Notices of Archaeological publications

J. B. S. & J. N.

To cite this article: J. B. S. & J. N. (1879) Notices of Archaeological publications, Archaeological Journal, 36:1, 105-115, DOI: [10.1080/00665983.1879.10851903](https://doi.org/10.1080/00665983.1879.10851903)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00665983.1879.10851903>

Published online: 14 Jul 2014.

Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)

View related articles [↗](#)

Notices of Archaeological Publications.

HENRY VII, PRINCE ARTHUR, AND CARDINAL MORTON. From a group representing the Adoration of the Three Kings on the Chancel Screen of Plymtree Church in the County of Devon. With an Appendix containing a notice of "Nicholas Monk, Rector of Plymtree, "John Land," &c. London: Printed for T. Mozley, Rector of Plymtree, &c.

In the opening lines of his book Mr. Mozley puts into the mouth of a reader the question "Where is Plymtree?" Henceforth such a question, at all events among Archæologists, will be absurd. Plymtree has found its *vates sacer*, and, since this book was published, has probably been enquired about and discussed more than any village of its (very small) size in the land; surely no edition of fifty copies was ever diffused so widely, or gave rise to so many gossiping conversations.

The work deals with the biographies of three persons, all more or less connected with the Parish of Plymtree, and may well be entitled "Historical Memorials of Plymtree" after the fashion of the well-known "Historical Memorials of Canterbury"; which, though setting out from narrow topographical basis, extend by digressions far out of sight of the starting point.

The first of the Memorials is concerned with a group of personages who, at first sight, would appear to be strangely out of place in a Devonshire village so secluded as to be, even at the present day, remote from highways. King Henry VII, Arthur his son, and Cardinal Morton his astute chancellor! Did these ever visit, or even hear of, Plymtree? By what literary artifice can the actors be brought to the front of the scene? With a dexterity which excites an amused surprise Mr. Mozley has got over the difficulty, and on a small material foundation furnished by the pictures on the screen of his parish church, he has built up a history in which the three above-named personages are the principal figures.

Devonshire churches, as archæologists know, abound in well preserved, and often handsomely painted, rood-screens; and among them Plymtree takes a foremost place in this particular, being enriched by paintings of thirty-four full length figures of saints and other personages appropriate to the place. In the author's words: "The chief ornament (*of the church*) is a magnificent screen, stretching right across the interior, and separating the chancel and chancel aisle, or chantry, from the nave and its aisle. This is profusely carved, painted, and gilded . . . There are thirty-four panels, constituting the solid part of the screen below the open work, and unfortunately below the level of the eye. It is not easy to make a probable conjecture as to the exact date of either the screen or the pictures; but as the Reformation was coming on rapidly by the year 1525, the date of the latest picture could hardly be later than that;

while it is possible, and not even improbable, that the group to which this notice is prefixed (*in the folio copy*) was done in the very lifetime of the persons represented."

The author then goes on to give his reasons for believing that of the three figures in the group of the "Adoration of the Kings," the first, clad in red, may represent Cardinal Morton; the second, a youth, Prince Arthur; and the third, a crowned king, Henry VII. After a not very laborious attempt to prove his identification of the Magi, Mr. Mozley puts together from trustworthy authorities, a vivid account of Cardinal Morton himself and of the times in which he lived. Due allowance, in the matter of *likeness*, being made for the fact that the paintings were executed by a decorator, and not by a portrait painter, we think that the author has made out a fair "case." At all events he has brought together a large quantity of interesting and trustworthy information about an eminent man, who was born within a day's ride of Plymtree; in whose days Plymtree Church was re-built and decorated; and whose skill in state craft was so generally recognised that Shakespere makes Richard III, Morton's political enemy, hearing that—

"Morton is fled to Richmond," &c.,

exclaim—

"Ely with Richmond troubles me more near
Than Buckingham with his rash levied strength."

