NOTICES OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH RIVER-NAMES. By EILERT EKWALL. 9½ × 6, xcii + 488 pp. Oxford University Press, 1928. 25s.

This book is a very fine achievement, and it is as nearly perfect in its way as any work of scholarship can ever be. It is written in flawless English by a Swedish Professor, who is master of his subject. It is one of those books which record the high-watermark of their subject; sandwiched between dillettanti and pedant, and partaking of the nature of neither.

The scope of Professor Ekwall's philological knowledge is almost limitless. He begins with a bibliography of 15 pages and a 'select list of other works consulted' of 5 pages. The introduction occupies 60 pages. The river-names themselves are arranged alphabetically—the inconvenient classification into hundred and parish being, mercifully, impossible here. Consequently, any name can be found at once, without having to look for it first in the index. Names of similar origin, however, are quite rightly grouped together, with a cross-reference in the strictly alphabetically place. We have consulted the book very frequently since it appeared, and have never had the slightest difficulty in finding what we wanted at once. This ease reflects a great amount of work on the part of both author and publisher, for which we are profoundly grateful. Indeed, none but an author can realise the immense labour which the production of this book must have involved. It is a mass of detail, like the Alhambra, and yet the detail is subordinated. There is no flaunting of erudition; it is a learned work in the best sense. *Ars est celare artem*; which may be paraphrased—knowledge should be digested, not vomited in footnotes.

Perhaps the most striking outcome of Professor Ekwall's survey is his statement that he cannot point to any definite river-name that strikes him as pre-Celtic. Yet ought we really to be surprised? The chances of survival are remote; the means of recognition are of the slightest and in the main negative. We do not even know what the pre-Celtic language of this island was; and we can only, at the best, infer that a word is pre-Celtic when we are sure that it cannot possibly be, in the form we know, either English, Scandinavian or Celtic. Probably, as Professor Ekwall admits, the Britons took over some words from the people they found here when they arrived. But they probably also rationalised them, as the Saxons later rationalised Celtic words (for instance, York, Rochester and Reculver); and under a disguise—perhaps under a double disguise occasionally—how can we hope to find certain traces of an unknown language? The most promising line of enquiry, we think, would be to subject certain names of very wide range, like Thames (which seems related to a Tamasa in the Ganges basin), to a searching analysis in every region where they occur. Concurrently, one might examine the earliest known forms of the river-

names of certain regions, such for instance as Finland and North Africa, where Celtic influence is non-existent, and see whether there were any helpful British parallels in the residue.

The distribution of Celtic river-names is interesting, if only because it is normal. The twelve and a half counties of East Anglia, South-east Anglia and the Lower Thames, together with Beds, Hunts, Cambs and Northants can show only thirty-nine ; the four counties of Wessex contain fifty-six, to which Somerset adds another twenty-eight. These results need very careful scrutiny, however, as Professor Ekwall himself is fully aware ; they may be affected by the relative absence or scarcity in each region of rivers, of documentary evidence and of Celtic population. The first two factors may easily be dealt with, for they are known. The number of rivers in East Anglia and Wessex is the same now as then ; and East Anglia, unlike Wessex, is a land of small streams. The rarity of Celtic names there, compared with their abundance in Wessex, cannot therefore be assigned to a purely geographical cause. The documentary aspect of the problem is dealt with by the author (on p. lxxxix), who quite rightly discounts it as the determining influence in East Anglia. Early documents are rare there, but there was, he thinks, a real absence of Celtic survivals. He attributes this to the hostile character of the earliest invasions. We should be inclined to attribute it rather to the sparseness of population, a feature first noticed by Dr. Cyril Fox and reinforced by the Map of Roman Britain. Our opinion is strikingly supported by the complete absence of Celtic names for rivers flowing only in the Weald. Such Celtic river-names as are known in Kent, Surrey and Sussex—there are only eleven certainties—are confined (with one exception) to rivers of the North and South Downs, and to just those portions of them where the Romano-British population was densest.

