Notices of Archaeological Publications.

ROME AND THE CAMPAGNA. By Robert Burn, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge. 4to. Cambridge, 1871.

Mr. Burn's book is a very valuable one of its kind, probably the best of its class, and that class is a numerous one. There are many books of the same class—that is a book made out of other books, relating to the history and topography of Ancient Rome. Mr. Burn has great advantages; no one can doubt his scholarship, his book teems with learning and overflows with references to the passages in the classical authors relating to Rome. He is also well acquainted with the modern languages, and has made good use of the numerous modern French, Italian, and German books on the subject that have issued from the press during the last fifty years. He has chiefly relied on Canina, who spent thirty years and a large fortune on his great work, and produced unquestionably the best work of his time on the subject. Mr. Burn has also been to Rome himself more than once to verify what he had previously made out by reading. He also shows that he is a good geologist, and brings that knowledge practically to bear; and he has in fact produced a valuable book. But there is a great drawback from the value of Mr. Burn's book, the author is not an archæologist, has not been in the habit of attending Professor Willis's admirable lectures on Archæology, or of following him in his discourses to the Archæological Institute, in which he shows so well how to apply the modern science of archæology in practice. The consequences of Mr. Burn having neglected this one most important study for his purpose are serious. His book, with all its learning and real historical value, is full of most extraordinary mistakes. He has forgotten that since Canina, and Nibby, and Fea, and Niebuhr, and Bunsen have written, great discoveries have been made in Rome, and that the last ten years have been years of very rapid progress in the modern science of Archæology, and its application to Rome. Mr. Burn ignores the important proceedings of the British Archæological Society of Rome, and by so doing he has sadly marred his otherwise valuable work. The opening passage of his book is a case in point. He says, "In the Aventine Hill, under the Monastery of S. Saba, there is a vast subterranean quarry, from which carts may often be seen at the present day carrying blocks of a reddish-brown stone to the various quarters of Rome, wherever new buildings happen to be in the course of erection. The stone obtained from this quarry is the harder kind of tufa, of which a great part of the hills of Rome consist. It naturally became the building-stone used by the first founders of Rome, and is found in all the most ancient fragments of masonry which still remain. In many places, as on the cliffs of the Alban Lake, and the sides of the many hillocks up in the

Campagna, this stone may be seen, presenting, when partially decayed, a very considerable likeness to a wall of horizontal layers of stone. When quarried, it naturally breaks into rectangular blocks, and suggests of itself that mode of building which we find actually to exist in the earliest efforts of Roman builders."

In this passage, which is in many respects excellent, it is clearly implied that the large blocks of tufa that were used in the walls of the Kings of Rome (and in their time everywhere in the Primitive Fortifications of that early period) may have been brought out from this particular quarry under S. Sabba in the Aventiue. It so happens that this particular quarry has been explored and examined many times by the Roman Society, and hundreds of its members have seen that this quarry has been made out of the tunnel or *specus* of the Aqua Appia, which passed through this part of the Aventine on its way from the Porta Capena to the Porta Trigemina, or rather to the cave of Faunus, near to it, which was used as the final reservoir at the mouth of this earliest aqueduct, on the bank of the Tiber. It must have passed this spot, it could not have gone from one part to the other in any other manner. The *specus* was as usual six feet high, and two feet wide only, just sufficient for a man to stand and cut away one side of it, to make it wide enough for a horse and cart to pass, and this is what has evidently been done. The wells that *descended* into the *specus* remain at regular intervals, with the holes for a man's foot, to enable him to go up and down to clear it out when necessary. Within this quarry part of the *specus* remains perfect, half filled up with the deposit of clay left by the water, and we have often seen a boy sent along it with a light until he was obliged to return for want of air.

It is evident that as this quarry was made out of the tunnel of an aqueduct this could not have been done until after that aqueduct was out of use, consequently not before the Middle Ages, and probably long after that period. Again, the size of the stones brought out of this quarry is very different from those used in the walls of the Kings'; we have seen scores of cart-loads of stones brought out of this quarry, but never saw a block of stone larger than a man's head; it is obtained by blasting, and is the stone commonly used for rubble-walling and for macadam roads. The stones used in the wall of Romulus are four feet long, two feet wide, and two feet thick; those of the later kings are rather smaller; they become gradually smaller as they are later in date (as a general rule, though not an invariable one). Those on the Aventine under S. Prisca, just opposite to this quarry, are not of the same quality, nor of the same size, as the stones that come from it, they are nearly as large as those of the wall of Romulus. This wall against the cliff of the Aventine is fifty feet high and twelve feet thick, and the quarry that supplied that stone must have been of considerable extent. Part of it probably was obtained from the Aventine, but from another quarry, not now in use, under S. Prisca, in the same large vineyard of the Jesuits, or of Prince Torlonia, in which the wall is situated. But it was only a small part of the stone that came from the Aventiue, that part which is of a pinkish hue. It is probable that the greater part of the stone used for the enormous walls of the Kings came from the ancient quarries now called the "caves of Cervaro," on the bank of the river Anio, about six miles from Rome, and was floated down the river on rafts. Part of it was probably dug out of

the hills of Rome, especially in the time of Romulus. In making the great fosses or trenches around the Palatine, and especially the great trench across the middle of that hill, on the southern side of his *Arx* or citadel, a great quantity of tufa must have been cut out.

In Mr. Burn's second paragraph we read—

"The most interesting of such primæval relics is a fragment of wall which skirts the west end of the Palatine Hill, and is assigned by Mr. Braun to the earliest enclosure of that hill the so-called Roma Quadrata of Dionysius. The blocks in this wall are arranged in layers placed alternately parallel to, and across the line of, the wall (headers and stretchers), so as to bind the mass together firmly. No mortar is used, and the joints are fitted so accurately as to show a more considerable knowledge of the art of masonry than we should expect at so early a period. It seems on this account questionable whether the usually received opinion as to the antiquity of this wall can be correct, and the fragments of the wall of Servius Tullius (B.C. 578—535), found on the sides of the Aventine and the Quirinal Hills are perhaps more deserving of attention as undoubtedly ancient works. In these fragments of the Servian wall the art of building appears in a more imperfect state than in that on the Palatine. The vertical joints are not so carefully arranged, and are often allowed to stand immediately one over the other, so as to impair the solidity of the masonry. The stones are placed close against the sides of the hill, and in some places the lowest layers of them are imbedded in the natural rock."

