

# Notes and Queries, Number 38, July 20, 1850 eBook

## Notes and Queries, Number 38, July 20, 1850

The following sections of this BookRags Literature Study Guide is offprint from Gale's For Students Series: Presenting Analysis, Context, and Criticism on Commonly Studied Works: Introduction, Author Biography, Plot Summary, Characters, Themes, Style, Historical Context, Critical Overview, Criticism and Critical Essays, Media Adaptations, Topics for Further Study, Compare & Contrast, What Do I Read Next?, For Further Study, and Sources.

(c)1998-2002; (c)2002 by Gale. Gale is an imprint of The Gale Group, Inc., a division of Thomson Learning, Inc. Gale and Design and Thomson Learning are trademarks used herein under license.

The following sections, if they exist, are offprint from Beacham's Encyclopedia of Popular Fiction: "Social Concerns", "Thematic Overview", "Techniques", "Literary Precedents", "Key Questions", "Related Titles", "Adaptations", "Related Web Sites". (c)1994-2005, by Walton Beacham.

The following sections, if they exist, are offprint from Beacham's Guide to Literature for Young Adults: "About the Author", "Overview", "Setting", "Literary Qualities", "Social Sensitivity", "Topics for Discussion", "Ideas for Reports and Papers". (c)1994-2005, by Walton Beacham.

All other sections in this Literature Study Guide are owned and copyrighted by BookRags, Inc.

# Contents

<a href="#">Notes and Queries, Number 38, July 20, 1850 eBook.....</a>	<a href="#">1</a>
<a href="#">Contents.....</a>	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">Table of Contents.....</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">Page 1.....</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">Page 2.....</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">Page 3.....</a>	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">Page 4.....</a>	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">Page 5.....</a>	<a href="#">14</a>
<a href="#">Page 6.....</a>	<a href="#">16</a>
<a href="#">Page 7.....</a>	<a href="#">18</a>
<a href="#">Page 8.....</a>	<a href="#">20</a>
<a href="#">Page 9.....</a>	<a href="#">22</a>
<a href="#">Page 10.....</a>	<a href="#">24</a>
<a href="#">Page 11.....</a>	<a href="#">26</a>
<a href="#">Page 12.....</a>	<a href="#">28</a>
<a href="#">Page 13.....</a>	<a href="#">30</a>
<a href="#">Page 14.....</a>	<a href="#">32</a>
<a href="#">Page 15.....</a>	<a href="#">34</a>
<a href="#">Page 16.....</a>	<a href="#">35</a>
<a href="#">Page 17.....</a>	<a href="#">36</a>
<a href="#">Page 18.....</a>	<a href="#">38</a>
<a href="#">Page 19.....</a>	<a href="#">40</a>
<a href="#">Page 20.....</a>	<a href="#">41</a>
<a href="#">Page 21.....</a>	<a href="#">43</a>

<a href="#">Page 22.....</a>	<a href="#">45</a>
<a href="#">Page 23.....</a>	<a href="#">47</a>
<a href="#">Page 24.....</a>	<a href="#">49</a>
<a href="#">Page 25.....</a>	<a href="#">51</a>
<a href="#">Page 26.....</a>	<a href="#">53</a>
<a href="#">Page 27.....</a>	<a href="#">55</a>
<a href="#">Page 28.....</a>	<a href="#">57</a>
<a href="#">Page 29.....</a>	<a href="#">59</a>
<a href="#">Page 30.....</a>	<a href="#">61</a>

# Table of Contents

Section	Table of Contents	Page
Start of eBook		1
NOTES.		1
L.		10
QUERIES.		11
REPLIES.		14
MISCELLANEOUS.		27
BOOKS AND ODD VOLUMES		27

# Page 1

## NOTES.

*What is the meaning of "Delighted," As sometimes used by Shakspeare.*

I wish to call attention to the peculiar use of a word, or rather to a peculiar word, in Shakspeare, which I do not recollect to have met with in any other writer. I say a "peculiar word," because, although the verb *To delight* is well known, and of general use, the word, the same in form, to which I refer, is not only of different meaning, but, as I conceive, of distinct derivation the non-recognition of which has led to a misconception of the meaning of one of the finest passages in Shakspeare. The first passage in which it occurs, that I shall quote, is the well known one from *Measure for Measure*:

"Ay, but to die, and go we know not where;  
To lie in cold obstruction, and to rot,  
This sensible warm motion to become  
A kneaded clod; and the *delighted* spirit  
To bathe in fiery floods, or to reside  
In thrilling regions of thick-ribbed ice;  
To be imprison'd in the viewless winds  
And blown with restless violence round about  
The pendant world." Act iii. Sc. 1.

Now, if we examine the construction of this passage, we shall find that it appears to have been the object of the writer to separate, and place in juxtaposition with each other, the conditions of the body and the spirit, each being imagined under circumstances to excite repulsion or terror in a sentient being. The mind sees the former lying in "cold obstruction," rotting, changed from a "sensible warm motion" to a "kneaded clod," every circumstance leaving the impression of dull, dead weight, deprived of force and motion. The spirit, on the other hand, is imagined under circumstances that give the most vivid picture conceivable of utter powerlessness:

"Imprison'd in the viewless winds,  
And blown with restless violence round about  
The pendant world."

To call the spirit here "delighted," in our sense of the term, would be absurd; and no explanation of the passage in this sense, however ingenious, is intelligible. That it is intended to represent the spirit simply as *lightened*, made light, relieved from the weight of matter, I am convinced, and this is my view of the meaning of the word in the present instance.

*Delight* is naturally formed by the participle *de* and *light*, to make light, in the same way as "debase," to make base, "defile," to make foul. The analogy is not quite so perfect in



such words as “define,” “defile” (file), “deliver,” “depart,” &c.; yet they all may be considered of the same class. The last of these is used with us only in the sense of *to go away*; in Shakspeare’s time (and Shakspeare so uses it) it meant also *to part*, or *part with*. A correspondent of Mr. Knight’s suggests {114} for the word *delight* in this passage, also, a new derivation; using *de* as a negation, and *light (lux)*, *delighted*, removed from the regions of light. This is impossible; if we look at the context we shall see that it not only contemplated no such thing, but that it is distinctly opposed to it.

## Page 2

I am less inclined to entertain any doubt of the view I have taken being correct, from the confirmation it receives in another passage of Shakspeare, which runs as follows:

“If virtue no *delighted* beauty lack,  
Your son-in-law shows far more fair than black.”

*Othello*, Act i. Sc. 3.

Passing by the cool impertinence of one editor, who asserts that Shakspeare frequently used the past for the present participle, and the almost equally cool correction of another, who places the explanatory note “*delightful*” at the bottom of the page, I will merely remark that the two latest editors of Shakspeare, having apparently nothing to say on the subject, have very wisely said nothing. Yet, as we understand the term “*delighted*,” the passage surely needs explanation. We cannot suppose that Shakspeare used epithets so weakening as “*delighting*” or “*delightful*.” The meaning of the passage would appear to be this: If virtue be not wanting in beauty—such beauty as can belong to virtue, not physical, but of a higher kind, and freed from all material elements—then your son-in-law, black though he is, shows far more fair than black, possessing, in fact, this abstract kind of beauty to that degree that his colour is forgotten. In short, “*delighted*” here seems to mean, lightened of all that is gross or unessential.

There is yet another instance in *Cymbeline*, which seems to bear a similar construction:

“Whom best I love, I cross: to make my gifts  
The more delay’d, *delighted*.”

Act v. Sc. 4.

That is, “the *more* delighted;” the longer held back, the better worth having; lightened of whatever might detract from their value, that is, refined or purified. In making the remark here, that “*delighted*” refers not to the recipient nor to the giver, but to the gifts, I pass by the nonsense that the greatest master of the English language did not heed the distinction between the past and the present participles, as not worth a second thought.

The word appears to have had a distinct value of its own, and is not to be explained by any other single word. If this be so, it could hardly have been coined by Shakspeare. Though, possibly, it may never have been much used, perhaps some of your correspondents may be able to furnish other instances from other writers.

SAMUEL HICKSON.

St. John’s Wood.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### AUTHORS OF “THE ROLLIAD.”

The subjoined list of the authors of *The Rolliad*, though less complete than I could have wished, is, I believe, substantially correct, and may, therefore, be acceptable to your readers. The names were transcribed by me from a copy of the ninth edition of *The Rolliad* (1791), still in the library at Sunninghill Park, in which they had been recorded on the first page of the respective papers.

## Page 3

There seems to be no doubt that they were originally communicated by Mr. George Ellis, who has always been considered as one of the most talented contributors to *The Rolliad*. He also resided for many years at Sunninghill, and was in habits of intimacy with the owners of the Park. Your correspondent C. (Vol. ii., p. 43.) may remark that Lord John Townshend's name occurs only twice in my list; but his Lordship may have written some of the papers which are not in the Sunninghill volume, as they appeared only in the editions of the work printed subsequently to 1791, and are designated as *Political Miscellanies*.

### *Names of the Authors of the Rolliad.*

Dedication to Kenyon	Dr. Laurence.
Family of the Rollos	Tickell, &c.
Extract from Dedication	General Fitzpatrick.
Criticisms from the	No.
<i>Rolliad</i>	George Ellis 1 & 2.
—	Dr. Laurence 3.
—	Richardson 4.
—	General Fitzpatrick 5.
—	Dr. Laurence 6, 7, 8.
—	General Fitzpatrick 9.
—	Richardson 10 & 11.
—	General Fitzpatrick 12.
Criticisms not in the	
original, but probably	
written by	Dr. Laurence 13 & 14.
Criticisms, &c. Part. ii.	George Ellis 1 & 2.
—	Richardson 3 & 4.
—	General Fitzpatrick 5.
Criticisms, not in the	
original	Mr. Reid 6.
—	Dr. Laurence 7.

### *Political Eclogues.*

Rose Dr. Laurence.  
 The Liars General Fitzpatrick.  
 Margaret Nicholson Mr. Adair.  
 Charles Jenkinson George Ellis.  
 Jekyl Lord John Townshend.

