

A monk who kept horses, hounds, &c., and frequently went hunting, had no choice but to acknowledge that any saying against hunting monks applied to him; nor could he deny the epithet "gownless" if he habitually appeared in fine clothes; but it is always open to a man to make a fair appearance in defending himself against being held reckless. The explanation given by Chaucer (l. 181) may fairly be taken as a parallel saying, conveying in substance the same reproach.

Chaucer tells us that on revising a transcription of his poems he found many errors. From this it follows that an uncorrected copy by a scribe inspired by the voice and presence of the poet was unreliable; and still more unreliable is that by a scribe with second-hand inspiration.

When one criticizes Chaucer, one is far from pretending to know more than the author; one does not even pretend to know more than the scribe, only more than is actually set forth in the writing.

With regard to what might be said of one who amended an author whose language he did not know how to pronounce, nothing more could be said against him than that his emendations were wrong. Anything more would be a mere *argumentum ad hominem*, that would recoil on the head of him who used it, showing him to be one who questioned the truth of the saying, "The proof of the pudding is in the eating, not in the knowledge or reputation of the cook." A. C. W.

INSTALLATION OF A MIDWIFE (9th S. v. 475; vi. 9, 177, 274, 336, 438).—The Act 3 Henry VIII. (1511) decided that no person should exercise or occupy as a physician or surgeon in London, or within seven miles, unless he were first examined or approved by the Bishop of London or the Dean of St. Paul's, who was to be assisted in the examination by four doctors of physic and by persons expert in the art of surgery—further, that no person not so approved should practise within any diocese of England unless he had been examined and approved by the bishop of the diocese, assisted by such expert persons as the bishop might, in his discretion, think fit. Letters testimonial under the bishop's seal were to be granted to the approved persons, and any one occupying contrary to the Act incurred a forfeiture of 5*l.* a month.

According to this Act, it appears that the archbishops and bishops and the Dean of St. Paul's constituted the only authorities who could grant licences to persons to practise physic and chirurgery in England. The Privy Council, although not named in the

Act, certainly possessed the same power. It granted a licence to Adrian [*sic*] Colman, widow, to practise physic in Norwich in 1596.

Midwives were in those days licensed by the same authorities. This was an absolute necessity, inasmuch as, if there was any danger of the child dying before a priest could be summoned, the midwife was bound to baptize it. It was therefore necessary that the midwife should be not only licensed, but also endowed with authority to perform so sacred a rite as that of baptism. Consequently, before the licence was granted, an oath containing fifteen items was solemnly administered to her. She was to use "pure and clear water only, and not any rose or damask water, or water made of any confection." The Norwich Diocese Book from 1770 to 1786 contains a record of licences given to thirty persons "to perform the office, business, and functions of a midwife," to three persons (two of whom were females) to practise as surgeons, and to two others to practise phlebotomy. No licence was granted after 1786. In the Archbishop of York's injunctions to his clergy curates were enjoined "to instruct midwives openly in the church in the very words and form of baptism, to the intent that they may use them and none other." The register of Hanwell records a singular mistake which occurred at a baptism of this kind:—

"Thomas, son of Thomas Messenger and Elizabeth his wife, was born and baptized October 24th, 1731, by the midwife at the Font, called a boy, and named by the godfather Thomas, but proved a girl."

From the table of fees in the Consignation Book, Norwich, 1706, it appears that licences to practise physic, chirurgery, or midwifery were generally one shilling each, sometimes two shillings: Cecily Dey, of Marlingford, paid two shillings for a licence to practise chirurgery, and Rachel Pank, of Swanton Abbot, one shilling and sixpence for a midwife's licence.

Licences were granted at the bishop's visitations, and those which were in force had to be exhibited and a fee paid. Those who refused to appear were proceeded against in the spiritual courts. Any person who presumed to practise without a licence was fined 5*l.* a month, one half of which went to the king and the other half to the informer. An example of a midwife's licence:—

"Philip [Yonge, 1761–1783], by Divine permission Bishop of Norwich, to our beloved in Christ, Sarah the wife of Jonathan Tomlinson, of Walsoken in the county of Norfolk, within our Diocese and jurisdiction, sendeth greeting. Whereas we understand by good testimony and credible certificate

that you are able and well qualified to perform the office, business, and functions of a midwife, as also that you are a person of good life and conversation, and a member of the church of England, we therefore,—as much as in us lies and as far as by law we may or can,—do admit, authorize and empower you to use and exercise the said office, &c., of a midwife in and throughout our Diocese of Norwich, with the best diligence you may or can, indifferently to poor and rich, and also to perform and accomplish all things about the same according to your oath thereupon made and given upon the Holy Evangelists, as far as God will give you grace.”