This paragraph contains several mis-statements. Mr. Burn must have been singularly unfortunate in the portion of the wall of Romulus that was shown to him; it must have been one of the pieces that have been rebuilt with the old materials at a later period. In the original parts that have not been disturbed, so far from the "joints being closely fitted together," there is sometimes room enough between the stones for a man to put in his hand and arm; and we have frequently seen a stout walking-stick inserted. The construction is as rude as it well could be. The size of the blocks of tufa has been already mentioned; they are split off the beds with wedges only, and are not cut with any iron tool; the construction is exactly the same as that of the walls of Fiesoli, Volterra, Perugia, and other Etruscan cities of the same early period, where the same building material is found. The construction of a wall is necessarily governed to a great extent by the nature of the stone of which it is built. What is often called Cyclopean masonry is generally caused by the geological character of the stone, which naturally splits into large blocks, very convenient for building the great walls of a fortification. Of the walls of Romulus we have remaining some portions on each of three sides of his *Arx*, which was an oblong fortification, consisting of the northern end of the Palatine Hill. 1. Against the north cliff, near the western corner, a piece of several yards long, in a genuine unaltered state. 2. The foundations of a series of towers at regular intervals, nearly all along from the west end to the east of this northern cliff, opposite to the Capitol, the most important point to be defended against the Sabines. 3. A reservoir for rain water, which appears to be of the same period; this is near the south-west corner, and behind the most perfect part of the wall. There are conduits or tunnels to bring the water into this great reservoir from various parts of the hill. This reservoir has been

recently *restored* by Signor Rosa (who, for a Director of Archæological Investigations, is much too fond of restoration). In this reservoir are several wells of a peculiar form—a hollow cone with the wide mouth downwards. There is a similar reservoir for rain-water under the corner of the *Arx* of Alba Longa (miscalled a prison), in which are also wells of the same peculiar form, and these two places are the only two where this form has been found in that part of Italy. Of the towers nothing more than the foundations remain, and as these have been built upon in the time of the Republic and early Empire, it seems that the fortifications of Romulus in this part had never been completed. 4. We have portions of this wall again, on the cliff near the church of S. Anastasia, at the north-west end of the *Arx* of Romulus, and behind this are the remains of one of the earliest temples in Rome, with a grand flight of steps leading up to it from the west, all of the character of the time of Romulus. 5. On both sides of the great trench, or fosse, before mentioned, across the hill from east to west on the south side of the *Arx*, parts of the tufa walls have been brought to light by the recent excavations of Signor Rosa, who calls this great piece of ancient military engineering, a *natural Inter-montium !*

We may, however, now turn to the great wall of Servius Tullius, which, to the eyes of Mr. Burn, appears more perfect than that of Romulus. By the way, the wall of Servius Tullius is not on the Quirinal nor on the Aventine. The great *agger*, faced by his wall was carried for a mile along the eastern side of Rome, on the high ground, and does not properly belong to any of the hills, or rather promontories, on that side. Each of the seven hills was originally a separate fortress; each formed one of the seven *arces* of Virgil, and remains of the tufa wall against the cliffs have now been found on each of the seven hills. Servius Tullius connected these seven distinct fortresses into one city, by making his great *agger* on the east side, where there could be no cliffs to scarp and support by walls, and by building short *aggeres* across the valleys from one cliff to the other, with a gate in each of these short connecting links. That part of the wall of Servius Tullius, respecting which there can be no doubt, his great eastern *agger*, is built in a very superior manner to the walls of the time of Romulus, the stones *are* well cut and closely fitted together, and are bound together by *iron clamps*, showing a considerable advance in civilization, as might be expected in two hundred years. A portion of this wall was pulled to pieces in 1870, to make room for an enlargement of the railway station. The work of destruction was carefully watched by many persons, and several of the iron clamps that were taken out of the stones in the middle of the wall were purchased at once on the spot by English visitors; amongst others by Mr. Parker, of Oxford, who carried some of them to the Ashmolean Museum, where they may now be seen. Others remain in Rome. Mr. Burn's plan of the *agger* of Servius Tullius (which he calls the Servian wall) is very incorrect or rather incomplete; he evidently does not understand ancient earthworks, and yet the original fortifications of Rome must have been mainly earthworks, as those of all other cities of the same period were. The walls are merely facings of the earthworks. He does not see that this *agger*, or bank, turns at a sharp angle at each end, to connect it with the cliffs of the Quirinal at the north and the Esquiline at the south, and at the angle at each end

is a great earthen mound, or round tower, to protect the approach to a gate. Mr. Burn's plans are almost entirely copied from Canina; and he takes no notice of the many discoveries made in the numerous excavations of the last five years. In accordance with the views of the sceptical school, to which he evidently belongs, Mr. Burn doubts about many things that appear to us natural and obviously true. He does not believe that the foundations of a wooden bridge on the Tiber, under the Aventine, are those of the Sublician bridge, nor that the Porta Trigemina was also in this narrow strip of ground under the Aventine, close to the foot of this bridge; yet this is the obvious place where any military engineer would have put those structures, and a long-established tradition should not be lightly set aside when the existing remains appear to bear it out, as in this case. The remains of the short *agger* are clearly visible at the south end of the *Salaria*, or salt wharf, which is, and always was, just within the Porta Trigemina. But Mr. Burn puts his Porta Trigemina in the Forum Boarium, a quarter of a mile to the north of the real site. His plan of the Palatine is only a reproduction of Signor Rosa's plan, and omits altogether the important discoveries made by the excavations of the Pontifical Government, under Visconti, in 1869 and 1870, in the southern part of the hill, which he leaves nearly blank.

The illustrations of Mr. Burn's book are admirable in their way; they are a series of the excellent woodcuts of the Jewitt family taken from photographs, which have been used as original sketches to make drawings from, and not merely reproduced literally. The exact and minute accuracy of the photograph is thereby lost, and in some cases, such as the construction of walls, this is a serious loss; no drawing ever shows the mode of construction like a photograph, and for historical purposes this is often very important. Many of these woodcuts are evidently taken from Mr. Parker's series, with which most of the recent visitors to Rome are familiar. In some instances Mr. Burn himself does not seem to understand the drawings or their object, and it would appear that someone else had supplied these illustrations, which may or may not fit the text. The bridges of the aqueduct, of which one is given (p. 11) near Tivoli, are not merely "picturesque objects," but are important for historical purposes also. The great wall against the cliff of the Aventine (p. 50) is not one of "the Servian walls," as Mr. Burn calls it. The Porta Salara (p. 60) is one of "the things that have been;" it is now entirely destroyed, and should not appear as one of the existing gates of Rome. The arch of Honorius, within the Porta di S. Lorenzo (p. 63), has also been destroyed. In the drawing of the Porta S. Giovanni (p. 66), the modern embrasure for cannon, erected by the Pontifical soldiers to defend themselves against the Garibaldians, forms so conspicuous a part of the picture that it should have been explained. This view also shows the Porta Asinaria, and it is curious to see Mr. Burn stating on the opposite page that "this old gate is unfortunately hidden by some buildings in front of it." As it has always formed part of the wall of Aurelian, it never could have had "buildings in front of it." The view is correct as it was seen two years ago, the embrasures have now been removed, and the aspect is thereby entirely altered. The blocks of marble in the Marmorata (shewn in p. 208) are now entirely hidden again by the mud left in the late flood.

