which cannot mislead.
For instance, the Teutonic habit of wearing a clasped belt, as contrasted
with the classical preference for more loosely girt garments, accounts for the
dominance of the characteristic German buckle in the one case and the
fibula in the other. By far the most prolific sources of supply for the
investigator are Germanic cemeteries, with their tomb furniture (chapter v).
Neither inhumation nor cremation appears to have been the exclusive practice of Teutonic peoples, but, as is only natural, cases of inhumation afford ampler tomb furniture than is usually incidental to cremation. Some cemeteries, like that of Keszthely, by the Plattensee, in Hungary, where as many as 4,500 graves have been opened, are important enough to be reckoned as forming separate groups of themselves. The custom of orientation in burials is no indication of date, since it was general long before the introduction of Christianity; neither is the custom, almost universal among pagans, of equipping the dead, necessarily an index of date, because it was only gradually relinquished long after the Teutonic peoples had become converted to Christianity.

Chapter vi details the arms and accoutrements of warriors, and chapter vii similarly treats of feminine ornaments. Glass beads, widely distributed as they are, nevertheless were not of Teutonic manufacture, but imported, probably from the great mart of Alexandria.

Other chapters are devoted to sepulchral objects not in personal use (e.g. coins, spoons, crystal balls, keys, briquets for striking a light, various sepulchral vessels of clay, mounted wooden buckets, bronze bowls, vases of glass and horse furniture); an examination of the question as to the Roman or Teutonic origin of the art of the period; technical processes and materials used, and the probable sources and history of Teutonic ornament. Under these last heads are reviewed the various groups of ornamental motifs:—(1) geometrical or abstract, (2) vegetable, (3) animals and fabulous monsters, and (4) the human face and form. In the twelfth and last chapter an attempt is made to estimate the aesthetic value of early Teutonic art.

The book contains 32 plates of half-tone blocks, but, as the format of the volume is only small quarto, and, in the majority of instances, four blocks are crowded into a single plate, the excessive reduction entailed seriously impairs the usefulness of the illustrations. It is impossible, for example, in the limited area of 1½ by 1½ inch, to convey the remotest idea of the extraordinary richness of the Visigothic votive crowns, now at the Hôtel Cluny at Paris.

The book concludes with a bibliography of English and foreign authorities, and an index.

A. V.

THE ROMAN ERA IN BRITAIN. By John Ward, F.S.A. Antiquary's Books Series. 9 × 5¼, xii + 290 pp. with a map and 76 illustrations in the text. London: Methuen and Co. 1911. 7s. 6d. n.

One of the causes of the indifferent quality of Romano-British study before the recent renaissance was the undue preponderance of synthetic over analytic treatment. Conversely, to the growing process of analysis must be attributed the very real advance in the field of this research to-day. A glance at the bibliography which Mr. Ward gives in the introductory chapter of his "Roman Era in Britain" bears this out, for of the hundred publications mentioned the large majority are earlier than 1890 and are either general surveys or else topographical descriptions based often upon imperfect or inadequate research. Exceptions of course exist, and the work of Roy, Bruce, Roach Smith, Pitt Rivers and some others, will always
be acknowledged with gratitude by students of this period. In the main, however, Romano-British study in the nineteenth century was marked by more print than prudence. The plans of buildings were often unnecessarily incomplete, and were often omitted altogether, while many of the inferences drawn were quite unwarranted. In which connexion it is regrettable that Mr. Ward heads his list of "useful works of reference" with Stukeley's *Itinerarium curiosum*, without a word of warning against that writer's quite colossal disregard for evidence. Of late, however, scholarship and scientific method have been working hand in hand, each season's work is summarised in *The Year's Work in Classical Studies*, published by the Classical Association, and in face of wider criticism and better models the amateur student is beginning no longer to waste but to make the utmost use of the evidence of his own spade. The result is an increasing output of really useful monographs.

Still, though the scientific analysis of Roman Britain has only recently begun, though much remains to be done, much to be re-done in more systematic fashion, a synthetic survey of the past twenty years' work was already due. And a work of this description must be more than a compilation, it must be a disciplined collation of all the evidence that is at present available for study. Mr. Ward has given us a book which well combines the functions of detailed guide and catalogue. He has not attempted a coherent interpretation of Roman Britain in the light of the latest evidence, but has confined himself to arranging that evidence methodically under its respective heads. The result is a handbook which he submits to "those whose interest in Roman Britain has been awakened by the prolific results of the systematic excavations of late years."

