

SUPPLEMENT [633

TO VOLUME LXXXIII. PART II.

Embellished with a beautiful Perspective View of **WHITBY ABBEY CHURCH**; and with a curious Brass Plate Representation of **WILLIAM Prince of ORANGE**, afterwards King **WILLIAM III.**

Mr. URBAN, March 30.
I SEND you a drawing of the East end of Whitby Abbey Church, Yorkshire, the most perfect part remaining of this once magnificent structure. It is in a fine style of Architecture, and not unlike the East front of Rievaulx Abbey*. Much is left standing of this venerable ruin. With my View (See the *Frontispiece to this Volume*) you will receive an account of the Abbey, which I hope will be acceptable.

J. C. BUCKLER.

The Abbey of Whitby, formerly Streanshal, ranks among the most early Monastic foundations in the kingdom. It owed its rise to Oswy, King of Northumberland, A. D. 657, on a victory obtained over Penda, the Saxon, but unconverted king of Mercia. Oswy placed the new Monastery under the care of his niece, Hilda, who became the first Abbess, and is highly praised by Bede for her learning, charity, and devotion. As Hilda had been educated under Aidan, bishop of Lindisfarne, who was himself bred at Iona, she zealously espoused the tenets of the Scotch and British Clergy, on the time of celebrating the festival of Easter. And a Synod was assembled at Streanshal, so early as A. D. 664, before Oswy and his Queen Eanfleda, a Kentish princess, who supported the Romanists; in which Wilfrid, then preceptor to the Prince, and Abbot of Ripon, prevailed in favour of the Roman ritual.

The dimensions of the Monastery of Streanshal, as given by Charlton (*History of Whitby*, p. 22.) apparently from Bede, far exceed the usual size of any churches in that age; and as such deserve the notice of Antiquaries.

The Abbey is described as being 100 yards in length; i. e. the East part 36 yards; the West part 49; the

breadth of the choir or cross part, probably of the transept, 15 yards; total, 100. The length of the choir or cross part, or of the transept, 50 yards; breadth of the nave within, including the cloisters, meaning probably the side aisles, 23 yards; height of the nave, 20 yards, of the tower, 35. These in many parts exceed the dimensions of the present structure.

It is certain the place was held in high estimation by the Northumbrian kings: as Edwin the first Christian Monarch had founded, and was buried in, St. Peter's Church at Streanshal, A. D. 633; Oswy also, and Eanfleda; and Edbert, king of Northumberland, A. D. 736, who retired to, and died at Streanshal.

A. D. 867. The Danes, under their prince Hungar, or Inguar, landed near Whitby, and entirely destroyed the Monastery, and laid waste the country. It appears to have remained in this state of desolation for two hundred years, to the time of the Conquest. At that period, A. D. 1066, these domains were the property of the Saxon Earl, Gospatric, who, after the decisive battle of Hastings, retired into Scotland. Whitby, *inter alia*, was soon bestowed by the Conqueror on his nephew, Hugh Lupus, Earl of Chester, who built two seats, Saeton and Hackness, in its neighbourhood. Yet this Earl of Chester soon disposed of his domains here to William de Percy, the first of that family, who, with his brother Serlo, came over with the Conqueror, and married Emma de Port, the daughter of Gospatric.

A. D. 1074. William de Percy re-founded the Monastery, dedicating it to St. Peter and St. Hilda, for Benedictine Monks; Reinold, a Benedictine Monk from Evesham, being the first Prior. To him succeeded Serlo de Percy, the brother of the founder; who died A. D. 1102, and was followed by his nephew, William de Percy,

* See this engraved in our Magazine for Feb. 1812, vol. LXXXII. p. 105.

when the Monastery was raised to the dignity of an Abbey. And in his time, or in the reign of Henry I. the present structure, which is a perfect specimen of the lancet-shaped Gothic, seems by the style of building to have been erected. The first W. de Percy died in Palestine, and was buried near Jerusalem; but Whitby continued till the year 1200, the usual burial-place of the Percy family.

The dimensions of this Abbey, as given by Grose, are, length 252 feet, breadth 56, nave 30, aisles 13 each. Walls in height 60 feet, tower 104.

At the dissolution of the Monasteries, the revenues in Dugdale are 437*l.* 2*s.* 9*d.* in Speed 505*l.* 9*s.* 1*d.*

Immediately after the surrender of the last Abbot, Henry de Vall, A. D. 1541, the Abbey lands at Whitby were let on a lease of 21 years, to Richard Cholmley, Esq. of Kinthorp, near Pickering, in Yorkshire. This R. Cholmley distinguished himself in an expedition under Lord Edward Seymour, on the coast of Scotland, A. D. 1544, in which Leith and Edinburgh were sacked and burnt; was knighted by that general; and the year after his return purchased for 333*l.* a large share of lands at Whitby.

The Manor, however, appears to have been granted by Edward VI. in A. D. 1550, to John Earl of Warwick, who alienated to Sir John Yorke in A. D. 1551; and he sold to Sir Richard Cholmley, knight, July 2, 1555; in the possession of whose family it yet continues.

