may, however, rest in peace, in the sure knowledge that the inhabitants of Jerusalem will never permit its undue tidiness; and the short shrift they gave to Mr. Ashbee's first play-garden will doubly assure him that all is yet well, and that the local girl guides, imbued with a 'trust in the beauty of the city', are still in a hopeless minority. The book is excellently produced and is illustrated by photographic and other illustrations, which are not only explanatory but also entirely satisfactory as pictures.

A. W. CLAPHAM.

John Siberch, the first Cambridge Printer, 1521-1522. By G. J. GRAY. In commemoration of the Four-hundredth Anniversary of Printing in Cambridge. 1921. $8\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$; pp. 25. 2s. 6d. net.

Mr. Gray speaks of himself as one who has helped to gather together a few unconsidered trifles which have thrown light upon the mystery enveloping Siberch's life and work. As such it is very satisfactory that he should tell his own tale. He naturally pays full tribute to the work done before him by Henry Bradshaw, Robert Bowes, Mr. Jenkinson, Mr. Gordon Duff, and Mr. Hessels. Mr. Gray's earlier work appeared in 1904, 1906, and 1913. In the present pamphlet he reproduces the section of Hamond's Plan of 1574, which actually shows Siberch's house. Only forty-two copies in all are known of Siberch's works, and of these twelve are in Cambridge. Four of his works are not in Cambridge. Mr. Gray is recognized as the authority on Siberch bindings, and he here recapitulates his discoveries. He looks for further references to Siberch when early college accounts at Cambridge are further examined.

C. E. SAYLE.

A text-book of European Archaeology. By R. A. S. MACALISTER, Litt.D., F.S.A. Vol. i. *The palaeolithic period.* $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$; pp. xv + 610. Cambridge University Press, 1921. 50s.

Two volumes on Prehistory have been published recently by the Cambridge Press, and this time the printer's reader has done himself justice. The untrimmed edges are a trial, but the illustrations, which are of unequal merit, are at least placed where they belong. Based on lectures given at University College, Dublin, this comprehensive treatise is to be followed by others on the Neolithic, Bronze, and Iron Ages; and comparison with Déchelette's *Manuel* is inevitable. But whereas the latter series deals principally with the antiquities of the author's own country, Professor Macalister devotes most of his space to continental discoveries that have of recent years been rendered accessible in English by various writers. France is certainly the headquarters of Prehistory, but that is only one more reason for making the best of home products; and the author, with all his knowledge and industry, seems to treat the Continental material as an end in itself rather than as a means of solving problems in the British Isles.

In a text-book nomenclature is all important, and though the Professor cannot be held responsible for current usage, he has missed a good opportunity of setting a better example. For the constant use

of 'engraver' as the equivalent of *burin* there is little excuse, as engravers and archaeologists alike recognize nothing but 'graver' in English. 'Mesolithic', a term due originally to a random guess, must have been imperfectly exorcised, as it makes a most unwelcome reappearance. Amygdaloid (p. 236) does not mean lozenge-shaped; and *Reliquiae Aquitaniae* is something more than a misprint, as it never occurs correctly. Students may also be puzzled by the substitution of *axis* for *apex* in an important passage on p. 146. On p. 147 there is a definition of *artefact*, 'a word more useful than beautiful', but it was deformed from birth and craves our sympathy. Such is the fashionable spelling, but the word is none other than the substantive of artificial, and the Latin rule is clear from such cases as *plebiscitum*, *sortilegium*. A more serious matter is the adoption of French place-names in their adjectival form as labels for the various prehistoric divisions. Our neighbours handle such forms with some success, but the names are themselves unfamiliar to many English readers, and it is no advantage to have Chelles, La Madeleine or Mas d'Azil disguised as Chellean, Magdalenian, or Azilian, even if there were any consistency in the English spelling. Ambiguity could be easily prevented, and in any case the practice is contrary to the genius of our language. Terms like Solutréen and Campignyien are no doubt manageable abroad, but would any one in his senses speak of Wiltshirean bacon or Banburyian cakes?

As a whole the book is highly orthodox and eminently readable. Those who have tried to keep abreast of prehistoric research will recognize with gratitude the patience and erudition involved in its production. As the main lines of the subject have been fixed for all time, the author is not often called upon to decide a question of policy; and the reader will once more review in a calm atmosphere the wonderful discoveries in the caves of western Europe, but may find his pulse quicken in the last chapter where the more personal treatment of Chapter V is again adopted.

