

Notices of Books.

AN INTRODUCTION TO ENGLISH CHURCH ARCHITECTURE FROM THE ELEVENTH TO THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY, by Francis Bond, M.A., Hon. A.R.I.B.A. (Oxford University Press, 1913; demy 4to., pp. xxxvi, 986, with 1,400 illustrations; price 42/- net).

Students of the mediæval architecture of England are already indebted to Mr. Francis Bond for his books upon this subject. He has given them at various times—his *Gothic Architecture in England* (of which a notice appeared in the Society's *Proceedings* for 1913)—his *Screens and Galleries in English Churches*—his *Fonts and Font Covers*—his *Wood Carvings in English Churches* in two parts—and his *Westminster Abbey*. They are now under a further obligation to him for this important work.

For those who have not as yet seen this book, it may be stated that it is published in two volumes; well arranged; well printed; and full of beautiful photographs—of plans, drawings, sections, and diagrams to the number of 1400. The book has not only had a vast amount of labour spent upon it, but that labour has evidently been a work of love; and Mr. Bond, assisted by many helpers, has left nothing undone to achieve the main object which he has had in view, viz., "to serve the needs of that great body of readers who nowadays are interested in mediæval architecture and wish to obtain some general knowledge of it."

In this, which we have ventured to call his main object, we think that Mr. Bond has very largely succeeded, as a short analysis of the contents of the book will show. Chap. I gives an account of the churches of the various religious orders, monastic, collegiate, and secular. Chap. II of the requirements of the greater churches. Chap. III of the planning of these churches and their distinctions as caused by the differing customs of the various bodies who built and used them. Chap. IV is occupied with the planning and growth of the Parish Church,—and a most fascinating account it is. In subsequent chapters the various methods and developments of construction follow:—the vaulting and system of abutments—the walls and arches—the pier and its members—the methods used to obtain a satisfactory system of lighting—the doorways—the triforium and clerestory—

protection from rain. The last chapter deals with towers and spires and here Somerset, not unnaturally, takes a prominent position.

It is clear, then, that we have an almost exhaustive account of the parts which go to make up a great mediæval church: almost, because Mr. Bond has hardly dealt at all with two features of a great church—the piscina and the sedilia—and this is the more strange because the piscina and sedilia are constantly to be seen in the smaller churches as well as in the greater and were in almost daily use; and the piscina is particularly interesting in respect of its development from a single form to a double. Mr. Bond does indeed incidentally refer to them in his story of the changes which befel the abbey church of Dorchester, but neither of them is dealt with in any detail; and while there is but one entry in the Index Rerum for the one—there is no entry at all of the other.

As far as we are able to judge, the purely architectural part of the book is singularly accurate. There are one or two slips. The second parish church in Glastonbury is dedicated to *St. Benignus*, not to *St. Benedict* (p. 24); the building at York is the College of *St. William* and not of *Sir William* (p. 104); and the illustration from Gerona (p. 696) has been printed upside-down.

But Mr. Bond tells us that he had a further object in view in this book. "What has been attempted is to give a plain, straightforward account of mediæval building construction as controlled by mediæval ritual." It is here, we think, that Mr. Bond has not been altogether successful. In the first place it is to be regretted that the term *ritual* should have been used rather than the term *ceremonial*, for it is ceremonial with which Mr. Bond has dealt. The distinction between the two terms is important inasmuch as *ritual* refers to the rite—to that which is said—a service—whereas *ceremonial* is concerned with that which is *done* in the course of a rite or service. And in the second place (and particularly in Chap. II) Mr. Bond makes many references to various ceremonies which occurred in the course of the services of the Middle Ages. These references might have been of much value; but unfortunately there are so many inaccuracies, that their value is but of small account. To call attention to a few of them:—Thus, altars were not "rehallowed" by the weekly sprinkling of holy water—the sprinkling was rather lustral: the priest did not cense "round" the altar then: the choir altar was not used at Mattins (p. 31) but the High Altar was—for it was this altar which was censed at that office. The Sunday Procession did not take place "while Terce was being sung." Terce was sung after the Procession was at an end: only one boy carried holy water (the printed Processionals sometimes mention two but the Consuetudinary says *one*): High Mass did not begin

directly after the Procession, but after Terce and sometimes after Sext and even after Nones. On Palm Sunday the principal Station was not made before the Sacrament outside the Church, but in the usual place before the Great Rood which on this day was specially uncovered during this station; there was no Procession after Lauds at any time, though there was one after Mattins in Easter week: and on Wednesdays and Fridays in Lent, a procession did not go "round" the Church, but on those days it went by the north presbytery door to each of the altars in turn as directly as possible.

