NOTICES OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL PUBLICATIONS

THE CARE OF ANCIENT MONUMENTS. By Professor G. Baldwin Brown, M.A. 8½ × 5½. xiv+206 pp. Cambridge: University Press, 1905. 7s. 6d. n.

We fear that our members will regard our notice of this work as somewhat belated, the more so as the argument for the preservation of the national monuments of Great Britain, so ably and cogently advanced by Professor Baldwin Brown, has, to a certain extent, been conceded by the government of the day. Indeed, the three Royal Commissions which have followed the issue of this volume, each of which has already issued the first-fruits of its labours, is the best justification, if such were wanting, of Professor Baldwin Brown's plea in favour of the more kindly and systematic treatment of the relics of the past which surround us on every side, and of which we have hitherto been so careless. It would probably have been more logical to have accompanied this notice of Professor Baldwin Brown's book by an extended critical examination of the volumes, each dedicated to a separate county, issued by the Royal Commissions for Scotland (Berwick, Sutherland, Caithness), Wales (Montgomery) and England (Hertford), for the interest has been removed from the Professor's plea for the doing of the thing to the Royal Commissions' methods of doing that thing. "It is recognised everywhere," he says (p. 60), "that inventorisation is a necessary first step in any scheme for the care and protection of monuments. A country, a district, a town, must know what it possesses before it can effectively concert measures for safeguarding its treasures." Well, this first step has been taken, and it is evident that the question of importance for antiquaries is—how is the work being done? To fairly and adequately answer that question would require a careful criticism of the publications of the Commissions, in which the differing methods of each—for their methods do differ in some rather important respects—should be minutely examined, not from the point of view of invidious comparisons, but in order that the public, which is interested in the subject and which is paying the bill, should have the advantage of an honest survey of the work already accomplished.

While, therefore, the greater part of the first half of Professor Baldwin Brown's book may be said to be so far out of date because the burden of his argument has been already conceded, the second and larger half dealing with "Monument Administration in the various European Countries," will continue to retain its value even when, instead of being as at present a source of guidance, its main use will be comparison. It is vain to ignore the proposals which, as antiquaries are generally aware, are being put forward in the form of legislation for the greater care of our ancient monuments; and we feel that to endeavour to review this section of Professor Baldwin Brown's volume as though no such thing were in this present year occurring as the appearance of several bills in parliament would be futile, for we cannot pretend to regard them as though

they were not. We need only say that Professor Baldwin Brown gives really admirable summaries of monument administration in the various European countries, and in a few others, and this portion of his labours cannot fail to be of permanent value.

A CONCORDANCE OF ALL WRITTEN LAWES CONCERNING LORDS OF MANNORS, THEIRE FREE TENANTES, AND COPIEHOLDERS. Compiled by WILLIAM BARLEE in 1578. Edited by A. L. HARDY. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$, iv+72 pp. London: The Manorial Society, 1911.

This is another of the very interesting series of monographs which are being published from time to time by the Manorial Society. Its value is much enhanced by the short note of the author's life, which is appended by way of preface by Mr. A. L. Hardy, the Deputy Registrar of the Society. William Barlee, who, it appears, was himself a gentleman of the long robe, evidently started on too great an undertaking which he was never able to finish. The contents of his work certainly do not justify its pretentious title. He appears to have married a lady named Serle and to have fallen on poverty. One wonders if his wife's dowry gave rise to the celebrated Serle law-suit which lasted for over a hundred years, and was only finally settled by act of parliament in the reign of James I. The work is interesting and well worthy to be recorded in print, although it certainly sets one yearning for those proofs which would help to solve so many difficulties if they were only forthcoming. For instance, it will be very annoying for the socialist to read the pleasing ejaculation "nolite malignari," and almost immediately under it to read the words "Yt ys proved that neither kynge nor quene can be freholder nor copie holder to her subiectes," and yet to look in vain for those very proofs. On the other hand the frequent reference to the royal prerogative suggests that there was at least a hope in the breast of the author that, perchance, his work might catch the eye of "the great Elizabeth," who, like all her Tudor forbears, had a bourgeois love of praise. It is especially interesting at this present time to read that "Yt ys proved that kinges may safely take the spoiles of disobedient subjects," but again it is disappointing not to have the reference. In the middle of the book is a kind of preface gone astray in which the author says that he will call to his help, *inter alia*, three famous judges and one obedient priest, and naively remarks that "Wyllinge hartes must frelie declare their consciences before thei can se anye other volumes," which we would take to mean that he will not publish the rest unless others provide the materials.

The author's discursiveness in this preface and the curious spelling at times make it somewhat difficult to follow. After a rather enigmatical discourse on the subject of religion "without dishonour to our gratious prynce," we suddenly wander off into the book of Esther and find ourselves in close proximity to the somewhat gruesome "gallowes of Mardocheus," which became "the jebett of Haman." There is nothing new under the sun, and it is interesting to find this Elizabethan writer confessing his poverty and comforting his creditors by "tellynge howe thiere debtes may bee payed," "albeyt I am not worthe tenne grotes." On the whole the book is full of human philosophy, but as a treatise on law it is vastly disappointing.

L. M. M.

NOTICES OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL PUBLICATIONS.

A STUDY OF THE BRONZE AGE POTTERY OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND AND ITS ASSOCIATED GRAVE-GOODS. Two volumes. By the Hon. John Abercromby, LL.D. F.S.A. Scot. 7 × 9, 291 pp. with 1611 illustrations of pottery, 155 examples of grave-goods and 10 plates showing ornamentation—altogether 171 full-paged plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. £3 3s. n.

Mr. Abercromby's study of the Bronze Age pottery of the British Isles is a work unique in the history of archaeological research, both on account of the abundance of its materials and wealth of illustrations. And yet the text, a good readable size of type, does not exceed 300 pages for the two volumes, of which only about the half is written fully out in the ordinary literary style of scientific works—sufficient, however, to show that the author is quite a master of lucid exposition of archaeological phenomena. The rest of the text is virtually a *catalogue raisonné*, with the descriptive details so abbreviated that the letterpress of a full account of an interment and its associated grave-goods is reduced to a minimum. Hence the reader, with a photographic illustration of an urn before him, is enabled after momentary perusal of a few lines of text to realise at once the form and size of the vessel, the kind of grave from which it was taken, along with its locality and dimensions, the character of the interment and its associated objects, and often with references to the literature and name of the museum in which the objects are preserved. These are just the practical points that would remain in one's memory after wading through lengthy reports, thus occupying much unnecessary time. The following example taken at random from the author's description of cinerary urns (vol. ii, p. 11) will explain how this is done:

Fig. 11. H. 10¼ in. Winterbourne Stoke, B. 42. Wilts D. 63 ft; H. 6 ft. Found in a circular hole with an interment of burnt bones and a bronze awl with part of its handle. A. W. 164.

At first sight this looks rather enigmatical, but when it is explained that H signifies height; B, barrow; D, diameter; and A. W. Sir Richard Hoare's *Ancient Wilts*, p. 164, all mystery vanishes. As these or similar contractions are repeated in hundreds of cases one begins to appreciate how much labour is saved to the busy reader. Ten minutes are quite sufficient for acquiring a complete mastery of these abbreviations.

Then again the illustrations are so numerous that practically all the urns and objects found with them, hitherto preserved in the archaeological collections of Great Britain and Ireland, are brought within the compass of 161 plates. The urns are for the most part photographs of the originals, and are so well reproduced that both as to colouring and ornamentation the reader fancies he is looking at the real article. There is only one drawback to be noted about these figures, namely that they are not drawn to scale; but to compensate for this the height of each vessel, when known, is given at the foot of the pages. These sepulchral urns and grave-goods thus form a veritable museum in miniature, representing many old

specimens as well as the more recent discoveries of bronze age remains. How, it may be asked, were illustrations of all these objects brought together in one book? Herein lies one of the special qualifications of the author for the production of this work. A collector and voracious reader of almost every new and old book bearing on his favourite study, no sooner had he ascertained by their means the whereabouts of any recent or ancient collection of bronze age relics than he at once visited the locality and had the objects suitable for his purpose photographed, at the same time taking careful notes of the circumstances under which they were found. In his preface the author acknowledges his indebtedness for new illustrations to the curators of the museums of Driffield, Devizes, Dorchester, Taunton, Colchester, Sheffield, St. Germain, Copenhagen and Kiel, besides the owners of some private collections.

Having collected his materials with such scrupulous care the author retires to his well-stocked library there to elaborate his opinions on British and Hibernian pottery of the bronze age, the result of which is now laid before the public.

The principal object the author had in view in undertaking such a laborious piece of work was to arrange the chief types of British and Hibernian pottery in chronological order. The desirability of such an attempt became manifest from the fact that Dr. Thurnam regarded cinerary urns as earlier than beakers, or as they are called by former writers "drinking cups"; while Mr. Abercromby holds that the latter "class of ceramics must take precedence of the other classes in point of time."

The Beaker class.—The author briefly describes beakers as follows:

"They are hand-made, usually from 6 to 9 in. high, with thin walls made of clay tempered with sand or finely pounded stone. The surface of the vessel has often a polished appearance from being smoothed and rubbed with a stone or a piece of bone. The vessels were fairly well baked in an open fire and assume a yellowish, light brown or drab colour, though a few are red or reddish. The ornament is profuse and arranged in horizontal zones with plain bands between, as in Continental bell-beakers. This class of pottery is found almost invariably with skeleton interments under barrows, though a few instances have been noted where there was no indication that a tumulus had ever existed."