The situation of this Abbey is on a lofty cliff, which commands a very extensive view of the German Ocean. The ruins have hence been always exposed in an unusual degree to the power of the wind; and Dec. 2, 1763, a violent storm overset the whole West part of the Church to the very foundation, though supported by above twenty strong Gothic Pillars and Arches. The ruins of this Abbey, from their elevated situation, upon a high cliff, are a useful sea-mark on a dangerous and rocky coast.

Mr. URBAN, Dec. 7.

THE following strictures on your volume for the current year, now hastening to its close, solicit the indulgence of your intelligent readers.

Part I. p. 10. In the "Remarks on the English Liturgy," most of

them, as seems to me, hypercritical rather than just or important, there is one mistake. "In the Nicene Creed," your Correspondent says, "our Translators omit the word *holy*, and supply the ellipsis by 'I believe in';" whereas the Creed exhibits the clause precisely as your Correspondent "thinks it would have been better," without the *in*. Bishop Pearson, however, justly observes, that the sense either way "is the same; nor does the particle *in* added or subtracted make any difference?" "I believe *in* one Catholic and Apostolic Church" is, "I believe *in* the existence of such a Church;" and "I believe one Catholic and Apostolic Church" is, "I believe *that* there is such a Church."

The "strong proof of the spuriousness of 1 John v. 7." which this Correspondent alleges, is merely negative: "Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople, about the Eighth Century, quotes the passage, without quoting the controverted clause of the Three Heavenly witnesses." Granted; but you must grant also, that Tertulian, in the Second Century, plainly alludes to this clause; and Cyprian, in the Third Century, twice quotes it.

Your pages, Mr. Urban, have often given cogent reasons to induce a belief, that this heavenly testimony is a genuine part of St. John's Epistle. I content myself with referring to an unanswered, and I think unanswerable letter on the subject, in *Gen. Mag.* 1798. vol. LXVIII. pages 208—216.

Page 15. b. The excellently learned and judicious Mr. Mede has offered some good reasons, in support of the opinion, that some of the last chapters of the book of Zechariah were written by Jeremiah. See his Works, p. 833.

Page 104. b. Your Correspondent N. is intitled to the thanks of the Clergy for his good wishes; but in matters of doubtful propriety, such as those to which he adverts, discretion and the circumstances of the case are the best guides; and nine times out of ten the "notice," or "courtesy," which N. recommends, would, as seems to me, be painful intrusion upon the sacredness of sorrow.

Page 105. Another view of Harlech Castle was given in your volume for 1800, p. 423; and the Seal of the Castle, in 1803, p. 910.

Page 111. W. M. asks, "What is there

there in the regular course of Nature to prevent the drowning of the earth?" What there may be in "Nature" to cause or to prevent inundation, I presume not to say; but there is a promise of the Author of Nature (Gen. ix. 11.) which will infallibly "prevent the drowning of the earth;" and in all contingencies, which are beyond the reach of human controul, such as whether the Lakes of Cumberland will "in three years" or "in two or three thousand years be all flat meadows," the faithful Patriarch's maxim, *Deus providebit* (Gen. xxii. 14.) is worthy of every wise man's adoption.

Page 214. The passage which A. H. quotes from Mrs. H. More, whose work on Christian Morals I have not read, he probably mistakes; but, however that may be, there seems to be a strange confusion in his own notions. That the soul subsists after death in a state of consciousness, and consequently in a state of happiness or misery, and that, at the resurrection in the last day, the righteous shall "have perfect consummation and bliss, both in *body* and *soul*," in heaven, are things perfectly distinct, and easy to be apprehended and believed; and we "cling" to the former as well as to the latter part of this "doctrine," not "because we think it shortens the long interval otherwise to be passed in the silent grave," but, because both parts of the doctrine are, as we conceive, clearly taught in holy Scripture, and have constantly been believed by the Christian Church, as they were before also by the Jewish Church.

With regard to the intermediate or "middle state of happiness or misery" as Bishop Bull calls it in a sermon on the subject, A. R. (p. 312. b.) has anticipated me in referring to several passages of the New Testament, which clearly prove the certainty of it. In particular, when St. Paul says, We are "willing rather to be *absent from the body*, and to be *present with the Lord*," (2 Cor. v. 8.) the words can, in appearance, admit no other sense; nor should it be forgotten, that this Apostle had been honoured with *personal proof* (if we may so speak) of this state; for "above fourteen years" before he addressed this Epistle to the Corinthians, he was caught up, as he assures us, not only "to the third heaven," the region of

supreme and final beatitude, but likewise "into paradise;" and even here, in this abode of intermediate consolation, he "heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful," or rather, as the margin has it, "not possible, for a man to utter." 2 Cor. xii. 2, 4. And this suggests an answer to Investigator's question (Part II. 108. b.) "What is the precise state of the soul in that solemn interval?" The answer is, "We cannot tell; God knoweth." St. Paul, who had witnessed that state, declares, in most emphatic language, that "to depart" from the body, "and to be with Christ, is *far better*." *πολλυ μωλλος κερυσσον*, Phil. i. 23; but concerning the nature of the state he says not a word, further than to assure us, that it is impossible to describe it. Meantime of this we may be certain, that the true modesty of this great Apostle would never have stated the doubt, whether these things were exhibited to him "in the body, or *out of the body*," if it was not possible, and a part of the divine purposes respecting man, that the soul should exist "out of the body," retaining its full powers of perception.