### *Probationary Odes.*



All the Preliminaries Mr. Tickell.  
Irregular Ode Mr. Tickell No. 1.  
Ode to the New Year George Ellis 2.  
Ode Rev. H. Bate Dudley 3.  
—— Richardson 4.  
Duan John Ellis 5. {115}  
Ossianade Unknown 6.  
Irregular Ode Unknown 7.  
Ode to the Attorney-  
General Mr. Brummell 8.  
Laureate Ode Mr. Tickell 9.  
New Year's Ode Mr. Pearce 10.  
Ode by M.A. Taylor Mr. Boscawen 11.  
—— by Major Scott Lord John Towns-  
hend 12.  
—— Irregular(Dundas) Never known to the  
Club 13.  
—— by Warton Bishop of Ossory  
(Hon. William

## Page 4

Beresford) 14.  
—— Pindaric General Fitzpatrick 15.  
—— Irregular Dr. Laurence 16.  
—— Prettyman General Burgoyne 17.  
—— Graham Mr. Reid 18.  
Letter, &c. and Mount-  
morres Richardson 19.  
Birthday Ode George Ellis 20.  
Pindaric Ode Unmarked 21.  
Real Birthday Ode T. Warton 22.  
Remaining prose Richardson.

I am not certain whether Mr. Adair, to whom “Margaret Nicholson,” one of the happiest of the Political Eclogues, is attributed, is the present Sir Robert Adair. If so, as the only survivor amongst his literary colleagues, he might furnish some interesting particulars respecting the remarkable work to which I have called your attention.

BRAYBROOKE.

Audley End, July, 1850.

\* \* \* \* \*

NOTES ON MILTON.

(Continued from Vol. ii., p. 53.)

*Il Penseroso.*

On l. 8 (G.):—

“Fantastic swarms of dreams there hover’d,  
Green, red, and yellow, tawney, black, and blue;  
They make no noise, but right resemble may  
Th’ unnumber’d moats that in the sun-beams play.”

*Sylvester’s Du Bartas.*

Caelia, in Beaumont and Fletcher’s *Humorous Lieutenant*, says,—

“My maidenhead to a mote in the sun, he’s jealous.”



Act iv. Sc. 8.

On l. 35. (G.) Mr. Warton might have found a happier illustration of his argument in Ben Jonson's *Every Man in his Humour*, Act i. Sc. 3.:—

“Too conceal such real ornaments as these, and shadow  
their glory, as a milliner's wife does her wrought  
stomacher, with a smoaky lawn, or a *black cyprus*.”

—Whalley's edit. vol. i. p. 33.

On l. 39. (G.) The origin of this uncommon use of the word “commerce” is from Donne:

—  
“If this commerce 'twixt heaven and earth were not  
embarr'd.”

—*Poems*, p. 249. Ed. 4to. 1633.

On l. 43. (G.):—

“That sallow-faced, sad, stooping nymph, whose eye  
Still on the ground is fixed steadfastly.”

*Sylvester's Du Bartas*

On l. 52. (G.):—

“Mounted aloft on Contemplation's wings.”

*G. Wither*, P. 1. vol. i. Ed. 1633.

Drummond has given “golden wings” to Fame.

On l. 88. (G.):—

Hermes Trismegistus.

On l. 100. (G.):—

“Tyrants' bloody gestic  
Of Thebes, Mycenæ, or proud Ilion.”

*Sylvester's Du Bartas*.

\* \* \* \* \*

*Arcades*.

On l. 23. (G.):—

“And without respect of odds,  
Vye renown with Demy-gods.”

## Page 5

*Wither's Mistresse of Philarete*, Sig. E. 5. Ed. 1633.

On l. 27. (G.):—

“But yet, whate’er he do or can devise,  
Disguised glory shineth in his eyes.”

*Sylvester's Du Bartas*.

On l. 46. (G.):—

“An eastern wind commix’d with *noisome airs*,  
Shall *blast the plants* and the *young sapplings*.”

*Span. Trag. Old Plays*, vol. iii. p. 222.

On l. 65. (G.) Compare Drunmond—speech of Endymion before Charles:—

“To tell by me, their herald, coming things,  
And what each Fate to her stern distaff sings,” &c.

On l. 84. (M.):—

“And with his beams enamel’d every greene.”

*Fairfax's Tasso*, b. i. st. 35.

On l. 97. (G.):—

“Those brooks with lilies bravely deck’t.”

*Drayton*, 1447.

On l. 106. (G.):—

“Pan entertains, this coming night,  
His paramour, the Syrinx bright.”

*Fletcher's Faithful Shepherdess*, Act i.

J.F.M.

\* \* \* \* \*

DERIVATION OF EASTER.

Southey, in his *Book of the Church*, derives our word *Easter* from a Saxon source:—

“The worship,” he says, “of the goddess *Eostre* or *Eastre*, which may probably be traced to the Astarte of the Phoenicians, is retained among us in the word *Easter*; her annual festival having been superseded by that sacred day.”

Should he not rather have given a *British* origin to the name of our Christian holy day? Southey acknowledges that the “heathenism which the {116} Saxons introduced, bears no [very little?] affinity either to that of the Britons or the Romans;” yet it is certain that the Britons worshipped Baal and *Ashtaroth*, a relic of whose worship appears to be still retained in Cornwall to this day. The Druids, as Southey tells us, “made the people pass through the fire in honour of Baal.” But the *festival* in honour of Baal appears to have been in the *autumn*: for

“They made the people,” he informs us, “at the beginning of *winter*, extinguish all their fires on one day and kindle them again from the sacred fire of the Druids, which would make the house fortunate for the ensuing year; and, if any man came who had not paid his yearly dues, [Easter offerings, &c., date back as far as this!] they refused to give him a spark, neither durst any of his neighbours relieve him, nor might he himself procure fire by any other means, so that he and his family were deprived of it till he had discharged the uttermost of his debt.”

The Druidical fires kindled in the *spring* of the year, on the other hand, would appear to be those in honour of *Ashtaroth*, or *Astarte*, from whom the *British Christians* may naturally enough have derived the name of *Easter* for their corresponding season. We might go even further than this, and say that the young ladies who are reported still to take the chief part in keeping up the Druidical festivities in Cornwall, very happily represent the ancient *Estal* (or *Vestal*) virgins.

## Page 6

“In times of Paganism,” says O’Halloran, “we find in *Ireland* females devoted to celibacy. There was in Tara a royal foundation of this kind, wherein none were admitted but virgins of the noblest blood. It was called Cluain-Feart, or the place of retirement till death,” &c ... “The duty of these virgins was to keep up the fires of Bel, or the sun, and of Sambain, or the moon, which customs they borrowed from their Phoenician ancestors. They both [i.e. the Irish and the Phoenicians] adored Bel, or the sun, the moon, and the stars. The ‘house of *Rimmon*’ which the Phoenicians worshipped in, like our temples of Fleachta in Meath, was sacred to the *moon*. The word ‘*Rimmon*’ has by no means been understood by the different commentators; and yet, by recurring to the Irish (a branch of the Phoenician) it becomes very intelligible; for ‘*Re*’ is Irish for the moon, and ‘*Muadh*’ signifies an *image*, and the compound word ‘*Reamhan*,’ signifies *prognosticating by the appearance of the moon*. It appears by the life of our great S. Columba, that the Druid temples were here decorated with figures of the sun, the moon, and stars. The Phoenicians, under the name of *Bel-Samen*, adored the Supreme; and it is pretty remarkable, that to this very day, to wish a friend every happiness this life can afford, we say in Irish, ‘The blessings of *Samen* and *Bel* be with you!’ that is, of the seasons; *Bel* signifying the sun, and *Samhain* the moon.”

—(See O’Halloran’s *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. i. P. 47.)

J. SANSOM.

\* \* \* \* \*

FOLK LORE.

*Presages of Death*.—The Note by Mr. C. FORBES (Vol. ii., p. 84.) on “High Spirits considered a Presage of impending Calamity or Death,” reminded me of a collection of authorities I once made, for academical purposes, of a somewhat analogous bearing, —I mean the ancient belief in the existence of a power of prophecy at that period which immediately precedes dissolution.

The most ancient, as well as the most striking instance, is recorded in the forty-ninth chapter of Genesis:—

“And Jacob called his sons and said, Gather yourselves together *that I may tell you that which shall befall you in the last days....* And when Jacob had made an end of commanding his sons, he gathered up his feet into his bed, and yielded up the ghost, and was gathered unto his people.”

Homer affords two instances of a similar kind: thus, Patroclus prophesies the death of Hector (Il. [Greek: p] 852.)[1]:—



[Greek: "Ou thaen oud autos daeron beae alla toi aedae  
Agchi parestaeke Thanatos kai Moira krataiae,  
Chersi dament Achilaeos amnmonos Aiakidao."][2]

Again, Hector in his turn prophesies the death of Achilles by the hand of Paris (Il.  
[Greek: ch.] 358.):—

[Greek: "Phrazeo nun, mae toi ti theon maenima genomai  
Aemati to ote ken se Pharis kai phoibus Apollon,  
Esthlon eont, olesosin eni Skaiaesi pulaesin."][3]

## Page 7

This was not merely a poetical fancy, or a superstitious faith of the ignorant, for we find it laid down as a great physical truth by the greatest of the Greek philosophers, the divine Socrates:—

[Greek: “To de dae meta touto epithumo humin chraesmodaesai, o katapsaephisamenoi mou kai gar eimi aedae entautha en o malist anthropoi chraesmodousin hotan mellosin apothaneisthai.”][4]

In Xenophon, also, the same idea is expressed, and, if possible, in language still more definite and precise:—{117}

[Greek: “Hae de tou anthropou psuchae tote daepou theiotatae kataphainetai, kai tote ti ton mellonton proora.”][5]

Diodorus Siculus, again, has produced great authorities on this subject:—

[Greek: “Puthagoras ho Samios, kai tines heteroi ton palaion phusikon, apephaenanto tas psuchas ton anthron uparchein athanatos, akolouthos de to dogmati touto kai progignoskein autas ta mellonta, kath hon an kairon en tae teleutae ton apo tou somatos chorismon poiontai.”][6]

From the ancient writers I yet wish to add one more authority; and I do so especially, because the doctrine of the Stagirite is therein recorded. Sextus Empiricus writes,—

[Greek: “Hae psuchae, phaesin Aristotelaes, promanteuetai kai proagoreuei ta mellonta—en to kata thanaton chorizesthai ton somaton.”][7]

Without encroaching further upon the space of this periodical by multiplying evidence corroborative of the same fact, I will content myself by drawing the attention of the reader to our own great poet and philosopher, Shakspeare, whose subtle genius and intuitive knowledge of human nature render his opinions on all such subjects of peculiar value. Thus in *Richard II.*, Act ii. sc. 1., the dying Gaunt, alluding to his nephew, the young and self-willed king, exclaims,—

“Methinks I am a prophet new inspired;  
And thus, expiring, do foretel of him.”