The second subject in these "Memorials of Plymtree" is based upon a local foundation far broader than the first. In this case a Rector—not an absentee or honorary—but an active, resident Rector of Plymtree, played an essential part in one of the greatest dramas of English history. Nicholas Monk, the Rector in question, was brother to George Monk, first, general of the Commonwealth, then, restorer of the Stuart dynasty, and Duke of Albemarle. More than this the rector was a staunch cavalier, and, masking a natural shrewdness by a seeming simplicity, he was the ambassador who, with success, conducted the negotiations between the king at the Hague and the general in Scotland. All the worthy deeds of his predecessor the present rector of Plymtree tells most pleasantly, and, although this need hardly be written, learnedly. Nicholas Monk was, however, not a mere political go-between; his biographer in summing up his character as a parish clergyman, writes:

"In the year 1643 the subject of this notice was serving the Church as resident curate. He was thus connected with Plymtree for more than nineteen years, . . . and his name appears in the parish book as contributing to a sort of voluntary (poor) rate till a year or two before the restoration. It is prominent also in the list of 'Gifts and Benefactors to the Poor of Plymtree,' put up early last century, if not earlier."

A third Plymtree worthy (as old Fuller would have used the word) was John Land, the younger son of a good yeoman family in the parish, who, leaving his home before the middle of the 17th century, went to London, became a prosperous goldsmith, and, while yet a bachelor, retired from business, disposing of his *goodwill* and shop, which adjoined Temple Bar on the city side, to Mr. Blanchard, also a goldsmith. Mr. Blanchard in his turn made way for Sir Francis Child and his clerk, Mr. Rogers, by whose successors the business, still known as "Child's Bank," has been carried on to the present day.

Land's will, which Mr. Mozley recites at length from a copy in the

parish chest, proves that in the midst of his prosperity in London he retained his affection for his Devonshire home, and for his kindred to whom he bequeathed many legacies. He left a hundred pounds to be placed at interest for the benefit of the poor of his native parish; he provided a crimson velvet pulpit cloth embroidered with gold for the church in which it still remains; but above all he directed his executors to sell—

“My two silver tankards, two silver plates, a silver guilt salver, caudle cupp and porringer, a silver boate and taster, a little silver box, two dozen of silver spoones, and one dozen of silver guilt spoones, and all my plate whatsoever. And also my large golde seale, my large plaine golde ring, three diamond rings, and eight other mourning and hair rings. And the money to be raised thereby I order to be laid out by my executors in the purchase of plate for the communion table of the church of the said parish of Plymtree.” &c.

It will be seen from this notice that Mr. Mozley, in common with a happily increasing number of the clergy, has recognized the fact that in his parish chest is to be found the Record Office of his parish; and also that written documents are not the only materials for writing the history of the place under his charge; but that the architecture and decorations of his church are ready to contribute their share to the tale of by-gone days. Having recognised this, he has successfully employed his practised pen in uttering to the world the story which he has compiled.

So much for the matter of this book; of the manner of its production we can only speak with admiration. In the first place it is lavishly illustrated, as we shall explain more at length presently, but in the second there is a peculiarity of the author's own invention. It is this: every one who is so fortunate as to receive this book has *two copies*! One a large folio containing the coloured plates, and the complete text printed in double column, with ample margin; and also an octavo hand-copy of the text, merely illustrated with outlines of the plates of the folio. Of the liberality of this duplex manner of issuing a book which is to be given away, we need not speak, the fact is eloquent; whilst of the convenience of the invention of an octavo for reading, and a folio for reference, every reader must be a competent judge.

We will now say a few words upon what we have previously remarked as the important part of the volume—the drawings. There are four coloured plates, each measuring $15\frac{1}{2}$ in. by $6\frac{1}{4}$ in.—fac-similes of the paintings on the screen. We have compared these with the original paintings, and we are happy to recognise the skill and ability of Messrs. M. and N. Hanhart, who have reproduced the paintings by chromolithography in a highly successful manner. We are more especially glad to say this, for in so many books the chromo-lithographs lose the mellowness, the depth, and the feeling of the old work. The tone and character of oil colour are here well preserved, and it requires a keen eye to discover a slight defect. The expression on the face of the Virgin in the original is not particularly happy, but yet quiet and placid. In the copy (plate 1) the mouth is distorted, and the profiled outline is not in good drawing; these, together with the slight defect in the right eye, produce an unpleasantness in the Virgin's face, which we are spared in the original. The expression of the child is “well caught.”

We turn with unqualified praise to the figures called Prince Arthur

and Henry VII. Here the artist having bestowed more care, has worked with singular success. The gradations from the high lights upon the crown, &c. to the deep background are carefully given, and the chromolithographs present the same richness of tone as the originals.