To facilitate their study Great Britain is divided into seven provinces, by means of which the author found it possible to watch the progressive changes that took place in any particular type as it moved gradually from south to north. As the object of his study is to arrange the beakers as near as may be in chronological order, this method, he thinks, "will show better than any other that the advance of the invaders was not rapid, and that to know the geographical position of the place where a beaker was found often gives us at once a general idea of its date with respect to the first arrival of the new colonists." The seven provinces are thus described:

I. England south of the Thames.
II. From the Thames to the Humber.
III. Yorkshire.
IV. The remaining counties in the north of England.
V. From the Scottish Border to the Tay, and the north of Ireland.
VI. The counties of Forfar, Kincardine and Aberdeen.
VII. The remaining northern counties.

To prevent confusion with true neolithic pottery the author informs us that he has adopted the "terminology of Dr. O. Montelius and treated the pottery here dealt with as belonging to the bronze age. What might be termed a 'transition' or a 'copper' period is therefore classed as Period I of the bronze age."

This restriction in the scope of the work is regrettable, as we thus lose the light the author, with his exceptional facilities for comparative research, might have thrown on one of the obscurest problems in British archaeology, namely, to what extent sepulchral pottery had been used by the earlier dolichocephalic races before the brachycephalic importers of the beaker came back upon the scene. Whence it came and what were its typical forms, are questions hitherto unanswered by British archaeologists.

In discussing beakers Mr. Abercromby adopts Dr. Thurnam's primary classification of them into three types (with however the addition of a number of sub-types). A. High-brimmed, globose cup. B. Ovoid cup with recurved rim. C. Low-brimmed cup.

In his analytical comparisons of these vessels through the seven provinces he observes that type A becomes rarer the farther north we travel, and that it never passed beyond the Tay; but on the other hand, that type C, which was represented in province I by only a single example, had gradually increased so much that it entirely supplanted the former in the north of Scotland. In the evolutionary sequence disclosed by these morphological changes in beakers, the author sees indications of absolute time, for, as he remarks, "it is reasonable to suppose that the changes of form in the beaker were stages in an evolution steadily advancing in one direction, and that potters reproduced these forms current in their generation just as they spoke the language of their own time and not of any other."

The author's object in arranging existing beakers in their relative order of time is to subserve the interests of history, and for this purpose he invents, or proposes, a time-scale by which certain historical events can be dated in terms of the pottery itself.

The next step in advance is to convert type A into such a scale. But on this point we must allow the author to define the rationale on which it is based.

"In trying to estimate the duration of type A in province I we have two questions to consider:—

(1) What is a reasonable time to allow for forms like 1 and 2 to degenerate to forms like figs. 18, 18 *bis*?

(2) What is a reasonable time for the invaders to pass from south of the Thames to the Tay? The answer is the same in both.

To make a beginning, I estimate the duration of phases I, II of type A at five generations each or ten generations in all. As the type never reached province VI, its duration coincides with the length of time required to advance as far as the Tay. From the south of England to the Tay is about 5½ degrees of latitude, or 385 miles, but in reality, as the invaders did not advance as the crow flies, the distance may be reckoned at about 500 miles: the distance by railway amounts to 447 miles. Accordingly they moved at the rate of 50 miles in each generation, or about 5 miles every 3 years.

The distance from the Thames to the Humber is nearly 200 miles; thence to the Tweed about 150 miles. Allowing for no northerly movement till after the first generation, the invaders would reach province III by the end of the fifth generation. In the seventh generation they would be in province IV, and in the eighth generation in province V. Not before the end of the tenth generation would they cross the Tay into

province VI, by which time type A was extinct. As beakers appeared first in province VI about ten generations later than in the south, they probably did not last longer than five or six generations in the northern provinces. Such an estimate assigns to the beaker period in Great Britain a duration of fifteen or sixteen generations, or about 450 years" (vol. I, p. 86).

The last stage in the chronological problem is the fixing of a date for the introduction of the beaker into Britain. This is accomplished, after a considerable amount of discussion, by reducing the absolute chronology of Dr. Montelius as applied to Britain by 500 years, which gives 2000–1500 B.C. as the date of importation and period of duration of beakers in Britain.

Contrary to the assertion of Dr. Thurnam, a few fragments of beakers have been recorded from Ireland, namely from a cairn at Mount Stewart, Co. Down, and a half-demolished tumulus at Mytura, Co. Sligo, but there is no evidence that they were brought there by the brachycephalic invaders of Britain. "Yet it is quite probable," as Mr. Abercromby remarks, "that some of them did pass over before 1500 B.C. Certainly after c. 1600, when the tribes of North Britain had become a mixed people, and could no longer be regarded as identical with the invaders, there is abundant evidence of their colonisation of Hibernia."

From Mr. Abercromby's lucid summary of the events that happened in Great Britain and Ireland from c. 2000 to 400 B.C. the following extracts will give some idea of the author's views on these brachycephalic invaders of Britain who introduced beakers from the continent. That there is a parallelism, both in form and ornamentation, between British and continental beakers is proved by no less than 54 illustrations ranging from the Iberian Peninsula to Denmark, North Germany and Italy.

"Assuming that the absolute chronology given above is not outrageously beside the mark, we find that about 2000 B.C. Britain was invaded by a rugged but enterprising people mainly of Alpine stock. Their ancestors, at a period still more remote, perhaps 300 or 400 years earlier, had lived beyond the Rhine; somewhere not very far north of Helvetia. Impelled by some unknown force, some of these gradually pushed northwards and traces of them are perhaps to be seen on the middle course of the Rhine. They may have followed the river for a time, but ultimately some must have moved westwards, till they came within sight of the white cliffs of Albion. Finally some small bodies of them crossed the channel and landed in Britain. There is reason to believe the invaders were not numerous, 300 or 400 persons, including women and children, may have been enough. For crossing the channel in coracles or small dug-out canoes was a dangerous enterprise and the number of such vessels at their disposal could not have been very great.

The civilisation of the invaders cannot be rated high. They had hardly emerged from the neolithic stage of culture, and perhaps landed without a single copper or bronze knife among them. But not very long afterwards we find them in possession of such small instruments, and perhaps flat axes. Their wealth must have consisted in cattle, sheep, goats and domestic swine, though whether they were able to transport on rafts or in canoes any of these animals with them when they arrived in Britain, or whether they plundered them from the earlier inhabitants, must remain uncertain; though it seems likely that they would be able to bring a few young animals with them, for they were eminently a pastoral people, depending on their flocks and herds. Though pastoral in the main, they were acquainted with wheat and perhaps other cereals, which would be cultivated on a small scale by the women. They were not an inventive people, for their sepulchral pottery can all be referred to two forms, which they retained with small variations for about 500 years, and they never broke the fetters of geometrical ornamentation," etc. etc.

"The neolithic inhabitants of Hibernia and North Britain, judging from their ceramic before they came in contact with the short-headed invaders, were probably of the same

stock, and those of the north of England would not be very different. Communication between the two countries must have been frequent. The date of the cemetery of Mount Stewart, Co. Down, by means of the beaker which it contained, may be placed rather below 1800 B.C. By this time the native Hibernians had developed, apparently spontaneously and apart from foreign influence, a richly decorated ceramic, the beginning of which cannot be exactly estimated in years. Some very fine specimens of it, earlier than the above date, have been found in Argyll, and others in Northumberland. An influence, which may be termed Hibernian, covered therefore a large area, and the cause of its spreading may be attributed to the community of origin of the native inhabitants" (vol. ii, 110–114).

FOOD-VESSELS.—Up to this point we have as far as possible eliminated from the context some notices of the beakers, so as to give readers a concise and consecutive description of their history from the author's point of view. We now come to the food-vessels, the leading features of which are thus described:

"The class of vessels with which we are now concerned served the same purpose as the beakers, and were evidently placed in the grave for the use of the deceased; in some of them bones of small animals or the remains of decayed animal and vegetable matter have been observed. Compared with beakers the walls of the vessels are thicker, more solid, and though generally of small size (from 4 to 6 inches in height), are heavier than a beaker of greater height. The forms are quite different and none can be derived from it; the ornamentation is far simpler, and no longer arranged in alternate zones: the technique of the ornament is also often different. The food-vessels of Britain south of the Tweed may be arranged under six main types, with several by-forms or sub-types" (vol. i, p. 93).

These vessels are treated analytically much in the same fashion as the beakers, but instead of grouping them over seven provinces, he considers three adequate for his present purpose, and to prevent confusion with the former he calls them "regions," thus: Region I includes the counties lying south of Derbyshire and Staffordshire. Region II includes these two counties and the rest of the north of England. Region III consists of Scotland and Ireland.

CINERARY URNS.—Cinerary vessels are divided into two classes. (1) Those of considerable size into which the cremated remains were placed, or which were inverted over them; and (2) small pygmy vessels from 1 to 3 inches high, commonly termed incense cups.

All these are classified under the following seven principal types: (1) The overhanging-rim type. (2) Pygmy vessels of various forms. (3) The southern groups 1, 2, 3. (4) The Deverel-Rimbury groups 1, 2. (5) The Cordon type. (6) The encrusted type. (7) Enlarged food vessels.