Again, Mr. Bond says (p. 50) that it was obligatory for priests to say Mass every day in mediæval times. This was not the case. We refer him to Lyndwood's *Provinciale*, p. 232, Oxford edit., 1679.

There is no authority so far as we know for the statement on p. 55 that "the later tombs and monuments were contrived that the upper slab should serve as an altar-slab." Such a practice would have been directly opposed to the canon law, and tombs such as those at Worcester and Winchester, which were chantry chapels, had their own altars and the altar in that of William of Wykeham (as in all others) was at the east end of the chapel and has been replaced there. Each of these inaccuracies may be reckoned small individually, but in a book which is intended to guide students well, it is obvious that the guidance should be accurate, and therefore we hope that in future editions Mr. Bond will see the necessity for a careful revision of all that he has said with regard to matters ceremonial.

One of the most interesting parts of the book is Mr. Bond's excursus upon the low side window. As he says, the low side window has been the subject of frequent debate for the last fifty years or more. Mr. Bond has classified these windows and the explanations which have been offered with regard to them. He himself, it would seem, has not yet come to any definite conclusion, but we gather that he is inclined on the whole to favour the opinion that they were used for ringing a small bell through the opening, at the consecration in the Mass. He is led to this by a consideration of two records, which he quotes. The second of these records may, we think, at once be put aside, as not really bearing upon the point under consideration. The whole circumstance of the case was abnormal. The first record on the other hand is directly to the point. It is in an extract from a Constitution of Archbishop Peccham (Lyndwood's *Provinciale*, p. 231, Oxford edit., 1679) and Mr. Bond has attempted to prove that in it is to be found the solution of the difficulty. This is the crucial sentence:

"In elevatione Corporis Xti ab una parte ad minus pulsantur campanæ,

i.e. at the elevation of the Body of Christ bells shall be struck on one side at the least." Lyndwood, in his gloss, says that this is what it means, or that it means what it says :

"Ut sc : sonent ex una parte ut dicitur in textu."

But Mr. Bond in order to ensure his position has to read into this a word which is not there—*ecclesiæ*—and then adds "what appears to be meant is that . . . the Bell is to be rung from at least one side of the Church," and so really begs the whole question ! The sense is quite clear—the bell is as we should say, to be tolled—the tongue will thus strike on one side only—and this is the minimum. Moreover, apart from the order to ring a bell, the true point of the constitution is evident

"Ut populares . . . ubicunque fuerint sive in agris sive in domibus flectant genua,

i.e. so that folk wherever they may be whether in the fields or at home may bend the knee." A small bell such as could be passed through the aperture of a low side window could never achieve the end of the constitution.

Students, then, must still keep their minds open upon this question. Possibly one of these days, some one will stumble upon the true solution, much in the same way as Mr. Garraway Rice was able to prove the identity of St. Dominic with "St. Sunday" (*Somerset Medieval Wills, 1383-1500*, edit. Weaver, *S.R.S.*, vol. xv). Perhaps there is more to be said for Mr. Fowler's suggestion that a light was placed within these windows. Whether it was a "dead" light or merely a guiding light (possibly for the priest on a winter's morning as he groped his way to his morrow mass) or sometimes for both these purposes in combination, who can say ?

In conclusion we may call attention to the useful glossaries of terms—English and French,—to the two Indices of places and of subject matter, without which the use of these beautiful volumes would lose a good deal of its pleasure.

S. J. M. PRICE.

MONS BADONICUS : THE BATTLE OF BATH, by Major P. T. GODSAL (George Gregory, Bath ; Harrison and Sons, London, 1914 ; Svo., paper covers, pp. 16).