The original paintings are on oak panels of about half an inch thick. They have a certain "old" appearance owing to the unevenness of the surface of the oak, and a few occasional chips—but generally they are in excellent preservation—somewhat hidden by successive coatings of common varnish.

One word more—we cannot impress too strongly the necessity that, wherever possible, copies of old paintings should be of the real size, in fact facsimiles in every way. It is only by doing this that we can hope to obtain the character and feeling of the original artist. We are too liable to forget that in reproducing for publication the works of past ages, we are not to attempt to make *pretty* drawings, but exact copies, line for line, of the originals—not as we think they should be, but exactly as they are. We are then doing good service, and handing on, for the study of future ages, many representations of the various schools of art, which are rapidly disappearing. Mr. Mozley has anticipated our ideas, and it is owing to his drawings being fac-similes that they have proved so successful and valuable. We should like to see the same loving care bestowed upon illustrations of the elaborate wood-carvings of the bench ends with which the whole of the church is filled.

J. B. S. AND J. N.

A KEY TO DOMESDAY, shewing the method and exactitude of its mensuration, and the precise meaning of its usual formulæ; the subject being specially exemplified by an analysis and digest of the Dorset Survey. By the Rev. R. W. EYTON, M.A., late Rector of Ryton, and Author of "Antiquities of Shropshire." London: Taylor & Co. Dorchester: James Foster.

In our last number we had the pleasure of noticing a work by the learned historian of Shropshire, and it is now our privilege to introduce to our readers another volume by the same author.

It was justly observed by the late Sir Henry Ellis in 1833, in the preface to his valuable Introduction to the Domesday Book (to the diligent and careful study of which he had devoted twenty years), that "Domesday Book is a mine of information which has not yet been sufficiently wrought. Illustrations of the most important and most certain kind upon our ancient institutions, tenures and tenures of lands, are still to be drawn from it, and its metal cannot be exhausted by the perseverance of any single labourer."

In much of this spirit has Mr. Eyton entered upon the study of the Domesday of Dorset. He says, "Domesday is its own best interpreter, and those who would understand Domesday thoroughly must get their information from Domesday itself." In the work before us he fulfilled the promise of his lengthy title. In the preface he fully states his objects to be: "to enable the inquirer to ascertain with more or less precision the Domesday antecedent of every locality in Dorset; to distinguish and compare the various classes into which the property was then divided, whether a Borough, a Port of Commerce, a Vill, a Manor, a Farm, a Moor, or a Forest; to shew the areal extent of every such estate,

or, at least, to shew how far such extent may be determined from the text of Domesday;—of all occupied territory, whether plough land or meadow land, or pasture, or wood land, to shew the ratio of its culture or its uses; to determine the relative wealth of such estate, whether resulting from inherent capabilities, industrial care, or external adjuncts;—and coincidentally, to collect and review the hints which Domesday supplies as to the comparative numbers and condition of an almost exclusively agrarian population.”

It will thus be seen that the scope of Mr. Eyton's inquiry is very wide, but though extensive, his investigation has been most complete and exhaustive, leaving little to be done by future students as far as the county of Dorset is concerned; and, moreover, he has thrown a vast amount of additional light upon most of the obscurities with which the great record of which he treats is clouded, not only with relation to the county of Dorset, but also to the Surveys of other counties, especially those in the western part of England.

Mr. Eyton, in the first instance, proceeds to elucidate, in an Introductory Essay, the important questions of mensuration, technicalities, and phraseology of the whole Survey, comparing the rules and methods by which the Dorset Commissioners were guided with the Surveys of other counties in which the Commissioners acted upon a somewhat different process, observing that “the contrasts are often more instructive than the parallelisms.” He points out that throughout the whole of the Domesday Book reference is made to two distinct systems of mensuration—one system, he observes, was antiquated though not obsolete; the other was that then in use; the older being based upon the Saxon Hide, which, like Ellis before him, he calls *hidation*.