For analytical and comparative purposes Great Britain and Ireland are divided into five areas, thus: (1) The country south of the Thames. (2) From the Thames to the Humber. (3) From the Humber to the Tweed. (4) North Britain. (5) Hibernia.

Without having the illustrations of the various vessels discussed before the reader, so as to enable him to follow the increments of change noted, it would be useless to attempt to give an intelligent description of the comparative analogies and analytical processes to which the food-vessels and cinerary urns are subjected as regards form, ornamentation and associated relics. Indeed, it requires close attention and constant reference to the illustrations on the part of skilled experts to follow the author'-

successive points and inferences, amidst so many types and varieties into which the materials are divided. When, however, we come to the chapters dealing with summary results and ethnological problems, such as the physical character, religious rites and burial customs of the brachycephalic invaders of Britain, there is abundance of matter suitable for review purposes, had we not already exceeded our space limits. The last four chapters are devoted to a discussion—on Stonehenge and its cemetery of surrounding barrows—Who were the brachycephalic invaders?—the limits of the bronze age—and the relative chronology of pottery of the bronze age. Upon the whole we have no doubt that some of the methods, views and speculations adopted by the learned author will meet with some hostile criticism by rival schools of archaeology. But on a subject that is built up on fragmentary remains of meagre extent, and often imperfectly recorded, in a science that is still in its infancy nothing else could have seen expected. On the other hand most archaeologists will regard the record of facts and especially the wealth of illustrations in this work as large, valuable and permanent contributions to British archaeology which will remain a monument to the author's industry in this special field of research.

ROBERT MUNRO.

LE PALAIS DE LATRAN. ETUDE HISTORIQUE ET ARCHEOLOGIQUE. Par Ph. Lauer (Ecole française de Rome), 15 × 11, iv. + 648 pp. With plan, 34 plates and 143 illustrations in the text. Paris: Leroux, 1911.

It has long been known that M. Lauer was engaged on a monumental work concerning the Lateran. Let us say at once that the weighty folio that has now appeared will not disappoint the expectations which have been raised. The author traces in great detail the history of the palace and the church from its origin under the early Empire in the house of the Laterani down to modern times. This historical sketch occupies more than half the book. It is followed by an appendix, a bibliography (which might with advantage have been made somewhat fuller) and an invaluable collection of documents of various kinds. M. Lauer is to be congratulated on his success in penetrating into the Lateran archives, after four months of very tiresome negotiations; for during the nineteenth century these archives had been practically sealed up, so far as foreign scholars were concerned. The appendix contains a series of documents, partly from these archives, partly from other sources, concerning the relations between the Lateran and France, centring round the abbey of Clairac; for, curiously enough, since Henri IV, for political reasons, presented this abbey to the chapter of the cathedral of Rome, he and all subsequent rulers of France became theoretically canons of the Lateran. The position is none the less curious because Clairac was in the sixteenth century, and remained long after the donation in question, a centre of Prostestant disaffection to the Roman Church. M. Lauer has not, however, printed more than a few of the documents relating to the abbey, what he has printed being, as he says, only what the manifest hostility of the authorities has not prevented him from extracting. The first of the documents which occupy the remainder of the volume is the description of the Lateran by John the Deacon; this is followed by the lengthy description which was

written by Onofrio Panvinio of Verona; of this, hitherto, only extracts had been printed by Mai. These two descriptions between them occupy just one hundred pages of small print in double columns; the amount of labour involved in settling the text must have been anything but slight. Another eighty-five pages are occupied by transcripts of the old inventories of the property of the Lateran (the oldest being of the thirteenth century), lists of the dependent churches and religious houses, and so on. An important section consists of the building accounts from 1492 down to the eighteenth century. It is greatly to be regretted that nothing earlier on this subject is available. Under the cicumstances, it would have been worth while considering the possibility of collecting such earlier documents as are known to exist concerning work which was done here by various artists, whether architects or painters. M. Lauer has, for this kind of thing, been usually content to refer to such works as Müntz's *Les Arts à la cour des Papes*. Every reviewer naturally turns to see what the author has said about his own favourite subject; and so we consulted M. Lauer on the artist whom he calls "Vittore Pisanello," but who has now for some years been known, thanks to the researches of Biadego, by his right name of Antonio Pisano. But although a correction of an old chronological error, repeated in the text, is made in the Errata, we are disappointed to find nothing new; nor is any reference made to the document published by G. de Nicola in the *Bollettino d'Arte* for 1909 from the Lateran archives, implying that Pisanello was the immediate successor of Gentile da Fabriano at the Lateran. These details may not be of much importance, especially as the paintings have all disappeared; also, since a volume of this size takes years to print, we can well understand that the document just mentioned was published too late to find a place in it. But, again, in a volume of this size, one looks for completeness, and certain small details such as the misprints or mistaken forms Nardo Carbolini (for Corbolini) and Caradosso de Foppa (where the *de* is superfluous) seem to indicate that the author's knowledge of this side of his subject is not over-exact. A remarkable error, which occurs twice on one page, and is therefore presumably a lapse on the author's and not the printer's part, concerns the Jewish traveller who visited the Lateran about 1170. The worthy Benjamin hailed not from Toledo, but from Tudela, a very different place. M. Lauer must not think us captious if we note these small defects in what is a fine achievement; the first and last impression received from his book must always be one of admiration for his patient scholarship, but a very serious defect in a work of this size is the absence of any kind of index.

The illustrations, especially the plates, are on the whole highly satisfactory. In some of the text illustrations, however, full advantage has not been taken of the large scale of the volume. Thus in the plan of the excavations of 1873–1876 on p. 10, the reduction has made the hatching run together to such a degree that it is almost impossible to distinguish the various methods of construction.

We may remind the reader, since it was published too late to be of use to M. Lauer, that an elaborate description of the Lateran is to be found in *The Solace of Pilgrimes*, by Capgrave, who visited Rome in the middle of the fifteenth century. This delightful work is now accessible in the edition produced by the British and American Archaeological Society of Rome.

G. F. Hill.

DIE WAFFEN DER WARTBURG. By Alfons Diener-Schonberg. 14×11, xii + 196 pp. 78 plates. Berlin: Historischer Verlag Baumgartel. 60 Mk.

This fine and scholarly book supplies a long-felt want in giving to the world a comprehensive account of the interesting and valuable collection of arms and armour, most worthily housed in the historic old German castle, the Wartburg, near Eisenach, in Thuringia. This important collection consists of some 900 numbers, of which 340 are body armour, namely, 3 shirts of mail, one of which is Italian, the others Oriental; a Hungarian cap of chain-mail, and 7 smaller pieces; 99 full and half armours, 5 sets of bards, 99 helmets, etc.

Most of the plate armour is of German make, and it springs mainly from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Among it are worthy examples of the work of some of the great German masters, such as Kunz Lochner, Wilhelm von Worms the younger, Matthaus Frauenpreis, and Peter von Speyer. Armour usually called "Gothic," roughly that of the second half of the fifteenth century, fashioned after the form of the shapely Florentine dress, is represented by a fine cuirass, and there are several excellent suits of the style immediately succeeding, that of fluted "Maximilian" armour, ranging in date from about 1510 to 1540, thus fairly covering its course. One of these suits is by Matthaus Frauenpreis of Augsburg. Other fine harnesses cover the period up to the time of the general disuse of body armour. About the end of the first quarter of the sixteenth century we begin to get half armour (demi-suits), or landsknecht armour, a variety indispensable for the greater mobility required in the lighter troops; the collection is rich in this description, and many of the suits are engraved.

There are some remarkably fine helmets, notably of the Maximilian period, good examples of swords, and long and short-hafted weapons, with some interesting handguns and two cannons. All these have been arranged in chronological order, and the smiths' and other marks carefully registered and well reproduced. The objects in chain-mail have no special importance, though the treatment of the subject is good. It may, however, be remarked that "die Brunne" (broigne, byrnie) does not necessarily mean "trelice" mail, for it may have been something else. "Ein langes geschlitztes, 'armelloses Hemd" is not a "gambeson" as stated, but a surcoat. The gambeson, a quilted garment, was worn under the hauberk, the surcoat over it.

The general description of the armour and its successive changes and developments, chronologically set forth, is good. These changes were suggested partly, no doubt, with a view to the better protection of weak places and for resisting some more powerful weapon or mode of attack, though they were far more influenced by the fashions prevailing in civil dress: in fact the shape of the doublet, shoes, etc. of each period are all reproduced in steel.

Among the enriched armour is a suit bearing the monogram of Henry II of France, which is etched and gilded, dating about the middle of the sixteenth century. A typical armour and set of bards, by Kunz Lochner of Nuremberg, are both very notable, as also are harnesses by Wilhelm von Worms, Anton Peffenhauser, and a demi-harness by Peter von Speyer.

R. C. C.

NOTICES OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL PUBLICATIONS.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE PREHISTORIC SOCIETY OF EAST ANGLIA FOR 1908–9 AND 1909–10. Vol. I, part I. Edited by W. G. CLARKE, hon. secretary. 8¼ × 5¼, 121 pp. London: Lewis, 3s. 6d. n.