Again, in *Henry IV., Part I.*, Act v. sc. 4., the brave Percy, when in the agonies of death, conveys the same idea in the following words:—

“O, I could prophesy,  
But that the earthy and cold hand of death  
Lies on my tongue.”



Reckoning, therefore, from the time of Jacob, this belief, whether with or without foundation, has been maintained upwards of 3500 years. It was grounded on the assumed fact, that the soul became divine in the same ratio as its connection with the body was loosened or destroyed. In sleep, the unity is weakened but not ended: hence, in sleep, the material being dead, the immaterial, or divine principle, wanders unguided, like a gentle breeze over the unconscious strings of an AEolian harp; and according to the health or disease of the body are pleasing visions or horrid phantoms (*aegri somnia*, as Horace) present to the mind of the sleeper. Before death, the soul, or immaterial principle, is, as it were, on the confines of two worlds, and may possess at the same moment a power which is both prospective and retrospective. At that time its connection with the body being merely nominal, it partakes of that perfectly pure, ethereal, and exalted nature (*quod multo magis faciet post mortem quum omnino corpore excesserit*) which is designed for it hereafter.

## Page 8

As the question is an interesting one, I conclude by asking, through the medium of the "NOTES AND QUERIES," if a belief in this power of prophesy before death be known to exist at the present day?

AUGUSTUS GUEST.

London, July 8.

[Footnote 1: For the assistance of the general reader, I have introduced hasty translations of the several passages quoted.]

[Footnote 2: (And I moreover tell you, and do you meditate well upon it, that) you yourself are not destined to live long, for even now death is drawing nigh unto you, and a violent fate awaits you,—about to be slain in fight by the hands of Achilles, the irreproachable son of Oacus.]

[Footnote 3: Consider now whether I may not be to you the cause of divine anger, in that day when Paris and Phoebus Apollo shall slay you, albeit so mighty, at the Scaean gate.]

[Footnote 4: Wherefore I have an earnest desire to prophesy to you who have condemned me; for I am already arrived at that stage of my existence in which, especially, men utter prophetic sayings, that is, when they are about to die.]

[Footnote 5: That time, indeed, the soul of man appears to be in a manner divine, for to a certain extent it foresees things which are about to happen.]

[Footnote 6: Pythagoras the Samian, and some others of the ancient philosophers, showed that the souls of men were immortal, and that, when they were on the point of separating from the body, they possessed a knowledge of futurity.]

[Footnote 7: The soul, says Aristotle, when on the point of taking its departure from the body, foretells and prophesies things about to happen.]

\* \* \* \* \*

*Divination at Marriages.*—The following practices are very prevalent at marriages in these districts; and as I do not find them noticed by Brand in the last edition of his *Popular Antiquities*, they may perhaps be thought worthy a place in the "NOTES AND QUERIES."

1. Put a wedding ring into the *posset*, and after serving it out, the unmarried person whose cup contains the ring will be the first of the company to be married.



2. Make a common flat cake of flour, water, currants, &c., and put therein a wedding ring and a sixpence. When the company is about to retire on the wedding-day, the cake must be broken and distributed amongst the unmarried females. She who gets the ring in her portion of the cake will shortly be married, and the one who gets the sixpence will die an old maid.

T.T.W.

Burnley, July 9. 1850.

\* \* \* \* \*

FRANCIS LENTON THE POET.

In a MS. obituary of the seventeenth century, preserved at Staunton Hall, Leicestershire, I found the following:—

“May 12. 1642. This day died Francis Lenton, of Lincoln’s Inn, Gent.”

## Page 9

This entry undoubtedly relates to the author of three very rare poetical tracts: 1. *The Young Gallant's Whirligigg*, 1629; 2. *The Innes of Court*, 1634; 3. *Great Brittain's Beauties*, 1638. In the dedication to Sir Julius Caesar, prefixed to the first-named work, the writer speaks of having "once belonged to the *Innes of Court*," and says he was "no usuall poetizer, but, to barre idlenesse, imployed that little talent the Muses conferr'd upon him in this little tract." Sir Egerton Brydges supposed the copy of *The Young Gallant's Whirligigg* preserved in the library of Sion College to be *unique*; but this is not the case, as the writer knows of *two* others,—one at Staunton Hall, and another at Tixall Priory in Staffordshire. It has been reprinted by Mr. {118} Halliwell at the end of a volume containing *The Marriage of Wit and Wisdom*, published by the Shakspeare Society. In his prefatory remarks that gentleman says,

"Besides his printed works, Lenton wrote the *Poetical History of Queene Hester*, with the translation of the 83rd Psalm, reflecting upon the present times. MS. dated 1649."

This date must be incorrect, if our entry in the Staunton obituary relates to the same person; and there is every reason to suppose that it does. The *autograph* MS. of Lenton occurred in Heber's sale (Part xi. No. 724.), and is thus described:

*Hadassiah, or the History of Queen Hester*, sung in a sacred and serious poeme, and divided into ten chapters, by F. Lenton, the Queen's Majesties Poet, 1638.

This is undoubtedly the *correct* date, as it is in the handwriting of the author. Query. What is the meaning of Lenton's title, "the Queen's Majesties Poet"?

Edward F. Rimbault.

\* \* \* \* \*

Minor Notes.

*Lilburn or Prynne?*—I am anxious to suggest in "Notes and Queries" whether a character in the Second Canto of Part iii. of *Hudibras* (line 421), beginning,

"To match this saint, there was another,  
As busy and perverse a brother,  
An haberdasher of small wares,  
In politics and state affairs,"

Has not been wrongly given by Dr. Grey to Lilburn, and whether Prynne is not rather the person described. Dr. Grey admits in his note that the application of the passage to Lilburn involves an anachronism, Lilburn having died in 1657, and this passage being a description of one among

“The quacks of government who sate”  
to consult for the Restoration, when they saw ruin impending.  
CH.

## Page 10

*Peep of Day.*—Jacob Grimm, in his *Deutsche Mythologie*, p. 428., ed. 1., remarks that the ideas of light and sound are sometimes confounded; and in support of his observation he quotes passages of Danish and German poets in which the sun and moon are said to *pipe* (pfeifen). In further illustration of this usage, he also cites the words “the sun began to peep,” from a Scotch ballad in Scott’s *Border Minstrelsy*, vol. ii. p. 430. In p. 431. he explains the words “par son l’aube,” which occur in old French poets, by “per sonitum aurorae;” and compares the English expression, “the peep of day.”

The Latin *pipio* or *pipo*, whence the Italian *pipare*, and the French *pepier*, is the ultimate origin of the verb *to peep*; which, in old English, bore the sense of chirping, and is so used in the authorised version of Isaiah, viii. 19., x. 14. Halliwell, in his *Archaic Dictionary*, explains “peep” as “a flock of chickens,” but cites no example. *To peep*, however, in the sense of taking a rapid look at anything through a small aperture, is an old use of the word, as is proved by the expression *Peeping Tom* of Coventry. As so used, it corresponds with the German *gucken*. Mr. Richardson remarks that this meaning was probably suggested by the young chick looking out of the half-broken shell. It is quite certain that the “peep of day” has nothing to do with sound; but expresses the first appearance of the sun, as he just looks over the eastern hills.

## L.

*Martinet.*—Will the following passage throw any light on the origin of the word *Martinet*?

Une discipline, devenue encore plus exacte, avait mis dans l’armée un nouvel ordre. Il n’y avait point encore d’inspecteurs de cavalerie et d’infanterie, comme nous en avons vu depuis, mais deux hommes uniques chacun dans leur genre en faisaient les fonctions. *Martinet mettait alors l’infanterie sur le pied de discipline ou elle est aujourd’hui.* Le Chevalier de *Fourilles* faisait la même change dans la cavalerie. Il y avait un an que *Martinet* avait mis la baïonnette en usage dans quelque régimens, &c. —Voltaire, *Siecle de Louis XIV.* c. 10.

C. Forbes.

July 2.

*Guy’s Porridge Pot.*—In the porter’s lodge at Warwick Castle are preserved some enormous pieces of armour, which, *according to tradition*, were worn by the famous champion “Guy, Earl of Warwick;” and in addition (with other marvellous curiosities) is also exhibited Guy’s porridge pot, of bell metal, said to weigh 300 lbs., and to contain 120 gallons. There is also a flesh-fork to ring it.

Mr. Nichols, in his *History of Leicestershire*, Part ii. vol. iii., remarks,

“A turnpike road from Ashby to Whitwick, passes through Talbot Lane. Of this lane and the famous large pot at Warwick Castle, we have an old traditional couplet:

## Page 11

“There’s nothing left of Talbot’s name,  
But Talbot’s Pot and Talbot’s Lane.’

“Richard Beauchamp Earl of Warwick, died in 1439. His eldest daughter, Margaret, was married to John Talbot Earl of Shrewsbury, by whom she had one son, John Viscount Lisle, from whom the Dudleys descended, Viscount Lisle and Earl of Warwick.”

It would therefore appear that neither the armour nor the pot belonged to the “noble Guy”—the armour being comparatively of modern manufacture, and the pot, it appears, descended from the Talbots to the Warwick family: which pot is generally filled with punch on the birth of a male heir to that noble family.

W. Reader.

\* \* \* \* \*{119}

## QUERIES.

NICHOLAS FERRAR OF LITTLE GIDDING.

Dr. Peckard, in his Preface to the *Life of Nicholas Ferrar of Little Gidding*, says the memoir he published was edited or compiled by him from “the original MS. still in my possession” (p. xi.); and in the Appendix adds, that “Mr. John Ferrar,” the elder brother of Nicholas, was the author of it (p. 279.).