It is unnecessary that we should enter very closely upon the question of the extent or area of a hide. It has long been admitted by all Domesday students that neither the *hide* nor the *carucate* were ever areal measurements, and Mr. Eyton draws attention to the fact that the term Hide was used by the Saxons as representing the quantity of land, whatever its extent, which was attached to a *homestead*, and because in most instances the area was just sufficient to employ and support a team of oxen the term *hide* and the term *carucate* became convertible. He observes that when in the time of King Ethelred 976-1016 (it was in 1007) it became necessary to levy a tax to buy off the Danes, the country was sub-divided for the purpose of equal taxation, and the hide was accepted as the basis of assessment. On this occasion the hidage of the whole country was carefully examined and re-adjusted, consequently when in Domesday the term *hide* is used it must be understood as a term of record, and represents such a quantity of land as was determined to be a hide and to be gildable as a hide by the taxation of King Ethelred or some later fiscal authority. The Domesday Commissioners of Dorset, therefore, Mr. Eyton says, got the hidation assigned to Dorset manors rather from previous record than present inquest, and that, with some slight alterations, they obtained it from the Dorset Gheld-Roll (as he writes it) made at Easter 1084.

The actual area of *hides* differed very widely. In Cornwall the same Commissioners who visited Dorset are found to have frequently drawn an apparent contrast between the reputed and the actual hidage of certain manors. For example, the Manor of Tregel at the time of the survey

held by Osbert Bishop of Exeter, in the time of Edward the Confessor was gilded for two hides, nevertheless, the Commissioners say, there are twelve hides; and Mr. Eyton points out that this was not corrective but explanatory, shewing that Tregel, though a manor of twelve hides, was gilded for two hides only, ten hides being, by prescription, exempt from gild. He states that no such formula as this is found in the Dorset Domesday because a non-gildable hide in Dorset would not be called a hide at all but a carucate. With reference to this subject it is remarked that it was a principle of the Saxon gild-laws that not only the ancient demesnes of the crown were to be absolutely free from gild, but that the bona-fide demesnes of the Thanes, or Tenants in Capite, should also be exempted from the current gild levy, because, in respect thereto, the tenants had to render personal service. Mr. Eyton exhibits numerous instances of beneficial hidation, shewing very extensive contrasts in the area of land denominated a hide. Cornwall was particularly favoured in this respect. The Manor of Heleston, held by Earl Harold in the time of King Edward, now by the King, is rated for six and half hides of ordinary Cornish *hidation*, but it covered an area of more than 30,000 acres of mixed lands which, according to the hidation of Dorset, was equal at the least to forty hides, and it paid gild in the time of King Edward for only two hides. Besides the hidation thus especially privileged there existed numerous other circumstances which disturbed the uniformity of the hides, from which it would appear that hides were originally regulated in the time of King Ethelred rather by intrinsic value than area. In other instances the hidation of manors would appear to have been greatly influenced by adventitious circumstances such as salubrity of climate, proximity to some great thoroughfare, or centre of trade, &c., and Mr. Eyton mentions the remarkable fact that in Dorset alone some hides are represented by at least 4000 statute acres, whilst others contain not more than eighty-four; observing, however, that the average for the whole country would give from 230 to 240 acres. Our author accounts for the hide having obtained the repute of being an areal measure by suggesting that the most important characteristic of a Dorset manor was its quota of plough-land, and that it came to pass that the specific hide of most manors appears in numerical conjunction with a single plough-gang, or in the words of the Dorset Domesday, a *terra ad unam carucam*, by which means the Dorset hide was brought into a sort of parallelism with the Dorset plough-land, and Domesday itself, he says, indicates that the word carucate implied much the same thing as the term hide, only that not having been converted into a hide, or made gildable, it remained in name a carucate. The typical carucate of Dorset, he adds, resembles the hide in that it contained a single plough-gang, combined with other territorial adjuncts; it differed from the hide in that its essence was nothing but land.

The plough-gang, or *terram ad unam carucam*, differed from the carucate as a part differs from its whole, and in the same manner did the plough-gang differ from the hide. In the Dorset Domesday where the number of ploughs (*caruce*) proper of any given manor was equal to, or in excess of, the number of hides there one great element in the value of such manor was its arable land, and conversely, where the number of (*caruce*) proper is found to be less than the reputed number of hides then the element of value which constituted the hide consisted of other advantages, such as mills, meadows, pastures, woods, &c.