Many of the leading members of the East Anglian Society are already well known as exponents of the advanced school in all that relates to prehistoric study, and consequently the views expressed in these *Proceedings*, although sufficiently startling, will cause little surprise in archaeological circles. Established societies naturally shrink from the responsibility of publishing theories and ideas which the bulk of their members consider to be inconsistent with generally accepted views and unsupported by ascertained facts, but there are advantages in having such ideas recorded and crystallised in permanent form, so that criticism may be focussed on them. Moreover, even though the views of an enthusiast may be fantastic, they frequently contain some germs of truth and, awakening new ideas, prevent the stagnation which may result from remaining too long in the old rut.

The attitude of the East Anglian Society seems to be well defined by Dr. Allen Sturge in his presidential address, in which he charges the archaeologists of this country with having relapsed into indifference regarding prehistoric study, and of lagging behind other countries; and it is undoubtedly a fact that very little activity has lately been displayed in prehistoric matters by the leading archaeological societies. The reason is not far to seek, for the majority of the problems involved are no longer archaeological but geological. Much work is being done in this direction, and those who are thus engaged find it more advantageous to place their observations before geological societies, whose members are better qualified to deal with many of the difficulties.

The mere accumulation of stone implements, classified according to type, is unlikely to add much to knowledge. What is now required is the study of implements in situ, and of the beds in which they occur, and it is to be feared that a society formed exclusively for the study of prehistory may suffer in its researches by want of co-operation on the part of the geologists.

In the discussion upon the discoveries of Mr. J. Reid Moir, which claim to prove the existence of "Sub-Crag Man," two important points have come forward prominently: one shows how conflicting are the opinions among geologists as to whether the crag deposits have been disturbed or not, and the other that the human origin of the so-called implements is very doubtful. Some of these stones appear to have a resemblance to rough specimens of palaeolithic type, and under ordinary circumstances might probably not have been regarded with suspicion. The majority, however, are very unconvincing, and the illustrations which accompany

Mr. Moir's article go far to support those who believe them to be merely natural forms. Mr. F. N. Haward, in a very able paper, the result of observations extending over many years, which he has recently published, contends that natural forces are capable of producing far greater simulation to man's handiwork than has generally been credited. Little is known as to Nature's work in flint-chipping. It is a line that has been insufficiently followed, and such experiments as have been made are mostly unsatisfactory, owing to the difficulty of reproducing the natural conditions. The greater caution should be exercised therefore in accepting conclusions based on rudimental chippings or occasional bulbs of percussion.

Since the epoch-making discovery of Boucher de Perthes, many claims have been made to carry man's presence into remoter geological periods, but these claims rest on very slender evidence and cannot be said to have received satisfactory support by subsequent discoveries. The question of eoliths is of a similar character. During the many years that have passed since these were first claimed as the handiwork of man, what has been discovered to support the contention? Dr. Sturge admits that the question "has been more or less in abeyance, and our science has for all practical purposes gone to sleep." At any rate science seems to have displayed more activity in discrediting eoliths than in producing additional evidence in their favour. How different is the case of the river-drift implements, at first treated with far less respect than eoliths: evidence has continued to accumulate, until now all doubts concerning them have passed away.

An excellent plan has been adopted by the East Anglian Society for dealing with such observations as those of Mr. Moir, in the appointment of a special committee of enquiry. Although the committee should doubtless have been chosen on much broader lines, it nevertheless shows the honesty of purpose which animates this band of zealous workers, for questions of such great complexity, on which hang such weighty conclusions, should never be left to the unsupported exertions and testimony of a single investigator. On the other hand the conclusions of the committee, however confidently expressed, are not necessarily the last word on the subject.

A lengthy paper is contributed by Dr. Sturge on "The Chronology of the Stone Age," in which he has proceeded along lines which seem far from satisfactory. To classify surface implements according to colour, patination, staining and type, seems to be a hopeless proceeding for the determination of sequence, and one full of liability to error, while the exaggerated importance given to scratches on flint, as evidence of ice-action, appears to be a misconception of the mechanics of natural agencies. That some scratches on flints are the result of ice-action there is little reason to doubt, but it is futile to argue, as if it were a matter beyond question, on the assumption that flints have been scratched by this means only. Such an opinion is held by few, if any, practical field-workers. Dr. Sturge, it is true, only puts his chronological divisions forward as a beginning, but it seems very improbable that the various stages of the neolithic period are to be recognised by the condition of implements found on the surface. The length of time occupied by the neolithic period was doubtless very considerable, and during this time many changes have taken place. These

may perhaps have been of slight geological importance, but sufficient to modify considerably much of the surface which existed at the earlier stages of this period. A long and careful examination of the holocene deposits of our rivers would be more likely to furnish the evidence by which implements on the surface might be classified.

The same note of conviction which seems to pervade this publication of the East Anglian prehistorians is echoed by Lieut.-Colonel Underwood, in his plea for the recognition of "Figure-stones," when he says: "It is in my opinion only a matter of time, and that a short one, when 'Figure-stones' will be generally accepted." Although the number of people who are collecting these things has increased, it can hardly be said that there is a corresponding increase of convincing evidence on the subject. In spite of the large number of animistic flints that have now been got together, are there any among them which could universally be accepted as anything but a freak of nature?

It may be doing an injustice to the Prehistoric Society of East Anglia to conclude that this first number of their journal reflects the views of most of its members, many of whom, judging by the reports of the meetings, appear to be working on sound lines. Succeeding issues may do much to remove any wrong impression, and if those first in the field have done nothing more than demonstrate the difficulties surrounding the problems of the early history of man, it is no mean achievement.

F. W. R.

THE ROMANIZATION OF ROMAN BRITAIN, New Edition, Revised and Enlarged. By Professor F. Haverfield. $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$. 70 pp. with a preface, index, and 22 illustrations from drawings and photographs. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. 3s. 6d. n.

Originally read to the British Academy and published in its Proceedings (1905, ii, 185–217), this important paper has been revised and enlarged and is now issued in book form by the Clarendon Press. It is a masterly and convincing survey of accumulated evidence. The example of the thorough efficiency of the Silchester excavations has given a stimulus to Romano-British exploration generally; the yield of evidence in the last twenty years has increased proportionately and its interpretation has become yearly more intelligent. The study of this period has emerged from a time of mere suggestive speculation, in which the inferences so often bore little relation to the evidence, to a stage where methods of careful analysis and comparison are steadily establishing incontrovertible fact. The traditional attitude of the older archaeologists, who saw in every excavated site a military environment, has been definitely abandoned. In its place we have a very different picture, which Professor Haverfield in this admirable treatise brings with great insight to a focus that is almost clear.

History, in estimating the Roman empire, has recognised that provincial administration was its greatest achievement, but it has failed to recognise adequately the work it did *within* the provinces. It is here that archaeological evidence, when accurately read, offers a tardy justice. The function of

history lies with the ruled as well as with the rulers,[1] and if the historian's treatment of Roman Britain has lacked a due sense of proportion between frontier organisation and internal development, Professor Haverfield's interpretation of the positive evidence of archaeology convincingly restores the balance. In the Romanisation of Britain we find a process that is consciously constructive. Incorporation in the empire involved more than denationalisation; it meant absorption in the material civilisation of Rome, resulting in a Roman fabric to which the native elements in their more essential features almost entirely conformed. It meant that, while this absorption was not wholly uniform, and that here and there conditions of locality or of especial fitness show indigenous survivals, yet in the main in the lowlands of southern and eastern Britain the difference between Roman and provincial practically vanished. The process was a conscious one; the method was the alluring admixture of suggestive example with a certain measure of local devolution. *Idque apud imperitos humanitas vocabatur, quum pars servitutis esset.*

In addition to the evidence of material civilisation and of art Professor Haverfield cites the less weighty attestation of language. That Latin was in general the language of epigraphy in Roman Britain is not in itself conclusive evidence of Romanisation. But when Latin is found to be also the language of *graffiti* we are brought face to face with a material fact. So far one country town has supplied the bulk of this evidence, and despite the wonderful completeness of its excavation, epigraphical remains are sadly lacking to confirm the wisest theories as to the place Calleva occupied in the political civilisation of Roman Britain. The case for Romanisation in respect of language, however, is not weak but merely incomplete.

Historical evidence, on the other hand, is weak, but it plays some part in establishing the chronology of the process of Romanisation, which is shown to have started almost with the Claudian conquest, to have assumed definite proportions in the towns by the end of the first century, and to have reached its culminating point in the Constantinian age. It is to this latter age that the "villas," farms, and Romanised rural industries most generally belong. As to the extent to which even then the peasant life of Britain was Romanised Professor Haverfield speaks with a cautious reserve. There is as yet no definite evidence, for few traces of Roman modifications of peasant dwellings (rude hypocausts, painted stucco, etc.) have been found far from the vicinity of some definitely Romanised estate. The region of the frontiers, at any rate, Wales and the north and the extreme south-west, were left essentially Celtic.

In the last chapter the sequel is briefly discussed—the Celtic revival in the later Empire. The Romanisation of Britain is shown to have been more than a merely transitory interlude, rigidly marked off by the arrival and departure of the legions. In spite of a Celtic revival and an English invasion its influence could still be faintly traced even in the sixth century.

This book is a great addition to Romano-British literature. It represents a vivid personal point of view, and is replete with the stimulus which the author is giving generally to the field of this research.

A. M. W.

[1] Professor Haverfield: Inaugural address to Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

MEMORIALS OF OLD NOTTINGHAMSHIRE. Edited by EVERARD L. GUILFORD. 9 × 6, xiv + 353 pp. 44 plates and 14 illustrations in the text. London: George Allen and Co. Ltd. 1912. 15s. n.