In this early stage in the scientific study of English place-names, however, it would be rash to draw conclusions without indicating the numerous pitfalls on every side. The distribution of place-names is but one of the many distributions potentially available ; river-names are but a sub-division of place-names ; and the splendid work being carried out by the English Place-name Society has not yet had time to provide others on a large scale. When it has, it will be a fascinating task to compare results with archaeological distributions ; each then will check the other, for they are quite independent. We say this not by way of criticism, for Professor Ekwall is a model of scientific caution ; but by way rather of hinting at probable future developments.

If a general criticism must be made, it would be that Professor Ekwall's explanations of the meanings of some of the river-names seem rather far-fetched. Another critic has called attention to the incredible number of synonyms that are postulated to express the notion of winding ; nor are we convinced by some of the other connotations suggested. In one instance he has clearly overshot the mark ; the river Meavy (O.E. Maewi) in Devonshire is the Mavia in the list of rivers given by Ravennas, and can therefore have nothing to do with the Saxon word for a gull ! It is fair to add that the author is obviously dissatisfied with his own suggestion—it is no more—and as usual states the case fully and without reservation.

It is a mistake to expect place-names always to have a logical meaning. It is particularly dangerous when a mixture of languages has occurred.

What, for instance, will future philologists make of such not uncommon names on our maps of the Syrian Desert as Gebel Musharif and Bir Naam—the Hill of ' I don't know ' and the Well of ' Yes ' ! But, such extreme instances apart, we know, from the place-names of the New World and the works of O. Henry, that a trivial incident is often the begetter of a place-name. (Of course, this is unlikely in the case of the *largest* rivers ; nor can it apply to common river-names.)

The charge of neglecting the lists of place-names given by the Ravenna Geographer cannot fairly be brought against Professor Ekwall ; for in the first place he does cite them occasionally, and in the second, if there is neglect, it is English scholars rather who should be blamed. We hope ourselves to remedy this neglect some day. Meanwhile we could point out that Ravennas' list of river-names becomes much more intelligible when we realise that he goes round the coast, clockwise. The first name Traxula (not Fraxula) may well be the Test ; and, if so, provides a striking confirmation of Professor Ekwall's purely philological remarks about Tersta. The Dorset Axe is probably the Axium of Ravennas ; and his Sarva (as it is spelt in two of the three manuscripts) may be philologically connected with Sor and Soar. So, too, it seems likely that Sarebrook (Staffordshire ; O.E. Seares-broc) is derived from *Sorbio- ; we have a precisely analogous form in Seares-byrig (=Salisbury) which we know to be derived from Sorbiodunum of which it is a translation. Iwerne (Dorset) is probably the Ibernio of Ravennas, and may have been applied either to the Roman villa there or (more probably) to Hod and Hambledon Hills, where yew trees still form a remarkable and distinctive feature of the landscape.

A few miscellaneous minor points may be grouped together for attention, in view of a second edition :—

P. 7. Part of Shaftesbury is still called Alcester. There must have been a hill-fort there in Celtic times—the site cries aloud for it—and it may have been one of the many Alauna's. The Alauna silva of Ravennas would then have been the huge forest whose mediaeval members were called Blackmore, Gillingham and Selwood.

P. 9. (Alt). Compare Alit(h)acenon, Ravennas.

P. 35. The Hampshire Blackwater was originally called ' duddan broc ' (Birch, Cart. Sax. iii, ino. 1307), and this seems to be the same as the Dodebrok' of 1298 (D. of Lanc., For. Proc. 1, 8), Duddebrok 1336 (Le Neve's Index, P.R.O., Vol. 40, Fol. 70). There is still a Deadbrook Farm near the river in Aldershot Parish (Hants, 21 S.W.).

P. 57 (first line). Bune should surely be Buna ?

P. 67. Camlad. Surely Camulos is involved here ?

P. 72. Caundle. It seems probable that the word ' canuc ' is involved (see Birch, Cart. Sax. iii, 969, which I suggest may be Wootton Glanville, and compare the name Cank in Up Cerne, applied to a ridge of down and the farm below it).