How he compiled or edited “the original MS.” he states with much candour in his Preface (p. xv.):

“The editor’s intention,” in altering the narrative, “was to give what is not observed in the original, a regular series of facts; and through the whole a sort of evenness and simplicity of stile equally free from meanness and affectation. In short, to make the old and the new, as far as he could, uniform; that he might not appear to have sewed a piece of new cloth to an old garment, and made its condition worse by his endeavours to mend it.”

Again, at page 308., he says,

“There is an antient MS. in folio, giving an account of Mr. N. Ferrar, which at length, from Gidding, came into the hands of Mr. Ed. Ferrar of Huntingdon, and is now in the possession of the editor. Mr. Peck had the use of this MS. as appears by several marginal notes in his handwriting; from this and some loose and unconnected papers of Mr. Peck.... the editor, as well as he was able, has made out the foregoing memoirs.”

Can any of your numerous correspondents inform me if this “antient MS.” is still in existence, and in whose possession?

Peckard was related to the Ferrars, and was Master of Magdalen Coll., Cambridge.

In “A Catalogue of MSS. (once) at Gidding,” Peckard, p. 306., the third article is “Lives, Characters, Histories, and Tales for moral and religious Instruction, in five volumes folio, neatly bound and gilt, by Mary Collet.” This work, with five others, “undoubtedly were all written by N. Ferrar, Sen.,” says Dr. Peckard; and in the Memoir, at page 191., he gives a list of these “short histories,” ninety-eight in number, “which are still remaining in my possession;” and adds further, at p. 194.,

## Page 12

"These lives, characters, and moral essays would, I think, fill two or three volumes in 8vo., but *they are written in so minute* a character, that I cannot form any conjecture to be depended upon."

I have been thus particular in describing these "histories", because the subjects of them are identical with those in Fuller's *Holy and Profane State*, the first edition of which was published at Cambridge, in 1642. "The characters I have conformed," says Fuller in his Preface, "to the then standing laws of the realm (a twelvemonth ago were they sent to the press), since which time the wisdom of the King and state hath" altered many things. Nicholas Ferrar died December 2, 1637, and the Query I wish to ask is, Did Fuller compose them (for that he was really the author of them can hardly be doubted) at the suggestion and for the benefit of the community at Gidding, some years before he published them; and is it possible to ascertain and determine if the MS. is in the handwriting of Ferrar or Fuller?

Is there any print or view in existence of the "Nunnery," at Little Gidding?

In the *Life of Dr. Thomas Fuller*, published anonymously in 1661, it is stated, that at his funeral a customary sermon was preached by Dr. Hardy, Dean of Rochester, "which hath not yet (though it is hoped and much desired may) passe the presse," p. 63.

Query. Was this sermon ever published? and secondly, who was the author of the *Life* from which the above passage is quoted?

John Miland.

\* \* \* \* \*

STUKELEY'S "STONEHENGE."

May I request a space in your periodical for the following Queries, drawn from Dr. Stukeley's *Stonehenge and Abury*, p. 31.?

1st. "But eternally to be lamented is the loss of that tablet of tin, which was found at this place (Stonehenge) in the time of King Henry VIII., inscribed with many letters, but in so strange a character that neither Sir Thomas Elliott, a learned antiquary, nor Mr. Lilly, master of St. Paul's school, could make any thing out of it. Mr. Sammes may be right, who judges it to have been *Punic*. I imagine if we call it Irish we shall not err much. No doubt but what it was a memorial of the founders, wrote by the Druids and had it been preserved till now, would have been an invaluable curiosity."

Can you or any of your contributors give me any further information about this inscription?

2. The Doctor continues,



“To make the reader some amends for such a loss I have given a specimen of supposed Druid writing, out of Lambecius’ account of the Emperor’s library at Vienna. ’Tis wrote on a very thin plate of gold with a sharp-pointed instrument. It was in an urn found at Vienna, rolled up in several cases of other metal, together with funeral exuviae. It was thought by the curious, one of those epistles which the Celtic

## Page 13

people were wont to send to their friends in the other world. The reader may divert himself with trying to explain it.”

Has this inscription ever been explained, and how? Stukeley's book is by no means a rare one; therefore I have not trusted myself to copy the inscription: and such as feel disposed to help me in my difficulty would doubtless prefer seeing the Doctor's own illustration at p. 31.

Henry Cunliffe.

Hyde Park Street.{120}

ATHELSTANE'S FORM OF DONATION.—MEANING OF “SOMAGIA.”

Tristram Risdon, in his quaint *Survey of the Co. of Devon*, after mentioning the foundation of the church of High Bickington by King Athelstane,

“Who,” he says, “gave to God and it one hide of land, as appeareth by the donation, a copy whereof, for the antiquity thereof, I will here insert: 'Iche Athelstane king, grome of this home, geve and graunt to the preist of this chirch, one yoke of mye land frelieth to holde, woode in my holt house to buyld, bitt grass for all hys beasts, fuel for hys hearth, pannage for hys sowe and piggs, world without end,'”—

adds presently afterwards, that

“Sir John Willington gave *Weeksland* in this tything, unto Robert Tolla, *cum 40 somagia annuatim capiend in Buckenholt* (so be the words of the grant) in the time of K. Edw. I.”

The Willingtons were lords of the manor of UMBERLEIGH, where Athelstane's palace stood, with its chapel dedicated to the Holy Trinity, formerly rich in ancient monuments, and having a chantry near to it. Some of the monuments from this chapel are still preserved in the neighbouring church of Atherington.

My Queries upon this Note are:

1. Whence did Risdon derive his copy of King Athelstane's form of donation? 2. What is the precise meaning of the word *Somagia*?

In *Ducange* (ed. Par. 1726, tom. vi. col. 589.) I find:

“*Somegia*. Praestatio, ut videtur ex *summ*is, v. gr. bladi, frumenti. Charta Philippi Reg. Franc. an. 1210. Idem etiam Savaricus detinet sibi census suos, et venditiones, et quosdam redditus, qui *Somegiae* vocantur, et avenam, et *captagia* hominum et

foeminarum suarum, qui reditus cum una Somegiarum in festo B. Remigii persolverentur; deinde secunda Somegia in vicesima die Natalis Domini, et tertia in Octabis Resurrectionis Dominicae, ei similiter persolventur; caponum etiam suorum in crastino Natalis Domini percipiet solutionem: unaquaeque vero somegiarum quatuor denarios bonae monetae valet.”

Ducange refers also to some kindred words; but, instead of clearing up my difficulty in the word *somagia*, he presents me with another in *captagia*, the meaning of which I do not clearly understand. Perhaps some of your more learned contributors will obligingly help me to the true import of these words?



## Page 14

J. Sansom.

\* \* \* \* \*

Minor Queries.

*Charade*.—Can any one tell who is the author of the following charade? No doubt, the lines are well known to many of your readers, although I have never seen them in print. It has been said that Dr. Robinson, a physician, wrote them. It strikes me that the real author, whoever he be, richly deserves to be named in “Notes and Queries.”

“Me, the contented man desires,  
The poor man has, the rich requires;  
The miser gives, the spendthrift saves,  
And all must carry to their graves.”

It can scarcely be necessary to add that the answer is, *nothing*.

Alfred Gatty.

July 1. 1850.

“*Smoke Money*.”—Under this name is collected every year at Battle, in Sussex, by the Constable, one penny from every householder, and paid to the Lord of the Manor. What is its origin and meaning?

B.

“*Rapido contrarius orbi*.”—What divine of the seventeenth century adopted these words as his motto? They are part of a line in one of Owen’s epigrams.

N.B.

*Lord Richard Christophilus*.—Can any of your readers give any account of Lord Richard Christophilus, a Turk converted to Christianity, to whom, immediately after the Restoration, in July, 1660, the Privy Council appointed a pension of 50*l.* a-year, and an additional allowance of 2*l.* a-week.

CH.

*Fiz-gigs*.—In those excellent poems, Sandys’s *Paraphrases on Job and other Books of the Bible*, there is a word of a most destructive character to the effect. Speaking of leviathan, he asks,

“Canst thou with *fiz-gigs* pierce him to the quick?”

It may be an ignorant question, but I do not know what fiz-gigs are.

C.B.

*Specimens of Erica in Bloom.*—Can any of your correspondents oblige me by the information where I can procure specimens in bloom of the following plants, viz. *Erica crescenta*, *Erica paperina*, *E. purpurea*, *E. flammea*, and at what season they come into blossom in England? If specimens are not procurable without much expense and trouble, can you supply me with the name of a work in which these plants are figured?

E.S.

Dover.

*Michael Scott, the Wizard.*—What works by Michael Scott, the reputed wizard, (Sir Walter's *Deus ex Machina* in *The Lay of the Last Minstrel*), have been printed?

X.Y.A.

*Stone Chalice.*—Can any of the readers of "Notes and Queries" inform me whether the use of *stone chalices* was authorised by the ancient constitutions of the Church; and, if so, at what period, and where the said constitutions were enacted?

X.Y.A.

\* \* \* \* \*{121}

## REPLIES.

## Page 15

### ULRICH VON HUTTEN AND THE "EPISTOLAE OBSCURORUM VIRORUM."

(Vol. ii., p. 55.)

I have never seen the article in the *Quarterly Review* to which your correspondent H.B.C. alludes: he will probably find it by reference to the index, which is not just now within my reach. The neat London edition, 1710, of the *Epistolae* was given by Michael Mattaire. There are several subsequent reimpressions, but none worth notice except that by Henr. Guil. Rotermund, Hanover, 1827, 8vo.; and again, with improvements, "cum nova praefatione, nec non illustratione historica circa originem earum, atque notitia de vita et scriptis virorum in Epistolis occurrentium aucta," 1830, both in 8vo.

The best edition, however, is that given by Dr. Ernst Muench, Leipsic, 1827, 8vo., with the following title:

"Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum aliaque AEvi Decimi sexti Monumenta  
Rarissima. Die Briefe der Finsterlinge an Magister Ortuinus von  
Deventer, nebst andern sehr seltenen Beiträgen zur  
Literatur-Sitten-und-Kirchengeschichte des xvi'n Jahrhunderts."