This volume is one of the series of *Memorials of the Counties of England*, under the general editorship of the Rev. P. H. Ditchfield, of which twenty-seven volumes have already been published. There are two classes of readers to whom the title appeals. On the one hand there are those who, from the love of their county, set store by personal details of a more or less gossipy nature, and who will prefer such articles as those on the Poets of Nottinghamshire and the Clockmakers of Newark. On the other hand there are those who welcome the slowly built-up accumulation of scientific summaries of antiquarian research, county by county; and these will not be disappointed with this collection.

The editor opens with a clearly-written article on "Historical Nottinghamshire," and also contributes a scholarly account of the Civil War, which may be said to have begun and ended within this county, with the raising of the Standard at Nottingham, and the surrender at Newark.

Ecclesiastical art claims a large share, and the two articles on low-side windows and on church spires, by Mr. H. Gill, thoroughly illustrated with photographs and sketches by the writer, are just what should be undertaken for each county. The same may be said of the very complete descriptive list of roods, screens, and lofts, by that competent authority, Mr. Aymer Vallance. The county may well be proud of the fourteenth-century stone pulpitum at Southwell, and the magnificent and complete scheme of perpendicular woodwork which encloses the chancel at Newark. Mr. Hamilton Thompson writes on mediaeval church architecture with his usual facility of synthetical description, noting resemblances and influences, especially that of York, on the church building of Nottinghamshire, which served as a reservoir for the dissemination of the graceful style of architecture of the earlier fourteenth century. The chapter-house at Southwell and the Easter sepulchre at Hawton are two of the best known instances.

In the History of Southwell the Rev. W. E. Hodgson deals carefully with the tradition of the shrine of St. Eadburg, and the founding of the minster by Thomas of Beverley. One may venture a hope that Nottinghamshire antiquaries will some day be able to publish a transcript of the *Liber Albus*, a valuable collection of Southwell documents from the twelfth century in the minster library.

Dr. Cox, the learned writer of the account of religious houses in the Notts. volume of the *Victoria History* (vol. ii), contributes "Newstead Priory and the Religious Houses of Nottinghamshire," which perhaps hardly fulfils the promise of the second part of its title, for, after some very interesting general remarks, he devotes his remaining pages to a fascinating sketch of Newstead Priory (now erroneously called Abbey).

Mr. W. P. W. Phillimore writes out of full knowledge on the history of Nottingham, but much is omitted that might have been said about the relation of the town to the great Cluniac priory of Lenton, which on several occasions lodged in its guest-chambers royal visitors to the town, and held by charter of Henry II its Martinmas fair of eight days' duration. The mention of a house of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem is an error

started by Thoroton, due perhaps to the existence of a small hospital of canons of the Holy Sepulchre, and that of St. John which was entrusted with the repair of Trent Bridge, but had no connexion with the Knights Hospitallers.

Nottinghamshire is not rich in ancient houses, but the full description by Mr. J. A. Gotch of Wollaton Hall, built by Sir Francis Willoughby in the time of queen Elizabeth, affords an interesting study of the early development of palladian design. He attributes the original plans to John Thorpe, and points out the influence of Dutch and French art in the production, by English workmen, of this somewhat fantastic but certainly magnificent work.

There is a paper on the Nottingham mint, siege pieces, and tokens, by Mr. F. E. Burton. Sherwood forest and the river Trent, the two characteristic natural features of the county, are dealt with by Dr. Cox and Mr. Bernard Smith. The book is admirably illustrated, and provided with a rather inadequate sketch-map, and an excellent index.

A. D. H.

A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL LIST OF ROMANO-BRITISH ARCHITECTURAL REMAINS IN GREAT BRITAIN. By ARTHUR H. LYELL. 8¼ × 5½, xii + 156 pp. Cambridge University Press, 1912. 7s. 6d. n.

An eminent foreign writer in a recent and important survey of archaeological progress has dismissed Roman Britain in the following words: "Britain was only slightly affected by Roman civilisation. In addition to the northern protecting walls, accidental finds are occasionally made of baths, mosaics, etc. which, however, offer nothing peculiarly British. Under these circumstances the archaeologists or antiquarian societies of the island kingdom do not need to exercise great activity in regard to Romano-British art." The excuse for so lamentable a misapprehension is, I think, to be found in the very reason that has led Mr. Lyell to compile this invaluable list. Descriptive accounts of Romano-British remains are so widely scattered that the mere quest of them is in itself a matter of laborious research. Add to this the long lack of any unifying inspiration or control and it is not surprising that our results have, on the whole, met with scanty recognition on the continent. Mr. Lyell's list will do much to remedy what has been the student's serious disability.

In 1795 a correspondent in the *Gentleman's Magazine* suggested that a map of the Roman topography of Britain should be compiled, but naturally such a map was impossible in the absence of any topographical index. In 1879 Mr. Lawrence Gomme proposed the formation of such an index to the Index Society, and as his proposal did not receive support he himself collected and classified by counties all the notices of Romano-British remains that had appeared in the *Gentleman's Magazine* from 1731 to 1868. This was published in 1887 in two parts in the *Gentleman's Magazine Library*. The work was naturally not comprehensive of all the existing evidence, but within its limits it has been invaluable. It was followed up by the same compiler's *Index of Archaeological Papers* from 1665–1890, published

at first as an appendix to the *Archaeological Review*, afterwards by Messrs. Constable, and subsequently by the Congress of Archaeological Societies in union with the Society of Antiquaries.

But the existence of this annual index does not detract in any way from the consummate usefulness of Mr. Lyell's work. The fact that it is a topographical list and not an author's name-index alone establishes its great superiority as a hunting-ground for Romano-British reference; and the fact that it contains 150 pages more than justifies the distinction of a separate publication. The arrangement is a classification by counties, which are in alphabetical order. Each county list is headed with its own bibliography, and the references under the place-names are to these and to a more general bibliography at the beginning of the book.

As this is essentially a book for students it is to be regretted that the edition was not published with an interleaf. This would have added greatly to its usefulness. Not only is there a constant accession of fresh evidence to be entered from time to time, but room is also wanted for those references (probably few in number) which have eluded even the compiler's most exhaustive search.

By this patient and invaluable piece of work Mr. Lyell has earned the gratitude and congratulations of all students of Roman Britain.

A. M. W.

ENGLAND'S RIVIERA. A Topographical and Archaeological Description of Land's End and Cornwall. By J. Harris Stone. 9 × 6, xii + 492 pp. With 137 illustrations. London: Kegan Paul. 1912. 15s. n.

Mr. Stone has written a book which, while containing matters of interest for all readers, yet leaves confusion in their minds. He treats of all subjects, and in such a way that we find ourselves continually compelled to perform a species of mental acrobatics.

The archaeologist will find much to interest him in this volume. Mr. Stone has a good deal to say upon the subject of Celtic crosses, British villages, beehive huts, logan stones and standing stones. He is an enthusiast in folklore and has preserved much that is valuable, but all through there is a tiring discursiveness. An instance of this is to be found in chapter xxxii, where the well-known nursery rhyme about the St. Ives man who had seven wives leads Mr. Stone to discuss the universal regard held for the number seven. It is true that to whatever country we turn we find a certain sacredness attached to this number, but we hardly think the discussion quite in place here, especially as at the end of the chapter we are no wiser about the man with seven wives than we were before. Another number to which the author attaches a special interest is nineteen. He tells us that he believes originally all stone circles both in Cornwall and elsewhere had nineteen upright stones.

One point stands out among all that Mr. Stone tells us. The antiquities of Cornwall are suffering grievously from neglect. The crosses are becoming hidden by bracken and defaced by moss, the standing stones are doing duty as gate-posts and the beehive huts are likely before long to be entirely destroyed. We hope that something may be done to preserve these antiquities before it is too late.

In connexion with folklore, the author has much to say about all kinds of strange superstitions, now about adders, now about red hair, or crosses, or pilchards, or the north side of churches. Mingled with these are accounts of the pilchard fishery and the radium mine at St. Ives, and the peace cup of St. Ives leads Mr. Stone to write a chapter on loving cups in general.

Enough has been said to show that this is a book of value to those who will take the trouble to read through much that is irrelevant.

One thing must be emphasised, namely, the number and excellence of the illustrations, which alone make this book worth having to a student of things Cornish.

On page 118 we are sorry to see that Mr. Stone still considers low-side windows to have been used by lepers.

E. L. G.

LA BRETAGNE ROMAINE. Par François Sagot. $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$, xviii + 418 pp. With folding map and 5 plans. Paris: Fontemoing et Cie. 1911. 12 francs.