A bishop had no power to grant licences to persons not residing in his diocese. The archbishops could license in any diocese within their provinces.

CHARLES WILLIAMS, F.R.C.S.E.

Norwich.

P.S.—It is necessary to remember that the Gild of Barber-Surgeons was simply a society, fraternity, or company; it had no power whatever to grant licences to any person to practise medicine or surgery, nor could it give permission to any licensed person to practise in London or any other city. In Norwich, as elsewhere, the permission was given by the mayor and council. I will cite an example taken from the Assembly Books of the Corporation of Norwich:—

“17 Oct., 1677. Christopher Gornal of St. Martin in ye Fields hath leave to practise physick and chirurgery in his chamber in ys [this] city until further order, he having produced ye lycence of the Right Rev. Father in God, ye Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.”

‘GO TO THE DEVIL AND SHAKE YOURSELF’ (9th S. vi. 469).—The following extract from vol. i. of ‘The Cheshire Sheaf’ (pp. 86-7) may interest your correspondent:—

“In 1803, during the warlike excitement that then prevailed, Chester raised a large and efficient regiment of Volunteers, 1,300 strong, with Col. Roger Barnston for its popular Commandant. The regiment used to be marched after each parade to the Colonel’s house in Foregate Street, in the circular area in front of which they were formally disbanded, and where also the Colours, the present home of which we are unable to give, were presented to the Volunteers by the lady of their Colonel in March, 1804. One day as they were returning up Watergate Street from their usual parade on the Roodee, Bishop Majendie’s carriage, with his lordship therein, drove down Northgate Street; turning abruptly at the Cross, so as to get between the band and the grenadier company of the regiment; and so proceeded along Eastgate Street to the entrance to the Colonel’s house. Just as the Bishop’s carriage got into this position, the band struck up a new tune, ‘Go to the devil and shake yourself,’ which they continued to play in a most vigorous style! The accidental humour thus occasioned immensely tickled the martial crowd, who cheered hilariously, to the no small chagrin of the

Bishop, whose always imperturbable face looked more than ever rigid and impassive, as he found himself the unwelcome centre of this sudden popular mirth.”

This, the description of an eye-witness, was written by the late Mr. Samuel Johnson Roberts, formerly a leading solicitor in Chester city and father of Mr. Russell Roberts, the well-known Chancery barrister.

Henry William Majendie was nominated as twenty-fifth Bishop of Chester on 24 May, 1800, and consecrated on 14 June. He was translated to Bangor in 1810.

T. CANN HUGHES, M.A.

Lancaster.

Since writing I have found this old jig is still published in Boosey’s ‘Musical Cabinet—Dance Series,’ No. 65, p. 20, No. 46. I was specially interested in finding it in Crabbe’s ‘Convert,’ Tale xix., because of an amusing incident connected with it and the Duke of Buckingham, about 1795, which is told in ‘The Records of the Corrie Family,’ part ii. p. 34, in which the authoress says that the tune is mentioned in the biography of Harriet Beecher Stowe, who states that she and her brothers and sisters used to dance to the old tune during their merry evenings at home together.

M. B. WYNNE.

Allington Rectory, Grantham.

When Sir Godfrey Webster contested Chichester as a Radical in 1826, the special tune played by his band was

Go to the devil and shake [shave?] yourself,  
And when you come back behave yourself.

So, at least, I was told many years ago by an old fellow who had played the bassoon in that band.

E. E. STREET.

Chichester.

PITCHED BATTLE (9th S. vi. 286, 497).—When the history of the verb *to pitch* is worked out, I think it will be found that the reference is to the choosing of the ground and the pitching of the tents beforehand, as indicated in ‘H.E.D.’ Shakespeare has *pitched battle*, and also *pitched field*, and speaks of pitching tents, pavilions, and stakes. In Middle English I can find no mention of pitched battle. The corresponding phrase is “in pleyn battayle,” as in Chaucer, ‘C. T.’, 988. But Stratmann shows that Robert of Gloucester speaks of the pitching of stakes and of tents, ed. Hearne, pp. 51, 203.

The ‘Century Dictionary’ refers us to Sir Philip Sidney’s ‘Apology for Poetry,’ where we may find the phrase “a pitched field.” No reference is given, but see Arber’s ed., p. 64.

WALTER W. SKEAT.