

## Reviews

*Canterbury College, Oxford.* By W. A. Pantin. Vols. I and II. Oxford Historical Society, new series, Vol. VI. Clarendon Press. 1947 (for 1941).

The first two volumes of Mr. Pantin's history are document books. Vol. I contains the inventories of the college from 1443 to 1534, with an appendix of personal lists of books and effects; Vol. II has a series of college accounts, the first of a date between 1379 and 1385, the latest of 1528-29, along with brief accounts of payments received from the wardens of manors. The college, founded in 1363, was a dependent of Christ Church, Canterbury, which accounts for its surviving records being kept for the most part among the priory muniments now in the possession of the Dean and Chapter. Mr. Pantin began work upon them more than twenty years ago, and we are promised in further volumes (to include a history of the college) the rich and fruitful outcome of all his labour.

The college consisted of a Warden and Fellows who were monks of Christ Church; of *pueri*, five in number, who were secular scholars; and of a number of sojourners, mostly monks from other houses like St. Swithin's Priory at Winchester, Battle, Reading, Evesham, Coventry, and so forth, so that the college was an important guest-house for religious who wanted to spend some months or longer in Oxford. The college servants were a manciple (*promus, pincerna*) and a cook, while the accounts also mention an under-cook and a janitor who had also to look after the garden. The accounts in Vol. II show the annual revenue of the college to have varied between 60 *l.* -90 *l.*; it was drawn at first principally from the farm of an appropriated rectory, Pagham; and later (in the account of 1459) from the warden of the manors through the prior. The letting of rooms in the college produced annually about 4 *l.* Tithes was assessed at 11 *l.*, and one entry records the payment of Peter's Pence at no more than 4d. There were a number of fixed rents—to St. Frideswide's, Balliol, University College and Godstow Abbey. The warden's salary was fixed at 13 *l.* a year, each of the five fellows got about 8 *l.*, and the total annual cost of the scholars was a little more than 8 *l.* also. Gaudies at the two festivals of St. Thomas of Canterbury, the Warden's expenses (journeys, etc.) on behalf of the college, repairs and other casual payments constituted the main outgoings. The accounts of the Wardens reveal some interesting expenses in litigation (e.g. against Oriel, in a boundary dispute) showing what was spent on entertaining counsel and influential friends and on one occasion 'the greater and more discreet men of the jury', on whom it was hoped to bring pressure in a local dispute. A former manciple cost the college a good deal in one such suit (*cf.* ii, 128, 153).

The story of the college, to be told later in detail, can to a certain extent be outlined from these accounts. It is clear that a good deal of building was in progress at the end of the 14th century and the early part of the 15th. From 1395-97 there are Warden's accounts for the 'new work' in which masons, slaters, sawyers, plasterers and other workmen make their appearance, and all sorts of building material was entered as purchased. The gap between 1397 and 1435 is unfortunate, but the 15th-century material is fuller and gives the picture of a college increasing

## REVIEWS

in numbers towards the end of the period, probably under the zealous care of Prior Selling, whose interest in letters is reflected in the book lists in Vol. I. Comparatively late in its existence the college was in a flourishing condition; it was, as the editor points out, 'a true college, with the marks of a permanent corporate existence', not a glorified hall. Small as it was, it played an important part in the intellectual life of the Benedictines in the southern province, and the variety of its studies can be seen from the list or inventory of Warden Bocking (1510, i, 45 f.) or the second inventory of Warden Holynborne (*ibid.*, 39 f.). Holynborne's list shows that there was a cupboard or bookcase for *ars grammatica*, and it is natural to find, as the 15th century closes, literary and humanistic works taking their place beside the well-tried classics of theology, philosophy and the canon law (i, 62). The editor's notes on the inventories of books are most useful. It is interesting to find Ockham's *Octo quaestiones de potestate papae*, if it was this, occurring in a list of 1508; incidentally, is the *Breviloquus* in Anthony Woolton's list Ockham's *Breviloquium*? The library was lucky in having behind it the great Christ Church collection, listed by Dr. James for Prior Eastry's time, and many of the books at Oxford were transfers from Canterbury. Holynborne's private list has the significant remark that 'many of hys bokys be yn small volumys sowe pt they [. . .] an rare workys and therefor we thynke he bowght them'. What we should term the *incunabula* of this collection, e.g. Pico della Mirandola and Filelfo, are thus distinguished from the manuscripts by their smaller size, and perhaps this physical distinction is on the whole a true one for undifferentiated early 16th-century book-lists. The Warden's list did not observe the distinctions between *libri scripti* and *libri impressi* found in the later inventories of the College.