The author of this paper had meant to bring it before the Somersetshire Archæological and Natural History Society at the Annual Meeting at Bath last June, but found himself unable to attend the meeting. Copies of it were, however, printed and issued to some of the members attending and the following notice may be taken as a contribution to the discussion which would have taken place had the paper been read.

Major Godsall attempts to identify the much disputed site of Mons Badonicus with "the mountain" on the slopes of which the city of Bath stands, and to show that this site fulfils so exactly the topographical requirements of the story of the Saxon defeat given by Geoffrey of Monmouth that we are compelled to accept his (Geoffrey's) version as based on an authentic source. In his arguments Major Godsall displays all the brilliance and perverseness which alternately delight and irritate readers of "The Storming of London," to which book this pamphlet is a sort of appendix. But the author is on much more slippery ground in his endeavour to identify the site of Mount Badon than he was while expounding on military lines the story of the conquest of Britain, given in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.

To begin with he makes the bold assertion that

"Mons Badonicus is the Latin for Bath Mountain, and Bath Mountain is the English for Mons Badonicus."

If this were a fact, what room would there be for doubt as to the site of the battle? But the fact is that the Latin for Bath is *Aquæ Sulis*, with which "Badonicus" has obviously no connection. That there may have been a British name for *Aquæ Sulis* akin to the Welsh *badh*, "bath," is no doubt possible, but we have been unable to find any trace of it and in the absence of evidence a writer is hardly entitled to assume the existence of such a name and to build on the assumption.¹ Furthermore, the earliest English rendering of "Mons Badonicus" which we know of is to be found in King Alfred's translation of Bede's "Ecclesiastical History," where it appears as "*pære Beadonescan dune.*" Clearly this does not mean "Bath Mountain," but is a mere turning into English of the Latin name. From what we know of King Alfred's methods of translation it is obvious that he did not know where Mons Badonicus was and did not identify it with Bath. Even allowing for the period between the destruction of Roman *Aquæ Sulis* and the rise of Saxon *Bapanceaster*, when the site lay waste and moorhens nested by the side of the great Roman bath, it seems unlikely that the Saxons would have so soon forgotten the site of Mons Badonicus, had the battle been fought at a town so well known as Bath.

The military reasons for identifying Mons Badonicus with Bath, adduced by Major Godsall, do not read convincingly, but seem rather to have been framed to support a pre-conceived opinion. To take an instance Major Godsall states that at some period before the battle of Mons Badonicus (*circa* 516) the Saxons

"made a dash at Marlborough (*Cunetio*) and took it with ease. The Roman road led on to Bath, only 30 miles distant. . . . Why not take it as they had taken *Cunetio*?"

1. *Caer Baddon* is given in Morgan's *British Cymry* among the seats of the chief Druids, but we do not know what authority there is for the name.

Could it be imagined from this that there is not a shred of evidence to show that Cunetio was captured before 516, while topographical and other considerations strongly suggest that it was not taken till after the battles at Old Sarum (552) and Barbury (556) ?

As regards the argument from Geoffrey of Monmouth, Major Godsall is unconsciously following in the footsteps of the late Rev. Professor J. Earle, who contributed a paper on "Traces of the Early History of Bath and its Neighbourhood" to Vol. 1 of the *Proceedings of the Bath Natural History and Antiquarian Field Club*. Professor Earle quotes largely from a British legend of the battle of Mount Badon, drawing the same conclusions as Major Godsall draws from Geoffrey of Monmouth, viz. that the topography of Bath fits the legend so satisfactorily that we must have here a bit of genuine history. Unfortunately Professor Earle does not indicate whence he got this legend beyond saying that it was from a book of three volumes of British story largely connected with King Arthur.

After comparing it carefully with Geoffrey's story we are forced to conclude that if this legend is not the original authority on which Geoffrey drew for his account of the battle, they must at any rate have both been taken from a common source. There is no detail of importance in Geoffrey which is not to be found in the legend, except the statement that "the Saxons were drawn up in a wedge, as their manner was." Moreover, some incidents which are obscure in Geoffrey's account are explained by the legend, e.g. the absurd statement, as Major Godsall rightly calls it, that the Britons took possession of the Saxon ships after the battle. This does not refer, as Major Godsall suggests, to boats patrolling the River Avon, but to the Saxon fleet lying at Totnes, to which post according to the legend the Saxons fled, chased and outstripped by the Britons! This gives a fair idea of the value to be attached to these fables. They both locate the battle at Bath and contain no details beyond the powers of a Welsh romance writer who knew the locality.