Of the fifteen chapters four cover in condensed form practically the whole ground of the same author's "Romano-British Buildings and Earthworks" in the same series, an overlapping which the arrangement of the volume under review scarcely seems to justify, seeing that the subjects of the remaining chapters (roads, religion, burial, and "finds") are treated as exhaustively as are the structural remains in the companion volume. A solution of an admitted difficulty of space would have been to publish both volumes under a common title and to replace this overlapping section by those chapters which Mr. Ward informs us had to be abandoned in his scheme, comprising a historical review, hints on exploration, and a resume of our public Romano-British collections; to which might be added, to supply an element of coherence to a somewhat disconnected treatment, a summary of the modifications which all this array of evidence has brought to bear upon the conclusions of the past. For, after all, the purpose of this publication is, presumably, to show that there is gradually being evolved a relative sequence in the Romanisation of Celtic Britain which further periods of enlightened exploration, resulting in a gradual accession of more datable evidence, may one day render absolute. The military occupation and the resultant civilian development from that occupation are being thoroughly and systematically analysed. But the analysis is far from being complete. Verulamium and Uriconium have yet to supplement richly the evidence of Silchester and Caerwent. More frontier towns or settlements may not unreasonably be expected to furnish analogies to Corstopitum. Plans of more rural establishments and villa residences must be recorded and
compared to enable us to differentiate their types; and, above all, more epigraphical evidence is wanted to furnish material for a closer study of the economic organisation of Britain under Roman rule, leading thereby to a better understanding of the extent to which the native element was Romanised.

Without such summary the “Roman Era in Britain” lacks a vivifying feature. Mr. Ward has made his book a useful compendium only, reliable but not, to the general reader, inspiring because it is neither a treatise on the one hand nor a really vivid personal view on the other. It is just a handbook compiled with the accuracy and care that have marked the author’s well-known work at Cardiff, Caerwent, and Gelly-gaer.

The introduction deals with the physiography and political distribution of Roman Britain, and ends with some bibliographical notes. The chapter on roads, bridges, and milestones would more properly belong to the companion volume1 from which that dealing with decorated mosaic pavements might well be taken in exchange. Military remains are summarised and the main principles of defence described and illustrated, but some of these are treated more in the light of their variations than of their development. Double arched gateways, for instance, can certainly be assigned to early work, and the varying shapes of bastions are not casual. The object of a bastion being to supply defence by means of enfilading fire, the highest development is shown in that shape which, by eliminating angles, leaves no unprotected face, and thus secures support for its extreme point. Hence the superiority of the Porchester bastions over those at Richborough.

The chapter on houses well points out that the time has come to add to the existing classification those pillared residential buildings whose increasing list is beginning to claim the label of a distinctive type. But “basilical” is an unnecessarily misleading title where “pillared” would suffice. Mr. Ward favours the theory that these barn-like residences represent a primitive type of domestic architecture, whereas the corridor-houses are the product of a higher stage of culture, based on exigencies of climate. But till more plans of the former are recovered, it is perhaps unwise, in a book published under popular auspices, boldly to trace to this prototype the Saxon farmhouse, the early Pompeian house, and the mediaeval barn. The important thing at present is to direct the attention of explorers of villa-buildings to the possibility of this structural peculiarity, which is liable to pass unnoticed by reason of its frequent later adaptation into a “corridor” plan, the result being either the semblance of an internal peristyle, as at Clanville, Carisbrook, and Mansfield Woodhouse, or else a barn-like annexe to an unpretentious residence like that at Petersfield.

The many complexities of the religious syncretism of the Romano-British era are well illustrated in this book by a deal of evidence, largely epigraphical, nor does Mr. Ward forget to point out that as yet archaeology still refuses to support the many historical traditions as to the existence of a vigorous and even dominating Christianity in this island during the third and fourth centuries.

The second half of the book is a detailed and descriptive catalogue of the

varied “finds.” Nearly every shape and form of vase, ornament, and implement is illustrated. On the other hand the chapter on coins is very short and has no illustrations. In the “Roman Era in Britain” Mr. Ward has arrayed a vast amount of evidence to the accumulation of which he has devoted a great deal of work and sound judgment. The only pity is that he has arranged this evidence, somewhat casually, in a museum of print from which many, after wandering without aim, will emerge dissatisfied. The amateur will find here the accumulated evidence, but he will be disappointed that he is not invited by a further chapter to share that insight into the real character of Roman Britain which the author must have gained. Mr. Ward in his preface admits that his book is incomplete; and perhaps in a second edition the blanks will be filled up. Meanwhile he is to be congratulated on producing, within the limitations of a series, a comprehensive catalogue of excavated evidence. The book contains an index which needs enlarging.