P. 92. Conuc is a recorded personal name. See my article in this *Journal*, lxxvii, pp. 145–6.

Pp. 93, 4. Coquet. The MSS. of Ravennas seem to favour -neda (Cocuneda, *Paris* ; Coccuneda, *Basle* and *Vatican*) ; but in all three the distinction between ' u ' and ' n ' is so slight that throughout the manuscripts it is generally impossible to say which letter is intended. We incline there-

fore to the reading Cocuueda. But be it noted that Professor Ekwall's remarks under this heading betray a confusion between forest and wood. The mediaeval *forest* was sometimes quite devoid of *woods*, especially in the north.

P. 123. The derivation suggested for Deverill is most apt. The whole region abounds in Celtic fields.

P. 150, line 1. For British read English ?

P. 382. Stour. If this name is Celtic, why does it not occur in the West of England, in Wales, or in Ireland ?

P. 393. The Cardiff Taff is probably the Tamion of Ravennas.

P. 424. The Teffont stream rises in a remarkable spring 700 yards NW. of the Church of Teffont Magna. The water wells up suddenly from the ground with a powerful flow. The stream was the boundary of Grovely Forest throughout mediaeval times and doubtless formed an early boundmark, thus confirming Professor Ekwall's derivation. The 'springs of Teffont' is the name on an old map of 1579.

P. 425. Two of the Ravennas MSS. give Tinoa, one Tinea.

P. 467. Can the Vividin of Ravennas be connected with the Witham ? It falls at the right place geographically.

There are a few omissions—very few indeed, considering the immensity of the task, and all of quite minor streams. E.g. The Dun (Berks), flowing into the Kennet above Hungerford ; the Wallop (Hants), perhaps to be connected with the Catguoloph of Nennius. Liss (Hants) is probably a stream-name, but there is no evidence of it ; the name occurs as a stream-name in Glamorganshire. One or two additional instances are cited in my article on Celtic Place-names in Vol. lxxvii of this *Journal*.

In conclusion, may we thank Professor Ekwall for a masterpiece of learning, and express the hope that he will publish other books on British place-names ?

O. G. S. C.

TRAVAUX DES ETUDIANTS DU GROUPE D'HISTOIRE DE L'ART DE LA FACULTE DES LETTRES DE PARIS. Annee 1927–28. Institut d'art et d'archeologie. Paris 1928. 11¼ × 9, 110 illustrations and diagrams. 162 pp. + viii.

This collection of essays is dedicated to the memory of M. Gustave Fougères and is preceded by a 'few notes' by M. Paul Valéry. The body of the book consists of nineteen essays on architecture, painting and archaeology, including such diverse subjects as Paleolithic art, Carolingian goldsmith's work and the work of André Lhote. Amongst the architectural essays the most interesting are those dealing with the Narthex at Tournus, the chapel at Germigny les Prés and Cormac's chapel at Cashel ; the first of these is yet another exposition of a very vexed question, on which this is certainly not the final word. It is a singular comment on the strength and the weakness of French archaeology that combined with much brilliant deductive power there is so frequently a neglect of those details on which all sound deduction must be based. Thus this essay is illustrated by plans and sections of the Narthex at Tournus which have already done duty for many publications and are at the same time both misleading and in some

points actually inaccurate. The essay on Germigny is useful if only in restoring the true plan of the building, which many writers of the first rank have inexcusably suppressed. The study of Cormac's chapel very justly emphasises the early date of the ribbed vault of the chancel; the building was consecrated in 1134 and since this form must have been introduced from England is one more argument for the priority of the ribbed vault in England as against France.

Other essays that may be noted are those on the technique of glass-painting in France in the latter third of the thirteenth and the first third of the fourteenth century; notes on figure-sculpture in Transcaucasia; on Romanesque doorways in Hungary and the excellent study of Carolingian goldsmith's work before mentioned.

The format of the book is good, but the illustrations suffer almost invariably from the thinness of the paper. The plans, almost without exception, lack a scale.

A. W. C.

ENGLISH GOTHIC CHURCHES. By C. W. Budden. $7\frac{1}{4} \times 5$, x + 145 pp., xli plates, 53 figs. B. T. Batsford. 1927. 7s. 6d. net.

