NOTICES OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL PUBLICATIONS.

LES SOUTERRAINS-REFUGES DE LA FRANCE: Contribution a l'histoire de l'habitation humaine. Par ADRIEN BLANCHET, Membre de l'Institut. 9 × 5⅝, iv + 342 pp. 15 plates of plans. Paris: Auguste Picard. 1923.

M. Blanchet's study of the numerous subterranean dwelling-places of France, accompanied by a *catalogue raisonné* arranged according to departments, makes large additions to previous lists and is founded upon an exhaustive acquaintance with the literature of the subject. The origin, date, and purpose of these intricate burrows are open to much discussion, and no uniform theory will fit so wide-spread a series, some members of which show traces of the work of neolithic man, while many, especially in the north-western departments, are not earlier than the middle ages, and others may be early quarries subsequently used as hiding-places. Excavations which are obviously quarries and nothing more are excluded from the survey, and theories which tend to lay too much stress upon subterranean store-houses and cemeteries are discussed and dismissed as inadequate. Provisions for ventilation, though seldom very plentiful, show that the examples collected were planned for human habitation, while the tortuous methods of access to the principal chambers indicate a defensive purpose, to guard against the attacks of human enemies. Finds, as a whole, point in a large number of cases to a pre-Roman origin, but the interest of such refuges lies rather in the ingenuity of their plan than in the traces of occupation which they yield.

Apart from the important mediaeval groups in the departments of Nord, Pas-de-Calais, Oise, and Somme, the chief districts for this study are the departments between the Loire and Garonne, extending southward to those of Tarn and Tarn-et-Garonne, and eastward to that of Allier, from which M. Blanchet quotes a number of unrecorded examples. East of the Loire examples appear to be almost non-existent: this is also the case in the southern departments. In Normandy there are very few, and examples in Britanny, according to M. Blanchet's classification, are chiefly sepulchral.

The research which the author has put into his work is remarkable, and the detailed descriptions of the most important objects cited in his catalogue are proof of his close personal observation of these curious monuments. To many readers the most interesting part of his investigations will be his citation of the evidence derived from historical texts. He recognises the significance of the passage in the *Germania* in which Tacitus describes the artificial caverns, with entrances concealed by dung-heaps, used as refuges from winter cold and store-houses for crops. These, in times of invasion, were either overlooked or, if their existence was known, were hard to find. Although Tacitus does not say definitely that on such occasions they became hiding-places for the people of the locality, that they did so is

a fair inference; and M. Blanchet sees in the passage the most comprehensive explanation of the series with which he is concerned. It is interesting to note that, when Pepin marched from Bourges to the Garonne in 767, among the fortresses which he captured were many *speluncae*, in the very region in which subterranean retreats are most plentiful to-day. During the invasions of the Northmen the monks of Marmoutier in 852, and those of Saint-Germain-des-Pres in 861 sought refuge under ground; and it is not improbable that the labyrinth beneath the quarter of Paris in which the latter abbey stood, a maze of ancient quarries, was then used as a hiding-place. A passage, written in the second half of the eleventh century, from the chartulary of Saint-Pierre at Chartres, indicates that the grottoes which here, as at Orleans and several other French cities, exist to-day, were at that time ancient. Examples of texts from the later middle ages are abundant, especially with reference to the district where subterranean refuges are most numerous. During the extermination of the Albigenses, Raymond VII of Toulouse ordered such places to be destroyed or to be blocked up, a command which includes natural as well as artificial caverns. Their use during the hundred years' war has left its trace in the so-called *caves des Anglais* of the Rouergue, and it has been argued that these were dug out at that date, though they may well be earlier.