A.M.W.


This volume is one of those collections of papers which the pupils and friends of some distinguished scholar or archaeologist are accustomed, especially on the continent, to put together in his honour. The person so honoured in the present case is Prof. Antonio Salinas, who with his record of publication extending over more than half a century may well be called the doyen of Sicilian archaeology. The occasion was the fortieth anniversary of his appearance as a teacher in the university of Palermo. The volume contains nearly fifty articles, divided between ancient and mediaeval or modern history and antiquities; and, though the subjects are not all directly connected with the island, they afford a good illustration of the multiplicity and continuity of the interests which find a centre in Sicily. The range is wide, and, besides archaeology in its various branches, philosophy, history, literature and art are all represented. Some great names appear among the writers, but we cannot expect that their contributions should be of equal value: for instance, Dr. Dorpfeld’s note (distinguishing Trinacria from the Homeric Thrinakia) is slight. It is obviously impossible to do more here than indicate briefly some of the more important papers in the volume, which, we may add, is accompanied by adequate illustrations. The gem of the collection appears to us to be the “Arcana Cerealia” by Prof. Hermann Diels, the rector of the university of Berlin, a discussion, in unimpeachable Latin, of the curious story about Baubo and Demeter, preserved by Clement of Alexandria and Arnobius, replete not only with learning but also with humour. Greek archaeology is represented by Prof. Orsi’s account of two fragments of grave reliefs of the end of the fifth century B.C. in the museum at Syracuse, by Prof. Theodor Schreiber’s (of Leipzig) description of a series of Alexandrian terra-cotta figures representing mourning women, and by Prof. Patroni’s not quite convincing attempt to identify busts at Pavia and Naples as the portrait
of Lysimachus. There are several papers on numismatic subjects, ranging from the origin of the early Greek types in Italy and Sicily down to the coinages of mediaeval times. The heading of Italian topography includes an account by Prof. Sogliano (who is in charge of the excavation of Pompeii) of the origins of Cumae, with references to the researches of Mr. R. E. Stevens, whose collections have now been acquired for the Naples museum; a collection of Greek place names in Elba by Prof. Saba; a description of the Roman walls of Alba Pompeia; and a note by Prof. Beloch fixing approximately the site of the Sicilian town of Herbita. Extra-Italian antiquities are represented by Pere Delattre's resume of his discoveries in the fourth-century necropolis of the priests and priestesses at Carthage, and by Prof. Lampakis's account (in modern Greek) of the Christian antiquities of Cenchreae, the port of Corinth. In the domain of Roman history we may mention a note by Prof. Vulic of Belgrade calling attention to a recently discovered inscription recording the usual grant of citizenship to discharged soldiers, which seems to show that Castris is not added to the names as a place of origin in default of a town with municipal rights (for Viminacium, the place in question, had already received them), but merely as indicating that the person was born during the military service of the father.

The second part contains a number of articles dealing with the history and literature of Sicily from Norman times onwards, together with others which relate to Italy generally. Prof. Nallino of Palermo gives an interesting account of some Arabic epitaphs from Naples and neighbouring places, possibly of refugees from the Norman conquest. The art of the renaissance in Sicily is not neglected, and we may specially refer to the publication of some new facts about that charming sculptor, Francesco Laurana, by another veteran Sicilian archaeologist, Mgr. Di Marzo. We have mentioned only articles dealing with antiquities in the proper sense, but there are few departments of the study of the past in its widest sense which are not touched upon or illuminated by this volume.