To meet the necessities of an assessment based upon the hide in taxing estates of various value, less than a hide, it became essential to divide the hide into lesser denominations, and the terms used were so suggestive of areal measurements as to lead to, or strengthen, a misapprehension on the subject. These subdivisions were:

1 Hide = 4 Virgates = 16 Ferndels = 48 Acres.

1 Virgate = 4 Ferndels = 12 Acres.

1 Ferndel = 28 Acres.

In Dorset the gild-hide was divided into four virgates, and each virgate into twelve acres, but in Devon and Cornwall, where the gild-hide was, in many instances, of enormous extent it was necessary to introduce an intermediate denomination between the virgate and the acre, which was called a ferndel (farthing or fourth-ing), but none of these denominations were any more areal measures than was the hide. The *acræ ad gheldum*, as Mr. Eyton prefers to write it, was quite distinct from the measured, or Norman, acre used in stating the quantities of meadows, pastures and woods, which latter was simply the statute acre legalised afterwards by King Edward I., and continuing in use to the present time. This is proved by many examples extracted from the Domesday Book.

The term *carucate* Mr. Eyton considers a Norman term introduced at the Conquest, and, he supposes, was very nearly analogous to a Saxon hide; and he illustrates this conjecture by the fact that in the Fief of Strigoil (Chepstow), in Monmouthshire, which had never been conquered by the Saxons, the term hide is not used, and the *carucate* is expressly mentioned as a Norman measure (*L carucatas terræ, sicut fit in Normannia*). In the survey of Lincolnshire also the term hide is not used, and evidence is shewn that the *carucate* and the hide were corresponding quantities. But on the other hand the *terra ad unam carucata*, or plough-gang, was of a different character, and constituted very nearly, if not quite, an area of about 120 acres statute measure. The plough-gang also was subdivided. As the *caruca*, or full ox-team, consisted of eight oxen, so was the plough-gang divided into eight *bovates*, and the smallest quantity of arable land mentioned in the Dorset Domesday is two *bovates*, and this is not described as *Due bovata terræ* but *Terra ad duos boves*. This was a fourth part of a *Terra ad unam carucam*, and consisted of thirty acres.

The lineal measures by which the meadows, pastures, woodlands, and wilds, were described are more definite. This system of measurement, Mr. Eyton tells us, was that then in vogue, and the Norman Commissioners chose thereby to classify the result of their own investigations as distinct from information received by evidence of others. These measures, taking the *pertica* or *virga* at $16\frac{1}{2}$ feet, or $5\frac{1}{2}$ yards, is thus tabulated:

Table, p. 25.

16½ feet =	5½ yards =	1 virga or pertica.
66 feet =	22 yards =	4 perticæ = 1 acra.
660 feet =	220 yards =	40 perticæ = 10 acræ = 1 quarantina
7920 feet =	2640 yards =	480 perticæ = 120 acræ = 12 quarantinæ
	=	1 Leuua or Leuga or Leuca.

In consequence of the use made in Domesday of these lineal measures, it is very important to understand in what respects they differed from our

present conception of measures of length. This Mr. Eyton has clearly explained, shewing that instead of proceeding from the farling (four long) or quarantine, to the Norman league of twelve quarantines, we have adopted, as the next higher denomination, a *mile* consisting of eight quarantines, and above the English mile we have the higher denomination of a *league*, or three English miles, which is just double the Norman *leua* or *leuga*. Of the areal or superficial measures, he remarks that they must not be confounded with *square measures*, because the Domesday measures have usually unequal sides; and discarding the measures called *local*, he shews that the Domesday perch consisted of $5\frac{1}{2}$ yards, as subsequently confirmed by statute, and still remaining in use.

Table, p. 30.

TABLE OF AREAL MEASURES of the Dorset Domesday, the lineal perch perch or virga being taken at $16\frac{1}{2}$ feet or $5\frac{1}{2}$ yards.

$30\frac{1}{4}$ square yards =	1 "pertica" or square perch.
4840 square yards =	160 "perticae" = 1 areal acre.
48400 square yards =	1600 "perticae" = 10 areal acres = 1 square quarantine.
580800 square yards =	19200 "perticae" = 120 areal acres = 12 square quarantines = 1 areal league.

With this table the modern system corresponds in ratio, though using different denominations.

Having treated very fully and ably of the mensuration of Domesday, our author proceeds to describe the district surveyed—its Royal Forests, its woods, its pastures, its meadows, its vineyards, of which there were two, its gardens, its orchards, and its churches and church lands—shewing the application of the measurements before described, and the probable condition at the time of the survey of each class of land.