At all times indeed resort has been made in time of war or persecution to these means of protection. M. Blanchet notes the employment of the vast crypts cut in the chalk at Naours (Somme) by refugees during the early part of the thirty years' war: they are known to have been in existence in 1331, and were possibly old quarries. In this disturbed district excavations were actually made during the seventeenth century for this purpose. The subterranean chambers and galleries of Vendée and the neighbouring districts, to which the author has paid special attention, played their part in the guerilla warfare of the revolutionary period: of these, several notable examples are of great antiquity, and probably served their purpose at the time of the invasions of barbarians and Northmen. One at La Minerie, which M. Blanchet has carefully explored, he concludes to have been made in the fifth or sixth century of the Christian era. Not his least interesting observation concerns the employment during the recent war of the subterranean refuges of northern France, the knowledge of which by the enemy enabled them to prolong their occupation of strategic lines, such as the Chemin-des-Dames, in districts honeycombed with galleries and caverns of various origin. In such circumstances natural caverns take their place and are adapted for use by the hand of man, and the case of the Caverne des Dragons is mentioned, which was converted by the Germans into a great barrack and arsenal. There are certain instances of comparatively modern excavations which have had no defensive object and have been made to serve the whim of some amateur. M. Blanchet cites the grottoes of Ferrand (Gironde), which were made in accordance with the will of a citizen of Bordeaux as a memorial of the glories of the reign of Louis XIV. But these are exceptional to a practice the object of which, in the great majority of cases, was safety and defence.

M. Blanchet's speculations upon the models followed by the pioneers of this underground art tend to the theory that the burrows and earths of animals furnished frequent suggestions. His remarks upon the variety of

the names given in various districts of France to these retreats will be read with interest; we may also call attention to his notes on the form of their vaults and numerous other details of construction. The plans and sections at the end of the book illustrate their complexity, which reached its height in the middle ages, as in the elaborate galleries and chambers at Gapennes (Somme), where, as in several other instances, part of he site is covered by a church. Although in certain districts nature and art have combined to hollow out the subsoil with a bewildering intricacy, the student of M. Blanchet's researches will find in them no colour for the empty legend of subterranean passages made to connect buildings often at a considerable distance from one another. They have been made under buildings or buildings have been erected above series of crypts of earlier origin; some towns, like Laon, may have had their origin in troglodytic settlements; but the subterranean refuges of the middle ages were constructed for the use of separate communities, and there is no evidence of any system of tunnels which connected them with one another, or served as a secret communication between two points above ground. The *cul-de-sac* in which such chambers end was a safe, though imperfectly aired retreat: at the same time, if the precautions taken to conceal it were discovered, the inmates were liable to be smoked out, and there are plenty of instances from all periods to show that, great as its defensive capacities were, the underground refuge had notorious disadvantages.

A. H. T.

ENGLISH CHURCH FITTINGS, FURNITURE AND ACCESSORIES. By J. Charles Cox, LL.D. F.S.A. with an introduction by Aymer Vallance. 9¼ × 6½, xii + 320 pp. 274 illustrations. London: B. T. Batsford, Ltd. 1923. 21s. n.

The late Dr. Cox, well known to members of the Institute as an ecclesiologist of remarkably wide experience, did not live to see the production of this book, which was intended to be a sequel to his earlier volume on the English parish church. It follows much the same lines as the comprehensive account of English church furniture which he produced several years ago in collaboration with Dr. Alfred Harvey; but, while it is much more fully illustrated, it covers a somewhat wider field in a more cursory manner, and without any attempt to give exhaustive lists of examples of the numerous objects of interest generally described. Even though we occasionally miss notices of famous and beautiful works of art which might have found a place in these pages, a very satisfactory idea is given in a small space of the amount and wealth of the treasures which have survived spoliation and destruction in the churches of this country. Mr. Vallance remarks, in an introduction written with enthusiasm and some eloquence, that 'no single church, in its present day condition, affords the satisfying splendour and loveliness which ennobled it in the past.' Enough, however, is left for the intelligent and imaginative student to recover some conception of that beauty; and this book will certainly assist him in his effort to do so.