The touch thrown in by Geoffrey that the Saxons fought in a wedge, "as their manner was," needs a word of comment. Major Godsall tells us that "the wedge formation has no virtue in a defensive battle unless the ground happens to suit it," and explains it by the shape of the summit of Beacon Hill, the site in Bath where he thinks the battle took place. But need we go beyond the reason given by Geoffrey, who knew that the wedge was the accustomed battle array of the Northmen? There is no evidence of its use by the Saxon invaders, so far as we know, but it was very ancient, tradition ascribing it to the teaching of Odin, and we do not look for rigid accuracy in Geoffrey of Monmouth. Incidentally we may remark that Major Godsall's knowledge of

the drill-book of to-day leads him to undervalue the battle tactics of the fifth and sixth centuries. In the days of short-range artillery and hand-to-hand fighting, when the wedge was enveloped the attacking lines naturally spread themselves along the sides and rear and thinned out opposite the point. This gave the wedge an excellent chance of breaking out, when it might shake itself clear, or reform for further fighting. It was therefore an ideal formation for the offensive defence, the best of all defences.

Many other points in Major Godsall's paper we should like to refer to but we have already overstepped the limits laid down. Although our conclusion is that he fails to make out his case, his paper is well worth study as an interesting contribution to the discussion of a problem that will probably never be finally settled.

ALBANY F. MAJOR.

THE GREEN ROADS OF ENGLAND, by R. Hippisley Cox (Methuen and Co., 1914; 8vo., pp. xv, 217; maps, plans and other illustrations; price 10s. 6d. net).

This book should delight all field archæologists, especially those who study the earliest traces of civilization in the lands. The author tries to picture the country at a time when track-ways, still largely existing as green roads, or absorbed in later roads and lanes, were its only highways. He argues that these formed a complete system of travel-ways along the watersheds connecting the hill-forts, the latter arranged systematically along the watersheds in a way that negatives the idea that they were tribal strongholds, constructed only for local purposes. His conclusions are summarized as follows in his preface:

"In the south of England the common meeting-place of these hill-roads was Avebury, where the greatest prehistoric monuments in Europe are still to be seen. It is not unreasonable to suppose that this central gathering-ground was the seat of government, and that its authority extended as far as the roads that radiate from it, and the earthworks that protected them.

"The evidence . . . points to the Stone Age as the period when the hill-forts were built, and if the ridge roads can be attributed to the same time it follows that a civilization existed in this country long before the Celtic invasions. To what stage that civilization had advanced it is difficult to realize, but the harbours connected with the ridge roads suggest that there was much trade over the seas, and the Stone Circles at Avebury, Stonehenge, Knowlton, and Rollright are proof that astronomy had advanced beyond the limits of savage outlook."

In support of this theory the author has examined the trackways and earthworks along the watersheds of the Thames, devoting special attention to the ridgeways that, leading from the uplands round Avebury and Stonehenge to the coast at various points along the Channel and Severn Sea, enabled a traveller to cross England to the shores of the North Sea without traversing any important river except the Thames at Streatley. Even this crossing could be avoided by a long detour. His study of the trackways and earthworks of Wiltshire, Hampshire and Dorset is fairly exhaustive. In Somerset he deals mainly with the track that led from Salisbury Plain to the Severn Sea along the Mendips and with the trail that, branching from it at Jack Straw's Castle, ran along the border of the county to Cadbury (Camelot) and thence southwards into Dorset.

To say that the author has fully established his thesis would be going too far. Much closer comparison and examination of earthworks, by spade-work especially, is required before we can agree that the hill-top or watershed camps belong to one age, or one system, even allowing for differences due to local conditions, or methods of construction. Moreover, even if we admit that there was a system of strongholds and travel-ways along the watersheds, which the author goes far to prove, we might argue that religion and commerce were motives sufficient to induce the tribes of various localities to co-operate in maintaining such a system without there being necessarily a central controlling authority. But in any case the book gives powerful support to those who believe that "man, the primæval savage," arrived very early at a stage where to maintain amicable relations and barter goods with one's neighbours was found more profitable than a state of perpetual feud.