Dr. Sagot has set himself to write a history of the Romans in Britain covering the whole of the imperial rule. So far, the volumes which have dealt with the Roman occupation as a whole have been elementary in character, and no doubt there is room for more exhaustive treatment of the subject. The task is by no means an easy one, the shadowy outline which we gain from literary sources must be supplemented by inscriptions and the study of archaeological researches, the latter often of varying quality and widely scattered among the transactions of learned societies and other publications. It must be admitted that Dr. Sagot has under obvious difficulties produced a volume which does credit to his industry and research. From the early expedition of Caesar down to the final abandonment each phase of the occupation of Britain is dealt with. The military and civil organisation of the province is treated in detail, while chapters are devoted to the industries and social life of the people. The book contains much that is of interest to the general reader as well as to the student. We can well accept the claim put forward that no text of importance has been overlooked, but we lay down the volume with the feeling that the writer would have succeeded in conveying a more complete and vivid impression of his subject had he been more familiar with the archaeological work of recent years. The excavations of the past decade have provided so many valuable illustrations of Roman life in this country that no volume can be considered complete which fails adequately to deal with them. The uncovering of Corstopitum with all its impressive buildings deserves more than a passing reference in a footnote. Gellygaer might have been cited as an admirable plan of one of the smaller castella, a plan revealed on a larger scale by Professor Bosanquet's work at Housesteads. The importance of the excavations at Bar Hill is not sufficiently appreciated, and we find no mention of Inchtuthill with its military bath-house on the Upper Tay, so far the most northerly post to which we can with certainty assign a Roman occupation; indeed the records of Roman excavation contained in the *Proceedings* of the Scottish Antiquaries would have well repaid more adequate treatment. The plans given are in-

sufficient; in a book of the kind, so largely dependent for its information on archaeological results, this form of illustration cannot be dispensed with. Still, we welcome the work as a genuine attempt to bring within the compass of a single volume much that even in an era of free libraries is not generally available.

J. C.

BRASSES. By J. S. M. Ward. 6½ × 4½, viii + 160 pp. With 25 illustrations. (The Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature). Cambridge University Press, 1912. 1s. n.

This little book appears to be entirely based on the Rev. H. W. Macklin's *Brasses of England*, published in 1907. It closely follows Mr. Macklin's divisions into the various periods, and closes with an "index of places" arranged under counties, an index which Mr. Macklin himself invented, apparently for the express purpose of worrying the persons consulting it. The first chapter deals with the earlier brasses, but exception may be taken to the remarks that Sir John D'Abernon's "feet rest on a lion, which is said to signify that he fell in battle," and that the fact of some figures having crossed legs "does not prove that they were crusaders, but only that in some way they were benefactors to the church." In his account of the fifteenth-century brasses the author, in describing the beast at the feet of dame Margaret Vernon at Tong, goes out of his way to slander a good mediaeval elephant by calling it an "extraordinary dragon." Other chapters deal with the mediaeval clergy, the monasteries, palimpsest brasses, and the later brasses from 1485 to 1773. Special types, foreign brasses and architectural details are also shortly described. The concluding chapter treats of rubbings and how to produce them, but "cobblers' wax" is hardly to be recommended for rubbing purposes: the material generally used is heelball. In this chapter are also some remarks on the destruction of brasses and on their restoration or repair. An appendix contains a good list of typical examples, but the bibliography at the end is weak. The illustrations vary in quality, some are fairly good whilst others might have been improved by a little careful hand work. Taken as a whole the book is a useful little work and cheap at the price.

M. S.

PORCHES AND FONTS. By J. Charles Wall. 9½ × 6, xx + 348 pp. With frontispiece and 159 illustrations in the text. London: Wells Gardner, Darton & Co. 1912. 10s. 6d. n.

Mr. Wall has combined porches and fonts for a symbolical reason; as through the porch one enters the church, so by the font one is admitted into the Church of Christ. This is unfortunate, for fonts have been so thoroughly treated that another book on the subject was scarcely needed: on the other hand, when dealing with porches the author has a delightful subject and a clear field.

It is good to find that Mr. Wall deals at length with the liturgical and other uses of the porch. Porches were not intended for shelter only; the

first part of the rites of Baptism, Marriage and Purification took place within them ; and above the porch there was often a room used for many purposes. Interesting instances are given of its use as a treasury, a school, a chapel, or even as an armoury. The treatment of the architectural side is less satisfactory. The various examples are grouped, apparently at random, under the old headings of Romanesque, Early, Middle, and Third Pointed, and described carefully in detail. The font section is well arranged, but very little is added to what has already been said on the subject. Mr. Wall might have refrained from illustrating those fonts of which Mr. Bond gives excellent photographs in *Fonts and Font Covers*, for there is no lack of new material.

There are a few slips that could have been avoided. In mediaeval England the blessing of new fire on Easter eve did not take place in the porch, but as the York books tell us " in occidentali parte ecclesie prope fontem inter duas columnas australis insulae." The Sarum rubric is to the same effect though less precise. Woolpit and Beccles are not happy examples of the use of good local freestone, for they are both in flint districts, and the stone was brought from distant quarries. The Ewelme font cover shows no trace of Jacobean work, though in Mr. Bond's photograph the well-cut pinnacles of early nineteenth-century date do look like " Jacobean spindle-baluster ornamentation." Again it is unwise to call the beautiful fan-vaulted porch of Maids' Moreton church " debased " on the strength of the date on the seventeenth-century outer doors.

The illustrations are numerous and beautifully drawn. It is pleasant to find pen and ink work in these days of process blocks.

F. E. H.

THE BATTLE OF BLOREHEATH. By Francis Randle Twemlow. 8¼ × 5¼, x + 37 + xxi pp. With 3 folding maps. Wolverhampton : Whitehead Bros. 1912. 3s. 6d. n.

It is a curious fact that singularly little is known about the details of the battles which were fought in England during the middle ages. We may know their date, their approximate locality and the names of the leaders on either side, but of the actual course taken by the fighting we know next to nothing. The chroniclers on whom we depend for our facts are both reticent and not infrequently inaccurate, and it is therefore difficult to reconstruct the course of events.

Mr. Twemlow has expended much labour and research on this detailed study of the battle of Bloreheath. The book is undoubtedly one for those who live in the vicinity or who have devoted themselves to a special study of the Wars of the Roses, and it may well serve as a model for others to copy.

The author describes the events which led up to the fight, the constitution of the opposing forces, the lie of the ground, the question of arms, tactics, and generalship, the actual battle and the subsequent events. The volume is completed with several appendices and illustrated with maps.

E. L. G.

NOTICES OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL PUBLICATIONS.

MEDIAEVAL FIGURE SCULPTURE IN ENGLAND. By Edward S. Prior, M.A. F.S.A. and Arthur Gardner, M.A. F.S.A. 11 × 8¾, xi + 734 pp. 855 illustrations. Cambridge University Press, 1912. £3 3s. n.

This fine work, in setting out a comprehensive view of a neglected national art, is of quite national importance, and it regularises a new province in English archaeology. Surely, too, it will have an influence on the work of our modern sculptors. To-day, as when Professor Cokerell, the fine expert in Greek art, made the remark, " casts of them would surprise modern practitioners." We used to be told that mediaeval figures were not anatomically correct. Now, however, it begins to be allowed that there are different kinds of correctness and that certain kinds of results can only be reached by their appropriate means.

Professor Prior and Mr. Gardner have worked at their subject for ten or a dozen years, accumulating, we may suppose, thousands of photographs and visiting all the finer sculptures in their habitats. Over 800 illustrations are given on more than 700 pages of text. To venture to " criticise " such a work would be absurd. It will take years before it is properly absorbed and before we are in a position fully to estimate the value of the classifications offered. It is pre-eminently a book of reference and a quarry out of which to dig material for the building up of many subsidiary theories. It is, moreover, a comprehensive and worthy record of the handiwork of our forefathers.

In a review of the volume in the *Athenaeum* doubts are raised as to the Saxon date of the fine Romsey rood (fig. 113) but we agree with Messrs. Prior and Gardner. It seems, as they point out, that this must be a companion work to the very remarkable rood on the west front of Hedbourne Worthy church, and that both must be works of the Winchester school, c. 1000. The hand of God which appears above the Romsey crucifix is an early symbol: it is found on the Irish crosses, and on the Saxon embroidery at Durham.

One of the most puzzling things in this stimulating book is the beautiful early Madonna from York (fig. 135). From the illustration it seems as if the sides of the stone on which it is wrought decrease upwards as though it had belonged to a cross. The lettering is of beautiful style and looks early. Besides the square **C** noticed by the authors, does not the final **a** approximate to the form of letter here given? If so, that should be an early characteristic.

On page 165 the euthors appear to question the current view that at an early time in the monastic centres, some of the higher clergy as Bernward of Hildesheim, were skilful artists. But in the Carlovingian era it does seem that several famous abbots were competent masters of monastic

art-schools. Surely the evidence that our own Dunstan was such an artist is too strong to be put aside; and Theophilus, who practised many arts, and was probably the greatest expert of his age, was a monk.

The authors have brought into play what is almost a new criterion for the critical history of English art by considering the several kinds of stone in which the sculptures are wrought, the quarries from which they were derived, and hence the probable centres of production.

Perhaps the best defined point in the chronology of our mediaeval art is the year of the Black Death, which formed a great boundary line in culture. A deep change of feeling quickly supervened, and probably no works were wrought after this time which had the old gaiety and spring. Applying this test we should be inclined to date the tomb of Lady Montacute at Oxford before, rather than after, the year of crisis.

The authors properly uphold the seventh-century date of the Ruthwell and Bewcastle crosses. This seventh-century school of what is practically early Christian art in England needs careful working out. If the choicest illuminated texts, sculptures, and metal work were effectively illustrated, we might astonish Europe, as indeed the crosses have astonished Signor Rivoira. What a magnificent work, for instance, is the cross-head at Cropthorne (fig. 95) which must represent very nearly what the head of the Bewcastle cross would have been. The systematic study of our early national monuments has been so neglected that a professor of the university of Yale has recently published a work in which he follows Rivoira in regard to the Ruthwell and Bewcastle crosses, and would make them the work of king David of Scotland, c. 1140.