Its most helpful feature is the clear and succinct account of the history and use of the numerous objects of which it treats. Dr. Cox was a lover of ancient ritual and historic customs, and wrote of them with a practised hand and a trenchancy of style that gave no quarter to merely fanciful

theories. Deeply imbued as he was with love for the middle ages, he nevertheless had a strong sense of the value of the admirable church fittings of a later period, and full justice is done here to the dignity and excellence of post-Reformation furniture. His indignation with the wilful mistakes of modern church restoration was at least equal to his wrath with the iconoclasm of the persons to whom he gives the unofficial title of the 'Edward VI Spoliation Commissioners.' While he explains with understanding the use of Easter sepulchres and double piscinas, and enters with relish into the perennial dispute upon the purpose of the low-side window, he is equally informing upon the history of altar rails, dole cupboards, and vamping horns. If he has little patience for hatchments, he can discern artistic merit in the painted texts and commandments of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and finds pleasure in sand-glasses and maidens' funeral garlands. A third of the illustrations in the book are taken from post-Reformation subjects, and, although the caricature of the interior of a church, drawn in 1790, which appears as a preface to the introduction, is no doubt intended to contrast with the mediaeval attractions of Astbury, Ewelme, and Thaxted, all shown to advantage in its near neighbourhood, it nevertheless exhibits features for which, apart from the hatchments, Dr. Cox was not without tenderness.

There are a considerable number of printers' errors, especially as regards names of places and persons, some of which are probably due to the difficulties involved in posthumous publication. We notice the following, which stand in need of correction. Oddicombe (p. 32) should be Odcombe; Lynchwood (p. 35), Lyndwood; Embledon, Granly (p. 36), Embledon, Granby; Byliffe (p. 49), Bywell; Little Hockesley (p. 66), Horkesley; South Searle, South Bonington (p. 103), South Scarle, Sutton Bonnington; Holton Holgate (p. 110), Halton Holgate; Picardi (p. 127), Ricardi; Cooksey (p. 128), Cookley; Derbyshire (p. 131), Derby; Great Hallingham (p. 147), Great Hallingbury; South Carney (p. 147), South Cerney; Telford (p. 165), Tetford; Scorell (p. 168), Serrell; Wistanton (p. 169), Wistanstow; Hugutin (p. 194), Hugutio; Barchester (p. 195), Barcheston; Becket (p. 211), Peckitt; Weston (p. 232), Westow; Bradbrook (p. 239), Braybrooke; Upper Snell (p. 304), Upper Swell. Some others are more obvious at first sight, and need not be noted. Occasionally a place is attributed to a wrong county. Elton, Rutland (p. 32), seems to be Etton, Northants; Beckington, Wilts (p. 166), should be in Somerset; Bengeworth, Gloucestershire (p. 170), should be in Worcestershire; Merevale, Worcestershire (p. 207), in Warwickshire; Patcham is not in Surrey (p. 210), but in Sussex; Axbridge, Devon (p. 214) seems to be an error for Axminster; Mayfield, Kent (p. 222), should be in Sussex; while Badley, Leicestershire (p. 223), Ecklington, Suffolk (p. 279), and Cuxton, Gloucestershire (pp. 286, 289), are places of uncertain identity. There are several apparent misreadings in the Latin inscriptions cited here and there, and Trestui, in a French inscription on p. 97, does not mean 'Pause.' Bell-ringers will be surprised to find two of their favourite peals described on p. 86 as 'Treble Bob and Grandiose Tripples.' Our ignorance may fail to comprehend the precise nature of a 'vestured' Jesse tree (p. 206), but, as the example in question is highly retouched, the word probably should be 'restored.' The 'apex' of St. Anselm's chapel at Canterbury cathedral may be its apse,

and we are at any rate sure that St. Paul's contact with the viper, there depicted, did not take place at 'Miletus' (p. 212), but at Melita. St. Godric's shrine (p. 281) was at Finchale, not at Tunstall. It is a pity that so many errors should have been allowed to pass in a book which otherwise has many virtues and has a special interest as the last of that long series of volumes in which its author generously dispensed the fruits of a long and in some respects exceptional acquaintance with the churches of England.

A. H. T.

THE CHARTULARY OF THE PRIORY OF ST. PETER AT SELE. Edited by L. F. Salzman, M.A. F.S.A. xxvii + 118 pp. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons, Ltd. 1923.

This small but highly interesting volume is intended to be an initial contribution to a series of Sussex monastic records. The editor, whose special qualifications for his task are well known to all antiquaries, has done his work with great care, and has produced an excellent translation of the 188 documents contained in the chartulary of this small priory, omitting such repetitions as are without real significance, and adding in brackets words and phrases from the Latin original where their insertion is desirable or necessary. As he notes in the preface, there will always be some difference of opinion with regard to the method of editing mediaeval Latin records, and there is no doubt that scholars versed in their forms and vocabulary prefer them in an untranslated state. Mr. Salzman, however, provides valid reasons for his choice of an English version, and, where the translator, as in the present case, is experienced and competent, there can be no serious objection to a course which places a valuable collection of documents within reach of a wider audience than they would otherwise command.