This contains many important additions, and a copious historical introduction. Both the editors write in German.

That this admirable satire produced an immense effect at the period of its publication, there can be no doubt; but that it has ever been thoroughly understood and relished among us may be doubted. Mr. Hallam, in his *Literature of Europe*, vol. i., seems to have been disgusted with the monkish dog-Latin and bald jokes, not recollecting that this was a necessary and essential part of the design. Nor is it strange that Steele, who was perhaps not very well acquainted with the history of literature, should have misconceived the nature of the publication, when we learn from an epistle of Sir Thomas More to Erasmus, that some of the stupid theologasters themselves, who were held up to ridicule, received it with approbation as a serious work:

"*Epist. Obs. Viror.* operae pretium est videre quantopere placeant omnibus, et doctis joco, et indoctis serio, qui dum ridemus, putant rideri stylum tantum, quem illi non defendunt, sed gravitate sententiarum dicunt compensatum, et latere sub rudi vagina pulcherrimum gladium. Utinam fuisset inditus libello alius titulus! Profecto intra centum annos homines studio stupidi non sensissent nasum, quamquam rhinocerotico longiorem."

[8]

Erasmus evidently enjoyed the witty contrivance, though he affects to disapprove it as an anonymous libel. Simler, in his life of Bullinger, relates that on the first reading Erasmus fell into such a fit of laughter as to burst an abscess in his face with which he was at that time troubled, and which prevented the necessity of a surgical operation.

## Page 16

The literary history of the *Epistolae* and the *Dialogue* is involved in obscurity. That Ulrich von Hutten had a large share in their concoction there can be no doubt; and that he was assisted by Crotus Rubianus and Hermann von Busch, if not by others, seems highly probable. The authorship of *Lamentationes Obscurorum Virorum* is a paradox which has not yet been solved. They are a parody, but a poor one, of the *Epistolae*, and in the second edition are attributed to Ortuinus Gratius. If they are by him, he must have been a dull dog indeed; but by some it has been thought that they are the work of a Reuchlinist, to mystify the monks of Cologne, and render them still more ridiculous; yet, as the Pope's bull against the *Epistolae*, and Erasmus's disapproving letter, find a prominent place, and some other well-grounded inculpations occur, it appears to me that some slender-witted advocate of the enemies of learning has here shown his want of skill in handling the weapons of the adversary.

How much Sir Thomas More was pleased with the writings of Hutten we may gather from the opening of a letter which Erasmus addressed to Hutten, giving an interesting account of his illustrious friend, in August, 1519:

"Quod Thomae Mori ingenium sic deamas, ac pene dixerim deperis, nimirum scriptis illius inflammatus, quibus (ut vere scribis) nihil esse potest neque doctius neque festivius; istue mihi crede, clarissime Huttene tibi cum multis commune est, cum Moro mutuum etiam. Nam is vicissim adeo scriptorum tuorum genio delectatur, ut ipse tibi plopemodum invideam."

The *Dialogue* (*Mire Festivus*), which in the edition of 1710 occurs between the first and second parts of the *Epistolae*, bears especial marks of Hutten's manner, and is doubtless by him. The interlocutors are three of the illustrious obscure, Magisters Ortuinus, Lupoldus, and Gingolphus, and the first act of the comedy consists in their observations upon the promoters of learning, Reuchlin, Erasmus, and Faber Stapulensis, who afterwards make their appearance, and the discussion becomes general, but no impression can be made upon the stupid and prejudiced monks. The theme is, of course, the inutility of the new learning, Hebrew and Greek and correct Latinity. One short passage seems to me admirable:{122}

"*M. Ging.* Et Sanctus Ambrosius, Sanctus Augustinus, et alii omnes zelossimi doctores non sciebant ipsi bene tot, sicut iste Ribaldi? *M. Ort.* Ipsi deberent interponere suis. *M. Lup.* Non bene indigemus de suo Graeco. *M. Ging.* Videtur eis, qui sciunt dicere *tou, tou, logos, monsoiros, legoim, taff, hagiotos*, quod ipse sciunt plus quam Deus. *M. Ort.* Magister noster Lupolde, creditis, quod Deus curat multum de iste Graeco? *M. Lup.* Certe non, Magister noster Ortuine, ego credo, quod Deus non curat multum."

Ranke, in his *History of the Reformation*, has very justly estimated the merits and character of these remarkable productions:

## Page 17

“We must not look for the delicate apprehension and tact, which can only be formed in a highly polished state of society, nor for the indignation of insulted morality expressed by the ancients: it is altogether a caricature, not of finished individual portraits, but of a single type;—a clownish sensual German priest, his intellect narrowed by stupid wonder and fanatical hatred, who relates with silly *naïvete* and gossiping confidence the various absurd and scandalous situations into which he falls. These letters are not the work of a high poetical genius, but they have truth, coarse strong features of resemblance, and vivid colouring.”

Ranke mentions another satire, which appeared in March, 1520, directed against John Eck, the opponent of Luther, the latter being regarded in the light of a successor of Reuchlin, under the title of *Abgehobelte Eck*, or *Eccius dedolatus*, “which, for fantastic invention, striking and crushing truth, and Aristophanic wit, far exceeded the *Litterae Obsc. V.*, which it somewhat resembled.” I have not yet been able to meet with this; but such high praise, from so judicious a critic, makes me very desirous to see and peruse it.

S.W. Singer.

Mickleham, July 3. 1850.

[Footnote 8: “Ubi primum exissent *Ep. Ob. V.* miro Monachorum applausu exceptae sunt apud Britannos a Franciscanis ac Dominicanis, qui sibi persuadebant, eas in Reuchlini contumeliam, et Monachorum favorem, serio proditus: quamque quidam egregie doctus, sed nasutissimus, fingeret se nonnihil offendi stylo, consulati sunt hominem.”—*Erasm. Epist.* 979.]

*Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum*.—Your Querist H.B.C. (Vol. ii., pp. 55-57.) will find, in the 53rd vol. *Edinb. Rev.* p. 180., a long article on these celebrated letters, containing much of the information required. It is worthy of remark, that in page 195. we are told

“In 1710 there was printed in London the *most elegant* edition that has ever appeared of these letters, which the editor, Mich. Mattaire, gravely represents as the productions of their ostensible authors.”

Now this edition, though neat, has no claim to be termed most elegant, which is hardly to be reconciled with what the reviewer says in a note, p. 210., “that the text of this ed. of 1710 is of no authority, and swarms with typographical blunders.”

The work on its first appearance produced great excitement, and was condemned by Pope Leo X. See *Dict. des Livres Condammés, &c.*, par Peignot, tom. ii. p. 218.



Many amusing anecdotes and notices are to be found in Bayle's *Dict.* See particularly sub nomine Erasmus. Burton, in his *Anatomy of Mel.* pt. i. sec. 2. Mem 3 sub 6. citing Jovius in Elogiis, says,

“Hostratus cucullatus adeo graviter ob Reuchlini librum qui inscribitur, Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum dolore simul et pudore sauciatus, et scipsum interfecerit.”

## Page 18

See also *Nouv. Diction. Historique* in the account of Gratius, O.

There is also a good article on these letters in a very excellent work entitled *Analectabiblion, or Extraits Critique de divers Livres rares, &c., tirez du Cabinet du Marq. D. R. (oure)*. Paris, 1836. 2 tomes 8vo.

F.R.A.

*Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum*.—The article inquired for by H.B.C. (Vol. ii, p. 55) is probably one in the *Edinburgh Review*, vol. liii. p. 180., attributed to Sir William Hamilton, the distinguished Professor of Logic in the university of Edinburgh.

CH.

\* \* \* \* \*

CAXTON'S PRINTING-OFFICE.

(Vol. ii., p. 99.)

Mr. Rimbault is wrong in giving to Abbot Milling the honour of being the patron of Caxton, which is due to Abbot Esteney. Mr. C. Knight in his *Life of Caxton*, which appropriately formed the first work of his series of *Weekly Volumes*, has the following remarks upon the passage from Stow, quoted by Mr. Rimbault:

"The careful historians of London here committed one error; John Islip did not become abbot of Westminster till 1500. John Esteney was made abbot in 1474, and remained such until his death in 1498. His predecessor was Thomas Milling. In Dugdale's *Monasticon* we find, speaking of Esteney, 'It was in this abbot's time, and not in that of Milling, or in that of Abbot Islip, that Caxton exercised the art of printing at Westminster.'"—p. 140. #/

I have no work at hand to which I can refer for the date of Milling's death, but if 1492 be correct, perhaps he may have been promoted to a bishoprick.

With reference to Mr. Rimbault's remark, that Caxton first mentions the place of his printing in 1477, so that he must have printed some time without informing us where, I may be allowed to observe that it seems highly probable he printed, and indeed learned the art, at Cologne. At the end of the third book of his translation of the *Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye*, Caxton says:

"Thus end I this book which I have translated after mine author, as nigh as God hath given me cunning, to whom be given the laud and praises ... I have practised and learned, at my great charge and dispense, to ordain this said book in print, after the manner and form as you may here see."{123}

And on the title-page he informs us:

“Whyche sayd translacion and werke was begonne in Brugis in 1468, and ended in the holy cyte of Colen, 19 Sept. 1471.”

## Page 19

This may refer to the translation only; but as Caxton was both translator and printer, it does not seem unreasonable to regard it as indicating when his entire labour upon the work was brought to a close. I might support the view that Caxton printed at Cologne by other arguments which would make the matter tolerably certain (see *Life of Caxton*, p. 125., &c.); but as the excellent little work to which I am indebted for these particulars is so well known, and so easily accessible, I should not be justified in occupying more of your space, and I will therefore conclude with noting that the parochial library at Shipdham, in Norfolk, is said to contain books printed by Caxton and other early printers. Perhaps some one of your correspondents would record, for the general benefit, of what they consist.

Arun.