The book is professedly written for the tourist and is intended to provide an easy method of determining the date of any particular feature of a building and a summary list of the chief objects of architectural interest in each county. For this purpose it may perhaps prove useful, if only for the admirable series of illustrations, but it cannot be recommended for the more serious student. The author perpetuates an unusual number of hoary, but none the less fallacious, traditions and his looseness of expression leads him on many occasions into actual error. The monastic orders, as usual, form a prominent stumbling block, and the reiterated insistence on the architectural importance of the Black Death is a well-worn theme, which it is almost impossible to substantiate from definitely dated examples.

The publishers have done their part with the efficiency usually associated with their firm.

HARRISON OF IGHTHAM. Prepared for publication by Sir Edward R. Harrison. $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$, xviii + 395 pp. 12 plates. Oxford University Press. 1928. 15s. net.

Whatever be their views on Eoliths, all Archaeologists must recognise the exceptional merits of Benjamin Harrison, the grocer of Ightham, who obtained world renown by his patient investigation of the antiquities of the neighbourhood in which his life was spent. In this volume, piously compiled by his son, the village antiquary is allowed to speak for himself, for much of it consists of letters and extracts from his diaries. It is a wonderfully interesting human document, and will be read with pleasure by those taking both sides in the eolithic controversy.

H. J. E. P.

THE OLD COTTAGES AND FARMHOUSES OF NORFOLK. By Claude J. W. Messent. 10 × 7½, 248 pp., 112 illustrations. Norwich: H. W. Hunt. 1928. 10s. net.

It is stated in the preface that 'the object of this book is to describe and illustrate the many fine old cottages and farmhouses of Norfolk . . . in the hope that the public may be led more fully to realise what a splendid heritage they have. . . .'

Any endeavour of this description is welcomed. For the local type in our rural architecture is to-day in great danger of disappearing when, both for new building and repair to old, it is so often more economical to bring from afar than employ native material and labour, the use of which gave to the smaller buildings of the past so much of their distinctive character.

In Norfolk brick and flint are the materials most generally used, but clay-lump, Carstone, wattle and daub and half-timber work all occur. A chapter has been devoted to each of these materials, explaining how they are obtained, how used in construction and giving examples of the smaller and lesser known buildings in the county where each is employed. There are also chapters on dove-cotes and old village shops.

The interior of a house is of as great an interest as the exterior and of greater importance to most people; it is therefore a pity that to this scarcely a reference is made and that no plans are given.

The book, however, is copiously illustrated with reproductions of pen and ink sketches by the author. These apparently accurate delineations of exteriors, unfortunately, in too many cases fail to convey, except perhaps to the initiated, either the charm of the buildings or the beauty of their surroundings.

E. A. R. R.

EARLY CHURCH ART IN NORTHERN EUROPE. By Joseph Strzygowski. 9½ × 6, 172 pp., lii plates, 65 figs. B. T. Batsford. 1928. 21s. net.

This book is based on a series of lectures delivered by the author at University College, London, and is equally instructive as to his methods of argument and volatility of mind. The general thesis would appear to be that an indigenous timber architecture flourished during the first millennium throughout the north and radically affected the stone architecture introduced by the Christian missionaries from the Mediterranean south, and furthermore that the barbarian north brought much of their timber technique into the Mediterranean lands at the fall of the empire. This thesis is supported almost entirely on typological grounds with an avowed neglect of chronology which is as disconcerting to the critic as it is convenient to the author.

Any reader of Strzygowski's earlier works, and of the making of them there has been no end, is familiar with the author's methods of argument and the slender foundations on which he builds; the ordinary rules of evidence are totally ignored and the widest gaps in his theory are confidently bridged by an assumed gap of equal dimensions in our knowledge, or by a corresponding destruction of the evidence by the hand of time.

The author's work on Early Christian Art contained a chapter on the

early art of England which inspired little confidence in the extent or accuracy of his local knowledge and consequently in the validity of his argument; the same attempt to build epoch-making theories on superficial information is observable in the English chapter of the present work. He seems, for instance, to be entirely unaware that, with the exception of Greenstead, all the earliest surviving timber-structures in this country are of aisled form and should thus (according to his own theory) be derived from the despised basilica; furthermore that some of the earliest examples show the greatest efforts to imitate stone construction, as can be seen in the Bishop's Hall at Hereford, and thus operate in precisely reverse action to his theory.