Though the book is not as exhaustive as its name suggests, the amount of ground surveyed by Mr. Cox, mainly he pleads in "short week-ends snatched from other duties," is surprising. Readers with local knowledge may occasionally think his treatment inadequate. For instance, Dorsetshire Gap where trails from north to south converge on a camp-guarded pass, which may be partly artificial, surely deserves more than the bare mention it gets on page 78, even though the ancient trackways that pass through it lie outside the scope of the book. Again the course of Wansdyke, also outside the author's scope, is not correctly shown either in the text on pages 20 and 125, or in the map facing page 24.¹

The historical allusions also are not always correct. It was not "at Charford that Cerdic in 508 defeated the British King Nathan Leod," but at a site in Hampshire not definitely identi-

1. Cf. Part I of this volume, pp. 62-67.

fied. The battle at Charford is assigned to the year 519. Again, Mr. Cox says that Merdon Castle in Hursley Park, near Winchester, was the scene of "the bloody slaughter of the Ethelwolf's (*sic*) army by the Danes in 867 A.D." The reference is apparently to the battle fought at Meretone by King Ethelred and Alfred in 871. Five or six sites at least have been suggested for this battle and Marten near Great Bedwyn and Martin near Bokerly Dyke have strong claims.

But in the eyes of Somerset folk the author's gravest offence will probably be that on pages 26 and 27 he sets out the Wiltshire theory of the battle of Ethandun as if it were accepted history, suppressing the fact that Edington near Westbury is only one of many suggested sites and ignoring entirely the theory that the battle was fought at Edington on Poldens, which members of this Society have gone far to establish, even if at present their arguments may perhaps fall short of absolute proof.¹

Such points as these, though but small blemishes on a delightful book, serve to warn readers that the author cannot be accepted as an infallible guide.

ALBANY F. MAJOR.

THE WOOLLEN MANUFACTURE AT WELLINGTON, SOMERSET,
COMPILED FROM THE RECORDS OF AN OLD FAMILY BUSINESS,
by Joseph Hoyland Fox, 1914 (Arthur L. Humphreys, 4to.,
pp. viii, 121, with portraits and other illustrations; price
7s. 6d. net).

Literature connected with the growth and manufacture of wool in Somerset continues to accumulate. Many years ago, Lord Somerville, of Fitzhead, did much for the improvement of the breed of sheep in the county, and for the increase of the wool supply, and wrote a very able book on the subject. The matter has also had attention from time to time, from other local authors, in the *Proceedings* of the Bath and West of England Agricultural Society. Moreover, in 1879, the late Mr. Charles Henry Fox, of Wellington, issued, for private circulation only, a volume entitled "Chronicles of Tonedale." This was devoted mainly to the history of his family, but it also contained much information relating to the development of the large woollen business at Wellington. Mr. C. H. Fox also read a paper entitled: "Notes

1. See "The Site of the Battle of Æthandune," by (the late) Bishop Clifford, *Proceedings*, vol. XXI; "The Battlefield of Ethandune," by (the late) Rev. C. W. Whistler, *The Antiquary*, June and July, 1901; "The Story of the Battle of Edington," by the Rev. W. Greawell, Taunton, 1910; and "Early Wars of Wessex," by Albany F. Major (edited by the late Rev. C. W. Whistler), Cambridge University Press, 1913.

on the Woollen Manufacture of Wellington, Somerset," at the meeting of our Society, in the town named, in 1892. This led to a very interesting discussion, in the course of which Professor Boyd Dawkins reminded those present that long before the Norman Conquest the art of spinning wool had arrived at great perfection in this country. He also referred to the frequent discovery of various articles used for spinning, in the old habitations of the county, and remarked that "When he put the facts together, he could not help believing that the art of spinning and weaving woollen articles dated back, in that very district, certainly as far as the Bronze Age, and probably as far back as the Neolithic Age."

