

EASTER 1950

No. 101

THE
DIAL





EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

L. J. POTTS, M.A.	J. W. FINDLAY, M.A.
R. ADLAM, B.A.	A. McA. GIBB
J. N. HILLGARTH	B. N. MEREDITH
N. A. NEVILLE (Editor)	J. M. POCOCK
C. TEMBLETT-WOOD	J. E. VAIZEY
(Sub-Editor)	

EDITORIAL NOTE

IT has been said that a college only gets the magazine it deserves. Like most aphorisms this one contains some truth and a good deal of nonsense. The last few copies of this magazine have been far worse than the college deserves. In past editorials appeals have been made to history and for greater effort: they have evidently fallen on deaf ears.

Horizon and the Strand have fallen by the wayside; little seemed to be stopping the Dial going the way of all little reviews. However, an attempt has now been made to give the College something better than it deserves, in the hope that readers will be shamed into giving in the future as good as they are getting in this issue.

Plate I is reproduced by kind permission of the Trustees of the British Museum. Plates II and III are reproduced by kind permission of the Chatsworth Estates Company.

TOWN HOUSE PARTY

A recent article in the *Times* described the new method of recruitment and training for the Foreign Service. This method was developed at the end of the war to replenish, by means of 'reconstruction competitions', the regular staff of the Administrative class of the Home Civil Service, the senior branch of the Foreign Service, the Northern Ireland Administrative class and the Special Departmental class. The combination of the ending of these competitions with the demand for economy which was directed towards the Civil Service Selection Board resulted in its translation from Stoke D'Abennon to 29 Chesham Place, S.W.1. Here the Stoke D'Abennon idea is maintained, although the course is necessarily foreshortened. Open examination for the Foreign Service can only be taken by this method; for the Home Civil (at present at least) there is the choice between it and the written examination, the pre-war method, now known as 'method 1'.

The first difference between the new home of C.I.S.S.B. and the 'country house' is that it is non-residential. The tests extend over two days, accomodation being provided at a government hostel, which though not costly is also not nearby. Approximately twenty-five candidates gather at one session, who are subdivided into groups in the manner of the Naval Selection Boards or the W.O.S.B. The fact that candidates only meet during the eight hours of the two days tests, instead of living under the same roof for three or four days, tends to diminish the community spirit, but as each has so much in common with the rest this spirit remains one of the many attractions of the tests. All have passed the preliminary examinations (they were held this year in January); most are students or undergraduates, the majority being from the two older universities. All are apprehensive, though in varying degrees, of what the two days hold in store and of the yet distant but more alarming final board which will follow within a few weeks.

To consider the events of the two days may allay the apprehension of some few, and can be of interest to the many whose way will not take them through 29 Chesham Place. Intending

candidates already bursting with confidence are wasting their time to read further; it is for the remote possibility that there may be even one who still harbours a doubt, that these observations have been set down. The first striking fact of the two days is this spirit of co-operation and friendliness underlying all parts of the tests. On first arrival the candidates are reassured that the examination is not competitive in the sense that the number of places is definitely fixed, and that there is therefore no need for any idea of 'cut throat' competition. This is a good beginning. To 'break the ice' candidates are dispatched in their groups to have an 'informal discussion'. With the ice broken, in fact a general thaw will have been in progress since from the time of the first arrivals at 9 o'clock, the tests begin in earnest. The time being short the programme is planned to the minute. In general there are three classes of test; group tests, individual and personal tests. They are scattered about the time-table and fitted in as circumstances make possible.

There are two group tests. The first involves attending and presiding over a committee all of whom have had a brief on some administrative problem. This may be the practical political and social problems of a newly settled 'peace island' or of a more controversial 'new town'. No specialised knowledge is demanded although it is perhaps the economist who tends to emerge with the answers. Not that there are definite answers. Ability to grasp essentials and to accept and discern good advice is more important than producing a 'right' answer. The second, 'lecturettes', tend to spread a shadow of gloom. On the first day six subjects are submitted by the candidates on which a speech (with shirt cuff notes) of seven minutes might be given. Of these one is selected, and fifteen minutes are allotted to prepare it. This is the moment for Union men and those who have visited Blarney, but more important than the plain ability to speak intelligibly (which is of course great) is the ability to marshal some moderately intelligent thoughts on the subject (which may be anything from 'Nothing' or 'Winnie-the-Pooh' to 'German Nationalism' or 'Russo-Iraqi relations') and produce them in the right order and with some conviction. To make it more interesting both for speaker and addressed he is asked to name his audience; he may find himself facing the Hogsnorton Parochial Church Council or the Senate just as he pleases—a great opportunity which may never recur.

Individual tests take the form of intelligence tests, where, as with the Tripos, all depends on you and the fountain pen. A

general knowledge paper is included among these, with the sensible innovation that the answers are provided, unfortunately with a number of irrelevant ones thrown in, simply to be marked with a pencil. As with the Tripos therefore, some definite knowledge is useful. Writing short stories about lantern slides is something of a relaxation, if inclined to be a tax on the imagination. One or two letters in connection with 'Peace Island' demand attention, and the psychologist slips in with his papers. In these the anagram expert tends to shine; solace for the crossword addict if he seeks it. C.I.S.S.B. is not ridden with psychology, although it was this aspect of the Board that received most publicity at the time of the recent enquiry. The staff are determined to assert their independence of the new tyranny, and candidates are assured that psychological tests are merely used as a general indication and form only a subsidiary part of the 'general assessment', which is what the Board produces for each one at the conclusion of the tests. There is no 'pass' or 'fail' at Chesham Place.