In respect to our Lord's promise to the penitent thief, Luke xxiii. 43. J. P. (p. 682. n.) certainly is at liberty, if he pleases, to alter the punctuation, and extort from the words a sense, which is frigid to the very edge of fatuity; but he must not say, others are "not correct," who adhere to the common construction and more obvious and important meaning, as, I will venture to predict, ninety-nine in a hundred always will do, while common sense maintains its empire in the world.

R. C.

Mr. URBAN, NOV. 10.

I OBSERVED in p. 137, a Review of Southey's "Life of Lord Nelson." The article, though very brief, is so introduced, as clearly to convey your approbation of it, I have not yet had an opportunity of perusing these volumes, from which I anticipate both amusement and benefit; and therefore, in the remarks I intend to offer, I rely upon the accuracy of your quotations. I have too high an opinion of your candour and liberality to suppose that you will refuse me a place in your respectable Miscellany, merely on the ground of my opinion being

being at variance with yours, if my observations shall be found in other respects unobjectionable.

As the errors of celebrated men are calculated to do more injury than those of writers of inferior repute, the detection of them becomes a matter of so much greater importance; and it is principally on that account, as well as to endeavour to do justice to a deceased commander, that I presume to obtrude myself upon your notice, by pointing out a statement of Mr. Southey's, that appears to me to be the result either of an imperfect or a mistaken view of the subject.

In summing up the account of the events that took place at the close of the action off Trafalgar, Mr. Southey makes use of the following words: "Unhappily the fleet did not anchor, as Nelson almost with his dying breath had enjoined." Now, Sir, from the manner in which this is expressed, there is, in my mind, a manifest insinuation thrown out, if not a positive charge brought, against the conduct of the late Lord Collingwood. As far as I can understand it, Mr. Southey leaves every reader to infer, that had the dying injunctions of Nelson been followed up, the subsequent disasters that befel the captured ships might not or would not have happened, and consequently the not anchoring the fleet must attract censure to the individual who had the directing of its movements after the battle.

I should be sorry to allege positively that Mr. Southey had any intention, when he wrote this sentence, to cast such a stigma on the memory of the brave Companion and Successor of Nelson: I merely state the impression which it made upon me, and the interpretation to which it is liable, and which perhaps many will be disposed to put upon it.

Let us then attend for a moment to what would seem to be the facts of the case. Lord Collingwood's dispatch of the 22nd October, 1805, giving a description of the battle, contains these words: "The whole fleet was in a perilous situation, many dismasted, all shattered, in thirteen fathom water off the shoals of Trafalgar; and when I made signal to prepare for anchor, few of the ships had an anchor to let go, their cables being shot." In addition to this, let it be remembered, that the

blowing directly into the Bay of Cadix. Here, Sir, we have the declaration of the Admiral, that every effort was made, that could be made, to comply with Nelson's last orders. Nelson, at the time he gave the order, could not be acquainted with the condition of the ships and their cables, because the signal had not then been made. His order for the anchoring of the fleet was issued under the belief that the cables were in a serviceable state. But, Sir, can it be fairly urged as matter of accusation or insinuation against Lord Collingwood, that he did not anchor, when it had been ascertained that they were unserviceable? Admitting, however, for the sake of argument, that not a thread of any cable in the fleet was touched, is Mr. Southey so much or so little of a seaman, as to make no allowance for change of circumstances after Nelson fell? Concedes he nothing to that discretionary power, the exercise of which was to be called forth, and to be varied, according to the emergency of the moment? What might have been highly judicious and necessary before Nelson breathed his last, and while the weather was yet calm, might (I speak under correction) be very much the reverse some hours afterwards, with a gale of wind on an Enemy's shore, night coming on, a heavy sea setting in, the ships disabled, and consequently incapable of working off had they been driven any closer to a lee shore. Lord Collingwood, it is true, says that "the wind shifted a few points, and drifted the ships off the land, except four of the captured dismasted ships, which are now at anchor, and I hope will ride safe till these gales are over." But he goes on afterwards, in his dispatch of the 24th, to say that, "since the 22nd, I have had a continued series of misfortunes; but they are of a kind that human prudence could not possibly provide against, or my skill prevent." And again, "Many of the ships, taking advantage in the dark and boisterous night, got before the wind, and have perhaps drifted upon the shore and sunk. The remnant of the combined fleet, ten sail of ships, stood up to leeward of my shattered and straggled charge, as if meaning to attack them, which obliged me to collect a force, and form to leeward, for their defence; all this retarded the progress of the hulks, and the bad weather

weather continuing, determined me to destroy all the leewardmost that could be cleared of the men." Hence it would appear that several at least had not been yet cleared of the prisoners, and consequently the danger of their again falling into the hands of the Enemy must have been imminent in the extreme.

In his letter of the 28th October, the following passage occurs:

"Since my letter of the 24th, our situation has been most critical, and our employment the most arduous that ever a fleet was engaged in. On the 24th and 25th, it blew a most violent gale of wind, which completely dispersed the ships, and drove the captured hulls in all directions. I have since been employed in collecting and destroying them *where they are at anchor*, upon the coast between Cadiz and six leagues Westward of St. Lucar, without the prospect of saving one to bring into port."

