

lavish publication by Roach Smith as *Inventorium Sepulchrae* in 1856.

Though well written, this book is not always well organised. Wright tends to treat all types of evidence as being of equal importance and the resulting mass of detail often breaks the thread of the narrative and leads to topics being introduced out of sequence. A firm editorial hand and the use of appendices would have improved the organisation, but if Wright is less confident with archaeology – the chapters on Anglo-Saxon burial are weak and his eulogising of Faussett as an archaeological pioneer because he kept records is unconvincing – it is because he gamely attempts to provide a balanced account for a wide readership.

That said, Wright succeeds in his ambition to write a biography that will bring Faussett's archaeological work to national attention. Wright often treats Faussett as a Kentish hero, but the wider significance of this book is that it is only the second extended biography of an eighteenth-century English archaeologist: Stuart Piggott's of William Stukeley (1687–1765) being the other (Piggott 1985). As such it contains important new materials for our understanding of the history of archaeological thought in Britain and beyond.

Douglas, J 1793. *Nenia Britannica: or, a sepulchral history of Great Britain*, John Nichols, London

Piggott, S 1985. *William Stukeley: an eighteenth-century antiquary*, 2nd edn, Thames & Hudson, London

Roach Smith, C 1856. *Inventorium Sepulchrale: an account of some antiquities dug up ... in the County of Kent, from AD 1757 to AD 1773*, T Richards, London

ANDREW FITZPATRICK

doi:10.1017/S0003581516000172

*The Art and Architecture of C F A Voysey: English pioneer modernist architect and designer*. By DAVID COLE. 289mm. Pp 256, many ills, mostly in col. Images Publishing, Mulgrave, Victoria, 2015. ISBN 9781864706048. £50 (hbk).

The title of this book makes the spirits sink, and they sink even lower when, in the Introduction, we are told that Voysey 'is universally regarded as ... one of the pioneers of the international Modern movement of architecture and design'.

He is *not* so regarded: he himself said that the Modern Movement was 'pitifully full of such faults as proportions' that are 'vulgarly aggressive [*sic*], mountebank eccentricities in detail, and windows built lying down on their sides. Like rude children' we have 'broken away and turned our backs on tradition'. To him, this was 'false originality, the true originality having been for all time the spiritual something given to the development of traditional forms by the individual artist'.<sup>1</sup> Obviously Voysey did not see any connection between his long ranges of windows, the lights separated by plain stone mullions, and the 'windows lying on their sides' so favoured by those Modernists who lifted images from pre-1914 ocean-going liners of the *Titanic* vintage. Nor should anyone else hold such perceptions, save those who look with their ears.

Voysey objected strongly to having his name included among the originators of a non-architecture he heartily hated: indeed, he was very 'cross'<sup>2</sup> with Nikolaus Pevsner for so labelling him in his highly selective, pernicious and unhappily influential polemic, *Pioneers of the Modern Movement from William Morris to Walter Gropius*,<sup>3</sup> in which Pevsner viewed him through Gropius-tinted spectacles. Pevsner considered the Voyseyan use of 'bare walls and long horizontal bands of windows' as coming near 'the idiom of the Modern Movement',<sup>4</sup> and the stone mullioned-and-transomed bows of Voysey's 'Broadleys', Bowness-on-Windermere, Westmorland (1898–9), were hailed by Pevsner as coming 'amazingly close to the twentieth-century concrete and glass grid'.<sup>5</sup> These utterances are as absurd pieces of contorted wishful thinking and false projections as could be desired by any *apparatchik* of Modernism's apologists. When J M Richards approached Voysey to discuss his inclusion as a 'pioneer' in Richards's own book on Modern architecture, the veteran Arts and Crafts architect objected to being lumped in with the originators of a style he heartily disliked, but, of course, despite his protestations, Richards included him anyway.<sup>6</sup> 'Few now accept the view of ... Pevsner ... of

1. Note by Reginald W Cave, Hon Secretary of the Bartlett School of Architecture Architectural Society, describing a paper given to the Society by Voysey on 21 Feb 1934: *RIBA* 1934, 479.

2. Pevsner 1940, but see Pevsner 1968, II, 151.

3. Pevsner 1936, 31, 43, 107, 115, 141 *et seq.*, 150 *et seq.*, 156, 163, 165, 175, 217, 222, 228, 231.

4. Pevsner 1960, 645.

5. Pevsner 1968, II, 148.

6. Richards 1940.