G. McN. Rushforth.


This illuminating little monograph on the Special Land Tenure Bill, 1911, written by Herbert W. Knocker and published by the Manorial Society, certainly puts the reader upon enquiry as to the probability of the bill really being an effective measure for abolishing the ancient customary tenures of the country, quite apart from the more important consideration of whether such abolition, if effective, would really be beneficial to the community at large. That the bill is supported by equity lawyers of great distinction, however, makes one very loath to criticise its draftsmanship, but as there is unfortunately no preamble to the bill we are left entirely in the dark as to what was the mischief in the minds of the promoters which they hoped to remedy by it. Did they wish to abolish all ancient customary tenures? If so, why have they omitted all mention of tenures
of ancient demesne? It is doubtful whether such tenures would be covered by section 3, as the wording of that section would lead one to suppose that it only referred to tenures ejusdem generis with those that have gone before. Again is the act framed in such a way as to deal effectively with vested interests in reversion in one or other of these customary tenures? It seems not. For instance, under section 1, sub-section 3, all sorts of questions might arise as to vested interests of a wife married before the passing of the act in her customary rights to dower, etc. Endless points, both good and bad, might no doubt be raised on the bill itself. But to proceed to a consideration of the utility of such a measure: First of all it should be borne in mind that, speaking generally, apart from the fact that all land in Kent is presumed to be gavelkind unless the contrary is proved, and hence no difficulty arises there, all other special customary tenures have to be strictly proved, and if not strictly proved the presumption of tenure at the common law prevails. Is it not better to leave it so than to attempt by legislation to cure a presumed wrong which, if left alone, will cure itself? Again, if looked at from another point of view, which is the more equitable and enlightened principle, the old peaceful principle of partibility of the Saxon community, or the later feudal principle of primogeniture which arose out of the unhappily unsettled state of Norman England? Why should the men of Kent have their primitive and ancient tenure, which is so much more equitable, taken away from them now when the primary reason for the feudal system is gone? It is amusing to be told that this bill is a radical measure, for one of its merits seems to be that it will prevent the men of Kent from sharing out on the death of their parent as heretofore, and will make a little landlord of each eldest son. However, the whole question of English customary tenures is a question of such very great difficulty that on the whole one feels that a short bill like the present to abolish all ancient tenures in the country will only lead to much legislation and produce more hardship than it cures. Space does not permit even of touching on the vast questions of the modes of assurance of customary freeholds, which it would be very difficult to effectively abolish. The whole subject bristles with difficulties. One can most heartily recommend Mr. Knocker's able little book as a most admirable introduction to the study of the subject.

L. M. M.


Small churches may be just as interesting as large ones, and Professor Cole proves that a simple cruciform building virtually of two dates can have a good deal to say for itself. The story of Cholsey church is told in a careful if slightly lengthy manner, and little exception can be taken to any of the deductions arrived at save two.

In the first of these the author gives it as his opinion that the original chancel had an apse continuous with the side walls, but rashly adds that
it conflicts with that of Mr. John Bilson, and is not able to give a single instance of such a plan to any church of the same date in this country. The other theory to be questioned is that the stair turret is original in the lower part, though it confessedly is of an hexagonal set out, and has a fourteenth-century doorway of entrance at the bottom!

Exception must also be taken to some expressions made in the description of the building, such as "apsidal arch" and "apsidal entrance," which are meaningless; then again "the two western tower caps" and "the north and south tower arches" are certainly difficult to understand, when there is only one tower and that in the middle. Surely such a word as "plinthiform" is novel, and the continued use of "cap" for capital does not harmonise in diction with such words as "asymmetrical" or "morphological."

The illustrations are quite good and well illustrate important features, but the plans, of which there are two, leave much to be desired. The first, representing the original church, is drawn to one scale with the east end at the top of the page, while the second, depicting the present structure, is to a different scale with its north side to the top of the page, so that comparison between the two plans is absolutely impossible.

Notwithstanding those few faults the author is deserving of every encouragement, as the book is a great advance on the usual guide-book type of description to which our interesting churches are generally subjected, and it forms an excellent lesson in painstaking study of the building and comparison with other like structures, which should be followed by all who have the story of their parish church to tell.

Harold Brakspear.
to be suppressed with a stern hand. At his second visit William erected another castle on the opposite bank of the river and it is with this that the book deals.

Of the history of the earlier erection of the Old Baile little is known, for it appears to have been overshadowed in importance by the newer building, and indeed there is no sign that any masonry was ever erected on the site. And this again is a point upon which Mr. Cooper lays stress, namely that the earlier castles erected by the Normans in England were not built of stone as is so popularly believed. It is true that there are examples of extremely early stonework but they prove an exception rather than a rule. York was of the mount and bailey type, the artificial mound provided with a wooden tower and the bailey defended by a ditch and timber stockade upon the ramparts.

At York we are able to state to within a year or two when stone work was first used, viz. 1245-1259.

Mr. Cooper has traced with care and diligence the gradual evolution of this wooden castle into the stone fortress which dominated the capital of the north, and served as a gathering place for armies during the wars with Scotland and as a frequent residence for monarchs.