Most of the subjects in Mr. Burn's plates are what are usually called

the "hack subjects" in Rome, familiar to all those who know Rome and the usual photographs of it. The few that are novel are taken from Mr. Parker's series. There are many points on which we should not agree with Mr. Burn's conclusions, as we believe that the more the existing remains are brought to light, the more fully they are found to support the general truth of the traditional history of Rome as recorded by Livy, followed by Dionysius.

The excavations of 1871 have not yet been recorded, and are probably the most important that have ever been made in the same space of time.

We proceed now to notice some of the points on which Mr. Burn has expressed an opinion differing from those who have followed the researches of the Archæological Society in Rome.

Mr. Burn, p. 69, n. 1.—The Porta Ardeatina. — Nibby Mura di Roma, p. 201; Festus, p. 282. Nibby thinks that this gate was built in the tenth century, but Mr. I. H. Parker refers it to the time of Trajan. (Parker's Lecture before the Society of Archæology at Rome, p. 18.)

From this note it appears that Mr. Burn cannot distinguish between the construction of a wall and gateway of the first century and one of the tenth. This appears to us very extraordinary, for they are most essentially different. The brickwork of the time of Nero, and from that to the time of Trajan, is the finest brickwork in the world, that of the tenth century is about the worst. The construction of this gateway, shown in one of Mr. Parker's photographs, is unquestionably of the first century of the Christian era, as we have stated, and such was also the opinion of Nibby, the mistake is that of his engraver only, who by some accident or some piece of ignorance has put in an 0 where Nibby never wrote one, and has made 1 into 10. The text of Nibby says, plainly enough, that the gateway is of the first century, and this fact is a very important one, as it proves that the outer boundary of Rome was then in the same line as the wall of Aurelian in the third, so that if there was not a *murus* in the technical sense, there was an outer line of defence of some kind to which this gate belonged; and this is contrary to the theory of the modern antiquaries, who usually make the walls of Servius Tullius the boundary of THE CITY proper, the only boundary of Rome until the time of Aurelian.

Mr. Burn, p. 129, n. (4).—"These walls" (called by Canina, followed by Mr. Burn, the Forum of Julius Cæsar) "have been lately assigned by Mr. Parker to the dungeons of the Carcer Mamertinus, and to the wall of Servius Tullius. But there is not sufficient proof of this to justify an abandonment of the usual opinion about them."

These arches of travertine of the time of Tiberius no doubt belong to that part of the great prison that was rebuilt in his time, as recorded upon an inscription at the entrance to the vestibule under the Church of the Crucifixion, usually called the "Prison of S. Peter." But these arches of travertine rest upon tufa walls of much earlier character, of the time of Servius Tullius. These are the walls of a series of large subterranean chambers, now cellars under houses, which can hardly be anything else than that part of the great prison which was called the Lautumiae. as described by Mr. Burn himself. The subterranean passage from the vestibule had been excavated to the length of thirty yards, and the workmen had come to within six yards of the cellars at the end of April, and this appears to us conclusive.

Mr. Burn, p. 156, n. (4).—"The grotto of the Lupercal has lately, *it is supposed,* been discovered near the Church of S. Anastasia. It is, however, possible that the reservoir of an aqueduct may have been mistaken for it. See the *Athenæum* newspaper, No. 2,068, June 15, 1867."

This conjecture of Mr. Burn is of no value whatever; the grotto or cave called the Lupercal is at too great a depth for any of the aqueducts. The water gushes out from the rock under the north-west corner of the Palatine into the grotto exactly as described by ancient authors. The situation of it also, just on the edge of the Circus Maximus, agrees perfectly with the spot where the Lupercal must have been.

At p. 199 Mr. Burn says:—"It is to be observed that Panoinius speaks of the plan as found near the church,—Garrucci in the church, and Vacca behind the church on a wall. Jordan thinks that the plan was lying about near the place where the church was to be built, in fragments, the most considerable of which were used to cover part of the walls when the church was built." And he continues (p. 200):—"Two fragments of the Pianta Capitolina were discovered in 1867, during an excavation undertaken by the monks of SS. Cosma e Damiano. They represent the ground plan of the Porticus Liviæ, an oblong space surrounded by double colonnades. Mr. J. H. Parker (Archæologia of the London Society of Antiquaries, vol. xlii. pt. i. p. 11) seeks to identify this ground plan with the great platform between the Velia and Coliseum, commonly supposed to be the platform of the Temple of Venus and Rome. It is, however, quite a sufficient refutation of his view to point out that the remains of the central building now existing on the platform differ entirely from the plan represented on the new fragments. It is stated that the new fragments were discovered in a pit dug in a court-yard behind the church and monastery of SS. Cosma e Damiano, at the foot of a long, lofty wall of brick, on which numerous small bronze hooks, such as were used for securing a facing of marble slabs, were found. These hooks do not necessarily indicate, as Mr. Parker thinks, that the marble plan of Rome was attached to the wall by means of them, for such hooks or rivets were frequently used to attach ordinary marble facing to brick walls."

Mr. Burn overlooks some material facts in this case. The marble plan of Rome was made in the third century, in the time of the Emperor Severus, as is stated in an inscription to that effect upon one of the marble plates.[1] "The central building on the platform" was built or rebuilt thirty years afterwards, in the time of Maxentius, as was proved by his brick stamps found in the walls by Nibby; this building, therefore, could not be represented on the marble plan. Mr. Burn in his index refers to the Porticus Liviæ as identical with the Porticus Octaviæ. They are quite distinct: we have plans of both of them, with their names engraved on two of the fragments of the marble plan.

All the fragments of the marble plan have been found in the same place, at the foot of a lofty wall faced with brick of the time of Severus, in which are rows of metal hooks snapped off; these were evidently for the purpose of fixing a marble facing to the wall, and this plan is engraved on such a marble facing. It has never been trodden upon, the lines are quite fresh, but the slabs are broken into fragments. In front of this

[1] See Maii Spicilegium Rom., vol. vii. p. 654.

wall lies a great mass of one corner of the Basilica of Constantine, which had fallen from the top in an earthquake, and has the upper part of a corkscrew staircase in it, now lying upside down on the pavement, but buried again. It appears quite probable that such a mass of stone as this would fall through the roof of the Portico on to the pavement, and that the jar would cause the marble slabs to vibrate violently, break the hooks that held them up, and so cause them to fall and break to pieces in falling on the pavement. Those authors who were living at the time[2] when the other fragments were found, in the sixteenth century, describe this as the situation where these were also found.