Life in the college had its excitements. The scholars as well as the older commoners could be a difficult element. In 1436-37 the scholars rebelled against the Warden and took their case before Archbishop Chichele at Ford. In the account of 1466-67 we hear of 'a great discord arisen among the commoners of the college' (ii, 187). The former dispute may perhaps have led to the *reformacio* that came in the year of Chichele's death, and to the injunctions against which the discontented scholars protested (ii, 164). Another excitement may have been the 'public insurrection' mentioned in the account of 1459-60, during which the college quadrangle had to be barricaded for defence and the western door specially bolted. But these events were exceptional, and the great occasions usually no more than the taking of a doctorate by the archdeacon of Canterbury (Thomas Chichele, who had rooms in college), or the visit of the Spanish envoy. The health of the place seems to have been good. There is one reference to fumigation on account of the plague (ii, 255), and another to a sufferer from consumption (if *thisica passione* is the right reading), but little more. The standard of comfort in college, to judge from the personal lists, was quite decent; the effects of a secular sojourner, John Coles, show that inmates could do themselves well, but whether this affluence extended to the scholars seems doubtful. There are plentiful references to glass in the windows in the later building accounts, and the Warden seems to have had well furnished quarters.

We shall hear more about the architecture and the vestments of the chapel when Mr. Pantin publishes his later volumes. These present accounts and lists are edited with his wonted care: the only place where one might query the text

## REVIEWS

seems to be ii, 130, line 7 from the bottom, where the reading must be *in cibus et potibus*. On ii, 155, line 3 from the bottom, *hopacione* might be printed as *hop[er]acione*; in ii, 255, *per infirmorum* may stand for *perquisitis infirmorum*. The student of mediaeval Latin will certainly enjoy himself over the technical terms under *Reparaciones*, finding the equivalents of things like grates, scoops and shovels, trolleys, wheelbarrows, frying pans, nails and slates of all kinds, to say nothing of types of stone. There are some odd variants: *labrum* for—as the editor suggests—*lavacrum*, *pretexati* for *pretacti* (both on i, 83), and some pretty phonetic spellings, especially *senevectorium* or even *zenefactorium* for *cenevectorium*. The purchase of three *hurdillis pro bottoms dictorum lectisterniorum* is rather nice. Was there much give in a mediaeval hurdle?

E. F. JACOB.

*Oxford Replanned*. By Thomas Sharp. The Architectural Press, 1948. Pp. 224 with numerous photographs, maps and plans. 15s. net.

Long before these words are in print a very great deal will have been written, and still more will have been thought by Oxford people about the main proposals contained in this lively, intelligent, original, far-sighted, and extremely provocative book. It may be doubted whether any book about Oxford has ever stimulated so many people to think and write so much about the city as has Mr. Sharp's Report. But it would also be true to say that the overwhelming mass of this thought and writing has been concentrated on a very few of the very numerous points of interest which it contains; the battle of Merton Mall, the future of the Nuffield and Pressed Steel factories, the location of the Gas Works and the plan for a new road along the northern margin of the parks. These are all matters of the first importance for Oxford's future and they no doubt deserve the attention they have received. But they are not matters which are specially relevant to the local purposes which the Oxford Architectural and Historical Society exists to promote. The Report is, however, full of things which are the direct concern of the Society and which deserve the fullest attention of its members. In what follows, therefore, there will be no attempt to assess the merits and demerits of the main proposals which go to make up the Sharp plan as such: this notice is deliberately focused on the architectural and historical aspects of the problems which Mr. Sharp sets out to solve, and on the architectural and historical assumptions and judgments on which his solutions rest.

It can be said at once that the foundations of factual knowledge underlying the Report have on the whole been well and truly laid. Mr. Sharp has made a great effort to know his Oxford through and through, and his grasp both of the broad principles and of the details of its history and topography is firm, true and just. Very little indeed that is even remotely significant in relation to his purpose appears to have escaped his notice. Over and over again in this book those who like to think that they know Oxford well will find Mr. Sharp pointing out to the public at large the little things which they have cherished as personal and private discoveries of their own; the significance of the tree in the High next to the lodgings of the Warden of All Souls, or the miraculous effect on the architectural scene of the change from tarmac to cobbles at the junction of Magpie Lane and Merton Street, or the sudden and devastating treelessness that sets in beyond the Plain.