The dispatch of the 4th November describes the weather as "continuing very bad, the wind blowing from South-west, the squadron not in a situation of safety, seeing little prospect of getting the captured ships off the land, and great risk of some of them getting into port." Again, "The *Rayo*, dismasted, fell into our hands, *parted her cable*, went ashore, and was wrecked. The *Santa Anna* and *Algeziras*, being driven near the shore of Cadiz, got such assistance as has enabled them to get in:" and so on.

From all this, I trust, Mr. Urban, it has been shown that, in the first instance, the British fleet could not anchor immediately after the action; nor can I, with the little nautical skill I possess, comprehend, even if the fleet had anchored, that any more of the captured ships could have been saved. As it was, our fleet had enough to do to save itself from destruction. Every seaman will easily appreciate the extreme peril that attends the anchoring of a ship on a lee shore, exposed to the whole fetch of the Atlantic, during a violent gale of wind. One of the captured ships that *did* anchor went ashore, others got into the Enemy's port, and the rest ran great risk of following them. It may, at least, be presumed, that Collingwood was as anxious as any one to preserve as many trophies as possible of the victory that he had so ably contributed to achieve. From the 21st of October, till the 4th November, did

he and his Captains use every endeavour of British seamanship to save them. At last, after witnessing the hopeless nature of all his attempts to bring off the captured ships, and probably seeing his own ships in hazard, he reluctantly adopted the painful but necessary expedient of destroying the former, rather than that they should become again the property of those from whom they had been so dearly won. From the most attentive consideration that I could bestow on the subject, I have not been able to find that the four ships ultimately saved were any of those that anchored at first; but were brought out, I believe, by some of our fresh ships, after incredible difficulty and exertion.

It is matter of regret, therefore, that a point of such importance to the reputation of a deceased Warrior, who, according to the general belief, deserved well of his Country, should not have been permitted to rest upon the broad basis of those facts that were already before the publick, rather than upon an Author's notions or opinions, unsupported, as they are, by even the shadow of evidence. If Mr. Southey be of opinion, or can prove, that Lord Collingwood was guilty of misconduct in the management of the fleet after the action, it is incumbent on him to produce either his reasons or his testimony. He has advanced what may become matter of subsequent history, and it is proper that it should be incontrovertibly established. Now, therefore, is the time for Mr. Southey to substantiate, by proof, his implied allegation against Lord Collingwood; and he is called upon, in strict justice to the memory of the individual whom his insinuation goes to asperse, as well as of him whose heroic exploits are the subject of his eulogy, to produce other authority than his own bare assertion, however respectable every one will admit that to be. Besides, he ought to know, as well if not better than any man, that to exalt his Hero by derogating from the professional character of one of his companions in arms, is to confer on him a species of fame, which Nelson, if alive, would have disowned. His magnanimous soul would have suffered the lustre of his reputation even to be obscured for a moment, sooner than have borrowed a meretricious glare from the mistakes or the misfortunes of any of his brethren.

I may also add, that whatever may be the private opinion of individuals who were present in the ever-glorious and memorable fight of Trafalgar, and during the fortnight that succeeded it, the present is, as far as I know, the first public attempt to call in question the conduct of Lord Collingwood on that occasion. With regard to his merits or demerits during this or any other period of his naval career, I by no means profess to decide; but I cannot help remarking, that up to the 21st Oct. 1805, he had enjoyed the confidence and esteem of Nelson. For four years thereafter, he was continued, with the approbation of the Country, in the command of the Mediterranean fleet. Four years have now elapsed since he died on a foreign station; and yet, I believe, the breath of public reproach or suspicion has till now never tainted his memory. Had his mismanagement been the cause of the loss of no less than fourteen or fifteen captured ships of the line, is the Nation so dead to a sense of its injuries, as to have suffered him to escape; at a moment too, when its sensibilities were so keenly awakened by the death of his great Predecessor, and when every circumstance conspired to aggravate the contrast between them? Would successive and opposite Administrations have endured that the man should remain for years in the command of such a fleet, who had been the means of depriving the Nation of the fruits of the greatest victory that ever adorned its Naval annals?

It can hardly be urged, that Lord Collingwood was gifted with the happy talent of conciliating those who served under him, to such a degree, as to induce them to stifle their surmises and accusations, had there been sufficient grounds for bringing them forward. But admitting that he was so endowed, and that his officers, out of respect to his private feelings, had compromised the interests and honour of their Country (a supposition too absurd and extravagant) by keeping secret his delinquency, and hesitating to bring him to trial; his death, Sir, long since removed every restraint of this kind; and, although they are now unable to cite him before a Court Martial, his voice could not be heard from the grave against their just denunciations, if they had thought

him deserving of them. Is it then kind, is it generous, is it just, without deigning to assign any reason, to disturb the manes of these honoured Heroes, to set in hostile array against each other two gallant Spirits, who, whilst they inhabited mortality, knew no rivalry, no jealousy, but what arose from the pure, and noble, and honourable emulation of adding to their Country's greatness, and extending her power and her glory? But, Sir, this is foreign to the purpose. The honest, hardly but well-earned fame of Lord Collingwood is established upon too solid and lasting a foundation to require any feeble aid of mine to support it.