The church of Sele or Beeding, on the left bank of the Adur, was given by William de Braose in 1073 to the college of secular canons which he had founded in the church of Bramber, near his castle on the opposite bank of the river. That foundation, however, was short-lived, and upon its extinction, the church reverted, in consequence of a later grant, to the abbey of Saint-Florent of Saumur, which established a cell at Sele. Although the priory was never large, it had that definite conventual existence which alien priories in England, with their usual quota of only two or three monks, could seldom claim to possess. For some time at any rate after its foundation, eight monks were in residence, and this number was probably kept up approximately, as in 1397, when alien priories were gradually disappearing and their property was being granted to new collegiate and monastic foundations in England, Sele priory obtained letters of denisation. In spite of this, its suppression was only deferred. Its decline in numbers and reputation during the next half-century brought about a crisis in its history, and its dissolution was imminent for some years before the last monk disappeared. This was not till 1480, when the president and fellows of Magdalen college, Oxford, who were already in possession of the advowson, entered into full ownership of the priory and its appurtenances. In addition to this chartulary, compiled during the third quarter of the thirteenth century, the

college possesses a large series of deeds relating to the property of the house, which have been examined by Mr. Salzman and to which frequent reference is made in the introduction and footnotes.

The introduction gives in succinct form an historical account of the priory, for which among other sources, Dr. Horace Round's calendar of documents relating to France and an article by Dom Huynes in *Bibl. de l'Ecole des Chartes*, vol. xl, have furnished useful material. The editor points out the contribution made by the chartulary to the history of the Rape of Bramber, and the monastery derives special interest from its connexion with its hereditary founders and patrons, the lords of Bramber. The descent of the Braoses is traced from William, who came to England with the Conqueror from Briouze in Normandy, through eight generations, until, on the death of the sixth William, his daughter brought their lands to her husband John, second lord Mowbray of Thirsk. It was his descendant John, the third duke of Norfolk of the house of Mowbray, who granted the patronage of Sele priory to Magdalen college. Mr. Salzman says, by the way, that the patronage passed from the Mowbrays to the Howards; but it had been parted with before the arrival of the Howards in the Mowbray inheritance. He promises a future study of the history of the house of Braose, the connexions of which, as will be seen from his brief account of its chief members, were of exceptional interest.

Apart from William de Braose's foundation charter and successive confirmations of it by his heirs, the most important series of documents in the chartulary is that referring to disputes about tithe in various parishes, which brought the monks into conflict with several local rectors and with other religious houses, including the abbey of Fécamp, the nunnery of Rusper, and the secular canons of Steyning. Much of the business recorded belongs to the thirteenth century, when, as has been said, the chartulary was drawn up, and to the time of Walter Colevile, prior from 1254 to 1276; but there are additions after his date, and a few documents of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Among the churches appropriated to the monastery were those of Bramber, the original dependence of which upon Steyning led to the controversies with the secular body and with Fécamp, and of Old and New Shoreham. Vicarages were ordained in the churches of Sele and New Shoreham in 1261, and Mr. Salzman refers to the later decree by which Bishop John Langton made the commonalty of Shoreham responsible for the repair of the chancel of the second of these, a curious arrangement which was qualified, however, by the transfer to the burgesses for two years of the oblations and profits of the church and by the establishment of an annual contribution by the priory. Two compositions also will be found here, both of the later part of the twelfth century, referring to the chapels possessed by the Templars and Hospitallers at New Shoreham and their encroachments upon the rights of the parish church. After the suppression of the order their chapel passed into the occupation of Carmelite friars, who acquired it from the Hospitallers, and in 1493 the friars, threatened by inundations of the sea, took up their abode at Sele in the deserted buildings of the priory.