Two extreme examples of the author's archaeological cubism may be here given—he sees (pp. 50 and 101) in the main structural posts dividing the bays of a timber-frame, the origin of the Gothic buttress, and asserts (p. 29) that the round form of church may have owed its origin to the necessity of defending the church, 'the round shape being possibly derived from a bastion'; two points of exclamation are the only possible comment.

We find ourselves at times in a sort of architectural 'looking-glass land' and almost expect to find the attics built before the ground floor; thus the familiar boarded soffits of our arched timber roofs become ribbed barrel-vaults and the obvious originals of their stone imitators; our mind begins, unconsciously, to derive the Eddystone lighthouse, the martello towers, the Temple church, the Pantheon or any other round building from the hollow tree in which our primitive ancestors took refuge from the cold. And so, with some relief, we wake up with a start and find that we need not believe these things unless we choose.

To pass to the other side of the picture, chapter i provides us with an interesting general survey of the early churches of Dalmatia, and chapter iv an equally valuable study of the mast-churches of Norway. Here and there also we cull an acute and valuable observation, as for instance on p. 108, that the presence of pine in a country leads to full-timber construction and that of oak to half-timber construction.

A number of printers' errors have been observed—on p. 87 the date 582 should read 682 and on p. 108, the phrase 'burial-vaults or arched braces' should probably be translated 'barrel-vaults with arched braces.'

The book is admirably produced both in text and illustrations, but we advise the reader to devote most of his attention to the latter.

A. W. C.

ART AND THE REFORMATION. By G. G. Coulton. xxii + 622 pp., illustrated. Basil Blackwell. 1928.

A display of scholarship is an ill-fitting garment for an unsound thesis, and it seems to us that Dr. Coulton has done a poor service to the fascinating study of medieval art by publishing this bulky book of quotations from original sources, interleaved with his singularly unfortunate inferences therefrom. Since the days when Gothic architecture was held to be barbaric, through the period of the enthusiastic revival of the so-called Christian art, to the present-day sober but keen appreciation of medieval craftsmanship, we have steadily increased our knowledge, and the proof of our better understanding of these things lies, as all scholars know, in the degree of

confirmation which fresh discoveries give to our present deductions. The work of Prof. Willis, Sir Wm. St. John Hope, and to-day of Messrs. Lethaby, Bilson, Baldwin Brown, Peers and Clapham is concerned with the patient elucidation of date, provenance, function and style, and their writings are not marred by excursions into the fields of moral prejudices or religious controversies. The work of the medieval artist is eloquent enough to speak for itself, and its message, though it will no doubt vary with the personal equation in each one of us, is sufficiently explicit to win general acceptance.

The underlying fault in Dr. Coulton's argument is that he attempts to marshal modern scholarship and the documentary evidences, which form a small but important part of its basis, in support of his own contorted view of a psychological problem. The " why " of medieval art rests, in general estimation, in the activities and influence of the Christian Church ; the church was the main patron, client, taskmaster, customer—what you will—of the artist and craftsman, who were also members of that church, and it would have been strange if the art had not reflected this relationship in every phase of structure and detail. To deny this obvious fact is to mis-read the whole significence of the age, and to abandon the manifest clue to its meaning. Yet there is no doubt that Dr. Coulton means us so to mutilate this key that it will no longer unlock the casket of medieval art. Unwilling to see that there is nothing surprising in the fact that men of the Middle Ages were as sinful (and as virtuous) as the common run of mankind. he hunts up their misdeeds and by their means decries their church. Unconscious of the obvious hostility between the state of pure religious devotion and the pursuit of the arts (a hostility that shows itself at every point in church history, but that never succeeded, save among some puritans, in excluding art from the service of religion), he brings forward ecclesiastical strictures upon the artist to prove the latter's secular isolation ! And strangely blind to the sturdy independence of thought which characterised men who lived in the security of the ' age of faith,' he adduces the healthy scepticism of the medieval workman as evidence of the weakness of the Church's influence.