Dr. Rimbault has evidently not seen a short article on Caxton's printing at Westminster, which I inserted in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for April, 1846, nor the reference made to it in the magazine for June last, p. 630., or he would have admitted that his objections to Dr. Dibdin's conjectures on this point had been already stated; moreover, I think he would have seen that the difficulty had been actually cleared up. In truth, the popular misapprehension on this subject has not been occasioned by any obscurity in the colophons of the great printer, or in the survey of Stow, but merely by the erroneous constricted sense into which the word abbey has passed in this country. Caxton himself tells us he printed his books in "th' abbay of Westminster," but he does not say in the church of the abbey. Stow distinctly says it was in the almonry of the abbey; and the handbill Dr. Rimbault refers to confirms that fact. The almonry was not merely "within the precincts of the abbey," it was actually a part of the abbey. Dr. Rimbault aims at the conclusion that "the old chapel of St. Anne was doubtless the place where the first printing-office was erected in England." But why so? Did not the chapel continue a chapel until the Reformation, if not later? And Caxton would no more set up his press in a chapel than in the abbey-church itself. Stow says it was erected in the almonry. The almonry was one of the courts of the abbey, (situated directly west of the abbey-church, and not east, as Dr. Dibdin surmised); it contained a chapel dedicated to St. Anne, and latterly an almshouse erected by the Lady Margaret. The latter probably replaced other offices or lodgings of greater antiquity, connected with the duties of the almoner, or the reception and relief of the poor; and there need be no doubt that it was one of these buildings that the Abbot of Westminster placed at the disposal of our proto-typographer. There was nothing very extraordinary in his so doing if we view the circumstance in its true light; for the *scriptoria* of the monasteries had ever been the principal manufactories of books. A single press was now to do the work of many pens.

## Page 20

The experiment was successful; “after which time,” as Stow goes on to say, “the like was practised in the Abbeyes of St. Augustine, at Canterbury, St. Alban’s, and other monasteries.” The monks became printers instead of scribes; but they would not ordinarily convert their churches or chapels into printing-houses. The workmen, it is true, term the meetings held for consultation on their common interests or pleasures, their *chapels*; and whether this may have arisen from any particular instance in which a chapel was converted into a printing-house, I cannot say. In order to ascertain the origin of this term these Queries may be proposed:—Is it peculiar to printers and to this country? Or is it used also in other trades and on the Continent?

John Gough Nichols.

\* \* \* \* \*

### THE NEW TEMPLE.

Although I am unable to give a satisfactory reply to Mr. Foss’s inquiries, such information as I have is freely at his service. It may, at all events, serve as a finger-post to the road.

My survey gives a most minute extent, of 35 preceptories, 23 “camerae” of the Hospitallers, 13 preceptories formerly commandries of the Templars, 74 limbs, and 70 granges, impropriations, &c., and, among them all, not a single one of the valuation of the New Temple itself. *Reprises* of that establishment are entered, but no *receipts*.

The former are as follows:

“In emendationem et sustentationem ecclesie Novi Templi, London,  
et in vino, cera, et oleo, et ornamentis ejusdem ... x m.

“In uno fratri [*sic*] Capellano et octo Capellanis secularibus, deservientibus ecclesiam quondam Templariorum apud London, vocatam Novum Templum, prout ordinatum est per totum consilium totius regni, pro animabus fundatorum dicti Novi Templi et alia [*sic*] possessionum alibi ... lv m.

“Videlicet, frati Capellano, pro se et ecclesia, xv m., et  
cuilibet Capellano, v m., ubi solebant esse, tempore  
Templariorum, unus Prior ecclesie et xij Capellani seculares.

“Item in diversis pensionibus solvendis diversis personis per annum, tam in Curia domini Regis, quam Justiciariis Clericis, Officiariis, et aliis ministris, in diversis Curiiis suis, ac etiam aliis familiaribus magnatum, tam pro terris tenementis, redditibus, et libertatibus hospitalis, quam Templariorum, et maxime pro terris Templariorum

manutenendis, videlicet, Baronibus in Scaccario domini Regis Domino Roberto de Sadyngton, militi, Capitali baroni de Scaccario, xl.” &c. &c.{124}

enumerating pensions to the judges, clerks, &c., in all the courts, to the amount of above 60l. per annum. To

“Magnatibus, secretariis, et familiaribus domini Regis et aliorum;”

the pensions enumerated amount to about 440\_l.\_ per annum.

Then, to the treasurer, barons, clerks, &c., of the Exchequer (140 persons):

## Page 21

“Bis in anno, videlicet, tempore yemali, pilliola furrata pellura minuti varii et bogeti, et quedam non furrata; et tempore estivali totidem pilliola lineata de sindone, et quedam non lineata, unicuique de Curia Scaccarii predicti, tam minoribus quam majoribus, secundum gradus, statum, et officium personarum predictarum, que expense se extendunt annuatim ad ... x ii.”“Item sunt alie expense facte in Curiis Regis annuatim pro officio generalis procuratoris in diversis Curiis Regis, que de necessitate fieri oportet, pro brevibus Regis, et Cartis impetendis, et aliis, negociis in eisdem Curiis expediendis, que ad minus ascendunt per annum, prout evidencius apparet, per compotum et memoranda dicti fratris de Scaccario qui per capitulum ad illud officium oneratur ... lx m.”

“Item in donis dandis in Curiis domini Regis et aliorum magnatum  
*pro favore habendo* et pro placitis defendendis, et expensis  
parlialmentorum, ad minus bis per annum ... cc m.”

I have made these extracts somewhat more at length than may, perhaps, be to the point in question, because they contain much that is highly interesting as to the apparently questionable mode in which the Hospitallers obtained the protection of the courts (and probably they were not singular in their proceedings); annual pensions to judges, besides other largesses, and much of this “*pro favore habendo*,” contrasts painfully with the “spotless purity of the ermine” which dignifies our present age.

In the “extent” we have occasionally a grange held rent free for life by a judge. Chief Justice Geoffrey de Scrop so held that of Penhull in Northumberland.

Putting all these facts together, and bearing in mind that, throughout this elaborate “extent,” there are neither profits nor rent entered, as for the Temple itself, so that it seems to have then been neither in the possession nor occupation of the Hospitallers, is it not possible that they had alienated it to the lawyers, as a discharge for these heavy annual incumbrances,—*prospectively*, perhaps, because by the entry of these charges among the “reprise,” the life interests, at all events, were still paid; or perhaps the alienation was itself made to them “*pro favore habendo*” in some transaction that the Hospitallers wished to have carried by the Courts; or it may have been made as a *bona fide* bribe for future protection. At all events, when we see such extensive payments made annually to the lawyers, their ultimate possession of the fee simple is no unnatural result. But, as I am altogether ignorant of the history of the New Temple, I must refrain from suggestions, giving the simple facts as I find them, and leaving the rest to the learning and investigation of your correspondent.

L.B.L.

\* \* \* \* \*

STRANGERS IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

(Vol. ii., pp. 17. 83.)

## Page 22

Mr. Ross is right in saying that “no alteration has taken place in the *practice* of the House of Commons with respect to the admission of strangers.” The practice was at variance with the old sessional order: it is consistent with the new standing order of 1845. I do not understand how any one can read these words of the new standing order, “that the sergeant-at-arms ... do take into his custody any stranger whom he may see ... in any part of the house or gallery appropriated to the members of the House: and also any stranger *who, having been admitted into any other part of the house or gallery,*” &c., and say that the House of Commons does not now recognise the presence of strangers; nor can I understand how Mr. Ross can doubt that the old sessional order absolutely prohibited their presence. It did not keep them out certainly, for they were admitted in the teeth of it; but so long as that sessional order was in force, prohibition to strangers was the theory.

Mr. Ross refers to publication of speeches. Publication is still prohibited in theory. Mr. Ross perhaps is not aware that the prohibition of publication of speeches rests on a foundation independent of the old sessional order against the presence of strangers,—on a series of resolutions declaring publication to be a breach of the privileges of Parliament, to be found in the Journals of 1642, 1694, 1695, 1697, 1703, 1722, and 1724.

We unfortunately cannot settle in your columns whether, as Mr. Ross asserts, “if a member in debate should inadvertently allude to the possibility of his observations being heard by a stranger, the Speaker would immediately call him to order;” but my strong belief is, that he would not: and I hope, if there are any members of the House of Commons who have time to read “Notes and Queries,” that one of them may be induced to take a suitable opportunity of obtaining the Speaker’s judgment.

“Yet at other times,” Mr. Ross goes on to say, “the right honourable gentlemen will listen complacently to discussions arising out of the complaints of members that strangers will not publish to the world all that they hear pass in debate.” If this be so, I suppose the Speaker sees nothing disorderly in a complaint, that what has been spoken in Parliament has *not* been published: but I read frequently in my newspaper that the Speaker interrupts {125} members who speak of speeches having been published. “This is one of the inconsistencies,” Mr. Ross proceeds, “resulting from the determination of the House not expressly to recognise the presence of strangers.” Inconsistency there certainly is,—the inconsistency of making publication a breach of privilege, and allowing it to go on daily.

As strangers may be admitted into the House to hear debates, and not allowed to publish what they hear, so they may be admitted, subject to exclusion at certain times, or when the House chooses. And this is the case. The House, of course, retains the power of excluding them at any moment. They are always made to withdraw before the House goes to a division. This is a matter of practice, founded probably on some

supposed reasons of convenience. Again, on any member desiring strangers to be excluded, the Speaker desires them to withdraw, without allowing any discussion.

## Page 23

I have only to notice one other observation of Mr. Ross's, which is the following:

"When I speak of strangers being admitted, it must not be supposed that this was done by order of the House. No, everything relating to the admission of strangers to, and their accommodation in the House of Commons, is effected by some mysterious agency, for which no one is directly responsible. Mr. Barry has built galleries for strangers in the new house; but if the matter were made a subject of inquiry, it probably would puzzle him to state under what authority he has acted."