In writing of the Domesday agrarian population of Dorset he names the several classes in the order of their degrees of freedom, and shews the condition, respectively, of each class; leaning, we think, to a larger amount of freedom among the unfree than that which we had been accustomed to hold. He also shews the condition of the inhabitants of towns, the burgesses and the industrial classes, and treats of the farming stock, the values of lands and rents, &c., and brings before the reader a large array of illustrations, collected from Domesday itself, proving the theories he had advanced.

Having described the four Dorset Boroughs, and exhibited Tables of Dorset Landholders, with special notices of individuals, Mr. Eyton proceeds to treat of the lands held by the king, distinguishing the ancient demesnes of the crown from those which had fallen into his hands by escheat. The former were free from gild, but the latter, though held by the king, did not cease to be Hundredal and taxable. These chapters are particularly interesting and instructive. He compares the Inquisitio Gildi of 1084 with the Survey of 1086, and has appended very copious statistical tables, exhibiting the results of these enquiries.

Returning again to the question of statistics, it appears that the number of the adult male population of Dorset as deduced from the record of 1086, was about 9,000; whilst by the census of 1871, the total number of the whole male population of the county was 95,616. Assuming that 50,616 of these were children, the remaining 45,000 is only a five-fold

increase, or 500 per cent., in the period of 800 years. And Mr. Eyton points out that though in these eight centuries the increase of population has been 500 per cent, the same period has been marked by an increase of about 3,500 per cent. in the denominational price of corn and cereals; by an increase of about 6,000 per cent. in the denominational price of live stock; and by an increase of 24,000 per cent. in the denominational price, or rent, of land.

He estimates the average value of land in Dorset in 1086 as $1\frac{1}{2}$ d. per acre, and the present value as averaging £1 1s. 0d. per acre. He uses the term denominational advisedly, for as to real value there is a further question. The real value of a thing is the price for which it will sell, and the real value of money is the quantity of commodity a given amount will purchase. A shilling in 1086 would pay the rent of eleven and half acres of land, would suffice to purchase perhaps two store sheep, or a quarter of mixed corn. In one case it was as valuable as 240 shillings of our money, in other cases it would purchase as much produce as 35s. or 60s. But then arises the question. Why has land increased so much more in real as well as denominational value than the products of land in real value? In answer, Mr. Eyton states "that the increase in the value of land has been caused by forces about five times as great as those which have operated upon produce. One fifth only of such forces consists in the marketable increase per head, or per quarter, of land products. The remaining four-fifths of such forces consist in the circumstance that land has been brought to produce from four-fold to twenty-fold as much in bulk, or quantity, as it did at the date of Domesday."

One other subject demands a brief notice, viz., the parties by whom the Domesday territory of Dorset were held. Mr. Eyton has divided the whole area of the county into 265 parts, of which, he says, there will have belonged—

"To the King in demesne or by lapse, or escheat	nearly 36½ such parts
To the Bishop of Salisbury and other Ecclesiastical persons or bodies	102 such parts.
To Earls, Barons, and the greater Feudalists ...	98 such parts.
To the lesser Feudalists, or <i>Franci</i> , to the Kings' Thanes, to the Kings' Serjeants, to the four Boroughs of Dorset, and to a few unclassified land owners	about 28½ such parts,"

and he remarks that, "the great and marvellous feature in this disposition of the Dorset lands is, that the Church, with her vassals and dependents, enjoyed more than a third of the whole county, and that her patrimony was greater than that of all the barons and greater Feudalists combined."

OLD ENGLISH PLATE, Ecclesiastical, Decorative, and Domestic; its Makers and Marks, with improved Tables of the date-letters used in England, Scotland and Ireland, founded upon the Papers and Tables of C. Octavius S. Morgan, F.R.S., F.S.A. By WILFRED JOSEPH CRIPPS, M.A., Barrister at Law. London: John Murray, 1878.

Most of our readers will be well acquainted with the treatises on Assay marks, and with the valuable tables used at Goldsmith's Hall, London, by Mr. Octavius Morgan, printed in the *Journals* of the Institute for

1852 and 1853,¹ which, with the exception of a slender attempt made some years previously, was the first effort towards the identification of the date of Old English Plate. Soon afterwards, Mr. W. Chaffers published a work on the same subject, in which he not only improved Mr. Morgan's Tables by adding the forms of the shields in which the date-letters were placed, which Mr. Morgan had not thought it necessary to give, but appended also additional tables of marks used at the assay offices at Edinburgh, Dublin, and Exeter. These tables continued the standard authorities in the study of this very interesting subject until the publication of the very valuable work at the head of this notice, which greatly eclipses its predecessors. Mr. Cripps's work is based upon Mr. Morgan's tables, from which gentleman he has, in its preparation, received very valuable assistance, which in the fullest and most graceful terms he acknowledges. The Assay Tables in the work before us have been made more complete, and tables of the York, Norwich, and other local assay offices added; moreover, Mr. Cripps has appended very extensive tables of makers'-mark, which are very valuable to the student as enabling him, in many instances, not only to establish the year in which any particular piece of plate was made, but also to identify the master workman by whom it was manufactured.