The fact is that Dr. Coulton's judgment is so biased on the matters of religion and morals, which in their own limited sphere as applicable to human conduct have nothing to do with the arts, that he cannot be trusted to deal with the Church as a great social organisation which produced not only a transcendant art but a great period of civilisation. And, apart from this, Dr. Coulton does not seem to have any natural aptitude for the understanding of architecture itself or of architectural problems. His generalisation regarding ' perpendicular ' Gothic, as a cheap method of construction and decoration will not bear practical investigation, and even if it were true, would neglect the all-important point, which he elsewhere emphasises, that the ultimate phase of medieval art was profoundly influenced by the coming Renaissance. In his reference to regular and irregular coursing of stone, he loses sight altogether of the determining factor of the nature of the stone and the size of the quarry. His handling of the interesting subject of banker-marks and assembly marks is wholly inadequate and amateurish. But most amazing of all is the tangle into which he has got his two chapters entitled the Renaissance and Construction, which deal with the contract system and standardisation. If he had paused to arrange his ideas and his evidence he would have realised that art of every period is a great agent of

standardisation, and this was never exemplified more thoroughly than by the church architects in their system of construction in bays, and the fashions they set in their templates for mouldings. Far from the military builders making for standardisation, it is among castles that we find the greatest variety and irregularity, for utilitarian aims are not controlled by the artist's purpose. As for the modernity of the contract system, Dr. Coulton himself gives sufficiently early examples to make it probable that it is as old as the civilisation of mankind, and he ignores the multitude of important works that have been done without contract even to the present day. It is sad to see in this book over and over again the quotation from some interesting document, followed by a comment that completely misinterprets it. Can we ever, with confidence, advise a student to study original sources if this is to be the result ? Even Professor Lethaby's wise criticisms, which Dr. Coulton, with an apparently unconscious humour, quotes in his footnotes, have been unheeded. A little more familiarity with life, and a little more knowledge of buildings in the making would have saved the author from many a pitfall, and would have preserved him from the strange assertion that he opposes ' the attempt to put a sectarian ring-fence round Gothic art, with a sectarian turnstile for admittance ' !

After a careful perusal of this book, conscientiously read throughout its 595 pages, we feel it not only fails of its purpose, but what is more serious may succeed in confusing the issue for many readers. We are grateful for the transcription of hundreds of interesting documents. By themselves they would have been an admirable mine in which to dip for local colour. Dr. Coulton's thesis, if it had been presented in a short essay, would have made interesting reading, although it would have been to most people, a misreading of history. It would seem that next to the compilation of anthologies the author's real metier lies in fiction, for his chapter entitled ' Wander Years,' which is admittedly a fictional interpolation, is excellently told. If anything is wanted to confirm our view of him as an imaginative author, it is to be found in the final chapter, which, like his introduction, reflects a strangely mystical enthusiasm, in which the student or the artist who desires to keep his feet will find it hard to discover any firm ground.

W. H. G.

THE ROMAN FORT AT OLD KILPATRICK. By S. N. Miller, M.A. 63 pp. with 27 plates. Glasgow : Jackson, Wylie & Co. 1928. 12s. 6d.

Old Kilpatrick stands at the western end of the Antonine Wall, and thus in its day had the distinction of being the terminal station of the Roman frontier-system in the north-west. The existence of the fort was first established in 1790, and its position finally fixed in 1913. The site remained intact until 1923, when the land was acquired for housing development. In these circumstances the Glasgow Archaeological Society decided to excavate, and with wise discrimination invoked the services of its old henchman Mr. S. N. Miller as excavator. Mr. Miller's examination of the ground was hampered partly by the operations of the builders, partly by the meagreness of the remains, but sufficient evidence was recovered to elucidate the general history of the site.

As might be expected from its position on the estuary of the Clyde,

Old Kilpatrick was first occupied at the time of the Roman advance into Scotland under Agricola. Remains referable to this period included a length of clay-and-brushwood rampart and traces of a ditch-system unrelated to the later fort and dated by the associated pottery to the Flavian epoch. With fair probability Mr. Miller infers from these the existence of an earthen fort of Agricolan foundation, one of the chain of *praesidia* established by him between the Forth and the Clyde in A.D. 81. The pottery from this early fort indicated an occupation extending into the reign of Trajan, that is, beyond the end-date for the rest of the Agricolan system.