"It is well known (Mr. Burn, p. 224) to all Roman archæologists of any experience that the 'reticulated work' is not found after the time of Hadrian, or about A.D. 120. It is, therefore, probable that these quays were made or rebuilt at that time, or towards the end of the first century of the Christian era. It is probable, however, that they continued in use for two or three centuries, and that the blocks, neglected or left there so long in oblivion, were placed there in the third century, when such enormous quantities of marble were imported into Rome that they could not at once find employment for it. Further excavations, made after Mr. Parker wrote, showed that these great quays extended the whole length of the Port of Rome, or for about half a mile, and that the quay now in use for the same purpose, and always called 'The Marmorata,' was the upper part of the same series of quays. These were, however, not used for landing marble only, but also for wine and other things, as shown by the sculpture of an amphora on one of the walls, to indicate the place for landing such things on their way to the great warehouses above, called 'the Emporium.'"

The ruins of the Emporium consist of a large quadrangle, open on the side towards the river, and occupied on the other three sides with warehouses. Several of the quays in connection with this building have been lately (1868) excavated, and a vast number of valuable marble blocks of great size exhumed from the silt with which the river had covered them. These quays are mainly of brick, the walls against the cliff faced with *opus reticulatum*. Mr. Parker thinks that the reticulated work is of the first century. He considers that the newly excavated quays were intended to replace some older ones, then found to be placed at too low a level, and consequently abandoned. But why were the marble blocks left there? It seems more probable that they were neglected, and gradually silted up by successive floods during some continued period of great political and social distress.

The Coliseum (Mr. Burn, p. 236, note).—"The holes which are so conspicuous in the travertine blocks of the exterior were probably made in the Middle Ages for the purpose of extracting the iron clamps by which the stones were fastened together. Another opinion is that they were the holes in which the beams of the buildings which clustered round the Coliseum in the Middle Ages were fixed. See the treatise of Suaresius "De Foraminibus Lapidum," in Sallengre's Thesaurus, vol i., p. 313."

The general opinion now is that these holes were caused by the rusting of the iron clamps with which the stones had been fastened together.

[2] See Flaminius Vacca Memori, apud Fea Miscellanea, vol. i. No. 1.

This rust splits stone and causes the iron to fall out by a natural process not requiring any violence. The holes are always at the edge of the stones, just where clamps would come of the same simple form as those used in the wall of Servius Tullius. This appears to have been a common practice of the Roman builders for some centuries, when the nature of the stone or other circumstances seemed to call for such a precaution.

Mr. Burn, p. 219.—Frontin. de Aquæd., §§ 5, 20, 21, 65. Mr. J. H. Parker, Archæologia, vol. xlii., pt. 1., p. 11, thinks that we should read in all the four passages of Frontinus *specum* for *spem*. The accus. *specum* occurs in Suet. Nero. 48, and *specus* is fem. in Front. 17. But it seems impossible that *spem* could have been employed as an abbreviation for *specum* in the MS.

(P. 227.) Frontin. de Ag. 19. 20; Plin. Ep. vii. 29. Mr. Parker's conjecture that Pallantiani Palatini can hardly be admitted as possible. Arch. Journ. xxiv. p. 345. From Frontin. 19, 20, 21, and 5, 65, it seems to follow that Spes Vetus was the name of the district near the Porta Maggiore, where the Neronian arches of the Aqua Claudia leave the main aqueduct. Dionysius, ix. 24, mentions a ἱερὸν Ἐλπίδος there. J. H. Parker, Archæol. Journ. xxiv. p. 345, thinks that spes means specus.

The word *specus* is a local technical word for the tunnel conduit of an aqueduct, not used out of Rome, or in immediate connection with Rome. The word was not to be found in that sense in any Latin dictionary until quite recently; it was equally unknown to the original editors of Frontinus, who filled up the abbreviation "spe" with "spem," instead of "specum." Mr. Parker printed and distributed in Rome last season a brochure containing *all* the passages in Frontinus in which the word occurs, and facsimiles of the best manuscript of the author, that of Monte Casino. He has shown clearly that in every instance *specus* makes good sense of each passage in an obvious natural meaning. "Spes" generally requires a very forced and unnatural interpretation, not in any degree borne out by the facts.

J. H. P.

PAROCHIAL AND FAMILY HISTORY OF THE DEANERY OF TRIGG MINOR, IN THE COUNTY OF CORNWALL. By Sir John Maclean, F.S.A., &c.

Since our last notice of the parochial and family history of the deanery of Trigg Minor, by Mr. (now Sir John) Maclean, two additional parts have been issued, which are in no respect inferior to the first, which related exclusively to the parish of Blisland, in the county of Cornwall. These latter parts relate to the several parishes of Bodmin and of St. Bruered, or Breward, and of the borough, or secular district, of the former. That this part of the county had been brought under subjection to the Roman invasion is testified by the occurrence of Roman coins, as well as of inscriptions in these and various other parts of Cornwall, notwithstanding the claim, by some early, patriotic topographers, to a sort of exemption of Cornwall from Roman subjection, which is plainly untenable. So the establishment of Christianity in and throughout both East and West Cornwall, is illustrated by numerous way-side crosses and other like relics of very early type in the present work, though the

rude material employed on them forbids us to expect in this district any refined work of art.

It was imagined, for some time, that Arabic numerals of the twelfth century had been in ordinary use at that early date; but the fragments of a sepulchral inscription found in Bodmin Church have been re-examined, and referred by Mr. Jago and by Sir John Maclean to a far later date, and restored to the much more probable date of the sixteenth, and perhaps of the seventeenth, century.

To these observations on the parish church of Bodmin may be added the fact, heretofore only suspected, that the present church, notwithstanding its large dimensions and decorative features, is probably *not* the original church of the Priory of St. Petrock, of which the remains were in all probability removed and sold upon the dissolution. See part ii. p. 150; part iii. p. 345. The statement of the author relating to the Berry tower and its adjacent cemetery, the Bodmin copper tokens, and the gilds and fraternities of the same town, had received little or nothing either of notice or explanation from any previous historians.

The several manors which, before or since the dissolution of St. Petrock's Priory, have been found to exist separately from the "manor of the Priory" are not fewer than *six*, which are all now traced, and described and identified in the present work.

In addition to these topographical notices, the author has largely entered into the family history and heraldry of families more or less associated with the lands and property within the local limits of the borough or parish, including those of the families of De Bodmin or Bodman, St. Margaret, Carburra, Magle, Flammank, Phillips, Edyvean, Bligh, otherwise Blight, Achym, Michell, Spry or Sprey, Dagga, Bullock, Pennington, Thomas, Vyvyan, Munday, Tailour, Beket, Bere, Kempthorne, Hobbs, Collins, Brown, and Pomerory.