It is perhaps hair splitting to draw a line between individual and personal tests: written and personal would be more accurate. The latter consists of interviews of which there are three; one each with the group chairman, the 'observer' and the psychologist. Subjects for discussion will have been submitted on one of the joining forms. The excellent practice in the Royal Navy of using 'Will' forms to newly joined members of the ship's company, with the informative title; "This is not a Will", has not yet been adopted by the Board. They do however make up for it in other ways. Two points are interesting in this connection, first that the most frequent question seemed to be: was the candidate enjoying the tests, and despite whatever may be thought to the contrary, assuming that the one reader has persevered to this point, perjury was not committed in answering it. Second, these interviews, and particularly that with the psychologist, were even said by some to have been enjoyed more than any other part of the course. Perhaps it has taken the faculty of Moral Science to teach us that to take pleasure in exchanging ideas it is necessary to win the confidence; in any event here is a receptive and understanding audience prepared to listen for a whole hour.

After the last tests the assembled candidates were wished God speed by the chairman of the Board. He apologised for the labels attached to each of them, suggesting that removing them before going into the road would eliminate glances of curiosity. Having

gone through what in two days seemed so much together, it was something of an anticlimax to fumble into a greatcoat and for each candidate, now more than a mere number on a label, to go his separate way through the rain soaked streets of Belgravia. The extent of this regret is the measure of that community spirit which serves not only to prove 'method two' a remarkable and successful experiment but to dispel the anxiety of the neophyte.
Anon

NOTES ON ROGET'S *THERAUSUS*

Polonius: What do you read, my Lord?

Hamlet: Words, words, words.

. . . who would have bought them for the substantifick quality of the elementary complexion, which is intronificated in the terrestreity of their quiddative nature to extrancize the blasting mists . . .

Rabelais

THERE is an eminent industrialist who has for his bedtime reading Lewis and Short's *Latin Dictionary*. The volume is too heavy to be held in the air or balanced on the anatomy. It has to be suspended above the bed by a system of counterweights. Every evening this gentleman lowers the volume gently to a convenient position, reads two columns and then hauls it steadily up to the ceiling where it remains until the following evening. This practice he claims improves his English, provides light entertainment, tests his eyesight and strengthens the arm muscles. To those who enjoy the same sort of reading but have no classical background nor a flair for managing counterweight equipment, I would suggest for their perusal, Roget's *Thesaurus*

of English Words and Phrases. The reader who delights in exquisite form will hardly be able to get beyond the 'Synopsis of Categories' where meticulous subdivisions of metaphysical subtleties will hold him enthralled (Class I: Abstract Relations; Section I: Existence; No. 1: Abstract; No. 2: Concrete; No. 3: Formal and so on). The connoisseur of style will be delighted by the sumptuous selection of epithets, and the reader who asks only for a good story will be captivated by the rollicking action of Chapter 959: Drunkenness, intemperance, inebriety, intoxication, termitency, bibacity, comotation, bacchanalia; or by the gentle pathos of Chapter 828: pain, mental suffering, dolour, dejection, mortification and anguish.

The *Thesaurus* however was not compiled for diversion but for practical use. It is the Muse's Practical handbook, used by the poet who wants to write 'beauty' but has three syllables to fill. Looking under the synonym for 'beauty' he finds the very word, 'pulchritude'. For embarrassed and harassed barristers who may be asked to define a dame's Oomph and It, the *Thesaurus* is heaven sent. Turning to Section 845 they can explain to his Lordship that Oomph is synonymous M'Lud with form, elegance and grace, indicating concinnity, charm, *je ne sais quoi* and style. It suggests M'Lud affinities with Venus, Hebe and the Graces. His Lordship may by then be interested enough to ask to see the explanation himself.

But a few words of warning to beginners. The book must be used with discretion. Do not be carried away by the wealth of verbiage. Select with care or the sense of your writing, overlaid with synonym, may become obscure and you will be guilty of obtuseness and spinosity, of unintelligibility and imperspicuity, of incomprehensibility and inconceivableness, perhaps even of ambiguity, perplexity, mystification and *obscurum per obscurius* and your best work will be only so much empty sound, a *vox et praeterea nihil*, mere nonsense, gibberish, jabber, hocus-pocus, fustian and rant; nothing more than bombast, balderdash, flummery and palaver; as little worth as bavardage and rodomontade, as twaddle and twaffle, as fudge and trash and bosh; to be treated as rubbish or moonshine, as wish-wash or fiddle faddle.

Yet there are times when a torrent of words is tremendously helpful. The Legislative Assemblies of the Continent are the real training ground for calumnious verbosity, but the English language is the richest in the world and can be used with powerful effect. Next time you are justly incensed do not exclaim: "You clumsy fool" or hurl a platitudinous obscenity at your protag-

onist, but have learnt by heart some sections of Chapter 501 and fling them at him vigorously, loudly and uninterruptedly. The dialogue might run thus:

He: Watch out, what you're doing you damn fool!