Then followed a period of abandonment lasting until the time of the Scottish campaign of Lollius Urbicus in 142. With Urbicus' reconstitution of the Forth-Clyde frontier the strategic importance of Old Kilpatrick was once more established, and the re-fortification of the site followed as a matter of course. The sequence adopted is instructive. A rectangular area of some 9 or 10 acres abutting on the Clyde to the north-east was enclosed with ditches to form a fortified quay. The fort itself, covering an area of nearly 5 acres, was then inserted in the northern half of this enclosure. Its defences comprised a series of ditches and a turf rampart on a stone foundation. The rampart was equipped with wooden corner-towers and wooden gateways. The buildings in the interior of the fort were of stone and wood variously. Those of stone included the headquarters building, a granary, and a latrine, those of wood three structures adjacent to the headquarters building and identified as storehouses and workshops, and six barrack-blocks occupying the Praetentura. In the Retentura, which could not be excavated, there was room for four more barrack-blocks, so that presumably the fort had been garrisoned by a *cohors miliaria*. Finally, when the fort had been completed, but not until then, the line of the Antonine Wall was completed on either side. Fort and wall were thus structurally independent, though, as Mr. Miller rightly argues, both belonged quite certainly to the same defensive scheme. Their structural independence is established by the slight gaps left between the two, their general contemporaneity by constructional similarities and the trend of the associated datable evidence.

The history of the turf fort falls into two main phases, separated by the great disaster that befell the northern province about 155. In this disaster most of the internal buildings of the fort were destroyed. Shortly afterwards, however, the site was re-occupied and the buildings restored, with the exception of certain of the barrack-blocks. Probably, therefore, the re-occupation was on a reduced scale. The second phase of diminished occupation lasted until 182, when Old Kilpatrick, in common with the rest of the Antonine Limes, was involved in a second and final disaster. Some perfunctory rebuilding followed, but it was merely incidental to the final abandonment. And so ends the story of an unusually interesting site.

Mr. Miller is to be congratulated on an admirable piece of work. The recovery of the history of the fortified harbour of Old Kilpatrick makes a distinct advance in our knowledge of Roman methods of frontier-defence in Britain, and lays all students of the subject under a still heavier debt both to him and to the Glasgow Archaeological Society. For Mr. Miller's Report no praise can be too high; it is a credit to himself, and an incentive to the rest of us.

V. E. N.-W.

BUDDHISM IN PRE-CHRISTIAN BRITAIN. By DONALD A. MACKENZIE. 178 pp. with 12 plates. London and Glasgow: Blackie & Son, Ltd. 1928. 10s. 6d.

The purpose of this book is to show that when Asoka, the emperor-monk of India in the third century B.C., claims to have made religious conquests in Europe, and when Origen declares that Britain was easily converted to Christianity because it had first been converted to Buddhism, 'they must be taken quite seriously.'

In pursuance of this worthy aim the author begins by stating and solving (!) the 'Celtic Question.' This he achieves by the simple process of fitting together all the evidence that will fit and ignoring all that won't. Then follows a sketch of the westward spread of Mithraism and Manichaeism, not because these have anything to do with the subject, but just to show that religion, like measles, *can* spread.

And now comes the great discovery of the book, that the Celtic Cernunnos figured on the Gundestrup bowl (the identification is taken for granted) 'is postured like a typical Buddha and given, as is pointed out for the first time in this volume, the attributes of the Hindu-Buddhist god Virupaksha.' Virupaksha, by the way, lacks Cernunnos' most distinctive attribute, the pair of horns, but that is no difficulty for Mr. Mackenzie—he ignores it. The equation of Virupaksha with Cernunnos made, philosophy and comparative religion do the rest. The particle *cern*, 'horned,' occurs in the name of 'the famous Irish hero Conall Cernach,' of Herne the Hunter of England, and of St. Kentigern of Scotland, so that evidently the horned Cernunnos, *alias* the hornless Buddha, was extensively worshipped in these islands. Incidentally, the case for Buddhism in Scotland is particularly complete, for 'in the Glasgow coat of arms the saint's tree is the oak, . . . while Cernunnos . . . is depicted on one of the French monuments pouring out acorns from a bag' (p. 55).