The names of witnesses to charters, here as elsewhere, deserve study, and include several names of beneficed clergy which should be of value to compilers of lists of incumbents. The names of masons and other craftsmen

also occur in some number. We have said that Mr. Salzman is careful to supply the Latin in cases where the meaning demands it. It is doubtful whether *missas notivas* (p. 12) should be translated 'sung masses,' as though it were *missas cum nota*: we suspect that the true reading is *missas votivas*, and this is indicated by the context. *Libellus convencionalis*, on p. 17, and in another passage, is translated as meaning a formal list or record: the adjective, however, refers rather to the *conventio* or covenant embodied in the document than to its conventional character. It is possible that *tam in capite quam in membris* (p. 46) may mean 'in the case of the mother-house and its cells,' but the ordinary connotation of the phrase is the corporate body constituting a monastery, i.e. the abbot as head and the convent as members, and the allusion seems here to be to the ordinary division of property between the abbot's household and the common fund of the house. It is amusing to note that the local scribe wrote *Brembris* instead of *membris*. The canon of 'Peutroy' (p. 46) for which the editor suggests Pentney, was more probably a secular canon of 'Pencriz,' i.e. Penkridge, and, as he was acting as commissioner of the dean of Bridgnorth, this seems all the more likely. Mr. Salzman queries his suggestion of 'square' for *placeam* (p. 49); but *platea* for a road or street is not uncommon, and the meaning in the present instance seems to be clearly this. If we may here and there question his interpretations, he shows in general an enviable familiarity with the rare words of which there are several examples in these pages.

A. H. T.

OLD DEVONSHIRE HOUSE BY BISHOPSGATE. By Margaret Sefton-Jones. 8 × 5, 160 pp. The Swarthmore Press. 1923. 6s. n.

After the great fire of 1666, the Society of Friends, whose meeting-house at the Bull and Mouth in Aldersgate street had been destroyed, obtained a lease of part of the mansion which stood a little distance to the east of Bishopsgate street, near its junction with Houndsditch, and was then the London house of the earls, afterwards dukes, of Devonshire. In 1678 the Society bought part of the site and erected the meeting-house which became the centre of its activities in London. Mrs. Sefton-Jones has traced with much labour the history of the various tenements which occupied the site now owned by the Society, and tells her tale clearly and succinctly. The early annals of this property involve some description of the suburb outside the city wall, the bishop of London's manor of Stepney, and the history of the bishop's gate. Ailwin Hunne, the tanner, one of the twelfth-century landowners on the site, has left his name to Houndsditch. The present block of property, which extends to Bishopsgate street, includes the sites of the old house known at an early date as 'the stone house' and later as the Dolphin, and of a tenement called 'Staple de Hall.' The actual history of Devonshire House itself begins with the building by Jasper Fisher, who died in 1579, of a handsome mansion called by himself Mount Fisher, but by his contemporaries Fisher's Folly. On his death, the estate seems to have lapsed to the earl of Oxford as ground landlord. In 1588 it was purchased from Edward, earl of Oxford, Burghley's worthless son-in-law, by Sir William Cornwallis, from whose son-in-law, the earl of Argyll, it was bought by John, lord Harington of Exton. As Harington

House, it was the residence of his daughter, the famous Lucy, countess of Bedford, the friend of poets. It was not until the second earl of Devonshire and his wife Christian, daughter of Edward, lord Bruce of Kinloss, came into possession, that Fisher's Folly acquired the name of Devonshire House. Its story is thus connected with more than one well-known person, and Mrs. Sefton-Jones proves that it is worth telling. It is possible that her account of the early days of the place needs some revision: we are not sure whether she has a clear conception of the real nature of folk-land, and we strongly doubt her suggestion that 'folly' is a corruption of 'folk-lea,' which is certainly not the opinion of persons versed in the science of place-names. We also more than doubt whether the title Bretwalda, which was not an official designation, implied a formal act of crowning; and, even if it had, the name Ossulstone is no evidence for any connexion of St. Oswald with a stone which took its name from one Osulf or Oswulf. The portion of the book in which these points occur shows a less firm grasp of fact than the later part of the narrative, which is good and workmanlike.

A LITTLE HISTORY OF ST. BOTOLPH'S, CAMBRIDGE. By A. W. Goodman. 7½ × 5, 128 pp. Cambridge: Bowes & Bowes. 1923. 7s. 6d.