You: Me! You pay more attention where you're going you ninny-hammer you! you inept Tom Noddy! nincompoop! You ill-mannered loutish loon! dullard! doodle! Oaf! addle-head not to apologise. Shallow brain! dunderpate and logger-skull! I've a good mind to report such a vertiginous sawney, such a corybantic gawk, such a clotpoll lackwit, so hoddy doddy a man of Boeotia. Be off with you, you jobbernow! changeling! mooncalfish gobemouche. (Shouting after him as he slouches away, defeated). Never let me meet you again you dithyrambic dotard! drivelling old crone! you maudlin and bigoted grandmother! I know your sort you shatter-plated sot à triple étage. (The last only to be attempted by those holding matriculation).

A reader who makes good use of his *Thesaurus* has no need ever to be the worse for liquor. No need at all. As they help you out of 'The Anchor' at 10.15 on a Saturday night do not let them deceive you. "I am not drunk," tell them, "not drunk at all. Just a little bucolic, mellow perhaps, merry and elevated—*inter pocula*." Convince the parapet of the bridge in Silver Street that you are by no means intoxicated, only happily flushed, somewhat disguised, even groggy or beery, but not inebriated. Whisper to the Granta ducks that tonight, as a treat, you are top-heavy, potent, half seas over, a little overcome. And feeling your way along the wall, make sure that tomorrow you will deal with those people who suggested you were inebriated. The very idea! Simply a trifle bibacious, whittled, a touch primed and screwed, inclined to be corned, to be raddled. Negotiating the railings, your feet in danger of submersion, take heart, you can make it. You are not temulent, just a bit sewed up, three sheets in the wind, lushy in a way, nappy and muddled. And as you snuggle into bed wake your room-mate and get him to witness that you are only a wee spot obfuscated and maudlin, a little capulous and pot valiant but certainly not drunk.

It is a sad comment on human affairs that there should be such an amplitude of words indicating obfuscation. A further cause for concern is the disparity between the number of words under the heading, "Purity" and the number under the headings "Impurity" and "Libertine". In the first group there are 32, in the second 280.

Every heading in the *Thesaurus* is subdivided into a number of grammatical sections: noun, verb, adjective, adverb, interjection and phrase. The last two divisions are of great interest and supply the reader with useful things to say on all occasions, always in the very best taste. Thus we learn that when giving vent to outbursts of irascibility, petulance or pugnacity, the appropriate interjection is: Pish! If an object raises our contempt we damn it with faint praise and hold it up to scorn with the crushing interjections: a fig for etc., away with! fiddle-de-dee! Abhorrence, repugnance, disgust, loathing, nausea and horror are to be expressed by the terms: faugh! foh! ugh! The most useful phrases of all are to be found in Chapter 870 under the heading, "Wonder". How often have we watched a sunset behind dark hills and found words inadequate, or heard a scandal that has taken our breath away, a piece of news which leaves us speechless. On such occasions we need no longer be silent. The appropriate comments have been listed by the industry of Mr Roget:

Lo and behold! O! heyday! halloo! humph! hem! good heavens! gad so! well a day! dear me! only think! lack-a-daisy! my stars! goodness gracious! mercy on us! heaven and earth! odzootkins! O gemini! hoity-toity! Heaven bless the mark! can such things be! zounds! 'sdeath! who would have thought it! how now! where am I?

C.T.-W.

Digitiser's note: Subsequent research has shown that the House of Anjou had no connection with the Devonshire tapestries. See, for instance: *The sign of the dog: an examination of the Devonshire hunting tapestries*, by Ann Claxton, in *Journal of Medieval History*, Vol. 14, No. 2, 1988 June, pp. 127-78

PRINCESS MARGARET OF ANJOU

MARGARET was sixteen years old when she married King Henry VI at Titchfield Abbey in April 1445, and nineteen years old when she founded Queen's College, three years later. Several portraits have been identified and Mr Browne hopes to publish the set before too long¹, but these are all portraits of her as Queen. A few months ago, however, there was displayed in the French Landscape Exhibition at Burlington House, Piccadilly, a huge Gothic hunting tapestry from the Devonshire Collection² entitled *Falconry*; and in its upper left-hand corner there appears seated on a palfrey a fair round-faced child gorgeously dressed. The suggestion has already been made that this is "a portrait, possibly of Margaret, daughter of René of Anjou, some time before she came to England in 1445"; also that "iconographically the representation agrees with the only certain portrait of Margaret in the British Museum illumination; while confirmation is provided by the letter 'M' on the horse-trappings, the 'marguerites' or daisies with which the ground is strewn, and the known extent to which her engagement was made an occasion for luxuries"³. In passing it may be observed that the British Museum illumination, in a MS given her for her coronation, is *not* "the only certain portrait" of Margaret. But it is the one nearest in date to the great tapestry.

The sequence of events leading up to the marriage was as follows: 1444 January, truce between England and France proposed, Margaret's marriage mooted; May, truce signed; March, the Earl of Suffolk⁴ and his wife went to France; May, Suffolk, as proxy for King Henry VI of England, formally espoused Margaret, aged fifteen; celebrations; great Tournament arranged by King René, daisies were worn by all present. It was not until April 1445, when she was sixteen, that Margaret was married to Henry at Titchfield.