I proceed, in the next place, to mention, that Mr. Southey, in his peroration (if I may so speak), says, that "Vice-Admiral Alava died of his wounds." It is, no doubt, true that Lord Collingwood in his dispatch of the 24th Oct. states, that "Vice-Admiral Don Alava is dead." But it is no less true, that in his letter of the 28th, he expresses himself thus: "By my correspondence with the Marquess Solana, I found that Vice-Admiral d'Alava was *not* dead, but dangerously wounded; and I wrote him a letter claiming him as a prisoner of war." And, if my recollection, Mr. Urban, does not very much fail me, Alava has been alive since the breaking out of the Spanish Revolution, was alive when Mr. Southey wrote his *Life of Nelson*, and, for aught that I know to the contrary, is alive at this present moment. In the same concluding paragraph, the Biographer of Nelson tells us, that "one ship effected its escape into Cadiz." Now, Sir, I find, on examining Lord Collingwood's dispatches, what has already appeared in this paper, namely, that *two ships*, "the *Santa Anna* and *Algeziras*, being driven near the shore, got such assistance as enabled them to get in" (to Cadiz). These two latter points, I acknowledge, are of very subordinate interest, and the taking notice of them may, perhaps, savour a little of hypercriticism. Yet, trifling as they are, they are still errors, and errors too that ought not and could not have been committed, if the least attention had been observed in inspecting Lord Collingwood's dispatches in the *London Gazette*; for there the whole facts are detailed

detained in plain terms beyond the possibility of doubt or misconception. These inaccuracies, however, though probably in themselves of trivial import, have, nevertheless, served to generate in my mind a sort of belief or conjecture that Mr. Southey has either never examined these dispatches, or, if he has, it has been done with a degree of carelessness almost unpardonable, and certainly unjustifiable, in a work of which correctness ought to be a primary and distinguished feature. Least of all, I apprehend, has he read them with the anxious wish to discover in them any vindication of Lord Collingwood from the account which he has himself given of the most trying and difficult transactions, in which he, or perhaps any other man, was ever engaged.

Yours, &c. A LAND-LUBBER.

ON ARMORIES. NO. IV.

(Continued from our last Supplement, Part I. 1813. p. 607.)

FOR Augmentations, some were of mere grace, some of merit. *Richard* the Second, choosing *St. Edward* the Confessor to be his patron, empale his coat with the arms of England; and of his mere grace granted* to *Thomas* Duke of Surrey to empale likewise the same *Saint Edward's* armes in a Border Ermine with his owne, and to *Thomas Howbray* Duke of Norfolk, the same holy King's armes intirely: notwithstanding *Henry Howard*, Earle of Surrey, lineally descended from him, was attained, among other pretences, for so bearing the same. The said King *Richard* also granted to his favorite *Robert Vere*, Earle of Oxford, and Duke of Ireland, that he should beare during his life Azure, 3 Crownes Or with a border *Argent*. In like manner and respect, to omit many; King *Henry* the Eight granted to the familie of *Manours*, now Earles of

Rutland, the *Flowre-de-lys*, and *Lyons* which he beareth in chiefe, for that they descended from a sister of King *Edward* the Fourth. He honoured his second wife, *Queene Anne Bolton*, with three coates; his third wife, *Queene Jane*, with one; *Katherine Howard*, his fifth wife, with two; his last wife, *Katherine Parr*, with one, by way of Augmentation.

For Merit, he granted to *Thomas Howard*, Duke of Norfolk, and his posterity, for his victory at *Floddenfield*, wherein King *James* the Fourth of Scotland was slaine, a demy *Lyon Geules*, pierced through the mouth with an arrow, within a double treasure foured of the same, in the midst of the bend of the *Howard's* armes. And about the same time he rewarded *Sir John Clerk* †, of [Hitcham] *Buckinghamshire*, who did take the Duke of *Longuile* at the battail of *Spurres*, with a Canton *Azure*, therein a demy *Ramme* salient *Argent*, two *Flour-de-lys Or* in chief; over all a Batton truncked, in the sinister point of his owne armes; for that no Christian may beare entirely the armes of a Christian, whom he taketh in warre. In like manner *Ferdinand*, King of Spaine, honoured *Sir Henry Guilford* with a Canton of *Granado*; and *Charles* the Fifth, *Peter Bead* of *Grimingham*, with a Canton of *Barbarie*, for his service at *Tunis*.

An *Inschocheon* of armes may have place amongst Augmentations, which is the armes of a wife being an heir generall, inserted in the centre or middle of her husband's coates after he hath issue by her, to manifest the apparent right of her inheritance transmissible to his and her issue. Otherwise, if she be not an heire, hee may but onely impale it with his owne ‡.

Crests being the ornaments set on the eminent toppe of the *Healme*, and called *Tymbres* by the French, I know not why, were used anciently to terrifie the enemy §, and therefore were

* Pat. 9 Ric. II.