There is an excellent theory, encouraged by many eminent authorities, that incumbents of parish churches ought to fit themselves to become the historians of their own parishes. There are many instances of neophytes who have rushed into the perilous paths of local history without preliminary training; but there are also clergymen who, taking the advice with a sense of its real implication, have done work of this kind with skill and success. Mr. Goodman is one of these. His history of the parish of which for some years he was rector has a modest title; but a great deal of careful research is brought into a small compass with a very satisfactory result. The topography of Cambridge has occupied many skilful antiquaries, and few towns have been so fully described. Mr. Goodman shows, however, that even now it is possible to choose an area which has not been completely worked, especially in its parochial relations. His preface is the justification for a work in which he takes the opportunity of rectifying errors made by previous topographers and even sanctioned in official documents, with regard to the boundaries of the parish and the tithe which is the incumbent's main source of income. A discussion of this subject is followed by a detailed survey of the parish on both sides of the Cam, an account of the church and churchyard, and the curious and complicated story of the advowson which is very unusual, involving as it does the transfer of an appropriated rectory through more than one set of proprietors to an individual rector. The illustrations include a map of the parish, plans of the church and its glebe, reproductions of part of Loggan's plan of 1688, and of the deed by which bishop Eustace of Ely granted the church to Barnwell priory, and a view of Trumpington street in 1827, showing the church and the old rectory house. This sound and unpretentious piece of work is dedicated by Mr. Goodman to his successors at St. Botolph's, who may be congratulated upon his legacy as a source of reference and as a cogent defence of their rights against heedless statement.

BRITISH BOROUGH CHARTERS, 1216—1307. Edited by ADOLPHUS BALLARD and JAMES TAIT. 9½ × 6¼, 400 + cii pp. Cambridge: University Press. 1923.

The material for this volume, a sequel to the late Mr. Ballard's earlier collection of borough charters published in 1913, was in an advanced stage of preparation at his death. Much, however, was necessary for its completion, and Professor Tait's part in the editorship has included a revision of the whole work, with some additions, and the writing of the very thorough and detailed introduction, which is an important contribution to the study of municipal history. It is fortunate that Mr. Ballard, whose eminence in this field of work was undisputed, has been succeeded in his chosen task by one who is so well equipped at all points to continue it.

The system adopted in the earlier volume of presenting the documents in an analytic form, with an arrangement of topics founded on a scheme suggested by Maitland's treatment of the English borough in the thirteenth century, has been employed again in this collection. Its disadvantages are acknowledged in the preface, and will be apparent to any student who wishes to consult the text of any given charter as a whole. Thus, to take a single example, the charter granted to Salford by Ranulf, earl of Chester, about 1230 is split up into twenty-four separate sections according to the order of subjects chosen by the editors, a method which involves the sacrifice of its consecutive form, as well as a certain amount of repetition of clauses. At the same time, the special purpose of the volume would have been defeated, had the charters been printed in their original form, under which it would have been difficult to subject them to a clear analysis; and the drawbacks of the scheme have their compensation in the ease with which it enables us to compare similar clauses in a group of charters, conveniently placed side by side, without hunting for parallels in a multitude of disconnected documents. In addition to a tabular index of contents of the charters thus analysed, considerably over five hundred in number, there is an index of the widely scattered sources from which their texts have been taken; so that little room is left for criticism of a method which has much to commend it to the historian of institutions as distinct from the purely local historian.

The arrangement of clauses comes under eight general heads, each of which is divided into a number of subsections, viz. (i) formation of borough, (ii) burgage tenure and law of real property, with tenurial privileges, (iii) burgess franchise, (iv) jurisdictional privileges, (v) mercantile privileges, (vi) borough finances, (vii) borough officers, (viii) public services. The last, represented only by a few examples of provisions for the maintenance of morals, public health, and roads, is an addition to the seven sections of the first volume; but, while a few of the earlier subsections remain without augmentation, a large number of new subsections are introduced, particularly as regards privileges of jurisdiction. These differences are clearly indicated by special marks in the table of contents, from which the general character of the progress of municipal organisation in the reigns of Henry III and Edward I can be easily grasped.