## REVIEWS

Here and there indeed the effort to achieve this near approach to omniscience has led Mr. Sharp into errors of judgment. His unreasonable irritation at the inability of the University (an inability which anyone conversant with the unpredictabilities inherent in the advance of knowledge would see to be inevitable) to tell him where and how it may want to expand in the next fifty years is an obvious instance: he cannot bear not to know what in fact no one in this case can possibly be expected to tell him. But, baffled at this point, Mr. Sharp seems to have made unnecessarily heavy weather of his attempts to compile other statistical information about the University: a judicious use of such reference books as the University Calendar and the Resident Members List and a few discreet enquiries in the Science Area or the University Chest Office should have made unnecessary his despairing cry that (p. 62) 'no one knows, even approximately, how many professors, readers, lecturers, tutors, administrators and others are engaged in the education of these undergraduates'. There should be no great difficulty in assembling the material for a very accurate calculation of this figure.

A more serious criticism relates to the map (facing p. 132) on which an attempt has been made to indicate the comparative architectural quality of the buildings in central Oxford. This map contains a number of inaccuracies: the Nag's Head in Hythe Bridge Street (entirely rebuilt a few years ago), St. Peter-le-Bailey Church (built in 1874), the modern part of Blackwell's shop, Raworth's motor showrooms at the corner of Speedwell Street, St. Aldate's Church (mostly 1862-74) and the east end of the St. Swithun's buildings at Magdalen (1880-84) are all coloured as 'Ancient Monuments (pre-1714)'. The category of 'other buildings of architectural value' is even more capricious: it omits some houses on the list of important buildings compiled by the Society's Old Houses Committee and approved by the Oxford Preservation Trust<sup>1</sup> (e.g. 89 and 91 St. Aldate's) and, while including the modern frontages of Balliol facing the Martyrs' Memorial, the new buildings of St. John's, the east and west ends (but not the central portion) of the Rhodes Building at Oriel and the Rector's Lodgings at Lincoln, omits all other modern College and University Buildings, and even the Anatomy School at Christ Church (1763), one of the most interesting little Georgian structures in Oxford.

That this map should have been allowed to appear with such imperfections suggests that Mr. Sharp's major proposals may need careful scrutiny for their effect on the existing architecture of the City. This is, indeed, the case. Mr. Sharp, while professing the greatest concern for the safeguarding not merely of the architectural gems of Oxford, but also of the older domestic buildings which form their invaluable setting, shows in fact a strange disregard of his own principles everywhere outside the University area. As has been pointed out on behalf of this Society elsewhere<sup>2</sup> his claim that the new layout of his streets and squares involves the destruction of only one building of consequence, Frewin Hall, is seriously misleading, for, in fact, not less than eighteen houses listed as architecturally important by this Society and the Oxford Preservation Trust are involved. Among them are such distinguished buildings as Littlemore Hall, Grey Friars, and Holy Trinity Vicarage. Vanbrugh House in St. Michael's Street would lose its position as a unit in a

<sup>1</sup> *Oxoniensia*, I (1936), 196-201.

<sup>2</sup> *Times*, 6th April, 1948.

## REVIEWS

continuous street frontage and be left with a rebuilt east wall precariously balanced on the corner of the new Frewin Street.

Much of this proposed destruction must be due to sheer inadvertence on Mr. Sharp's part, for apart from the violence done thereby to his own emphatically stated principles, most of the more important houses could be saved by minor realignments of his proposed new roads and squares. Thus Littlemore Hall and 84 St. Aldate's could be worked into the layout of Christ Church square, and the group from Grey Friars to the Jolly Farmer could be kept as an admirable foil to the gaunt splendour of the Castle Tower. And while the removal of the Prison buildings from the Castle precincts and their conversion into a public park is an excellent and indeed essential reform, Mr. Sharp appears to contemplate the demolition also of the crypt of St. George's chapel adjoining the Castle Tower: this building, however much its present appearance may owe to later rearrangements, deserves a better fate than this, and its disappearance would in any case leave the Castle Tower forlornly isolated with no hint that it once formed an integral part of an elaborate military and ecclesiastical complex.