† This *Sir John Clerk* took the Duke of *Langueille* prisoner at *Bomy* by *Tirwin*, 16 August, 5 Henry VIII. The arms above mentioned appear on his monument at *Tame*, in *Oxfordshire*.

‡ See *Guillim's Heraldry*, pp. 27, 28.

§ We are told by *Herodotus* (*Clio*), that the *Carians* first used the crest, and from thence it was called *Καρικὸν ἄλφορ*. It seems doubtful for what purpose the crest was designed, whether as an ornament to the helmet, or to strike terror and amazement into the enemy. We sometimes find the helmets of warriors enriched with gold, and adorned with divers sorts of paint, representing some noble exploit of their ancestors, or of themselves, or blessings received from the Gods; at other times,

strange devices or figures of terrible shapes, as that monstrous horrible *Chimera* outbreathing flames upon *Turnus*'s helm in *Virgil*:

Cui triplici crinita juba galea alta Chimera
Sustinet Ætnæos efflantem naribus ignem.

Of which sort many might be remembered, but when as *Papirius* said of the Samnites' Crests, when he encouraged his souldiers against them, *Cristæ vulnera non faciunt*: milder were used, as the *Corvus*, or Raven, by the family of *Corvinus*, for that while he fought against his enemy, a Raven perched upon his helm, and so seconded him with his beak and fluttering wings, that he gained the victory; whereupon he assumed both his surname and his crest, as *Silius Italicus* thus remembreth:

————— Nomenque superbum
Corvinus, Phœbea sedet cui casside fulva,
Ostentans ales proavite insignia pugnæ.
And by this verse of the same Poet:
Casside cornigerâ dependens insula.—

We learn that horns* were in use upon helmets for crests, and that a riband depended from the helmet, as mantles are painted now.

The first Christians used no other blazon in their shields then the name of Christ, and a cross for their crest, whereupon *Prudentius*:

————— Clypeorum insignia Christus
Scripserat, ardebat summis crux addita
cristis.

† Many yeares were these crests arbitrary, taken up at every man's pleasure, after they began to be hereditary, and appropriated to families. Here in England first, as I have hitherto observed, about the time of King *Edward* the Second. Of what esteeme crests were in the time of King *Edward* the Third, may appear by record in the 13th yeare of his reign, when the said king gave an eagle ‡, which he himself had formerly borne, for a crest to *William Montacute*, Earle of *Salisbury*; he also gave to him the manors of *Woodton*, *Frome*, *Whitfield*, *Mershwood*, *Worth*,

times we see them crowned with three or four plumes of horse's hair, or with the image of some frightful monster. The first seems to have been intended to excite admiration in their friends; the latter to excite terror in their enemies: whence that of *Homer*:

————— "Ὅσσι δ' ἄμυρδον

Ἀυχὴν χαλκῆν.

Iliad A.

Κρατὶ δ' ἐπ' ἰφθίμῳ κνήμῳ ἔλυκλον ἴθκειν

"Ἰπποῦριν δυνόνδε λόφος καθύπερθεν ἔειπεν.

II. G.

Some authors affirm that the projection on the top of the helmet was intended to secure the head, and make the commander known to his men in battle; and conclude, that from this arose the first hint of that crest with which we are acquainted. Whether therefore the crest was truly meant for ornament alone, for a mark of pre-eminence, or an emblem to characterise the leader of a warlike band, may well admit of dispute, for it seems, like numerous other points of antiquarian research, to be involved in uncertainty. At length, however, the crest came to be a less military mark of distinction, and to be considered rather in a civil light: it came to be viewed as an ornamental mark of distinction, if the expression may be used. This must necessarily have been the object, wherever the bearer was in any of the civil departments of life.

* The crest of *Pyrrhus*, we are told, was made of two goats horns.

† The time of introducing crests into Britain is uncertain. In a drawing by *Matthew Paris*, who lived in the 13th century, which relates to a military encounter of *Offa*, there is a figure with a kind of crest on the helmet. The same figure again occurs in another transaction of that period. However, it is to be doubted whether the author meant to represent ancient armour, or that of some time nearer his own æra. The great seal of *Richard I.* who died 1199, first represents the English King with something on his helmet resembling a plume of feathers. After the reign of *Richard I.* most of the kings have crowns on their helmets. On that of *Richard II.* prior to the year 1377, is a lion on a cap of state. On the helmet of *Henry IV.* is his crest, as also on the head of his horse.

‡ In addition to crests being the subject of royal grant, we have instances of them being assumed and confirmed in commemoration of warlike deeds, or other events, and retained as honourable; which is testified by the bearings of many old families. Some were taken to preserve the fame of a progenitor, and some were allusive to dignified offices. Several have been granted for certain services; and others were

relative



Thomas Drury; if so, he could not have had a son. And further, if he had had a Son, that Son would have succeeded him as a Baronet.

P. 231. b. An original Portrait of Sir C. Wray, with the collar of S. S. may be seen in your Magazine for 1805, vol. LXXV. p. 1105.

P. 232. a. The account of the monumental effigies with the collar of S. S. at Christchurch, Hants, given by the Editor of Hutchins's Dorset, was taken from your Magazine for 1791, vol. LXI. p. 816.