Mr. Ballard's elaborate introduction to the first volume of this work dealt at length with many of the topics raised by this new series, and Professor Tait's introduction is a supplement which concerns itself mainly with the novel features that call for comment. The variations of constitutional type indicated by these documents invite some revision of the

definition of a borough proposed by Mr. Ballard, depending upon the existence of burgage tenure and of a court of law with jurisdiction over all holders of burgage tenements. Professor Tait points out the qualifications to which such a definition is open, especially as regards the second clause, and reviews the restrictions upon the claims of the smaller chartered communities to be considered as boroughs suggested by the watch and ward regulations of the thirteenth century and by the distinction between boroughs and *ville mercatorie* in the parliamentary writs of 1283. His conclusion is that, with some little extension of the term, the definition which best covers the whole range of chartered towns during his period is 'a vill in which the tenements were held by burgage tenure.' This includes royal and seignorial boroughs alike, i.e. boroughs chartered by the crown and those created by charters of mesne lords, and distinguishes the vill which, according to this view of the case, was also a borough from the merely rural vill.

The discussion of this point is followed by a survey of the characteristics of the royal and seignorial boroughs whose charters are analysed. It is with respect to the borough of the second kind that the distinction just mentioned is most difficult to determine. Professor Tait comments upon the experimental character of the attempts of lords of manors to give an urban complexion to rural communities, and of the temporary nature of the privileges granted with this end. He quotes the case of most of the mediaeval boroughs of Lancashire, in which, from the sixteenth century onwards, the only feature of their former status was a survival to some extent of a burgage tenure which distinguished them from the surrounding villages. It is in boroughs of this type that the existence of a law-court is seen to be an insufficient criterion of burghal status; for the court of the mesne borough, presided over by the lord's steward, was the manorial court with little or no change. The fines and amercements went to the lord as before, and it was only when he granted the town at fee farm to the burgesses, or allowed them to have some form of control of their own affairs, that the borough court assumed a distinct character. The important case of Leicester is noted, where, although the earl did not farm out the borough to the burgesses, they exercised an unusual degree of freedom without interference. But few of the small seignorial boroughs were able to assert themselves in this way, and the fact that we have very little knowledge of their administration during this period is probably the consequence of their subordination to the authority of the officials appointed directly by their lords.

The era which this volume covers is of great importance to the development of boroughs. John had granted charters with prodigality, and, although he was not imitated by his son during the earlier part of his reign, the support of the boroughs was freely courted by Henry III as the result of the barons' wars. The number of new boroughs created by the Crown during the whole period is very small, but confirmations of old charters by regrant or by *inspeximus* were many. The regrants involved the concession of considerable privileges, especially in the case of the larger towns, and Professor Tait suggests that the preference of Edward I for grants by *inspeximus* implies that such towns had obtained under his father all the privileges that they wanted. At the same time, these privileges were in the main extensions of rights already acquired. The Crown still held fast to its control over the boroughs which it had founded, and the growth of

a separate administratio of financial and judicial business within boroughs did not bring with it complete emancipation from an external power which upon occasion could bring coercive forces into play.

When charters were so easily and frequently granted as they were by Henry III during the epoch already mentioned, they naturally tended to assume a mechanical and stereotyped form. The grant to one town of the customs of another, which gives an opportunity for the classification of the series in local groups depending ultimately upon single prototypes, was sometimes made without regard to detail. It is noted in the introduction that, in charters granting the customs of London to other boroughs, the mention of the portsoke, a jurisdictional area peculiar to London, is inadvertently included. With all the information that charters give with respect to local privilege, they leave much of constitutional interest untouched. The development of the office of mayor and the procedure of municipal courts, for example, are points on which the help that they offer must be reinforced from other sources. In the latter case, the ordinance made by Edmund of Lancaster for the reform and regulation of the court of portmanmote at Leicester is one of those documents which, standing almost by itself, has singular value as supplying a general defect. The care with which the leading features of the charters have been selected for comment by the editor makes the introduction an indispensable guide to the intricacies of the minute analytic divisions into which the charters are broken up. If these are numerous, every care has been taken to give clues to the labyrinth, and this work and its predecessor are models of scientific arrangement which by itself would render their publication a notable event in the progress of the study of institutional history.