It is impossible here to give even a synopsis of the history as interpreted by Mr. Cooper. The history of Clifford’s Tower, as the keep was called, is traced to modern times through all its strange vicissitudes, and the book is completed by an account of York prison within the castle bounds. It is much to be desired that Mr. Cooper’s example will be followed and histories written of others of our great castles.

E. L. G.

A GUIDE TO NEWARK AND THE CHURCHES OF HOLME AND HAWTON.

This last decade has witnessed the publication of more guide books than any other, and this little book by Mr. Blagg merits a longer notice here than its modest price and unpretentious appearance would seem to warrant. There is nothing more irritating to the thoughtful traveller and antiquary than to explore a strange town by the aid of an average guide book, which not infrequently garbles historical facts and is plainly ignorant of archaeology. Under these circumstances it is a pleasure to meet with such a guide as Mr. Blagg. His history is correct and his archaeology sound, and he writes in an interesting manner on an interesting subject.

Two points of archaeological interest require discussion. According to Mr. Blagg the screens in the church are the work of Thomas Drawswerd of York, who finished his work in 1508. The original document on which this statement is founded refers only to the reredos, and there are many who state that the term reredos was never used for a rood-screen. However, in the will of king Henry VI there is a reference to “the reredos bearing the roode-loft departing the quier and the body of the church.” Though at first sight Mr. Blagg is incorrect in saying definitely that the screen
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was finished in 1508 by Thomas Drawswerd, an earlier date is certainly suggested by the appearance of the screen, yet until some more light can be thrown upon the relation of the terms reredos and rood-loft it would be presumptuous to say that the author is really at fault.

The Beaumond cross has always provided an insoluble puzzle for local archaeologists. Mr. William Stevenson has done his best to clear away the difficulties by claiming it as one of the Eleanor crosses. Newark was practically the bishop of Lincoln’s town, and Mr. Stevenson, whom Mr. Blagg quotes with reserve, asserts that it is most likely that the funeral procession passed from Lincoln to Newark on its way south “probably accompanied all the way by the bishop of Lincoln himself.” Careful search, however, has led to the discovery that at this date the bishop was by the Thames in the very south of his diocese and therefore could not have been with the procession. The theory is worthy of notice, though it requires much more support before it can be accepted.

We would recommend this little book as a model of what a small guide book should be.

E. L. G.

CATALOGUE OF THE ANTIQUITIES IN THE MUSEUM OF THE WILTSHIRE ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND NATURAL HISTORY SOCIETY AT DEVIZES.


Wiltshire is fortunate among the counties of England in having retained within its borders the great majority of the pre-historic and Roman antiquities found therein. It is true that there are a considerable number of Wiltshire objects in the British Museum, and some are to be found in the Ashmolean, but speaking generally, nine tenths of the objects connected with the county are still to be found in the county, and of these, by far the largest and most important portion is preserved in the Wiltshire Society’s museum at Devizes. This museum is too little known, it cannot challenge comparison in the matter of its buildings with scores of other provincial museums, it has no municipal funds behind it, but so far as its contents are concerned it need fear comparison with very few. Indeed the collection of bronze-age objects here preserved is probably not to be equalled in England outside of the British Museum. Of these the “Stourhead Collection,” comprising the whole of the contents of the barrows excavated by Sir Richard Colt Hoare at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and described in his two splendid volumes of Ancient Wilts, so far as they have been preserved, was fully described and illustrated in part i of the Catalogue of Antiquities (iv + 96 pp. 175 illustrations, price 1s. 6d.) published in 1896. The recently issued second part completes the description of the antiquities of all ages in the Society’s possession. Palaeolithic flints from Knowle and Salisbury, neolithic and bronze-age objects not included in the “Stourhead Collection,” Late Celtic pottery from the recent excavations of Mr. and Mrs. Cunnington, the fine collection of Roman pottery from Westbury, a few good Saxon things only (for Saxon antiquities are unaccountably rare in Wilts), and a miscellaneous assemblage of mediaeval and later objects are all carefully and fully described, and illustrations of over 500 different
objects are given. All these are from the county of Wilts, for as the introduction tells us "from the foundation of the museum in 1854, and more particularly of recent years, the Society has made it its object to include alike in the archaeological and natural history collections and in the library, all kinds of objects found in or connected with the county of Wilts, to the exclusion as far as may be of all things 'foreign' to the district." The result of this policy is that the Devizes museum is more strictly "local" in its contents than almost any other provincial museum, and those who would know what Wiltshire has produced in the way of antiquities cannot do better than procure the two parts of this catalogue.