If E. M. S. who has furnished you with some curious extracts from the Patent Rolls, p. 419, &c. had not been too rapid in his Translations, he would, I am satisfied, have immediately reflected that *expeditentur* does not mean *beimpressed*, line 11. b. but "belawed," have the ball, or the three claws of their fore feet, cut off: v. the Law-Latin Dictionaries.

Your Correspondent T. P. speaking of the Arms at the Baptist's Head in Clerkenwell, p. 425. b. says, that "no trace of the then possessor is to be found;" and therefore it is probably no better than seeking a Needle in a Bottle of Hay to inquire to whom the Arms belonged; for there are several English families who bear a chevron between 3 bugle-horns, one of whom is more likely to be the person in question than the Scots family of Duncan: moreover, I think that the Arms of the Femme, and perhaps the second and third Quarters of the Baron also, are those of Radclyffe.

Yours, &c. J. B.

Mr. URBAN, Mainsforth,
Dec. 13.

THE Arms from the Baptist's Head, St. John's Lane (Gent. Mag. Nov. Plate II.) strike me as evidently belonging to one of the Forsters of Northumberland.

Sir John Forster, Knt. Warden of the Middle March, who died in 1602, married Jane daughter of Sir Cuthbert Radclyffe of Dilston and Derwentwater; and Nicholas Forster, his natural son, married Jane daughter and heiress of Cuthbert Radclyffe, of Blanchland, and was father of Sir Claud Forster, created a Baronet in 1619.

Arms of Forster: Argent, a chevron Vert between 3 bugle-horns Sable.

Radclyffe: Argent, a bend engrailed Sable. Radclyffe of Blanchland

bore the crescent as the filial distinction of a second house, for Cuthbert Radclyffe of Blanchland was the eldest son of Anthony, who was the second son of Sir Cuthbert Radclyffe above-mentioned.

Is the drawing quite correct? Forster generally quarters 2 and 3, Argent a bend cotised Sable, three martlets Or, for *Etherstone*; and this coat quartered with Forster and impaling Radclyffe would be the exact bearing of Sir John Forster, Warden of the Middle March.

Can the blank in Vaux's Epitaph, p. 425, be *Katerienc*, an ancient seat of a branch of the family of Vaux in Cumberland? See Burn and Nicolson, II. 394.
R. S.

Mr. URBAN, Sproxtton, Dec. 13.
IN your Obituary of November (p. 500.) it is remarked, that the village of Ober Sielmingen, near Stuttgart, is so healthy, that from December 1803, to February 1804 (14 months) only one person had died of a population of 350 souls. Extraordinary cases of this sort do now and then occur, without any allusion being made to salubrity of situation. One instance falls within my observation. In the parish of Saltby, co. Leicester, containing 213 inhabitants, there had not been, in the beginning of October last, a death for more than two years; the scale of mortality being here not one in 400 annually. From this circumstance, my curiosity led me to look into the Register for the last ten years, by which it appears there were 23 deaths only (a period of 20 years will give more), and one half of these were upwards of 70 years of age, or infants: hence it is clear, on a rough calculation, that latterly only one in 90 has died annually; yet so insensible are the inhabitants of this blessing, that they would smile at any intimation of the sort seriously advanced. Nor are there any remarkable instances of longevity to found any theory upon: one arrived to the age of 87, another to 92. And what may be equally worthy of remark, is, that there has not been a Wedding in the Parish for more than four years.

It is recorded, that Captain Cook, with a company of 118 men, performed a voyage of 3 years and 18 days throughout all the climates, from 52 North to 70 South Latitude, with the

loss of one single man only by disease. The loss here is only one out of 354. This is not quite so wonderful, when we consider that there were neither children nor old people of the number; and they might be all picked men. According to Dr. Price's calculation, one in 21 dies annually in London; and Dr. Percival says, one in 28 in Manchester; and according to the returns lately made to Parliament, the mortality in the county of Middlesex is the greatest, one in 36; and the least in the county of Cardigan, one in 78. And if we descend to villages, the average of 20, taken from the North-East corner of the county of Leicester, gives one in 48.

I only state facts, and leave others to draw conclusions. W. M.

Mr. URBAN, Dec. 3.

A CORRESPONDENT who signs himself *Amator Bibliomania*, p. 544, expresses displeasure, because the impressions of some interesting modern books are so small, particularly the "*Bibliomania*," and because the Author of that work and of the "*Bibliotheca Spenceriana*" has announced his determination not to print a Second Edition of either of them.

I conceive your Correspondent would do well, instead of leaving his complaint with you, to carry it to the Legislature, as an argument with them for the repeal of the Act 8 of Anne, cap. 19. which has recently been so interpreted as imperatively to enjoin, under a penalty, the forfeiture of Eleven copies of every new work; because the *tax* thereby imposed upon Literature will necessarily compel every Publisher, in justice to himself, to limit the number he prints within the bounds not of a *probable* but of a *certain* and *immediate* sale at the *full price*.