At the Shepton Mallet meeting of our Society, in 1907, Mr. A. F. Somerville, in his able presidential address, dealt largely with wool and the trade in woollen goods in Somerset. He reminded us that: "To the munificence of wealthy traders in this commodity we owe the building of so many stately church towers, and the rebuilding of churches between the end of the XIV and the beginning of the XVI Centuries." Mr. Somerville gave numerous quotations from churchwardens' accounts and other documents bearing on the subject.

The Woollen Industry of Gloucestershire has recently been dealt with by Sir William H. Marling, Bart., in the *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society*, vol. xxxvi (1913), pp. 315-333.

Now, Mr. Joseph Hoyland Fox has published a volume on "The Woollen Manufacture at Wellington, Somerset." The book is, he tells us: "A narrative of the growth of an industrial undertaking in the West of England, carried on for nearly 250 years by the same family." It opens with a chapter of family history, in which many interesting details are given about the Weres, or Weares, who were clothiers in West Somerset and East Devon for generations, and into which family Thomas Fox, the grandfather of Mr. J. H. Fox, married. A large number of documents relating to the firm are published and the volume sheds much light on local and national conditions during the XVIII and XIX Centuries. Mr. Fox says: "In 1850, I began my business life in the mills at Wellington, and have been connected with them ever since—a period of sixty-four years. During that time I have witnessed many great changes. Hand-looms and hand-combing have been replaced by power-looms and combing machinery; and many other changes have taken place. The improvements in machinery have been very great, and many new methods and processes have been introduced. The premises have been much enlarged and extended; additional works have been erected at Cullompton, Wiveliscombe and Culmstock, and the volume of business has greatly increased."

The firm has ever been mindful of the best interests of their employees ; and the volume contains good evidence of this. For instance, we learn that, as far back as 1863, a system of profit-sharing was set on foot. Amongst other means to the same end : it may be mentioned that they provided for old age pensions, half-wages in case of accident, compulsory insurance against sickness, and maternity benefits many years before the Government took such matters in hand. Dining-rooms and kitchen were also provided ; and recreation rooms have recently been added. In short, it is a fine record, and one that any business-house may well be proud of.

Portraits are given of several members of the Fox family, some of whom were well known in Somerset and the adjoining counties. There is also an illustration of two fine " Armada Chests," which still occupy a place in the board-room at Tone-dale, and which probably served the double purpose of bank and strong-room in the good old days when the firm had neither bank nor banking account, and were, therefore, compelled to keep a considerable sum of cash in hand.

The rise of their bank is thus briefly referred to : " Thomas Fox purchased large quantities of wool from the farmers of the district, and for greater convenience in paying them he began, in 1787, the issue of bank-notes, which has been continued to the present day. In later years this banking business was taken over by Fox, Fowler & Co., of Wellington, with numerous branches in Somerset, Devon, and Cornwall."

The book is a valuable addition to the commercial and social records of the county.

C. TITE.

THE ENGLISH PARISH CHURCH, by J. Charles Cox, LL.D., F.S.A.
(B. T. Batsford, 1914 ; 8vo., pp. xx, 338 ; copiously illustrated ; price 7s. 6d. net).

This book is " An endeavour to put into plain language the origin, development, and aims of the old English Parish Church more especially in the country districts."

In addition to an introductory chapter there are chapters on Planning, Styles, Materials, and what to note in an old Parish Church.

Of these five chapters the most interesting, and by far the most readable is the long introductory chapter. It deals with the number of Parish Churches, the origin and rise of the Parochial system, the construction, repairs, and upkeep of the fabric, the customs and practices of the Church, the many secular uses to which the Nave was put, and the harmony of design and situa-

tion. The chapter emphasizes the love of the people for their Church, the close connection which it had with their daily life, their sorrows and their joys; and also the adaptability of the buildings to the natural scenery amid which they are placed.