The temptation to associate the tapestry with this group of events is strong; but the sceptic will be quick to point out that in the mid-fifteenth century western Europe could produce dozens of pretty young noblewomen whose names began with 'M', and that the daisy is a fairly common kind of flower. Something more is required. But a figure is, I believe, present in the tapestry to provide that something more; for the stoutish, double-chinned, rather dignified personage on foot, who looks back at the group on horseback, is none other than King René himself.

He wears a large blue velvet bonnet embroidered with gold and with a short larilap, a fine leathern jerkin, fur-edged, a wide belt, gold-studded, and top-boots, long as waders, with a pair of large spurs at the heels. He also wears a gold chain composed of leaves round his neck and the chain, hanging down his back, can be seen again below the jerkin.

Any attempt to sum up in a short paragraph the character and accomplishments of this extraordinary man must be inadequate. His instability was less than that of most of his distinguished contemporaries who were suffering from those "growing pains" that were transforming mediaeval into modern Europe. He was more adult than most of them and deserved the title of "Good King René" because he was a good man and a good humanist. As King he was careless because he loved many things better than the art of government. To say that he dabbled in the fine and applied arts would be less true than to maintain that he excelled in them; and, where he failed as a ruler, he prospered as an artist in one of those rare and fortunate ages in which a man of birth could practise art and keep his dignity. There can be no doubt that he was very gifted as designer, painter, miniaturist, goldsmith and die-cutter, and it is highly probable that a prince who designed the stained glass for the Family Chapel at Angers might have made a cartoon—or anyhow a detailed sketch—for a great Tournai hunting tapestry whereon he and his daughter were figured. There is some evidence that King René enjoyed a sense of humour which carried him through many difficulties. He was an ugly little man; but his was a peculiar kind of ugliness that appeals to many women, and it was probably because of his success that he was humorously vain about his ugliness. He portrayed himself, he had himself painted, and had his portrait repeated with a variety of hats by Pietro di Martino a medallist from Milan⁵. It is from a careful study of these medals that one can confidently name the man on foot who looks back at the group King René.

The design of this tapestry would seem to be the creation of one who knew all the details of a situation that might approximate simultaneously to romance and to comedy. King René walks away to occupy himself with falcons, for this is where the tactful father should "fade out". Anyhow, the chaperon is there, seated dismally sideways on one of the princess' spare white palfreys—its trappings and her own overcoat adorned with Margaret's letter 'M'—seated sadly with a look of untellable boredom on her face. Then to the left, the little fifteen-year-old, elegantly side-saddle, a jewelled daisy in her hat, demure, virginal;

but is there a twinkle of naughtiness? Is such a thing possible in tapestry? Or has the designer's skill tricked us into imagining? Next, leaning towards her from the saddle of his dappled grey horse, whispering as he gazes at her dainty little face, is a man, handsomely dressed, and much older than the princess. His hat is elaborate, though not as grand as King René's, and he too wears a gold chain composed of leaves, but this is less magnificent than the chain which the king wears. The trappings of his grey horse are just like those of Margaret's palfrey, but those of the horse on which his squire sits have leaves like the leaves of the golden chains.

If we are now prepared to accept this tapestry as the record of an historic occasion, then we know already that the man is Suffolk. While Margaret's right hand grasps her horse's reins, her left hand is gently holding the man's right which rests on her body; his left arm is round her back and the fingers of the hand press her left breast. René, walking off, observes that the King of England's legate is taking his duty seriously. It is, indeed, a possibility that the slightly libidinous asides which Shakespeare⁶ has given to Suffolk are based on a traditional reputation which that nobleman had created for himself in the French wars. He was at a man's "dangerous age"; nearing fifty, when his King appointed him proxy for the formal espousal of the fifteen-year-old princess whom all the western world praised for her exceptional beauty and charm. Fortunately Suffolk was accompanied by his countess and the tender words which the earl, as mouth-piece for his king, was expected to whisper into the shell-like ear, were doubtless stylised and conventional. Nevertheless, you could not help seeing that ear and that pale golden hair.

Chivalry in the older sense was hardening into a kind of heraldic formalism; but within this stiffened framework it may be that Suffolk conceived a chivalric love for the child who was to become his Queen; and, until his death, he remained her most faithful and her most devoted servant. C.S.

¹ In the fine volume, *A Pictorial History of the Queens College of St. Margaret and St. Bernard commonly known as Queens' College, Cambridge*, produced by Mr Browne (with help from myself for historical details) which is delayed only by the prevalent congestion in the printing trade.

² Our picture is reproduced by permission of the Directors of the Chatsworth Estates Company. Thanks are due to Mr Francis Watson of the Wallace Collection for help given in various ways.

³ *The Times*, Saturday, February 25th, 1950, p.10.

⁴ Fourth Earl by succession, Marquess 1444, Duke 1448. See *D.N.B. sub voce* Pole, William de la.

⁵ See Sir G. Hill, *Corpus of Italian Medals of the Renaissance*, 1930, Pl.12, 51 (in Florence dated 1461), and others, nos 52, 53, 54, all with different hats.

⁶ *Henry VI, Part i*, Act V, sc.iii. This prepares the way for the scandalmongering of *Part ii*, Act IV, sc.i and sc.iv.