It is not only with respect to the tables here alluded to that Mr. Cripps excels. He has made a very careful study of the whole subject of Old English plate, and his disquisitions on the various marks and the several classes of plate, will be read with much interest and profit. Unfortunately articles of such great intrinsic value, and so easily convertible, as plate, are specially liable to destruction, and consequently we have to lament the loss of most of the magnificent objects of art-workmanship and value with which the beaufets of our knights and nobles and our religious houses, as well as the altars of our churches, were in mediæval times enriched. Into the subject of these losses Mr. Cripps fully enters, especially with respect to the destruction of the ancient church plate in the sixteenth and subsequent centuries. Space will not permit us to enter upon this subject further than to remark that all the ancient chalices and patens known now to exist, may be counted on the fingers. There is a fine chalice and paten, silver gilt and enamelled, at Nettlecomb in Somerset, exhibited at the Institute and at the Society of Antiquaries, by Mr. Morgan in 1869, a description of which by him is published in the *Archæologia* (vol. xl, p. 405), beautifully illustrated of the full size in chromo-lithography. But there are no articles of antient domestic plate of greater beauty and interest than the old mazers. Being made chiefly of wood, usually taken from the knotted knarles of the maple and beautifully polished, though enriched with silver mountings, their intrinsic value did not afford so strong a temptation to their destruction as if they were wholly composed of the precious metal.

Many of the ancient mazers continue in existence of various sizes, some as much as a foot in diameter and some very small. They are all ornamented in much the same style, having a rim of silver which, rising above the edge of the bowl, increased its depth, underneath which was a band on which an inscription is usually engraved. Mr. Cripps has given illustration of several examples, but there are none finer or more

¹ Vols. ix and x.

Mazer at Oriel College, Oxford.

beautiful than one preserved at Oriel College, Oxford, of the date (circa 1470), which was given to the college by Bishop Carpenter about the time it was made. A beautiful woodcut of it was prepared by the late Mr. Albert Way, but in consequence of his lamented death it was never used until a cast of it was lent to Mr. Cripps for his valuable work, and it is now here introduced. It is eight inches in diameter and two and half inches in depth, and on the band around the rim is the following inscription in Gothic letters—

*Vir ratione bibas non quod petit atra voluptas
Sic caro casta datur his lingue suppedatur.*

PALGRAVE FAMILY MEMORIALS, edited by Charles John Palmer and Stephen Tucker (*Rouge Croix*), Norwich: Printed by Miller and Leavins. (For private distribution only.) 1878.

Family memorials, though of course chiefly of interest to the families immediately concerned, are of considerable general value when they are carefully and conscientiously prepared. This appears to be the case with the work before us. Indeed the name on the title page of one of the most active and able of our Officers of Arms is a sufficient guarantee that the genealogy and heraldry have been carefully scrutinized.

The genealogy of the several houses of this name are carefully traced. They do not all seem to have descended from the same ancestor, and it is only those experienced in the work who can conceive the difficulty in such circumstances of identifying those of the same name and fixing them in their proper places in the respective pedigrees. The editors in this case appear to have been successful in their labours. The genealogy is well supported by abstracts of wills, extracts from parish registers, &c. The most remarkable man of the family would appear to have been the late Sir Francis Palgrave, deputy keeper of the Public Records, and the learned historian of "The Rise and Progress of the English Commonwealth," the "History of Normandy and England," &c. His original name was Cohen, but, having married Elizabeth, one of the daughters of Dawson Turner by Mary Palgrave, daughter and one of the coheirs of William Palgrave, of Coltishall, he upon his marriage, in 1825, with the assent of William Palgrave, then the head of the family, by Royal license, took the name of Palgrave, and was granted a Coat of Arms.