In dealing with the eolithic question the author assumes a bantering tone, and is all on the side of 'common sense'. He deplores the personal abuse to which it has given rise in certain (foreign) circles, yet invents and gives currency to such terms as Eolithist, Eolithophile, and Eolithophobe. Of what use are eoliths? Agreed that 'a use can be satisfactorily assigned to most Neolithic and Bronze Age implements' (p. 173), but can the Professor enlighten us as to the exact purpose of a palaeolith? In pre- (or, as he would say, pro-) palaeolithic days we should expect to find less obvious traces of human work as we go further back, till at last the work of man and nature can no longer be distinguished. Fixing the boundary line is at present a personal matter; and two of the authorities quoted (pp. 161, 165) have recently changed their minds, to the stupefaction of their many followers (*Proc. Prehist. Soc. E. Anglia*, iii, 261, 456). It is easy to dispose of thousands of alleged eoliths as natural products, but will the author deny *any* eoliths are of human origin? If one is admitted, *cadit quaestio*.

Little space is devoted to the pre-Crag theory, though the author somewhat ominously states (p. 169) that the first palaeolithic tools that

can be identified as human work lie in Stage 3 of his scheme for the evolution of technique. On p. 262 is a statement that will be contested by not a few collectors and geologists: 'The oldest gravels are those of the original plateau, relics of which remain capping the hills along the course of the river. These contain no implements other than the more than doubtful eoliths.' Again a passage on p. 581 may well lead the student to believe that Drift man was exclusively of Neanderthal type: 'Down to the end of the Middle Palaeolithic term the whole of Europe was peopled by the race called Mousterian. . . . There is no evidence that can stand criticism for a race resembling the modern type of humanity as existing in the Continent along with or previous to them.' Galley Hill man thus gets short shrift, yet the 'paintings' on the wall of Bacon's Hole near Paviland cave are treated with all consideration, though the owner of the cave has pointed out other streaks of ochre that have oozed through the rock since the discovery was made. On p. 434 are two misprints in place-names and a misleading reference in note 7. That on p. 254, note 1, should be to pp. 353, 361; and there are wrong references on pp. 258 and 431 to the illustrations. More might well have been expected, and overlooked; but there are some slips of more importance. Furze Platt is not at Caversham (p. 265), but 24 miles down the river at Maidenhead. The statement on p. 54 that 'Russia seems to be an eastward extension of Asia' will deceive nobody; but to place Nøstvet before Maglemose and Viby (p. 568) is to stultify the fine work of our Scandinavian colleagues. The parrot-beak gravers (fig. 104) are upside down, also fig. 100A and the Solutr blade on the cover, as the shading shows, and there is nothing in the text to prove the contrary. That mythical animal *Cervus elephas* appears on p. 192, and what seems to be a cross between it and *Cervus elaphus* is called *C. elephas* on p. 584.

In an undertaking of this kind a sense of proportion becomes a cardinal virtue; and in a text-book of Archaeology, not of Anthropology in general, better use might have been made of about 40 pages in the opening chapters dealing with kingship, the clan system, agglutinative languages, etc. Room might thus have been found for a fuller treatment of flint fracture and patination, the definition of types, and quaternary geology. But no one would belittle the service rendered by our Fellow to prehistoric archaeology, or the effort required to complete his own ambitious programme. In this he will have the good wishes of all serious students, on whom it is incumbent to remove the reproaches levelled at British (and Irish?) archaeologists on p. 260.

REGINALD A. SMITH.

Old Plans of Cambridge 1574-1798, reproduced in facsimile with descriptive texts. By J. WILLIS CLARK and ARTHUR GRAY. 9 x 5½; pp. xxxvii + 154, with a portfolio of plans. Cambridge: Bowes & Bowes, 1921. £4 4s. *od.* net.

These volumes have been worth the waiting. As long ago as 1909 the six Old Plans here reproduced were announced as to be issued with a descriptive letterpress by the late Registry of the University, Mr. J. W. Clark. Now, at last, after unavoidable delays the work that Mr. Clark initiated has been concluded by the Master of Jesus.