NOTES ON THE ILLUSTRATIONS

IN his short essay Dr. Seltman has shown the importance of the Chatsworth tapestry (of which Plate II is a mere detail) for the iconography of Margaret of Anjou: it is her earliest known portrait. Dr. Seltman has proved that the girl on horseback is Margaret by identifying the figure standing on the ground (Plate III) as King René. In order to substantiate the claim that René did in fact look like the tapestry portrait, a photograph (Plate I) of a medal of René by Pietro di Martino is shown for comparison. Plate IV is a photograph of the cast of a medal of Margaret by Pietro di Martino: it is the last known portrait of Margaret, made when she was about thirty-two, and it is shown by way of contrast with Plate II.

The tapestry in which the portraits of Princess Margaret and King René appear should not be dealt with in isolation. It is one of a set of four great hunting tapestries in the Devonshire Collection. By treating it as such it is possible, on the basis of both internal and external evidence, to show its close connection with King René of Anjou. Also, the tapestry and the medals, when taken together, illustrate very clearly the nature of the artistic movement that took place in France in the middle of the fifteenth century; and they show that this movement was largely instigated by René.

The four great *Hunting Tapestries* form one of the rare medieval sets before the middle of the fifteenth-century to remain intact. They were first recognised as a set by Arthur Long, Librarian to the House of Lords and Librarian at Chatsworth, towards the end of the nineteenth century. He discovered them at Hardwick House, where they had been cut up and nailed in strips on the piers between the windows of the Gallery. Between 1900 and 1910 the four tapestries were re-assembled and repaired. The set was then found to consist of four panels (each about 14 feet by 37 feet) woven in wool throughout¹. They depict four different subjects of the chase—*Roe Deer, Boar and Bear, Otter and Swan* and *Falconry*. The figures, animals and foliage are drawn with great skill and realism. In the treatment of heads and hands the technique of weaving is carried out with a painter-like method of modelling and colour. The costumes of the figures are of mid-fifteenth-century date; and the style of



Obverse of a portrait medal of King René of Anjou, made by Pietro di Martino of Milan in 1461. Observe the snub nose, low bridge, round chin and double-chin, and compare the king on the tapestry. The Latin inscription calls him "René by the grace of God King of Jerusalem, Sicily, etcetera." This picture shows the actual size of the medal.



PLATE II

Opposite: Part of a large hunting tapestry, *Falconry*, from the Devonshire Collection. Princess Margaret at the age of fifteen on horseback courted by the Earl of Suffolk as proxy for King Henry VI; beside her a lady in waiting; in the foreground falconers.



Above: The adjoining portion of the same tapestry. The central figure is King René of Anjou, magnificently garbed; falconers in the foreground.



Obverse of a portrait medal of Margaret of Anjou, Queen of England, made by Pietro di Martino in 1463 when she was aged 32 and had sought refuge at her father's court. The Latin inscription states that "she shines imbued with courage" and adds "Audias sagax," "meaning may you be styled shrewd"! The picture shows the actual size of the medal.

PLATE IV

the high-warp weaving suggests that they are French. In most early French tapestries (*e.g.* the late fourteenth-century *Apocalypse Set* at Angers) the faces are wooden and flat in treatment and the style of weaving is altogether different and inferior. Thus it appears that a tapestry of the excellence of *Falconry* must have been the product of some of the best weavers of the time, probably of Arras craftsmen, and a worthy rival of the best productions of the Low Countries.

Mr W. G. Thomson, in two articles in the *Art Worker's Quarterly*², suggested some time ago that there was a connection between the Hunting tapestries and King René. If Mr Thomson's suggestions are combined with Dr. Seltman's identification of one of the figures in *Falconry* as King René, the proof of this connection seems conclusive. Mr Thomson noticed three clues in the tapestries to the identity of the client for whom they were made. First, he noticed the obvious orientalisms in the tapestries. Turkish huntsmen, Moorish javelin-throwers mounted on dromedaries, and Europeans dressed in oriental fashions appear in the tapestries. Mr Thomson pointed out that King René had a predilection for oriental accessories. He was titular king of Jerusalem and Sicily, and he had Saracenic attendants at his establishments in Angers, Lorraine and Provence. And it is chronicled that in 1448, when he held a great tournament at Saumur, a procession was headed by Turkish footmen leading two lions by silver chains; while in the procession were Europeans in eastern dress. Secondly, Mr Thomson noticed several instances in the tapestries of ladies displaying the crescent as a necklace pendant, and pointed out that King René instituted the Order of the Crescent, also called the Order of Anjou, about this time. One of the ladies in the *Boar and Bear* panel wears a jewelled collar, from which hangs a crescent set about with pearls, that closely resembles the collar of the order. Thirdly, Mr Thomson identified the arms incorporated in the design of one of the panels as the arms of de Longwy: in the fifteenth-century Longwy formed part of the marquise of Pont-à-Mousson, which was one of René's possessions.

It has recently been suggested³ that the four Hunting tapestries do not form a set. The evidence in support of this argument is that one tapestry is reversed (left hands have become right hands) and is probably a low-warp copy of a high-warp cartoon, and that the quality of *Roe Deer* and *Boar and Bear* is inferior to *Falconry* and *Otter and Swan*. However, this evidence seems only to prove that the four panels in the Devonshire Collection

were not woven in the same workshop. It does not disprove that they are a set. The similarity of treatment and drawing in the four panels is so close that they must be a set. Indeed the cartoons appear to have been the work of one artist, for certain mannerisms (*e.g.* the way in which one figure places his or her hands on another's sleeve) appear throughout. It is likely that there were several copies of a set associated with so important an event as the marriage of Henry VI and Margaret. In fact, a fragment of tapestry belonging to the church of Notre Dame de Nantilly in Saumur was discovered in 1904 which is exactly similar to the part of the Chatsworth *Falconry*¹. It is interesting to note that Saumur—only thirty miles from Angers—was a favourite residence of King René, and it is recorded that he supplied tapestries to drape some of his boats going there up the Loire.