We agree with our authors in the view that "it is not clear that we now see Biscop's building on the Monkwearmouth porch." Two serpents forming a border with their heads interlaced above in the centre, as found here, are to be seen again on some of the Scottish gravestones. Carved symbols of the evangelists (see p. 28) are to be found in England earlier than the authors suppose. They are incised on St. Cuthbert's coffin at Durham; two of them still remain on the head of the Ruthwell cross; and is it not probable that the eagle illustrated from Brixworth (fig. 131) is the symbol of St. John from the arm of an early cross of exactly the same type?

One may perhaps remark that as a general tendency the authors are inclined to give England the benefit of any doubt on questions of originality or age. Thus on p. 573 the influence of the Tournay sculptured slabs which were imported in the twelfth century seems to be minimised. Again, certain fine ivories are accepted as English (see pp. 58, 373) having figure subjects arranged in bands between horizontal divisions set with small roses, which are said to indicate their English origin. There are four or five such ivories in the South Kensington collection, and another fine one belongs to Mr. Pierpont Morgan. At the British Museum is another, but in this case there are no roses. These ivories must have belonged to a very large class, and the friezes of figures are extraordinarily like those on the tympana of French doorways, while we have little or nothing of the kind.

With regard to the metal-sheeted and enamelled effigy of William de Valence at Westminster we are told on p. 662 that it is "in oak, overlaid with enamelled plates, which were, it would seem, obtained from Limoges by the effigy maker." Surely it was imported as a whole, with the chest

on which it lies, "ready made." One does not feel quite sure that the carved oak chest front (p. 532) is English. It is certainly shop-work of considerable facility, such as might have been imported, and undoubtedly some of the elaborate chest fronts, like that at St. Mary Magdalen, Oxford, were made abroad. There is a similiar one in the Cluny Museum, and a remarkable door (c. 1300) at South Kensington, which has arcades and other patterns almost identical with those on the type of chest we are discussing, was brought from France; but in the Museum it is labelled as English work, probably from its resemblance to the chests in question. A somewhat similar door exists (or existed) in Noyon cathedral (see Vitet's *Noyon*). Again, as to the white marble figure of queen Philippa, when the authors say "Hawkin from Liege" was employed, it suggests that he might have come here to do the work much more than if he were named Hawkin *de* Liège.

To some of the Wells sculptures are given dates as early as c. 1220. The Percy tomb at Beverley is dated c. 1320, but it has been pointed out that the quartered English shield occurs on it, and this could hardly have happened until after 1340. In regard to the "weepers" which stand in the arcades of Gothic tombs we are told that they appeared in freestone monuments c. 1275, but it is doubtful if we have anything like a guarantee of their use for nearly twenty years later. The tomb of queen Eleanor, who died in November, 1290, has no weepers; this brings us to 1291, but the accounts speak of small *metal* figures used on her other monument at Lincoln. The tomb of archbishop Peckham, who died in 1292, has freestone weepers, and the whole tomb closely resembles the one at Westminster of Crouchback, who died in 1296. Messrs. Prior and Gardner suggest, indeed, that the two last-named tombs, with that of Aveline at Westminster, were all made c. 1290, and Peckham's and Crouchback's during their lifetime. Against this, it may be pointed out that Crouchback was not brought to the abbey until 1300, and the resemblance of his tomb to that of Aymer de Valence (d. 1324) and the latter again to that of John of Eltham (d. 1337), are reasons for not pushing it back to a time before 1300. In Count Paul Biver's interesting account of Westminster Abbey just published, Aveline's tomb is assigned to c. 1300, Crouchback's to c. 1323, and that of Aymer de Valence to 1330. There is obviously some confusion here, but it is to our credit for advance in style when a competent French observer thus post-dates our works. According to the evidence the tombs in question should, we think, be dated as follows: Eleanor, 1291; Peckham, c. 1292; Aveline, c. 1295; Crouchback, c. 1300; Aymer de Valence, c. 1324.

In our large churches we often find carved heads used as label terminations or corbels. Some of these heads are obviously of laymen. They have strong character and look as if they might represent craftmasters. The fine head (fig. 230) from Westminster is the most perfect type of this kind. It is on an important point high in the middle of the north transept. Directly beneath it at the centre of the royal door is a fine crowned head of a beardless man. In such a position one must think that the latter was at least intended for the king who built the church of which this was the chief door, and that in fact it is in some degree a portrait of Henry III. The head above it may, perhaps, have been intended for one of the master builders. A good deal has been said as to there being

no real portraiture at this time, but it is difficult to imagine a king Nobody and an abstract craftsman in such positions. Then at Exeter there is a very similar head of a craftsman on a corbel at the entry to the quire, and at St. Albans another. Compare figures 210, 218, 224, 227, 233, 234, 236, in the volume before us, all of which seem to be studies from the life. On the question of portrait-effigies the authors are inclined to think that none earlier than that of queen Philippa are likenesses, but the idea of portraiture must, to some extent, have entered into the intention of patrons and artists. We can hardly believe that a beardless king would have been given a beard, or that a blonde lady would have had her hair coloured black. There may have been little accuracy, but surely there must have been an effort toward some approximation. According to the accounts the bronze effigy of Henry III was made in "the similitude" of the king, and in France portraits of the contemporary king Louis are accepted.

In the classified tables one fact which leaps to the eye is the supreme influence exercised by London and Westminster. These set the fashions which the other schools followed as they were able. This is true even of the great school of Purbeck marble sculpture. "London artistry made the backbone of the Purbeck craft . . . London should, we think, certainly be looked to for the origins of the figure style in marble" (p. 571).

W. R. Lethaby.

THE OLD COLLEGES OF OXFORD: Their Architectural History illustrated and described. By Aymer Vallance. 16 × 12, 160 pp. 50 collotype plates, 232 text illustrations. London: B. T. Batsford. 1912. £4 4s.

It is difficult in writing a short notice of this work to avoid using terms which may possibly appear exaggerated to those who have not seen this nobly illustrated and superb volume. The firm of Batsford has long been a household word for fine architectural publications, but it is doubtful if they have ever put forth any work which is likely to do them more credit than the book now before us. Mr. Aymer Vallance has no small reputation both as an art critic and an antiquary; he is yet in the prime of life, and it is to be hoped that he may live to produce many more volumes, but all the same this work on the colleges of Oxford is bound to remain his *magnum opus*.

A very large number of books of all sizes and of different degrees of merit or demerit have been produced concerning Oxford, but there is no work later than Skelton's, published in 1823, which treats of all the colleges seriatim from the exclusive point of view of their architectural history. As Mr. Vallance reminds us in an interesting and clearly written preface, the university was never formally founded. It came gradually into being as an acknowledged fact about the middle of the twelfth century. After a like fashion, the college system was evolved by degrees out of obscure and unambitious beginnings. One fact stands out clearly when studying their foundation, namely the tremendous service which the mediaeval Church rendered to the cause of education. All but three of all the pre-reformation halls and colleges were due to the generosity of bishops or of others in holy orders. "On the other hand, as though the flow of clerical liberality had been choked by the domestic cares of married divines, it

is significant that of the seven colleges founded after the introduction of protestantism, Jesus College alone owes its existence to a clergyman."

Mr. Vallance, in the introduction, as well as in the chapters devoted to particular colleges, shows that he has become thoroughly inspired with the ideal college life of mediaeval days, and is well able to express his thoughts in good nervous English. Here is one of a hundred or more admirable passages which, whilst pregnant with matured thoughts, avoid the use of a single word of mere verbiage:

"The word *collegium* of course implies corporate existence, which itself entails housing and other accommodation, determined by the requirements of the occupants. The mediaeval college became in a sense analogous to the mediaeval parish, or gild within the parish; and so, as the sense of corporate fellowship deepened, and the ties which bound the members of the community together grew stronger, what more reasonable than that they should seek to express their common life in common worship? Hence the college oratory of earlier times gave place to the college chapel for the daily round of mass and divine office. The ties thus formed were scarcely loosened even by death, and, as a pledge of the continual union between their living members and departed, some colleges, like Merton, were privileged to have their own graveyards, to which, as at New College, All Souls' and even the Jacobean foundation of Wadham, cloisters were attached. The bells which summoned the living to service and knelled the soul's passage into eternity must needs occasion the building of a belfry. So, piece by piece, additions to the structure of a mediaeval college came to be made, never from caprice or ostentation, but simply because they were required to satisfy a real practical need."

One of the most striking features of this book is the extraordinary wealth of illustrations, brought together from all kinds of sources, including admirable photographs taken from points of view expressly selected, and reproductions from a great number of engravings and original drawings and paintings from the royal collection at Windsor, from the particular colleges in question, and from a great variety of other sources. Take, for instance, Magdalen College. There are seven plates, including the noble tower, the west entrance, the west end of the chapel, the dais of the dining hall, the screen in the hall, and reproductions of Turner's tower and bridge, Loggan's view from the west (1675) and Mackenzie's gravel walk in 1847. The text illustrations in the section on Magdalen number twenty-five; several of these are special photographs of details, but they also include such highly interesting features as reproductions of Bereblock's view of the college in 1566, another from a panel about 1650, the founder's oratory, and several other water-colour drawings of Buckler between 1816 and 1833. It is quite out of the question within the limited space of this short notice to give any details as to the painstaking letterpress descriptive of the origin, growth and architectural development of each college. Suffice it to say that after a careful comparison with the best monographs on all the more important colleges, it is well within the mark to say that Mr. Vallance's account of each will compare favourably with any that have been yet produced. In almost every instance too, he is able to produce some new facts, or to arrive at sound conclusions which have not occurred to previous writers.