The third part of the volume relates to the parish of "St. Bruered," a saint unknown, we believe, to any English hagiology, and better known for some two or three centuries past by the common name of "Simonward," a supposed corrupt spelling of "St. Breward." This district, now parochial, is, or was originally, co-extensive with the manor of Hamatethy, which is to be found in Domesday. It is presumed that this is a parish founded by the Peverell family by the process to which Selden attributes the gradual formation of all parochial divisions, viz., by the voluntary appropriation of the tithes by the lords of manors for the ecclesiastical purposes of the lords and their under-tenants. This manor passed from the Peverells to the Hungerfords and Bottreaux ("de Boterellis," a Breton name). As in the case of Bodmin the author has traced the various lands and families connected with this parish or manor, including those of Burdon, Peverell, Hungerford, Hastings, Wylyngton, Trelawder and others, whose pedigrees are abundantly illustrated.

The three parishes already included in the work form only a part of the twenty which now constitute the entire deanery of Trigg Minor. Of these deaneries there are in Cornwall eight. Whether Sir J. Maclean will be spared to complete the work on the present scale for the entire county is open to question, but at all events we may be assured that, so far as his future labours extend, we cannot fail to find a very valuable contribution to the history of Cornwall.

Notices of Archaeological Publications.

CYTTIAU'R GWYDDELOD; MEMOIRS ON REMAINS OF ANCIENT DWELLINGS IN HOLYHEAD ISLAND, EXPLORED IN 1862 AND 1868. By the Hon. WILLIAM OWEN STANLEY, M.P., F.S.A. London: James Bain, 1, Haymarket; Minshull and Hughes, Chester. 1871. 8vo.

THE attention of antiquaries has of late been frequently directed to vestiges of habitations of the earlier races by which the British Islands were occupied. The terms Pit-dwellings, Hut-circles, and the like, are now familiar to every archæologist. Of these remains, those especially to be traced within the area of some mountain fortress, in the fastnesses of uncultivated heights, in morasses, occasionally on some headland overhanging a rocky shore, may be ascribed to a remote age, prior to Roman invasion. Cæsar found the swarming bucolic population of Britain hutted in abodes resembling those of Gaul—"Hominum est infinita multitudo, creberrima que ædificia, fere Gallicis consimilia." These Gallic dwellings, honourably designated edifices, were, as we learn from Strabo and Diodorus Siculus, of wood, of circular form, with conical roofs of straw. Cæsar also elsewhere observes, "Casæ Gallorum stramentis erant tectæ." The thatch in question was doubtless of brushwood, reeds, fern, or any *stramenta* nearest at hand. This general type of dwelling may probably have been retained from primitive antiquity; on the other hand, the cautious investigator of our circular sites should bear in mind the probability that in all parts of the country, the like simple rural type may not have been disused until days comparatively recent; as, indeed, still it is prevalent in North Britain, especially in the Hebrides and the Orkneys.

An interesting section of Pre-historic Archæology is presented to us in the semi-barbarous remains to which we have thus adverted; they vary considerably in character, although for the most part circular in form. The hut seems to have been sometimes quite troglodytic in its nature, and of considerable depth, in proportion to its very narrow diameter; such, amongst numerous examples that might be cited, are those excavated by the late Rev. F. Warre within the grand stronghold, Worlebury, that overhangs the Bristol Channel at Weston-super-Mare. Such, likewise, are certain dwellings near Salisbury, described by one of our most sagacious fellow-labourers in the pre-historic field of research, Mr. E. T. Stevens, to whose "Flint Chips"[1] we may refer for an account of these singularly curious remains of the "Neolithic" Age.[2] In other places the hut-foundations, clustered over extensive areas, present the

[1] Flint Chips, a guide to Prehistoric Archæology, as illustrated by the Blackmore Museum, Salisbury; p. 57.

[2] Journal Brit. Arch. Assoc. vol. xi. p. 305.

aspect of populous villages, such as the Pen Pits and the like vestiges in Wiltshire, regarded by Sir Richard Colt Hoare as habitations—"slight excavations, covered and protected from the inclemency of the weather by boughs of trees and sods of turf." Of such clusters of huts, placed, however, singly or apart from each other, Dr. Young has described remarkable examples near Whitby. Not less interesting remains have been traced near Newport, in the Isle of Wight, by the Rev. Edmund Kell, at Gallibury and Rowborough—a subject of attractive investigation at the next annual meeting of the Institute, when the varied antiquities of *Vectis* will be advantageously accessible from Southampton.

It has been suggested by some Archæologists that to a period of more advanced civilisation should be ascribed those circular dwellings, constructed with rude walls of unhewn stone, of which the ruinous sites are of frequent occurrence in the Principality, in Cornwall, on the heights of Shropshire and the Marches of Wales, on the Cheviots also, and elsewhere. Our present purpose would not admit of any detailed statement of the arguments. In a monograph of pre-historic remains of a domestic nature—still a desideratum in antiquarian literature—it would be requisite to carry out a careful and critical consideration of the nature of the most available materials in each locality where hut-circles occur. The use of simple rafters or poles, overlaid with boughs and sods, according to Sir Richard Colt Hoare's supposition above cited, would obviously prevail in a woodland country, whilst elsewhere, the ample supply of slaty or other stone suited for the construction of a rude dome of overstepped work, as in the typical examples of pagan houses in the Great Isle of Arran, and in Connemara, figured by Petrie (Round Towers, p. 126), the curious group of cloghauns at the ancient town of Fahan, county Kerry, figured by Mr. Dunoyer, in this Journal,[3] or in huts of more rude but analogous construction, noticed by Mr. Blight in Cornwall, could not fail to suggest the construction of such beehives as are actually the ordinary dwelling in certain parts of the Hebrides. Our lamented friend Dunoyer adverts also to similar buildings as frequently found, well preserved, in the mountains of Wales; a solitary example, however, has, to our knowledge, been there observed with the stone roof entire. It is on Penmaenmawr.

In connection with the interesting investigation of the constructive peculiarities of these remains, we may refer, with special satisfaction, to the memoir on "Ancient British Walls," by Sir J. Gardner Wilkinson, whose writings are always replete with sagacious observations.[4] Our inquiries will also derive much instructive information from recent explorations of "Prehistoric Antiquities of Dartmoor," by Mr. Spence Bate, to whose labours in the West we would refer with renewed satisfaction.[5] No systematic examination of the Cyttiau in the Principality had been carried out previously to that undertaken by Mr. Stanley, and carefully recorded by him in the Memoirs first published in this Journal. There appears to be no certain evidence whether the huts on his estates

[3] Journal Brit. Arch. Assoc., 1861, p. 1.

[4] Arch. Journal, vol. xv. p. 5. The cloghauns in Kerry are closed with a stone at the apex. Mr. Dunoyer observes that "in Wales, where such buildings as these occur on the mountains in good preservation, the apex stone is omitted, or else largely perforated to allow of the escape of smoke, and to admit light."