It would be possible to join issue with Mr. Sharp on several matters on which he lays down canons of architectural propriety. There are curious inconsistencies in these *obiter dicta*, of which perhaps the most striking is the combination of the view that the planner of new buildings in Oxford must at all costs avoid the temptation to be 'monumental' with his insistence on the use of ashlar stone, the 'monumental' building material *par excellence* as contrasted with the more homely and traditional limestone rubble against which his prejudice is very strongly expressed. It is difficult to follow him in either contention. Some of the finest architectural effects in old Oxford are the outcome of deliberate monumental planning, e.g. the work of Hawksmoor [not Hawksmore, p. 39] and Gibbs in Radcliffe Square or at Queen's, and it would seem unduly timorous to deny modern architects the opportunity to follow in the footsteps of their illustrious predecessors. On the other hand it is quite impossible to accept his view that the rubble stone used for facing many modern buildings is an inappropriate material in Oxford. The older parts of the city are, in fact, full of rubble buildings large and small: among the former one has only to mention Mob Quad at Merton, much of the Cathedral and part of the University Church, the whole of the surviving circuit of the City Walls and the towers of the Castle, St. Michael-at-North-Gate and St. Peter-in-the-East, to show how absurd Mr. Sharp's contention on this matter is. In humbler contexts rubble is still more frequent, especially in the numerous garden walls and College 'backs' to which this book rightly calls attention. Rubble and ashlar have been used in happy juxtaposition in Oxford in the past, and there are no grounds, aesthetic or historical, for banning the use of the former in the Oxford of the future.

It is odd that Mr. Sharp should think it relevant to dogmatize in this context on the principles to be followed in the restoration of decayed stonework. He prefers piecemeal replacement of badly worn stones to complete refacement of large surfaces. Thus he contrasts the complete renewal of Peckwater Quadrangle at Christ Church (p. 163) unfavourably with the partial restoration of the Fellows' Quadrangle at Merton. This is a matter on which much can be said on both sides, and it is a great pity that if it was to be discussed at all it should not be discussed properly. Mr.

## REVIEWS

Sharp's discussion is both subjective and superficial. He does not see that the partial restoration which he favours, however much it may preserve the generally mellow texture of an ancient building invariably distorts the emphasis of light and shade on its surface, drawing attention without architectural rhyme or reason to the new patches which may often be so placed or of such a shape as to upset the whole balance of the architect's conception. With mediaeval buildings where balance and proportion may have been less carefully planned and where work of different periods is often violently juxtaposed these unhappy effects of patchy restoration are often less noticeable, but in a highly sophisticated 18th-century elevation like Peckwater, where everything depends on the precise weight and subtle relationship of individual mouldings, piecemeal restoration will often be little less than disastrous. The complete refacing of Peckwater so far from having 'resulted in much loss' (p. 207) has revealed for the first time since the 18th century the full splendour and subtlety of Dean Aldrich's magnificent design. An example of how not to reface a classical building (though noted with approval by Mr. Sharp) is well shown in his illustration (p. 207) of the austere house fronts in Parks Road, south of Wadham. Here the irregular refacing of the window surrounds, and the heavy patches of new work above each, while the rest of the plain surfaces have been left to decay, have given an entirely false, almost meretricious emphasis to a façade whose whole intention was one of extreme restraint and simplicity.

Mr. Sharp does not refer to the expedient of renewal in plastic stone which some Colleges, notably Magdalen, have recently adopted on an extensive scale: but it may be surmised from his strange preference for stucco and cement surfaces over the traditional rubble that he would not view this practice with as much alarm and distaste as many good authorities now do. It may be noted in passing that the absence of Georgian brick buildings in Oxford, on which Mr. Sharp rests his proposal to ban the use of brick for new street frontages, is partly adventitious. There are, it is true, very few old brick buildings visible in the City now—the house at the corner of High Street, St. Thomas, opposite Quaking Bridge deserves mention—but there were once more. Two have quite recently been destroyed, one on the site of the new Bodleian, the other at the south-east corner of Carfax; two others, Westgate House, by the Castle, and 69 High Street, opposite Longwall, still exist, but are now completely encased by quite recent and inexcusable stucco. A tacit approval of such disfigurement would appear to be conveyed by Mr. Sharp's statement of his views on the use of brick and stucco in Oxford.