Though the *Hunting Tapestries* suffer from faulty perspective, and the size of figures is to some extent determined by their importance, the panels show such a rich display of naturalistic features in the drawing of the figures, in the forms of plants and animals, obviously drawn from life, and in their bright and varied colours, that they stand head and shoulders above anything woven in France before the middle of the fifteenth century. Also, their subject matter is unusual for their period: they do not illustrate Bible stories, or episodes from the lives of saints, but are simply hunting scenes. They are, perhaps, the first sign of the Renaissance in France: they are by an artist whose work is based on close natural observation, and who was working eight years before Leonardo da Vinci was born. King René, himself an artist, was the patron of this new artistic movement in France. Eighteen years after he had ordered the tapestries, he commissioned Pietro di Martino to work for him. Both the medals illustrated (Plates I and IV) clearly bear the imprint of the Renaissance on the obverse. On the reverse of the medal of Margaret is the figure of Prudence draped in a long classical girt tunic. In less than twenty years the Gothic style of the *Hunting Tapestries* had been left far behind.

ANTHONY NEVILLE

¹ I have followed the only complete description of the tapestries: W. G. Thomson, *Art Worker's Quarterly*, July 1902 and January 1904.

² *ibid.*

³ G. F. Wingfield Diby, *Burlington Magazine*, February 1950.

⁴ M. Westrée, *Annales de la Société d'Archéologie de Bruxelles*, Vol. XVII, Pt 1.

THE LIMITS OF HISTORY

THE historian's materials are quite different from those used in the arts, the sciences or the crafts. Though, in some ways, the historian resembles the artist, the scientist and the craftsman, in fact he differs from them in a great many more.

The arts differ one from another according to the materials they use. The artist, however, can be an artist, to a great extent, without materials. The chief material a painter uses is paint, but he can conceive the idea and the form and the colour of the picture he intends to paint, say the study of a girl's head, and think of the gold of her hair, the blue of her eyes, the red of her lips without reference to the mixtures of yellow, blue and red paint that are going to represent these features. This is not so with the historian: he must have the materials. His chief materials are facts. Without knowing a fact, even knowing one fact, the historian cannot begin to think, let alone work, as an historian.

For history consists essentially in knowing and, what is more, in knowing with relative certainty, knowing by evidence. The search for evidence is, indeed, the first business of historians. But it is not an aimless search: the facts and the evidence are not just any old facts and evidence. A glance at the subjects which have engaged the attention of historians since history was first written clearly demonstrates this point. Historians have inquired into the past of all things—they have examined civilisation and barbarism, progress and decline of ideas and empires, they have written of great men and small men, of historical knowledge itself and its methods, of man and of God. History, therefore, is concerned with the past of everything, and is a universal science. This does not mean, however, that it absorbs all the other sciences, or is the sole science, of which all the rest are merely departments; nor, on the other hand, that it is itself absorbed by the other sciences, being no more than their past systematically arranged. On the contrary, history possesses its distinctive features, in virtue of which it differs from the other sciences. If this was not so, history would be chimerical, and generations of historians would have been dealing with unreal problems. But that history is something real is proved by the fact that the human mind is compelled to ask the questions which

historians discuss, questions that, moreover, involve the principles on which the certainty of the conclusions reached by every science in the last resort depends.

Since history deals with the past of everything and the historian's main materials are facts, it is difficult to see how history can be a special science, or what it is in a fact that for itself interests the historian and makes it an 'historical fact'. It is best, therefore, to see what actually does distinguish this science and these facts from other sciences and facts. If, for example, history studies man, its object is not to ascertain the number of his vertebrae or the causes of his diseases; that is the business of anatomy and medicine. Nor does a historian study man to answer such questions as whether he possesses an intellect which sets him apart from the other animals or whether he possesses a soul; that is the business of the philosopher. Historians study man to answer such questions as 'how many vertebrae had a man in 200 B.C.?', 'how were his diseases cured in 1460?', 'was he thought to have possessed an intellect which set him apart from other animals in 1600?' To answer such questions means that such questions must have been asked. History, therefore, is not really concerned with the past of everything, but with the past of anything that man cares to concern himself about.

History proceeds by certain knowledge based on evidence. This has led some people¹ to say that an historical fact or event is an object or occurrence plus the interest and meaning which it possessed for the persons involved by or in it, and by which the evidence is determined. While this is largely true of written records, it is too limited a definition. For though it is true that it is men's concern or interest in an event that determines whether or not it is to be a fact of interest to the historian, it is interest shown at the time of the historian's inquiry rather than at the time of the event that matters. It is, of course, self-evident that, if an event has not been recorded in some way, there can be no record of it. Facts and events, however, are not always consciously recorded, and evidence on which a historian can work is frequently unintentionally left. For example, a skeleton found in the desert today may give the answer to the question about the number of vertebrae a man had in 200 B.C.—but the man dragging his carcass across the desert in 200 B.C. had no thought of leaving it there for the 20th century historian.