[5] Transactions of the Devonshire Association, vol. iv. 1871, p. 491.

in Holyhead Island had been roofed with stones "stepped over," as in the dwellings last mentioned, or covered by a framework of wooden poles, overlaid with brushwood, turf, and the like. The supposition that they were actually domed with pieces of stone, overlapping each other, may appear, in some degree, confirmed by the breadth of the base of the circular walls, so far as the small portion now existing is to be seen. These walls are constructed of pieces of stone, now found embedded in earth, and compacted by coarse vegetation. Within living memory, however, those walls, of which the materials have been converted into fences and the like, were, as has been stated, as high as a man's shoulder. It is remarkable that the decaying sites of such forsaken abodes were, three centuries ago, sufficiently prominent to arrest the attention of the sagacious observer, Camden. In the account of Anglesey, given in his Britannia, in 1590, the following allusion (to cite the translation by Philemon Holland) is made to the Cyttiau'r Gwyddelod, and their supposed Irish origin:—"Besides certaine mounts of earth entrenched about, which they call The Irish mens cotages, there is a place also, named *Yn Hericy Gwidil*, of the Irish men, who, as we finde it recorded in the booke of *Triades*, under the leading of *Sirigus*, put the Britans to flight in that place."[6] At the *Muriau Gwyddelod*, above Harlech, a group of circular chambers surrounded by large enclosures, the walls are in some instances 6 ft. high.

It is scarcely needful to observe at how early a period the spoliation of these "mounts of earth entrenched about" commenced, so soon as agricultural improvements, rendering enclosures necessary, caused the destruction of many venerable monuments of antiquity. In his Itinerary of Wales, Leland observes that "in tyme of mynde menne usid not in *Termone*[7] to seperate theyr Grounde, but now stille more and more they digge Stony Hillokkes yn theyre Groundes, and with the Stones of them rudely congestid they devide theyre Groundes after *Devonshire* Fascion. In digging of these [they] digge up yn many Places yerthen Pottes with the Mouthes turnid douneward, conteyning *cineres et ossa mortuorum*."[8] This appears to be the first mention of cinerary urns in British barrows; they may not have been considered, as by certain continental philosophers, to be a kind of earth-born *fungi*; but more than a century later we find Sir Thomas Browne sorely perplexed by Leland's observation,—"Why the Anglesea Urns are placed with their mouths downward remains yet undiscovered."

The special subject of archæological inquiry to which Mr. Stanley's researches relate had heretofore been neglected in England and Wales, where, however, numerous vestiges are to be found, especially in mountainous districts, where the advance of agricultural improvement has not effaced all traces of bygone generations. We cannot omit, however, to recall with satisfaction the instructive explorations by our brother archæologists in North Britain. We cannot fail to recognise, in perusing Mr. Stanley's graphic descriptions, the strong resemblance both of the

[6] Britain, or a Chorographical Description, &c., by William Camden, translated by Philemon Holland, Doctour in Physick, 1637, p. 672.

[7] *In termine*, probably, or *qu. terminibus*, with boundaries.

[8] Itin. of John Leland, ed. Hearne, 1769, vol. v. p. 54, f. 50. The royal antiquary, it may be remembered, received from Henry VIII, in 1533, his commission to explore the monasteries and ancient sites in England.

rude dwellings, and of the relics recovered from them, to those in the far North, and the islands of the Scottish seas. We are greatly indebted to such laborious and intelligent investigators as Captain Thomas, Dr. Stuart, Mr. George Petrie, Dr. Traill, the Rev. James Brodie, Mr. James Anderson (Curator of the Royal Museum of Antiquities at Edinburgh), to our lamented friend, Mr. Rhind also, with others whose honoured names we have in remembrance. In correspondence with Mr. Stanley, the following interesting remarks have been recently offered by Mr. Anderson, in reference to the remains explored in Holyhead Island :—

"The Memoirs on the Cyttiau present to us the best monograph that we possess on the subject of the dwellings of primitive times in the British Islands ; no one can peruse them without realising the value and importance of systematic exploration. The hut-circles that are scattered over the moorland districts in Scotland bear a remarkable resemblance to several of the group explored by Mr. Stanley. The out-buildings of the Brochs or Pictish towers—rude cells, with rounded corners built out of the fallen materials of the towers, have often the characteristic boles or ambries, small cupboard-like recesses in the walls. The relics that have been obtained from these early sites have a remarkable family resemblance, so to speak, to those brought to light at Ty Mawr and on the flanks of Holyhead Mountain. Bronze indeed appears to have been less scarce than it was amongst the hardy occupants of the remote north, but the stone troughs, hammer-stones, small vessels, spindle-whorls, and other relics of daily life seem to have been nearly the same.[9] The discovery recorded by Mr. Stanley of traces of pigment, possibly body-paint, is a curious and striking fact, and claims comparison with certain relics found in Orkney and elsewhere. The stone balls, with and without facets, are extremely common in the outbuildings of the Brochs ; so also are objects of jet ; necklaces, and buttons of that material usually occur, as at Pen y Bonc, accompanying interments. It would be very desirable to carry out careful comparison between the relics obtained from the early habitations, and those of neighbouring sepulchral deposits.

"In regard to minor relics, it deserves notice that a few of the curious little polished stones figured in Mr. Stanley's second memoir, p. 6, counters possibly, or pieces for some game of chance, are to be seen in the National Museum of Antiquities, at Edinburgh ; they are, however, somewhat larger than the specimens from Ty Mawr. One of these was obtained from a Broch, the other from a kitchen-midden. In pursuing the instructive comparison with such objects as have occurred in North Britain, we find amongst those that have been obtained in Shetland, a sharpening-stone or whetstone with grooves worn in it, as in figs. 18 and 19 of Mr. Stanley's second memoir. It is of sandstone, the grooves measure three or four inches in length, and are fully half an inch in depth. It has been much prized, apparently : a hole has been cut through it, so as to pass a thong or string for convenient transport. Some interesting notices of mechanical appliances of this description will be found in Mr. Albert Way's supplementary remarks. (Third memoir, p. 20). The oval perforated stones (*ibid.* plate vi. fig. 4) are not very common in the

[9] Our readers will remember the objects of domestic use brought to light in a "Pict's House" in Caithness, by our lamented friend, Mr. Rhind, as related by him in this Journal.

south, or in Wales. The example there figured indicates by its fractured extremity the use for which it was intended. Such holed stones are of common occurrence in the north, usually flattened, rounded, water-worn pebbles, with a hole pecked through them from the opposite flat sides. They vary from two inches to eight or nine inches across the flat side, and usually bear no marks of having served as hand-hammers or the like. It has been imagined that the use of these perforated pebbles may, in some instances, be explained by a curious passage in the Gisli Saga :[1]— 'Ingiald had a son called Helgi, and he was an idiot, the biggest you ever saw, and utterly witless. He was so treated that a pierced stone was tied round his neck, and he grazed out of doors like a sheep.' May it not be inferred that it was the custom to attach pierced stones to the necks of sheep, probably to prevent their running too far off, by the knocking of the stone against their knees?