It has been necessary in this review to examine critically some of the architectural principles underlying the recommendations of this Report. Such a process inevitably tends to concentrate attention on those statements and implications which appear most open to criticism. But it should be emphasized in conclusion that among Mr. Sharp's proposals, leaving aside altogether the major controversial suggestions which it is not our purpose to discuss, are a number which can be wholeheartedly welcomed. The clearance of the Castle site, already mentioned, is one; the proposed return of Carfax Conduit from its unmerited exile in Nuneham Park to a conspicuous situation in Oxford is another; a third is the opening of access to the outside of the City Wall in Holywell and Longwall (why not also to the bastions in the stretch between North Gate and the Turl?). There will be very general sympathy with the proposals for the improvement of Oxford's river frontages.

## REVIEWS

And the spirited blows struck by Mr. Sharp in defence of the Ship Street houses may very rightly bring blushes to the cheeks of those, including the present writer, who in the Old Houses Committee, or the Oxford Preservation Trust, felt in the days before the War that the case for preservation on architectural grounds was one which could not be fought to the last ditch. If this Report has no other permanent effect than to secure the safety of Ship Street, Mr. Sharp will not have been brought to Oxford in vain.

Finally, a word must be said in praise of the photographs in the Report. There are some superb illustrations of Oxford's architecture, both grand and humble, mostly from unusual viewpoints and taken with perfect understanding of the significance of light and shade. There are also the usual horror pictures which inevitably accompany any discussion of Oxford's scenic amenities. The whole series forms a magnificent record of Oxford's appearance in the 1940's and will be treasured as a collection of the greatest historical interest. Unfortunately the reproduction of the few coloured prints in the book has been very much less successful, but these, after all, can still be seen in the originals, which may not always be true of the contemporary townscapes so happily perpetuated in the photographs.

J. N. L. MYRES.

*Medieval English Pottery.* By Bernard Rackham. Faber, 1948. Pp. xiv+34 ; 4 colour and 96 halftone plates. 21s.

Mr. Rackham in this well-illustrated book sets out to give an aesthetic and avowedly not historical view of English Mediaeval Pottery. He certainly succeeds in this purpose, and it is most encouraging to find one of Mr. Rackham's taste and experience vindicating the artistic qualities of mediaeval pottery ; moreover, Mr. Honey in his foreword claims it as the most beautiful pottery ever made in England. It is a most welcome book. Mr. Rackham rightly stresses (p. 27) the stylistic break in the development of English pottery between the intimate touch of the craftsman's hand in the mediaeval tradition and the machine-wrought high-class domestic wares of the 18th century onwards, and points out that it is to the rougher modern vessels, such as bread pans, that we must look to-day for the stylistic successors of these mediaeval vessels. The infinite variety achieved by slight deviations from geometric precision is certainly most welcome at the present day, and luckily it seems always possible to acquire modern examples of pottery hand-thrown in this manner, in spite of Mr. Rackham's fears that they are rapidly being ousted by the more easily cleaned stoneware or enamelled iron.

It is unfortunate that the author has waved aside the historical implications of his material to the extent that a number of inaccuracies have crept in, which may considerably mislead the student, forced by lack of a textbook to use this book for purposes beyond its intended scope. It is pertinent to note here those relevant to Oxford mediaeval pottery. The choice of a jug in the Yorkshire Museum (pl. 80) to illustrate an Oxford biconical type with vertical applied strips is unfortunate, as this particular vessel has its upper part erroneously restored, making it too tall. Pls. 6 and 20, Oxford pots in the British Museum and Maidstone Museum respectively, are omitted from the 'Oxford' index entry ; pl. 6 is the famous 'Angel Inn' pot (*Oxoniensia*, v (1940), 42-44, pl. xi). Haslingfield, whence