Facts are not the historian's only materials, they are the materials he works on: there are also those he works with, which are largely immaterial. A builder cannot build a house without

his tools: without hod and trowel, spade and ladder, measure and plumb-line no habitable dwelling could be erected. The historian's most obvious tools, his pen and ink and paper, are actually of the smallest importance—at least one blind historian cannot read or write. History, however, cannot be written from facts alone. In the first place facts must be organised; in the second place, the historian must answer not only the questions 'how?' and 'what?' but the questions 'why?' and 'of what significance?' as well. Neither the classification of facts nor the answers to the last two questions arise out of the facts themselves. Before he can classify, before he can answer such questions, the historian must bring something to the facts. A catalogue cannot be made without some scheme of classification and without some purpose at the back of one's mind. Equally, it is impossible to interpret history without a principle of interpretation which history does not yield. Bias and point of view, then—so despised by 'scientific historians' who believe in impartiality—are really the very stuff from which history is made and some of the historian's most important materials, for clearly he cannot do without them. Nor is it desirable that he should. Clio's gifts are not given up to those who do not understand them, and if bias breeds malice it also breeds sympathy, mother of understanding.

Thus the historian's materials are of two kinds: those he works on and those he works with. Neither are completely within his control. Facts depend on evidence, and evidence may or may not exist. If it exists, it will either exist intentionally or unintentionally; if intentionally, it may be false. The facts he selects, the questions he asks are also to some extent beyond his control. They may be selected and asked by somebody else—he is merely attempting to answer them; or, if they are his own selection and his own questions, they are conditioned by his point of view which he can only slightly control. Lastly, the historian stands by himself because of his materials: he cannot be classed with artists, scientists or craftsmen because his materials differ from theirs both in kind and in quality.

N.A.N.

¹ C. H. Dodd: *History and the Gospels*, p.25.

TOBIAS AND THE ANGEL

THE 'Bats' production of James Bridie's *Tobias and the Angel* took place in March. It was a bold venture and in most respects, successful. But one couldn't help wondering if the choice of play was a wise one, for the production of *Tobias* requires an elaboration of setting, impossible in the Upper Fitzpatrick Room. To offset such a disadvantage, the play chosen should have had much greater intrinsic interest than Bridie has to offer here. But the choice once made, the producer, F. G. Smith, very ably assisted by his stage manager, J. Cunliffe-Pugh, tackled his problems with courage and resource. The play demands a realistic technique in production and realism we had, even down to the ferocious fish which we saw dragged from the Tigris which flowed (audibly) offstage. It says much for the quality of the production that in spite of the proximity of the audience to the stage (always an uncomfortable problem for the producer using a small hall) one was seldom conscious of any discomfort; only once, when the ladies were playing ball in oh so spirited a manner, did one feel uneasy.

The strength of the production lay principally in two fine performances—Colin Temblett-Wood's *Tobias*, and David Fenton's *Tobit*. It is never easy to impersonate irresolution and timidity on the stage, but this Temblett-Wood achieved to perfection; nor does youth assume with ease the characteristics of blind old-age, but David Fenton was thoroughly convincing, often moving and never mawkish. These two were well supported by David Wade (an angelic angel), Michael Hancock, Elizabeth Richardson and Mrs. Marjorie Birley (an *Anna* with the right mixture of querulousness and submission).

The producer and actors were helped by John Hughes' décor which was bold and striking, and by Raymond Adlam's music, spiced with suitable oriental inflexions. The production was certainly not unsuccessful.

A.J.T.

ITEMS OF NEWS

We congratulate Mr A. Ll. Armitage on becoming a Justice of the Peace for the Borough of Cambridge.

D. E. C. Yale (1946) has been elected to a Research Fellowship at Christ's College, Cambridge.

C. T. Lewis (1946) has a research appointment with the Royal College of Science.

C. M. Cochrane (1947) has been awarded the Raymond Gooch Scholarship at King's College Hospital Medical School.

D. G. Widdicombe (1942) has been awarded an Entrance Scholarship, of 200 guineas a year, for three years, at the Inner Temple.

G. C. Shephard (1945) has been awarded a Rayleigh Prize for an essay on Complex Regular and Uniform Polytopes.

The Provost and Fellows of King's College, Cambridge, have returned to Queens' John Scott's heraldic account of the Foundation of the University and College, presented by the author to John Davenant, President of Queens' (1614-1622).

Society and Club Reports

SAINT MARGARET SOCIETY

President: The Dean

Vice-President: P. G. I. Green

Secretary: R. Adlam

IN the Michaelmas Term the Society purchased a new gramophone; though less elegant in appearance than the instrument which had served the Society since 1941, and lacking its unpredictable temperament, the new gramophone has greatly improved the quality of the performance at the Sunday evening recitals, which have been arranged by M. F. Proctor since the beginning of the Lent Term.

The concerts in Mr Chadwick's rooms and in the Fitzpatrick Hall were well attended. Rehearsals of the St. Margaret Singers for the May Week Concert are now well under way, and a small string orchestra has been formed to take part in the Fifth Brandenburg Concerto at that concert.

R.A.