"Some of these holed stones, of which a few good specimens found in various parts of England have been noticed in the Arch. Jour., may have been weights, and rollers for the bottom ropes of a drag-net."

In the very limited state of our information regarding all early traces of domestic or personal life, nothing, it is obvious, which may supply evidence should be neglected. Mr. Stanley has done good service by rescuing from oblivion appliances that show the least measure of artificial adaptation in their form, and of which the original intention may often, through careful examination, be ultimately ascertained. For instance, holed stones of larger proportions and ruder construction than those above mentioned have occurred in hut-circles; their intention was at first sight by no means obvious. They may, however, serve to indicate the true nature and construction of the roofing, a point that has sometimes been in dispute. It is very probable that in many localities where suitable material was readily obtained, the covering of the bee-hive hut was of stone, overlapped or rudely domed, as in the Irish cloghauns and the primitive dwellings of Cornwall. Mr. Stanley has given some valuable remarks on this subject. (First Memoir, pp. 2, 7.) More frequently, it is probable, the roofing was constructed with wooden rafters, overlaid with brushwood, sods, and the like, the rafters being brought to a central point and there supported by an upright post. Such a stone disk embedded in the floor of the hut would be almost indispensable as a standard for the centre post. In Mr. Stuart's account of hut-circles at Strathardh (Proceedings, Soc. Ant., Scot., vol. vi. p. 408), it is mentioned that in the floor of one of the dwellings there were seven holes surrounded by stones, leaving a space sufficient to receive a good stout post. A similar hole was in the centre of the area. At Macduff, Banffshire, it was observed that the poles supporting the roof appeared to have been inserted, slanting-wise, in an earthen ridge that surrounded the hut. A systematic investigation of remains of this description, throughout the British islands, is greatly to be desired, and may, we hope, be originated through the impulse of the successful results of Mr. Stanley's well-directed researches.

Amongst the remarkable facts tending to elucidate the ancient conditions of incipient civilization in Wales, as brought under our consideration through Mr. Stanley's explorations, none perhaps has a stronger claim on our

[1] See Dasent's translation, p. 76.

attention than the indications that the Cyttiau'r Gwyddelod have revealed of the practice of stone-boiling or stone-baking. (First Memoir, pp. 7, 18, 33.) A few obscure traces of this practice have occurred in other quarters of the British islands, such as the "milk-stones" in Hampshire, brought before us by Sir J. Clarke Jervoise, and the "pot-boilers" noticed in the neighbourhood of Andover by the Rev. E. Kell and Mr. C. Lockhart. Unquestionable indications also of the same usage occurred in the unique troglodytic habitations at Fisherton, near Salisbury, examined by Mr. E. T. Stevens, as detailed in his "Flint Chips," a work that comprises so copious and instructive a collection of ethnological and antiquarian evidence. The like vestiges of a very primitive culinary expedient are to be found in the sister kingdom. The observations elicited through Mr. Stanley's minute researches at Ty Mawr may henceforth, it is hoped, invite attention to these and other suggestive indications, that cannot fail to throw light on the habits and daily life of the races by whom these islands were successively occupied at a very remote period. We gladly invite notice to these valuable researches, more especially as we believe that Mr. Stanley purposes to give to the public the advantage of his matured experience, gained during his researches at Ty Mawr, in regard to the form and construction of the Cyttiau, comparing them with similar early habitations in other parts of the British islands. He will, moreover, it is hoped, give a further account of certain interesting relics discovered since the publication of his memoirs.

Archæological Intelligence.

A VALUABLE and amply detailed memoir on the remarkable mural painting recently brought to light in Chaldon church, Surrey, has been contributed by Mr. J. G. Waller to the fourth volume of the "Transactions of the Surrey Archæological Society." Mr. Waller's admirable reproduction of that relic of early art in England was submitted to our society at their monthly meeting in London in April last, and on that occasion a very interesting discourse was given by our talented friend, to whom we are mainly indebted for the preservation of an example of early design and highly curious artistic symbolism, unique, probably, in this country. A chromo-lithographic illustration accompanies the memoir.

Mr. ROBERT FURLEY, F.S.A., announces the first portion of his "History of the Weald of Kent" as ready for issue. An outline of the early history of the county will be found in this work, and also a sketch, by Mr. H. B. Mackeson, of the physical features of the district. This contribution to local history is published, in two volumes, 8vo, by Mr. Igglesden, at Ashford, and Mr. J. Russell Smith, in London.

Notices of Archaeological Publications.

TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, *December* 16, 1871.

SIR,—I should feel much obliged if you could afford me space for the correction of the following misapprehensions in Mr. Parker's review of my book on Rome and the Campagna.

I. Mr. Parker has mistaken the meaning of the opening sentences which he quotes from the book. The remarks I have there made do not apply to the stone dug from the quarry on the Aventine, but to the "harder kind of tufa of which a great part of the hills of Rome consists." The whole of his criticism of this first paragraph rests upon a misapprehension of my meaning.

II. In the sentences following his account of the Servian walls, Mr. Parker says, "Mr. Burn's plan of the agger of Servius Tullius (which he calls the Servian wall) is very incorrect, or rather incomplete. He does not see that this agger or bank turns at a sharp angle at each end." Here there are two misapprehensions: (1) the plan on p. 49 is distinctly called "Servian agger." (2). The curves of the embankment at both ends are distinctly given.

III. Mr. Parker thinks that "Mr. Burn's plans are almost entirely copied from Canina."

There is *one* plan in the book, that on p. 306, which is taken entirely from Canina and acknowledged, but none of the others are taken from that source. The plan of the Mons Oppius on p. 233 is also taken partly from Palladio and partly from Canina, as stated in the description underneath.

IV. Mr. Parker observes, "*Many* of the woodcuts are evidently taken from Mr. Parker's series with which most of the recent visitors to Rome are familiar." But further on he says, "*Most* of the subjects in Mr. Burn's plates are what are usually called the 'hack subjects' in Rome, familiar to all those who know Rome and the *usual photographs* of it. The *few* that are novel are taken from Mr. Parker's series." There are eighty-five illustrations in the book, and of these *three* are taken from Mr. Parker's series. The three so taken appear on pp. 50, 142, 256. My obligations to Mr. Parker are acknowledged in the preface.