## REVIEWS

comes the painted jug in the Ashmolean referred to on p. 20, is actually in Cambridge-shire, not Oxfordshire, and this jug, in fact, belongs, with those of pl. 53 from Colchester, and pl. 50 from Fen Ditton, Cambs (which it particularly resembles), to a characteristic eastern-English style. This error arose from an old museum label, since corrected. Pl. 7 is a bowl not of the 13th, but 17th century: a very similar vessel was found in 1937 at Childrey, Berks., containing coins of James I and Charles I, presumably deposited during the Civil War (*Berks. Arch. Journ.*, xli (1937), 82), and Mr. Adrian Oswald tells me that similar vessels are found in the earlier 17th-century levels in London. The typical Oxford tripod pitcher (pl. 39) 'found near Parks Road' (restored without a tubular spout, *cp.* pl. 19) is, in fact, an old friend from Well 2 on the new Bodleian site (*Oxoniensia*, iv (1939), pl. x, 5, fig. 22, p. 101). Pl. 3 is not a 13th-century, but a Late Saxon cooking pot, and pl. 38 from Pevensey is again not 13th-century, but a late 11th-century import from northern France (*Arch. Journ.*, lxxv, 129, pl. iv, 3: *cp.* a similar French import from Dover, *Antiq. Journ.*, xxv (1945), 153-4; another is known from Exeter). It should be pointed out that the use of the word 'polychrome' to describe the Oxford vessel of pl. 83 (*Oxoniensia*, iii (1938), 173, pl. xixb) is in a general sense, and not in the specific sense as used by Mr. Dunning (*Archaeologia*, lxxxiii (1933), 126-34), and now widely accepted, to refer to a class of fine pottery made in SW. France (possibly at Saintes, where there is much of it) and imported into Britain and other countries of Northern Europe (*Arch. Journ.*, xcvi (1938), fig. 2; *Arch. Cant.*, liv (1942), 56; *J.R.S.A.I.*, lxxvi (1946), fig. 2, 1; 100-1; map, fig. 4: Lödöse, near Göteborg, Sweden, Carl af Ugglas, *Gamla Lödöse* (1931), 565-6, pl. iv). This imported 'polychrome' ware has not so far been found in Oxford, though not dissimilar imported wares are known. It might also be pointed out that the dark colours in the glaze such as on this Oxford pot are not due to the presence of manganese, but usually to the presence of large amounts of iron or copper in the glaze. Also, the glaze on the imported 'polychrome' jugs is not a tin glaze, as stated by Mr. Arthur Lane in another of this series of monographs on ceramics (*French Faience*, pl. 1), but the usual lead silicate glaze, though the examples I have analysed do contain somewhat more than the trace of tin usual in a lead glaze. This may possibly be due to the use of solder instead of lead for the glazing material.

Although Mr. Rackham's date of 15th century for the lobed vessel of 'Tudor' green glazed ware (pl. 44) might surprise some readers, such vessels and fabrics were in fact coming into use before the end of the 15th century, and parts of a similar cup were found in levels at All Souls in 1941 which probably pre-dated the building of the old cloister in 1495 (*Oxoniensia*, vi (1941), 89-90; vii (1942), 76-79).

The plates in this book provide a useful illustration of local variations upon the general types of mediaeval vessels found throughout England. For instance, with the Baluster Jug, the sharp but elegant profile as found in the Oxford region (pl. 84, and pl. 58 from Abingdon) may be compared to the bulbous London style (pl. 16), or to one from Guildford (pl. 21), to the tall slender and most elegant York style (pl. 62), to that of Nottingham and the north Midlands (pls. 63 and 82); see also two recent Ashmolean acquisitions. Worcester and Warwickshire also have their own individual Baluster styles, and the jugs listed above are not just isolated specimens, but serve as type examples for the styles prevailing in those areas.

This book might give the impression that pleasing vessels of the period are

## REVIEWS

to be found almost exclusively among the jugs; the author illustrates no example of a typical early mediaeval cooking pot (e.g. *Oxoniensia*, XI/XII (1946-7), fig. 24, nos. 1, 5, 15 : *Berks. Arch. Journ.*, L (1947), figs. 4 and 5), some of which possess undoubted plastic beauty, and dishes and pans (e.g. *Oxoniensia*, VIII/IX (1943-4), fig. 33) which were abundant and attractive wares in the middle ages, find little place in his pages.

The majority of illustrations are excellent ; of outstanding quality are colour plates C and D, and from such as these the student can learn much about textures of the vessels. But rarely is any indication of scale given. In the text, although the type is pleasing, the numerals are unpleasant.

Mediaeval pottery undoubtedly has its aesthetic attractions, but it must not be forgotten that the majority of examples in our museums are important because they form a body of archaeological data from which conclusions of historical significance may be drawn. It is to be hoped that many of those attracted to this material by Mr. Rackham's book may come to see it also in its historical setting, and by keeping their eyes open in both town and countryside, perhaps may contribute something to our knowledge of mediaeval pottery and hence of mediaeval life.

E. M. JOPE.