I do not think there is anything mysterious as regards admission. I am fond of hearing the debates, and my parliamentary friends are very kind to me. Sometimes I content myself with an order from a member, which takes me into the hinder seats of the non-reporting strangers' gallery; sometimes, when I know beforehand of an interesting debate, I get one of my friends to put my name on the "Speaker's list," and I then take my seat on one of the two front rows of the strangers' gallery; sometimes, again, I go down on the chance, while the House is sitting; and if I am fortunate enough to find any one of any friends there, he generally brings me, in a few moments, an order from the Sergeant-at-arms, which takes me also to the front row of the strangers' gallery. Some benches under the strangers' gallery are reserved for peers, ambassadors, and peers' eldest sons. The Speaker and the Sergeant-at-arms give permission generally to foreigners, and sometimes to some other persons, to sit in these benches. I do not know which officer of the House of Commons superintends the admission of reporters. Ladies are admitted to the Black Hole assigned to them, by orders from the Sergeant-at-arms. I have no doubt that the Speaker and Sergeant-at-arms are responsible to the House for everything relating to the admission of strangers, and without taking upon myself to say what is the authority under which Mr. Barry has acted, I have no doubt that, in building galleries for strangers in the new house, he has done what is consistent not only with the long established practice, but, under the new order of 1845, with the theory of the House of Commons.

As regards the passage quoted by Mr. Jackson from the *Edinburgh Review*, the reviewer would probably allow that he had overlooked the new standing order of 1845; and Mr. Jackson will perceive that the recognition of the presence of strangers does not legalise the publication of speeches. The supposed difficulty in the way of legalising publication is, that the House of Commons would then make itself morally responsible for the publication of any libellous matter in speeches. I do not see the force of this difficulty. But the expediency of the existing rule is not a proper subject for discussion in your columns.

CH.

Whatever the present practice of the House of Commons with respect to strangers may be, it does not seem probable that it will soon undergo alteration. In the session of 1849 a Select Committee, composed of fifteen members, and including the leading men of all

parties, was appointed “to consider the present practice of this House in respect of the exclusion of strangers.” The following is the Report of the Committee *in extenso* (*Parl. Pap.*, No. 498. Sess. 1849):

## Page 24

“That the existing usage of excluding strangers during a division, and upon the notice by an individual Member that strangers are present, has prevailed from a very early period of parliamentary history; that the instances in which the power of an individual Member to exclude has been exercised have been very rare: and that it is the unanimous opinion of your committee, that there is no sufficient ground for making any alteration in the existing practice with regard to the admission or exclusion of strangers.”

This Report confirms the statement of Mr. Ross (p. 83., *ante*), that within his experience of thirty-one years no change has been made in the present rule of the House upon this matter, which, it would seem, dates very far back. The Speaker was the only witness examined before the Committee, and his evidence is not printed.

Arun.

\* \* \* \* \*

### REPLIES TO MINOR QUERIES.

*Morganatic Marriage* (Vol. ii., p. 72.).—According to M., Ducange has connected this expression with *morgingab*; but I have looked in vain for such connection in my edition of the *Glossary* (Paris, 1733). The truth most probably is, that *morganatic*, in the phrase “matrimonium ad morganaticam,” {126} was akin to the Gothic *maurgjan*, signifying, “to procrastinate,” “to bring to an end,” “to shorten,” “to limit.” This application of the word would naturally rise out of the restrictions imposed upon the wife and children of a morganatic marriage.

C.H.

*Umbrellas* (Vol. i., p. 415. 436.; ii. 25.).—In Swift’s description of a city shower (*Tatler*, No. 238., October 17. 1710), umbrellas are mentioned as in common use by women:

“Now in contiguous drops the flood comes down,  
Threatening with deluge the devoted town;  
To shops, in crowds, the daggled females fly,  
Pretend to cheapen goods, but nothing buy;  
The Templar spruce, while every spout’s abroach,  
Stays till ’tis fair, yet seems to call a coach;  
The tucked-up sempstress walks with hasty strides,  
While streams run down her oiled umbrella’s sides.”

H.B.C.

U.U. Club, July 2.



*Bands* (Vol. ii., pp. 23. 76.)—*Scarf*.—I was glad to read Arun's explanation of the origin of the bands now worn by the clergy; which, however, seems merely to amount to their being an adoption of a Genevan portion of clerical costume. That they are the descendants of the ruff, there can be no doubt, just as wrist-bands have more recently succeeded to ruffles.

I cannot resist mentioning that an ingenious friend suggested to me, that the broad, stiff, laid-down collar, alluded to in the former part of Arun's communication, possibly gave rise to the modern band in the following manner:—When the scarf, still in use, was drawn over the shoulders and hung down in front, that part of the broad collar which was left visible, being divided up the middle, presented a shape and appearance exactly like our common bands. Hence, it was imagined, this small separate article of dress might have originated.

## Page 25

Is it Butler, Swift, or who, that says,

“A Chrysostom to smoothe his band in”?

Whenever this was written, it must have referred to our modern bands.

Who amongst the clergy are *entitled* to wear a scarf? Is it the badge of a chaplain only? or what circumstances justify its being worn?

Alfred Gatty.

July 1. 1850.

*Bands* (Vol. ii., p. 76.).—An early example of the collar, approaching to the form of our modern bands, may be seen in the portrait of Cardinal Beatoun, who was assassinated in 1546. The original is in Holyrood Palace, and an engraving in Mr. Lodge’s *Portraits*. The artist is unknown, but from the age of the face one may infer that it was painted about 1540.

C.H.

*Jewish Music* (Vol. ii., p. 88.).—See a host of authorities on the subject of Hebrew music and musical instruments in Winer’s *Realwoerterbuch* vol. ii., pp. 120. *seq.*, 3d edit. There is a good abstract respecting them in Jahn’s *Hebrew Antiquities*, sect. 92-96.

C.H.

*North Sides of Churchyards unconsecrated* (Vol. ii., p. 55.).—In illustration of, not in answer to, Mr. Sansom’s inquiry, I beg to offer the following statement. During a long series of years an average of about 150 corpses has been annually deposited in Ecclesfield churchyard, which has rendered it an extremely crowded cemetery. But, notwithstanding these frequent interments, my late sexton told me that he remembered when there was scarcely one grave to the north of the church, it being popularly considered that only suicides, unbaptised persons, and still-born children ought to be buried there. However, when a vicar died about twenty-seven years ago, unlike his predecessors, who had generally been buried in the chancel, he was laid in a tomb on the north side of the churchyard, adjoining the vicarage. From this time forward the situation lost all its evil reputation amongst the richer inhabitants of the parish, who have almost entirely occupied it with family vaults.

Whether the prejudice against the north side of our churchyard arose from an idea that it was unconsecrated, I cannot tell but I suspect that, from inherited dislike, the poor are still indisposed towards it. When the women of the village have to come to the vicarage after nightfall, they generally manage to bring a companion, and hurry past the gloomy end of the north transept as if they knew

“that close behind  
Some frightful fiend did tread.”

I cannot help fancying that the objection is attributable to a notion that evil spirits haunt the spot in which, possibly from very early times, such interments took place as my sexton described. As a suggestion towards a full solution of this popular superstition, I would ask whether persons who formerly underwent ecclesiastical excommunication were customarily buried on the north side of churchyards?

## Page 26

Alfred Gatty.

Ecclesfield, June 28. 1850.

I can only give from recollection a statement of a tradition, that when Jesus Christ died he turned his head towards the south; and so, ever since, the south side of a church has the pre-eminence. There generally is the bishop's throne, and the south aisle of ancient basilicas was appropriated to men. Simple observation shows that the supposed sanctity extends to the churchyard,—for there the tombstones lie thickest.

I find that my source of information for the {127} tradition was Cockerell's last lecture on Architecture, *Athenaeum* for 1843, p. 187. col. 3.

A.J.H.

"*Men are but Children*," &c.—R.G. (Vol. ii., p. 22.) will find the line about which he inquires in Dryden's *All for Love*; or, *The World well Lost*, Act iv. Sc. 1.

Dolabella (*loq.*):

"Men are but children of a larger growth,  
Our appetites as apt to change as theirs,  
And full as craving too, and full as vain."

J.R.M.

King's College, London, July 12. 1850.

*Ventriloquism* (Vol. ii., p. 88.).—Mr. SANSOM will find some curious information touching the words [Hebrew: 'or], [Greek: eggastromuthos], &c., in Dr. Maitland's recent *Illustrations and Enquiries relating to Mesmerism*, pp. 55. 81. The Lexicons of Drs. Lee and Gesenius may also be consulted, under the word [Hebrew: 'or]. The former of these lexicographers would rank the Pythian priestess with "our modern conjurers."

C.H.

St. Catharine's Hall, Cambridge.

*Cromwell's Estates—Magor* (Vol. i., p. 277. 389.).—As the South Wales line is now open as far as Chepstow, it may not be uninteresting to V. to know, that it diverges from the coast between Chepstow and Newport, in order to pass Bishopston and *Magor*, the last of which he rightly placed in Monmouthshire.

SELEUCUS.

*Vincent Gookin* (Vol. i., pp. 385. 473. 492.; Vol. ii. p. 44.) is described in a *Narrative of the late Parliament* (Cromwell's Parliament, d. 1656), in the *Harleian Miscellany*, as

“One of the letters of land in Ireland, receiving three hundred pounds per annum.”

He and three other Irish members, Colonel Jephson, Ralph King, and Bice, are classed together in this tract, which is hostile to Cromwell, as

“Persons not thought meet to be in command, though they much desire it, and are of such poor principles and so unfit to make rulers of as they would not have been set with the dogs of the flock, if the army and others who once pretended to be honest had kept close to their former good and honest principles.”

Vincent Gookin voted for the clause in the “Petition and Advice” giving the title of “King” to Cromwell.

CH.

*All-to brake* (Vol. i., p. 395.).—The interpretation given is incorrect. “All-to” is very commonly used by early writers for “altogether:” e.g., “all-to behacked,” Calphill's *Answer to Martiall's Treatise of the Cross*, Parker Society's edition, p. 3.; “all-to becrossed,” *ibid.* p. 91.; “all-to bebatted,” *ibid.* p. 133., &c. &c. The Parker Society reprints will supply innumerable examples of the use of the expression.

## Page 27

\* \* \* \* \*

### MISCELLANEOUS.

NOTES ON BOOKS, SALES, CATALOGUES, ETC.