The introduction, which covers 34 of these large pages, is a wonderfully comprehensively written piece of work. The best informed student of Oxford collegiate life and its remarkable development cannot fail to learn something from this striking summary. For the first time the substantial distinction between a hall and a college is clearly laid down. The hall was originally little more than a mere hostel or boarding-house for the temporary accommodation of undergraduates during their residence: the college on the other hand was founded and incorporated in perpetuity, and it was regulated by a body of statutes, abounding in precise details. It was also constituted, as a rule, to enable graduates to engage in further advanced studies, coupled with the duty to carry on certain specific religious obligations. The information as to the assigning of rooms in the later mediaeval days within the college walls will be novel to many. A set of rooms nowadays usually consists of one larger and one lesser room with possibly a small closet or store-room, each set being tenanted by a single occupant, but for some centuries an entirely contrary custom prevailed. No set of college rooms from the earliest known times, down even to so late a period as 1714, when Worcester College came into being, was occupied by less than two persons at the same time. The founders of New College, Magdalen and Brasenose, ordered that there should be three occupants in the smaller sets and four in the larger sets. At the present time the smaller room is the bedroom, and the larger one the study or sitting-room. But formerly the exact opposite was the case. In early days the large room served as a joint dormitory, whilst the smaller room leading out of it, or subdivisions partitioned off from the larger room, were intended as retreats for study.

To put it tersely, every paragraph of this informing introduction is of the greatest value to any one who really wishes to understand Oxford collegiate life, so far as its buildings are concerned, of either ancient or modern days.

J. C. C.

THE CATHEDRALS OF ENGLAND AND WALES, being a fourth edition of ENGLISH CATHEDRALS ILLUSTRATED. By FRANCIS BOND. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5$, xxii + 494 pp. with over 200 illustrations and a series of ground plans. London: B. T. Batsford. 7s. 6d. n.

The first appearance of this work, under a slightly different title, was in 1899. Since that time the writer has studied more and written more, notably his great book on *Gothic Architecture* and another on Westminster Abbey, and meanwhile he has in consequence developed, or, rather, modified his previous views. Thus, in the former editions, on the page facing the introduction he gives a table of the periods of English ecclesiastical architecture as based mainly on Sharpe's improved version of Rickman: i.e. Anglo-Saxon, early and late Norman, Transitional, Lancet, early and late Geometrical, Curvilinear, Perpendicular and Tudor, each with its limits clearly dated and defined. At the same time the descriptions in the body of the work tally with them, the periods of the buildings being severally divided under these heads. But in the present issue the only subdivisions are numerical, that is, first period, second, third and so on, the author

remarking in his preface that he makes no attempt to "cram" the actual building periods "into arbitrary imaginary compartments."

The illustrations are mainly new and show an immense improvement on those of the former editions; whilst a serious defect is now supplied in the shape of ground plans reduced to a uniform scale of 100 feet to the inch.

The greatest changes in the text have been made in respect of the cathedrals of Lincoln, Worcester, Llandaff, Exeter and Hereford. As to the first-named, it may be remembered that, not long since, in the *Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects*, from certain indications in the clerestory-wall of the quire Mr. Bond argued that this part of the building had been designed originally for a flat wooden roof only, the chief ground for this assumption being the existence of a series of "pigeon holes," which Mr. Bond took to be clerestory windows. From the same premisses, however, Mr. John Bilson deduced a totally opposite conclusion, namely, that the high vault had certainly been intended from the outset and that the "pigeon holes" are merely a device for relieving the substructure of some of the dead weight of the upper wall. Notwithstanding Mr. Bilson, Mr. Bond is unconvinced and repeats his "new reading" of the architectural history of Lincoln cathedral in the present work (p. 202).

In his description of St. Frideswide's, Oxford, Mr. Bond is, of course, far too sensible to endorse the crazy chronology of the late Mr. Park Harrison. The latter is not even referred to by name, except in the bibliography, but Mr. Bond dismisses his theories with the caustic remark: "It has been urged that the present church is in the main that one built in 1004; which is as who would say that *Paradise Lost* was written by Chaucer." As to the so-called watching-chamber the author happily compares it to the upper chapel of Henry V at Westminster, observing that both structures probably served the dual purpose of watching-loft and chantry chapel. The use as a chantry in the case of the Westminster example is undisputed, but it is not so generally known that the upper chamber at St. Frideswide's is similarly fitted up within for saying mass. It cannot, then, have been only a watching-loft.

Mr. Bond is enthusiastic, as who would not be? in praise of the exquisite east end of Carlisle cathedral, adding to Professor Freeman's panegyric his own to the effect that "it is a very poem in stone." On page 50, however, he is perhaps unduly hard on Billings, making fun of the latter for illustrating the canons' reading pulpit in the frater as a "confessional box." It is true that Billings so entitles the structure in question and even goes the length of illustrating with great circumstance this physically impossible process. The illustrations are of course ridiculous, an abbot sitting above and a lady penitent kneeling on the frater floor far below (how a lady could obtain access to the frater at all is unexplained); but Billings himself is only making a concession thereby to the commonly received opinion of his day, an opinion which, as his descriptive text shows, he was far from sharing. "This small apartment," he says, "has been from time immemorial called the confessional. . . . . An apartment similar in form to this is attached to the Beauchamp chapel, Warwick. These are the only ancient confessionals known to remain in England, *if they really were confessionals at all.*" It is certain from this passage that Billings was

too good an antiquary to believe the current nonsense of his day on the subject.

Under the head of St. Albans "cathedral" Mr. Bond says, "The sanctuary . . . seems to have been separated from the quire, as at St. David's, by a light wooden screen." From this it may be gathered that the author was writing from memory of no very recent visit to St. Albans. The two instances are not parallel at all. The situation of the beam-end at St. Albans is quite three times as high as the alleged "sanctuary screen" at St. David's, and is moreover exactly that of a beam or bracket for suspending the Lenten veil between the presbytery and the high altar. As to the wooden screen across the presbytery at St. David's, it is neither in situ nor in its original form. It is made up of at least two screens, and in its present form is much too long to go straight across, but has to stand at an oblique angle in order to fit into the space.

Such errors as these, however, are trifling in comparison to the value of the book as a whole, and the mention of them is not meant to be taken as depreciating a useful and interesting work.

A final word of praise is due to Mr. George Kruger's beautiful lettering on the cover, and it may also be observed that for the convenience of travellers the work is produced also on thin paper with rounded edges to make it a handy pocket companion.

A. V.

BYWAYS IN BRITISH ARCHAEOLOGY. By WALTER JOHNSON. $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$, 529 pp. 99 illustrations. Cambridge: University Press, 1912. 10s. 6d. n.

Mr. Johnson is the author of a former work entitled "Folk-Memory," and no doubt the reader would obtain a clearer grasp of the underlying ideas which knit together these disconnected essays had he read Mr. Johnson's earlier book. To quote the author's preface, "Running through the whole, implied, where not actually expressed, will be found an insistence on the principle which, in a former work, I ventured to call folk-memory. This folk-memory—unconsciously, for the most part, but sometimes with open ceremony—keeps alive those popular beliefs and practices which are individually called survivals. With some of these legacies from the past the present volume deals." Mr. Johnson has collected a remarkable amount of out-of-the-way information, which shows evidence of considerable reading and research, but at times it is set down with a certain lack of discrimination, and the result has been that we are overwhelmed by the weight of evidence, without being quite sure to what end the evidence is leading us. Mr. Johnson is scrupulously just: he gives us all the arguments on both sides, but his summing up is not as clear as it might be. It must not be thought that this book is not a useful one, for, to anyone desirous of information about any of the subjects which Mr. Johnson treats, we cannot imagine a more useful guide. All the rough spade work has been done and it only remains for the student to make use of the materials provided. If we state the subjects of the essays we shall show the wide range of Mr. Johnson's research. The first hundred pages are devoted to the question of the existence of churches on pagan sites. This is

followed by essays on " The secular uses of the church fabric," " The orientation of churches," " The orientation of graves," " Survivals in burial customs," " The folk-lore of the cardinal points," " The churchyard yew," " The cult of the horse " and " The labour'd ox."

We should like to present a short epitome of the arguments advanced and the theories put forward by the author, but this is unfortunately impossible in a limited space. The failings of this book are very clearly seen in such essays as those on the churchyard yew and the folklore of the cardinal points. From the latter we gather that it has been the practice of folklore to attach special qualities to the points of the compass, which qualities influenced the presence of north and south doors to churches, the burials on the north or south sides of churches, the position of churches to the north or south of old roads. Whatever theory one advances there is plenty of evidence to support it and quite as much to oppose it, so that at the end we are left uncertain whether after all the position of a church was not due to other and more matter of fact reasons altogether. The book is well illustrated and indexed.

E. L. G.