The chapter is marred by a wild and most unnecessary theory that the tithe was intended for the maintenance of the poor and for the exercise of hospitality and not to provide a maintenance for the clergy. Though Dr. Cox declares that this "fact" is abundantly witnessed to by episcopal registers and by a great variety of other documentary evidence he only quotes in support of it an essay reprinted in Vol. xxxvii of the *Transactions of the Devonshire Association*, written by the Rev. O. J. Reichel. We need only say that on such a matter as this we prefer the ruling of the Earl of Selborne to that of either Dr. Cox or Mr. Reichel. We are inclined to quote the old proverb, "Let the shoemaker stick to his last."

The other chapters are not as interesting as this first one. They contain much that has already been said before, and are somewhat dull and heavy to read.

The chapter on "Materials" is good and might with advantage be enlarged upon. It is a subject which has not yet received sufficient attention.

More attention than usual we are glad to see is given to the post-Reformation architecture of the country.

The illustrations are for the most part excellent, and chosen from the less familiar examples, but we would ask again that for books of this nature a less heavy paper should be used.

G. W. SAUNDERS.

THE HERMITS AND ANCHORITES OF ENGLAND, by Rotha Mary Clay (Methuen and Co., 1914; 8vo., pp. xx, 272, fifty-four illustrations; price 7s. 6d net).

An Anchorite was a solitary who was enclosed in a cell; a Hermit was one who lived the solitary life, but who was free to wander abroad. One could not undertake this life by mere self-dedication, any more than a man could make himself a monk or priest, or a woman could make herself a nun in that way. Lay-people must obtain the sanction of the Bishop, and one in religion the leave also of the Superior. An exception was St. Wulfric of Haselbury in Somerset, who without any appointment of the Bishop, with no solemnity of Benediction, but by the authority of the Holy Spirit who dwelt within, buried himself with Christ in a cell close to the Church. It might be well if the Somerset Record Society could see its way to print the *Vita*

St. Wulfrici of John of Ford ; so notable a man of Somerset ought to be known better than he is. The Solitaries were everywhere. Miss Clay gives a list of twenty-one cells in Somerset, and to these should be added the cell by Redcliff Hill, in Bristol, for this cell existed before Bristol became a county in 1375. There were island cells on the Holmes ; a cell by Rownham Ferry from Bristol to Somerset ; Forest cells at Badgworthy and in the Forest of Neroche ; apart from Glastonbury there were cells in the Fens at Andersey, "Oth" in Aller, and Burtle in Moorlinch ; a cell at Crewkerne ; and cells in villages such as Batheaston, Publow, Twerton and Winscombe. It would be interesting to recover the sites of these village cells ; an enquiry at Winscombe has been fruitless. It is strange that no cell is mentioned at Bath. With regard to the lives of the Solitaries it is clear that care was taken to ascertain their fitness for that severe state of life. Miss Clay prints a Commission sent by the Bishop of Worcester in 1351 to the Archdeacon of Worcester to enquire into the fitness of Lucy de Newchirche to be enclosed on Brandon Hill at Bristol, and if he found her fit to enclose her ; sometimes also a period of probation was enjoined. The service of enclosure, a very beautiful one, of which Miss Clay gives a translation, was commonly taken by the Bishop himself. There is an excellent series of chapters with regard to the conduct of life of the Solitaries : "Concerning the body," "Trial and Temptation," and "Human Intercourse" ; that life was viewed as a training towards perfection of those who as yet were by no means perfect ; and the advice given is marked by deep human sympathy and sound common sense. The question of course has been raised, how far the Solitaries were worthy of their profession, and with regard to that it may be truly said that even to the time of the Dissolution they were generally respected and revered ; of course in so large a number there were some who fell short, and equally of course the baser sort of lay-folk and even of clerics made the worst of such failures. A common charge was that theirs was a lazy life, and that charge might have been brought with equal truth, or untruth, against most of the country clergy ; yet none the less may the words of Richard of Hampole be true : "Hermits' life therefore is great, if it be greatly done." There is a tabulated list of cells arranged according to counties, and a full and well-arranged Index ; there are also more than forty illustrations, either of places which are of interest in connection with cells, or copies of illustrations taken from ancient manuscripts. Miss Clay's carefully wrought-out book supplies a want, and may serve to show that there was more good in the life of the Solitaries than many people have imagined.