V. Mr. Parker says, "Mr. Burn puts his Porta Trigemina in the Forum Boarium a quarter of a mile to the north of the real site." This is also a mistake, for on p. 51 of Rome and the Campagna it is stated, "The site of the Porta Trigemina was between the north-western corner of the Aventine and the river," and in a note on that passage, "Later excavations have proved that the Porta Trigemina was at the Salaria, and that the Pons Sublicius was close to it." Mr. Parker has I fear been misled by the position of the Pons Sublicius in the Ichnographia at the end of the book to which a mark of doubt is appended.

VI. The paragraph quoted by Mr. Parker on page 80 of the Journal, beginning "It is well known," and ending "the Emporium," is not taken from "Rome and the Campagna;" and I think that Mr. Parker has inadvertently marked it with inverted commas, as it appears to be his own statement, and is certainly not mine.

VII. Mr. Parker says, "The great wall against the cliff of the Aventine, p. 50, is not 'one of the Servian walls,' as Mr. Burn calls it." The wall in question is not called in my book "one of the Servian walls," but the title given to it is "Servian wall on the Aventine," which is explained in the text to mean that it is regarded as a portion of the stone wall with which, according to Livy and Dionysius, Servius Tullius surrounded the whole city.

VIII. On the Porta Asinaria Mr. Parker remarks, "This view (p. 66) also shows the Porta Asinaria, and it is curious to see Mr. Burn stating on the opposite page that this old gate is unfortunately hidden by some buildings in front of it." The meaning of the passage in question has been misapprehended by Mr. Parker; for though it is true that the *towers* on each side of the gate are still standing, and are represented in the woodcut, the *gate itself* is blocked up and hidden by modern buildings.

IX. In quoting my note in the Porta Ardeatina (p. 69, Note 1), Mr. Parker has misapprehended my meaning. The note was not written, as he seems to think, to express dissent from his views. If the passage to which the note is appended be referred to, it will be seen that the construction of the gateway is distinctly stated to be of "an early period," and I have no doubt that Mr. Parker is approximately right in referring it to the first century. I cannot, however, assent to the inference which Mr. Parker draws from the early date of the gateway, viz., that it "proves that the outer boundary of Rome was then in the same line as the wall of Aurelian in the third century." The gateway in question was evidently not built in the first instance as part of a line of fortifications, but belonged to some building incorporated into Aurelian's wall. Nibby describes it as "appartenente a qualche fabbrica del primo secolo del Impero." In quoting Nibby I had overlooked this sentence, and am obliged to Mr. Parker for pointing out that Nibby must have written 1 and not 10.

ROBERT BURN.

THE HAARLEM LEGEND OF THE INVENTION OF PRINTING BY LOURENS JANSZOON COSTER, CRITICALLY EXAMINED. By Dr. A. Van der Linde. Translated by J. H. Hessels, with an Introduction and a Classified List of Costerian Incunabula. London. Blades. 1871.

Mr. Hessels, who has been some years in this country, and is already favourably known to many members of the Archæological Institute for his remarkable acquaintance with the early history of printing, has conferred a great favour upon scientific bibliography by his translation of Dr. Van der Linde's able work. And to our members who had the opportunity of seeing the remarkable collection of early printed books brought together in the rooms of the Institute in May last, a notice of this work is due as a supplement to the valuable and entertaining discourse delivered by Mr. Winter Jones on the occasion of that exhibition. (See p. 1 of this volume.)

We need not re-state a question which has, for at least two centuries, engaged the attention of every student of the history of typography. The claims of Gutenberg and his associates rest upon too firm a foundation to require any additional support; but it is very satisfactory to have, in a convenient form, all the points at issue fairly set out and clearly disposed of, as they are in this volume. Both Dr. Van der Linde and his translator are natives of Haarlem, and interested, if any one can now be interested in the promulgation of a falsehood, in supporting the belief that Coster, their fellow-townsman, was a printer of books before Fust and Schoffer appropriated the invention of Gutenberg. Many distinguished bibliographers, both here and on the Continent, committed themselves to this view; and the people of Haarlem put up statues and monuments, the last in 1856, to the honour of Coster. In an amusing chapter, near the end of his work, Dr. Van der Linde traces what he calls the "metamorphosis of the legend;" and by way of pointing out, most easily, the character of his book, we may give a few of the heads under which, in this chapter, he has summarised the whole story. First, in a pedigree drawn up in 1546, it is asserted that Lourens Janszoon Coster brought the first "print" into the world, a hundred years before—namely in 1446. Guicciardini, in 1567, says, "The Haarlemers assert that the art of printing was invented in their town, and brought, after the death of the inventor, who left the art unfinished, to Mentz by a servant, who was received there with open arms. I don't know, however, whether this is true." Next comes the famous statement of Junius, made towards the close of the same sixteenth century, that a certain Lourens Janszoon Coster invented, on the occasion of a walk in the Hout in 1440, the art of printing from wooden blocks; that he printed a Dutch "Spiegel" with it, and that he afterwards used metal letters; that, finally, on Christmas night in 1441 he was robbed by his servant Johan, supposed to be Fust, who carried off the invention to Mentz. Omitting some intervening authorities of minor importance, we have then the story given by Scriverius in 1628, in which Lourens Jans-

zoon is called Sheriff of Haarlem in 1431. The story of Scriverius is in several places inconsistent with that of Junius, and is the more easily disposed of by Dr. Van der Linde. It is true that a sheriff of Haarlem, in 1431, was named Lourens Janszoon ; but it is also true that this civic worthy, who was by trade an innkeeper, died in 1436. It is, therefore, impossible that he was a chandler in 1441, and that he invented printing in that year, allowing, that is, that printing *was* invented in 1441. But the most circumstantial statement is that of Seiz, in 1740. He adopts and corrects the stories of his predecessors, and goes so far as to name the books printed by Coster; and so the legend grows and grows, is favourably received in many places besides Haarlem, and is adopted by Meerman, Koning, De Vries, Van Lennep, and many other authorities of various degrees of weight, while the subject of it alternately figures as an innkeeper, a chandler, a sheriff, and a sexton, until in May 1870, an article, written by Dr. Van der Linde, finally disposed of all the stories by showing their inconsistency with each other, and with authentic documents, nay even with the printed books hitherto attributed to the sheriff innkeeper, or the chandler sacristan. Who printed these books of *Donatus* and these *Spiegels* is a mystery yet to be solved; but it seems pretty certain, after a perusal of Mr. Hessels' preface, and after even a cursory glance at Dr. Van der Linde's part of the work, that they are later in date than has often been supposed, that they are the work of an unknown printer, and that all the stories given in the Cologne Chronicle, in Junius, in Scriverius, and others, are absolutely false. It must not, however, be supposed that there is nothing else of interest in a closely printed volume of almost 200 pages. On the contrary, it is full of collateral matter, and may be studied with advantage on a large number of the questions which will disturb the mind of every beginner in this most difficult and obscure branch of history.

W. J. L.