A. H. T.

THE STORY OF OUR INNS OF COURT. By Sir D. Plunket Barton, Bt. K.C. Charles Benham and Francis Watts. $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$, 320 pp. 17 illustrations. London: Foulis & Co. 10s. 6d. net.

This book contains a most unusual combination of research and rubbish. A comparison of the scholarly introduction with the absurd and inaccurate chapter headed 'A walk about Lincoln's Inn' is quite startling. In the one we are told again in a most informing and illuminating way about the early origins of the Inns of Court. In the other there is a lot of chit-chat, some of which is even misleading. For instance, we are told about the chapel that 'the outside you will possibly find more attractive than the interior,' whereas in point of fact the outside has suffered horribly from 'restorations,' while the interior contains among other features of interest some of the most beautiful woodwork, not only in London, but in England. Why on earth was not a Lincoln's Inn man chosen to write about Lincoln's Inn?

To return to the introduction, many very interesting points are raised by it. While I quite agree with the learned author that the establishment of the Court of Common Pleas as a permanent Court sitting at Westminster (an event which may well have taken place long before Magna Charta, and the better opinion seems now to be that such Court sat fairly regularly at Westminster from the last years of the reign of Henry I) might well have led to the concentration in its neighbourhood of the judges and the men of the law, I cannot agree with him when he goes on to say 'Thus it came

about quite naturally that a colony of lawyers settled down and a group of hostels for the reception and education of law students sprang up outside the city walls, on the side facing Westminster in and around what was then the suburban village of Holborn.' Why, I wonder why, not in Westminster itself or even in the village of Charing? Surely Holborn was much too far away in those far off days when there were practically no roads. I am sure the lawyers would wish to be closer to their courts. I suggest that the colony of lawyers did not settle down in their present abodes till much later, namely in early Edwardian times, after Edward I had decreed that the students of the law should itinerate with the judges and should not attend the universities any more, and had requested some of his great nobles, including Baron Grey de Wilton and Hugh de Lacey, afterwards earl of Lincoln, to give such students shelter and hospitality while they were pursuing their studies of the law and attending the king's courts. This is a very interesting matter which requires further investigation and research to be devoted to it, but such research would have to be conducted among state records of a much earlier date than any of the records possessed by any of the four Honourable Societies. One thing seems quite clear, that at any rate the earls of Lincoln continued living in their town house (Lincoln's Inn) long after they had given hospitality therein to the lawyers, but ultimately they surrendered it entirely to the lawyers. It would be interesting to get more information about the hospitality to the lawyers by that powerful prelate Ralph Neville, bishop of Chichester, still commemorated in the name of a little alley-way leading from Lincoln's Inn into Chancery Lane called Chichester's Rents. He was lord high chancellor of England, and his town house, which he built here, was probably a much larger house than that of the de Laceys, but the lawyers chose to name their confraternity after the earl of Lincoln and not after the great episcopal chancellor.

Of course, it is not possible in a book of this size to touch upon the lives of even the greatest lawyers, because they are many, and in most cases only those of other days have been referred to, but no account of Lincoln's Inn would, in my judgment, be adequate which did not mention one of her sons still living. I refer to Sir Frederick Pollock, probably the most learned lawyer the last hundred years has produced.

I entirely agree with a learned contemporary that this well-written record of the history of the Four Inns should be very welcome to a large circle of readers including our friends from across the Atlantic, but I do not know what they will think of our present system of government of the four Inns by Benchers, which is described, I think quite accurately, by one of the three learned authors as government by a body 'irresponsible, perpetual, adding to their number from the members as and when they choose.' And yet somehow it seems to work.

I am sorry to say that I do not agree with our learned contemporary in his praise of the illustrations to this volume. I consider the frontispiece by Herbert Railton might well have been omitted. It is of the pretty-pretty type, and to me it conveys no idea whatever of the dignity and charm of the precincts of the Temple Church. The wretched illustration of the south oriel of the Middle Temple Hall with its beautiful coats of arms might also, in my opinion, well have been omitted, and all the reproductions of portraits should have had labels of their origin and the name or reputed name of the painter.

L. M. M.