The two of Mr. Hunter's *Critical and Historical Tracts*, which we have had the opportunity of examining, justify to the fullest the expectations we had formed of them. The first, *Agincourt; a Contribution towards an authentic List of the Commanders of the English Host, in King Henry the Fifth's Expedition, in the Third Year of his Reign*, Mr. Hunter describes as "an instalment," we venture to add "a very valuable instalment," from evidence which has been buried for centuries in the unknown masses of national records, towards a complete list of the English Commanders who served with the King in that expedition, with, in most cases, the number of the retinue which each Commander undertook to bring into the field, and, in some instances, notices of events happening to the contingents. The value of a work based upon such materials, our historical readers will instantly recognise. The lovers of our poetry will regard with equal interest, and peruse with equal satisfaction, Mr. Hunter's brochure entitled *Milton; a Sheaf of Gleanings after his Biographers and Annotators*, and admit that he has bound up the new biographical illustrations and critical comments, which he has gathered in that pleasant field of literary inquiry, the life and writings of Milton, into a goodly and a pleasant sheaf.

Messrs. Sotheby and Co. will commence on Monday, the 29th of this month, a three days' Sale of Greek Roman, and English Coins, English and Foreign Medals, Cabinets, &c., the property of a Gentleman leaving England.

\* \* \* \* \*

### BOOKS AND ODD VOLUMES

WANTED TO PURCHASE.

(In continuation of Lists in former Nos.)

*Odd Volumes.*

MOULTRIE'S POEMS. Vol. I.

Letters, stating particulars and lowest price, *carriage free*, to be sent to Mr. BELL, Publisher of "NOTES AND QUERIES," 186. Fleet Street.

\* \* \* \* \*

NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

C.J.S. *The Inscription from the brass in Chinnor Church, Oxon, is* Mouns. Esmoun de Malyns fitz Mouns. Reynald de Malyns Chr. et Isabelle sa femme gisoient icy Dieu de ses ailmes eit mercy, *being in memory of Esmond de Malyns and his wife. The father, Renald de Malyns, was interred in the same church.*

VOLUME THE FIRST OF NOTES AND QUERIES, *with Title-page and very copious Index, is now ready, price 9s. 6d., bound in cloth, and may be had, by order, of all Booksellers and Newsmen.*

Errata. In No. 37., p. 98., col. 2., l. 16., for "1625" read "1695"; p. 101., l. 31., "Inchi\_g\_uin" should be "Inchi\_q\_uin"; p. 106., col. 2., l. 26. should be—

"And disappoints the Queen, poor little Chuck." {128}

## Page 28

\* \* \* \* \*

COMMITTEE FOR THE REPAIR  
OF THE  
TOMB OF GEOFFREY CHAUCER.

JOHN BRUCE, esq., Treas. S.A.  
J. PAYNE COLLIER, Esq., V.P.S.A.  
PETER CUNNINGHAM, Esq., F.S.A.  
WILLIAM RICHARD DRAKE, Esq., F.S.A.  
THOMAS W. KING, Esq., F.S.A.  
SIR FREDERICK MADDEN, K.H.  
JOHN GOUGH NICHOLS, Esq., F.S.A.  
HENRY SHAW, Esq., F.S.A.  
SAMUEL SHEPERD, Esq., F.S.A.  
WILLIAM J. THOMS, Esq., F.S.A.

The Tomb of Geoffrey Chaucer in Westminster Abbey is fast mouldering into irretrievable decay. A sum of One Hundred Pounds will effect a perfect repair. The Committee have not thought it right to fix any limit to the subscription, they themselves have opened the list with a contribution from each of them of Five Shillings; but they will be ready to receive any amount, more or less, which those who value poetry and honour Chaucer may be kind enough to remit to them.

Subscriptions have been received from the Earls of Carlisle, Ellesmere, and Shaftesbury, Viscounts Strangford and Mahon, Pres. Soc. Antiq., The Lords Braybrooke and Londesborough, and many other noblemen and gentlemen.

Subscriptions are received by all the members of the Committee, and at the Union Bank, Pall Mall East. Post-Office orders may be made payable at the Charing Cross Office, to William Richard Drake, Esq., the Treasurer, 46. Parliament Street, or William J. Thoms, Esq., Hon. Sec., 25. Holy-Well Street, Millbank.

\* \* \* \* \*

Now Ready, in demy 8vo., with Portraits, price 12s.

SOME ACCOUNT OF THE CORPS OF  
GENTLEMEN AT ARMS.

By JAMES BUNCE CURLING, Clerk of the Checque.

“Mr. Curling has succeeded in producing a book of much lively and curious historic interest.”—*Naval and Military Gazette*.

“The author has made the most of his subject, introducing anecdotes of the members of the corps from its first institution.”—*Atlas*.

RICHARD BENTLEY, Publisher in Ordinary to her Majesty.

\* \* \* \* \*

TO ALL WHO HAVE FARMS OR GARDENS. THE GARDENERS' CHRONICLE AND AGRICULTURAL GAZETTE,

(The HORTICULTURAL PART edited by PROF. LINDLEY)

Of Saturday, July 6. contains Articles on

Agricultural Society of England, Prof. Way's lecture on water  
Agriculture of Lancaster  
Annuals, English names of  
Ash, to propagate  
Balsams  
Bee, remedy for sting of  
Botanical names  
Butter, rancid  
Calendar, Horticultural  
Calendar, Agricultural  
Carts, Cumberland  
Cattle, to feed  
Clover crops  
College, agricultural  
Cropping, table of  
Cuckoo, note of  
Diseases of plants  
Drainage reports  
Evergreens, to transplant, by Mr. Glendinning  
Farming in Norfolk, high  
Farming, Mr. Mechi's, by Mr. Wilkins  
Farming, rule of thumb, by Mr. Wilkins

## Page 29

Fruit trees, to root prune  
Gardeners' Benevolent Institution, by Mr. Wheeler  
Gardening, villa and suburban  
Grapes in pots  
Guano frauds  
Highland Patriotic Society  
Kew, Victoria Regia at  
Peel, Sir R., death of  
Pike, voracity of, by Mr. Lovell  
Plants, diseases of  
Plants, names of  
Potato disease  
Reviews, miscellaneous  
Rhododendrons, on Himalayas, by Mr. Munro, Belfast  
Root pruning  
Rosa Manettii, by Mr. Paul  
Royal Botanic Society, report of the Exhibition for July  
Seeding, thin, by Mr. Mechi  
Slough Carnation show  
Slough Pink show  
Statice armeria, by Mr. Forman  
Swans, food of  
Thin seeding, by Mr. Mechi  
Timber felling  
Toads' skins, by Prof. Henslow  
Transplanting evergreens, by Mr. Glendinning  
Trees, to root prune  
Trees, to transplant, by Mr. Glendinning  
Villa and suburban gardening  
Vine, to summer prune, by Mr. Levell  
Viper, the, by Mr. Chaytor  
Water, Prof. Way's lecture on

THE GARDENERS' CHRONICLE AND AGRICULTURAL GAZETTE contains, in addition to the above, the Covent-garden, Mark-lane, and Smithfield prices, with returns from the Potato, Hop, Hay, and Seed Markets, and a *complete Newspaper, with a condensed account of all the transactions of the week.*

Order of Any Newsvender.—OFFICE for Advertisements, 5. Upper Wellington-street, Covent-garden, London.

\* \* \* \* \*

Now Ready, in small 8vo., price 3s. 6d.,

ANONYMOUS POEMS.

"The elegant version of Greek epigrams contained in this volume shows the scholarship as well as the taste of the writer."—*Britannia*.

"Many of the pieces have a very classical air, and all are marked with an unusual degree of elegance and power."—*Guardian*.

RICHARD BENTLEY, New Burlington-street.

\* \* \* \* \*

In Crown 8vo., elegantly bound in gilt cloth, price 7\_s\_. 6d.

MEMORIALS OF THE CASTLE OF EDINBURGH.

By JAMES GRANT; author of "Memoirs of Kirkaldy of Grange," "The Romance of War," "The Scottish Cavalier," &c. With Twelve Illustrations, engraved on Wood by BRANSTON.

"Of the different books of this nature that have fallen, in our way, we do not remember one that has equalled Mr. Grant's."—*Spectator*.

"Mr. Grant's very interesting history of the Castle of Edinburgh—a work equally distinguished by research, accuracy, and pictorial interest."—*Alison's Essays*.

"We have been much amused with this little book, which abounds in pleasant and interesting episodes, and we recommend it as an excellent specimen of local history."—*Athenaeum*.

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD and Sons, Edinburgh And London.

\* \* \* \* \*

Preparing for publication, in 2 vols. small 8vo.

THE FOLK-LORE OF ENGLAND.

## Page 30

By WILLIAM J. THOMS, F.S.A., Secretary of the Camden Society, Editor of "Early Prose Romances," "Lays and Legends of all Nations," &c. One object of the present work is to furnish new contributions to the History of our National Folk-Lore; and especially some of the more striking Illustrations of the subject to be found in the Writings of Jacob Grimm and other Continental Antiquaries.

Communications of inedited Legends, Notices of remarkable Customs and Popular Observances, Rhyming Charms, &c. are earnestly solicited, and will be thankfully acknowledged by the Editor. They may be addressed to the care of Mr. BELL, Office of "NOTES AND QUERIES," 186. Fleet Street.

\* \* \* \* \*

Vols. I. and II. 8vo., price 28s. cloth.

THE JUDGES OF ENGLAND; from the TIME of the CONQUEST. By EDWARD FOSS, F.S.A.

"A work in which a subject of great historical importance is treated with the care, diligence, and learning it deserves; in which Mr. Foss has brought to light many points previously unknown, corrected many errors, and shown such ample knowledge of his subject as to conduct it successfully through all the intricacies of a difficult investigation, and such taste and judgment as will enable him to quit, when occasion requires, the dry details of a professional inquiry, and to impart to his work, as he proceeds, the grace and dignity of a philosophical history."—*Gent. Mag.*

London: LONGMAN, BROWN, GREEN, and LONGMANS.

\* \* \* \* \*

Printed by THOMAS CLARK SHAW, of No. 8. New Street Square, at No. 5. New Street Square, in the Parish of St. Bride, in the City of London; and published by GEORGE BELL, of No. 186. Fleet Street, in the Parish of St. Dunstan in the West, in the City of London, Publisher, at No. 186. Fleet Street aforesaid.—Saturday, July 20. 1850.