Finally, a comparison of the content of Buddhism with that of the Celtic religion as gleaned from all the Celtic folklore under heaven reveals elements common to both, including fasting, metempsychosis, the use of snake-symbols, and belief in dragons. On p. 110 the author is haunted for a moment by dreadful doubts of polygenesis as the true explanation of this parallelism, but, remembering Asoka and Origen, he thrusts the phantom sternly aside, and strides on in triumph to the consummation of his high endeavour. The text is accompanied by a number of plates, including reproductions of some of the figures on the early Christian monuments of Scotland here identified as Buddhist (?) symbols.

Certainly Mr. Mackenzie may claim to have taken Asoka and Origen quite seriously. Whether his readers will take Mr. Mackenzie quite seriously is another matter. V. E. N.-W.

THE ART OF THE CAVE DWELLER: A STUDY OF THE EARLIEST ARTISTIC ACTIVITIES OF MAN. By PROFESSOR G. BALDWIN BROWN. 9 × 6, xix + 280 pp. 167 illustrations (one in colour) and 2 maps. London: John Murray. 18s.

In general scope the book includes a description of the art of cave man in Western Europe, a consideration of the beginning of art in general, and an attempt, in the light of modern psychological knowledge, to deduce principles which may elucidate aesthetic theory of to-day. The work of the first artists should be particularly suited to the study of basic principles. Having no (known) precedents to follow, they must have been almost

completely unsophisticated. Of what other School of Art can this be said with certainty, and of all its members ?

In considering the paintings and engravings of the caves, the personal adornment of cave man, and the dance, Professor Baldwin Brown maintains that all these activities started as non-artistic, and further that a utilitarian purpose can be detected in them all, either from the start, or very soon afterwards. It is shown that the element of Art only appears later as a modifying influence, when the activities had become well established

This influence is readily recognisable when it appears ; as a deliberate regard for proportion, balance, harmony, rhythm, etc. But the fundamental questions remain : what is the origin and nature of this influence ? and what is the definition of these subtle qualities of form ?

The fact that the artistic activities of cave man were utilitarian is shown to refute that aesthetic doctrine which holds that art must necessarily be *free*—a doctrine which surely hardly needs refutation.

In the case of representative art, it is presumed that the pictures, at least in the great majority of cases, had a use and purpose in the service of magic. At the same time it is recognised that there must have been pictures in the first place before they could be put to this use. In regard to the origin of drawing and modelling, the author is perhaps on doubtful ground in attributing the initial motive to man's imitative instinct. Imitation, in the sense of making a likeness, is probably not an instinctive act. The simplest explanation would appear to be that man first recognised a likeness in casual lines he made on damp clay. As Professor Baldwin Brown, indeed, points out : the act of recognition is the important one, it gives pleasure, which leads to the repetition of the act.

The possibility that the pictures may themselves have been the origin of magic, is not mentioned. The chance recognition of a likeness to some animal, in a natural formation of rock or stalagmite, which is the basis of so many of these representations, is just such a highly mysterious phenomenon as that described in Lewis Carroll's verse :

> ' He thought he saw a Buffalo upon the mantel-piece,
> He looked again, and saw it was his Sister's, Husband's, Niece.'

It is reasonable to suppose that this sort of thing may well have developed into the practice of Magic.

From a study of the style and methods of representation of the more advanced cave artists, another doctrine of aesthetics is refuted : that which maintains that the essence of Art is the imitation of nature ; again a doctrine which in these days is surely obsolete.

The book is not altogether easy to read, mainly because the systematic sub-division of the subject is not very satisfactory, and leads to a certain amount of repetition. The photographs are for the most part only moderate in quality ; many are too small and indistinct, and none is accompanied by a scale. They may be said to serve rather as an index to, than as an exposition of, the subject-matter of the text.

Lastly, an admirer of Professor Baldwin Brown's many valuable contributions to the study of western European craftsmanship may be pardoned for concluding with the pious hope that the production of this book has not been allowed to delay the long-expected completion of his monumental work on the Arts in Early England. D. A. C.