C. S. TAYLOR.

LIFE OF SIR JOHN LUBBOCK, LORD AVEBURY, by Horace G. Hutchinson, 2 vols., 1914 (Macmillan and Co.; 8vo., pp. xiv, 338, and x, 334; price 30s. net).

It is perhaps rather a bold venture on the part of the writer to attempt to write a notice of this work. His only excuses are (1) that he has had the advantage of coming into contact with Lord Avebury,—who, some twenty-five years ago, used to criticize in favourable terms the writer's entomological captures in Cranborne Chase; (2) that he has had the privilege of reading archæological papers under the chairmanship of Lord Avebury; and (3) that he has had the honour of conducting excavations on the site of that remarkable prehistoric area from which Sir John Lubbock took his title—archæological field-work in which Lord Avebury took a keen personal interest, as indicated by his visits to the excavations carried out there and reported upon to the British Association during the last few years.

This work, in two volumes, is more than a biography of a man who "touched life at every point"—and whose life was "one of the most useful that was ever lived"; it is also an extremely readable account of historical, political and scientific matters of later Victorian times, for Lord Avebury was more or less connected—and often very closely—with the chief events of his day. Charles Darwin acknowledged this fact, when he wrote (1881), "How on earth you find time is a mystery." Lubbock's methodical habits enabled him to collect with comparative ease much of the information which is embodied in his works. As he read he had in his book a slip of paper, cut to a certain size, on which he noted passages which specially appealed to him. These slips when tabulated and indexed formed an easily accessible means of reference. He formed a habit from early life of moving quickly from one subject to another, and brought to a scientific perfection the economy of time.

These volumes are nicely got up and well printed in forty-six chapters. We however venture to think that a work at this price might have had more illustrations—portraits of the family for instance, and at least one view of Avebury. Small errors are very few; we note that the name of Mr. James Fergusson, the antiquary, appears in more than one place without the double "s" (pp. 86, 87). *Prehistoric Times* has gone through seven editions in England, not six only as stated on p. 75. On p. 336 we are led to suppose that Minehead is in North Devon, instead of West Somerset.

It is with Lord Avebury as a scientist we are chiefly concerned. His earlier studies were devoted more especially to the archæological side of science, but later he became more wrapped up in natural science in which he shines mostly. Sir Charles Lyell,

Charles Darwin, Professor Huxley, Herbert Spencer, Professor Tyndall, and like "giants," received Lubbock and estimated him as one of their own select, yet great company. The members of his family were heartily in sympathy with his work; this was no doubt largely due to the delightful manner in which Sir John was able to interest those who came to him for instruction. Lady Avebury, it should be mentioned, was the second daughter of that distinguished field-archæologist, General Pitt-Rivers.

In a notice last year (*Proc.* LIX, ii, 111) of the seventh edition of Lubbock's *Prehistoric Times* we spoke of his work as an antiquary and anthropologist. He will always be remembered as the originator of the familiar terms "Palæolithic" and "Neolithic," as applied to the Stone Age stages of culture,—names which have met with general acceptance.

Mr. Fergusson and Sir John in the sixties had a friendly discussion as to the age of Avebury and Stonehenge. The former considered Avebury to be post-Roman, and Stonehenge to be British as late as A.D. 467! Sir John regarded Stonehenge as belonging to the Bronze Age, a view maintained by the recent excavations there. With regard to Avebury more will be put upon record when the writer's excavations have been completed there. It was Lubbock who introduced Ruskin to the wonders of Avebury in 1882, and he records in his diary that Ruskin "was enchanted with it."

Sir John Lubbock's Ancient Monuments Bill took some years to mature, but it became law in 1882, and empowered the State with the duty of protecting and preserving ancient monuments which owners were willing to place under the Act.

In the long course of his political life, Lubbock was destined to get many popular Acts passed by the legislature. He was undoubtedly one of the most accomplished of England's amateur men of science, a prolific and successful author, an ardent botanist, a student of landscape as related to geology, and a most earnest social reformer.

In August, 1883, he was included in the "Fancy Portraits" in *Punch*; the legend beneath ran thus:—

How doth the Banking Busy Bee
 Improve the shining hours,
 By studying on Bank Holidays
 Strange insects and wild flowers.

H. ST. GEORGE GRAY.