THE HISTORY SOCIETY

AT the first of four meetings in the Lent Term, Mr W. Ullmann, of Trinity College, read a paper entitled *Reflections on the Political Tendencies of Cluny*. At the second meeting E. W. N. Jackson spoke on *The Merits* and D. R. Melville on *The Demerits* of the pre-1832 Electoral System. Mr T. W. I. Bullock, a vice-President of the Society, at the third meeting, read a paper on *The Spanish Attitude to the nations of America in the sixteenth century*. R. W. Forbes, the last speaker of the Term, addressed the Society on *The Writing of History*.

During the Lent Term the Society raised £13:2:6, by a capital levy, in order to purchase books for the College library. The College authorities later authorised the Librarian to purchase history books to the value of a further £22. It is hoped that when both these sums have been used, the College library will contain most of the important books now recommended by the History Faculty.

On May 10th, at the only ordinary meeting of the Society to be held this term, Mr Laffan read a paper on *Machiavelli—the man*. The Annual Dinner, and the 150th meeting of the Society, was held on Ascension Day. The guests were Professor Brogan, Professor Sykes, Mr Charvet, Mr Findlay and Mr Salter. The after-dinner speeches took the form of a short debate on “History teaches nothing”.

The annual cricket match versus the College was postponed from early May to June 2nd.

M. J. C. W.

THE FRIENDS OF QUEENS' HOUSE

QUEENS' House has now been reopened for six months, and is once more an active club. The Warden, Miss D. Owen-Jones, is helped by two students and a Boys' Club leader, who has recently been appointed to reorganise the boys' clubs. A new senior girls' club has been started, and it is hoped that the opening of a senior boys' club will soon follow. Both the Sea Scouts and Sea Rangers are flourishing.

A party from the College visited the club for the week-end of March 18th. The activities included some useful distempering and a visit to a theatre. Visits are now being planned to take place during the long vacation.

On Saturday, June 3rd, the Friends will be hosts in Cambridge to a visiting party from Queens' House.

M. J. C. W.

Q.C.L.T.C.

Season 1950

Captain: M. E. Monkcom

Secretary: D. E. Cronin

With very few effective replacements for the players who went down last year, the College teams have made a disastrous beginning in the league competition. The first rounds have been successfully played off in the singles and doubles of the cup competition by teams which include S. P. O. Kumi and M. E. Monkcom, whose activities in the University and Grasshopper teams respectively often prevent them from playing in league matches.

D.E.C.

Q.C.S.R.C.

Last season on the whole was not an outstandingly successful one. At the beginning of the Christmas term the club had only one player who had previously been in the first team, namely, A. R. Morris, now the Captain.

The 1st team played enthusiastically and it was surprising that more matches were not won. The 2nd team, although keen, suffered from lack of experience.

The results were:—

1st team . . . played 12 . . . won 5 . . . lost 7
2nd team . . . played 12 . . . won 2 . . . lost 10

Colours were awarded to P. H. Reynolds and J. R. G. Dean.

The most outstanding feature of the season was the award to G. W. T. Atkins of a Squash Blue.

Q.C.R.C.

The club has not been active this term, but individuals have played a large part in the University Association. The two College Pairs did well in the McDonald Cup Inter-College Small-Bore Competition, being placed 2nd and 8th respectively. P. W. Taylor kept the Individual Challenge Cup (Cronin Cup) for Small-Bore in the College for the second successive year, and H. W. Symonds won the Captain's Spoon for the highest average over the season's matches. S. H. Thomas (captain), H. W. Symonds (Hon. Sec.), and P. W. Taylor were members of the University VIII.

Officers for next season are Captain, H. W. Symonds, and Hon. Secretary, P. W. Taylor.

H.W.S.

Q.C.T.T.C.

When the fixtures for the season 1949-50 were completed, the positions of the three College teams were as follows:—

		Played	Won	Lost	Position
Division I	— Queens' I	11	6	5	Equal 4th
Division II	— Queens' II	10	8	2	Equal 2nd
Division III	— Queens' III	9	6	3	Equal 2nd

The second and third teams only missed promotion because of inferior averages in sets. In the Cuppers the College team was narrowly beaten 5-4 by Christ's, who went on to win the competition.

At the annual general meeting held at the end of the Lent term, the following club officials were elected for the season 1950-51: Captain, P. G. Reed; Secretary, J. B. Hope

P.G.R.

CHESS CLUB

The club has had a successful season, but failed to win Division I of the Cambridge and District Chess League by half a point, after being unbeaten in all its matches.

In the Cuppers, the team defeated Jesus, but was then defeated by the strong Caius team.

Colours for the season were awarded to J. E. Baldwin and J. S. Fowlie.

ROWING

Club membership decreased somewhat in the Lent term, but nevertheless we were able to enter five VIII's for the races and of these, the 3rd VIII was the most successful, gaining two places. The 1st VIII after a ding-dong battle with St. Catharine's I, ended up 8th on the river.

The results were as follows:—

1st VIII	..	bumped once
2nd „	..	bumped once
3rd „	..	two bumps
4th „	..	bumped four times
5th „	..	bumped three times

This term membership has increased again and we are receiving strong support from other College Clubs which are now well represented on the river (i.e. Soccer and Rugger Clubs). Seven VIII's are in training for the Mays including a Gentlemen's VIII, a Rugger VIII and a Soccer VIII.

It is hoped to send two VIII's to the Henley Royal Regatta.
R.C.W.

*Printed by
Metcalf & Company Limited
Cambridge*