The *liberal* practice of the Trade has been to print comparatively large editions of new expensive works, at the risk of keeping a quantity of them for several years on hand to supply purchasers who may afterwards arise, or of selling part of that residue at a reduced price to men who possess more love for learning than means wherewith to indulge it. How much more this practice has contributed to the *Encouragement of Learning* by the diffusion of Literature than the

compulsory gift of Eleven copies to *opulent Public Bodies*, the rapid progress of knowledge during the Century in which it has prevailed will sufficiently show. But, if a Publisher has henceforward to provide for a tax so considerable as the value of *Eleven copies* out of the *profit* or *income* he derives from a work, it behoves him to pursue such a course as will make the return of *profit* to meet this tax not *contingent* and *remote*, but *real* and *immediate*; and this can only be done by discontinuing the former practice of printing at hazard, and instead thereof printing no more than the number for which he has a demand, regulating the price accordingly; or, in other words, it will be his duty to urge the sale and uphold the price of his books by making them *rare*.

That this consequence should arise out of a Statute professedly formed for the *Encouragement of Literature* is by no means imputable to the Publishers, but must be solely ascribed to the novel construction of that Statute. The less Literature is taxed, the more knowledge will be diffused.

Yours, &c.

T. F.

Mr. URBAN, *Hillingdon*, Dec. 3.

DURING many an entertaining hour amongst your volumes, whenever any recital has passed in continuation to a future year, I have wished it otherwise. Please to admit then this report of most strange gross misconduct in our Parish towards its best friend, William Munsey. His Epitaph may be read at length in p. 24: that shows him to have been good, munificent, and charitable.

The letter in the same page ending with "*Expostulate*," and this paper, will prove that forbearance of so many months has been thrown away on a party,

"*Fix'd in their error, obstinate in wrong.*"

Tombstones are considered as mere old materials, convertible, it appears, to any sort of purpose, without waiting for distant authority, in defiance of regulation, and of all simple honest feelings.

Many of your Readers have Family-Vaults, which their hearts are not prepared to abandon; to these such behaviour will be matter of surprize, doubt, and fear. Others, not left with any burial-places in charge, will

be

be careful that their children shall not be more incumbered; and, by avoiding present expences themselves, secure all descendants from being deceived hereafter.

The largesses of William Munsey set forth on the Slab would at compound interest be now above 5000*l.*; and yet the one only thing established here for himself has lost its place, has undergone a conversion, reflecting shame on all concerned. "Sacred to the memory of" do not begin W. Munsey's inscription. Are those words talismanic? does the want of them subject a tomb to demolition?

In any projected alteration of the Porch, it was easy to keep the tomb-stone over its corpse interred; but this decency of attention towards our Church-benefactor was too much to be paid; and a record preserved unhurt during nine successive reigns, fresh after above 150 years, legible as daylight, has been slipped away through rash usurping innovations, determined and deaf against more commandments than one.

After giving up the men as overboard of heart, the printed "Warning" was meant to move the fairer, more affectionate, interesting part of the creation.

"A WARNING.

Unless you speak out, and express plainly an abhorrence of Theft perpetrated over the Grave of WILLIAM MUNSEY, the consequences will probably be as under:

A Church-Yard Monument, solemn token of grief, fondly raised around all earthly remains of a lost, a beloved Child, whom the Mother's arms yet stretch toward in nightly dreams;—that Monument may be swept away for viler uses than WILLIAM MUNSEY'S; yes, more vile, more profane than his—to pave a Pig-sty. W. M. lies still degraded into an hearth-stone at a fire-place.

A Churchwarden, once differently instructed, possibly contemplates how best to transmit his own misfortune, as aggravated by a loss, to his poor Infants irreparable. Can bad examples ensure permanence to the Marble enumerating a WIFE'S acknowledged merits? Retribution is Nature's Law. The Family may cry out indeed, to be answered thus: What attention did your Father pay to the prominent claims of WILLIAM MUNSEY? Look at this Slab! once it recorded a good man's 'loving-kindness,' now despoiled, through misuse, of every

letter, it exhibits in one blank, both official breach of trust, and official ingratitude.

A Son, who has come home after successful battle, to keep off that Corsican Thief from your own Shores, may be looking, and look in vain, over hallowed ground, for the tomb-stone—for the memorial placed by himself on the body of an honoured Parent. What and whom may he meet? Most likely his own Mother in tears, like Mary Magdalen weeping at the sepulchre, 'because they have taken away my Husband—your Father! and I know not where they have laid him'.

MISORRY.

Mr. URBAN,

Dec. 5.

THE passage alluded to in p. 483, as omitted in the earlier editions of *Dr. Paley's Sermons*, claims insertion in your Magazine, for the benefit of such of your Readers, as may possess these mutilated copies. The first edition was printed for private circulation only, among the inhabitants of Bishop Wearmouth, and not designed for sale; and the second was offered in the first instance for publication, before the consent of the Author's family was obtained. In the third, which was printed under their auspices, the passage was restored to its place; and they in consequence have fully acquitted themselves of all participation in this singular omission. What, indeed, could be the motives of the original Editor, or his Advisers, in endeavouring to suppress it, is somewhat difficult to trace; for if they supposed it possible to conceal from his parishioners Dr. Paley's charitable views of those who differed from him in religious sentiments, they must have forgotten the many passages in his valuable productions, in which equal liberality is evinced.

The chief passage omitted, or rather garbled, in the first edition, but since restored to its place, occurs in *Sermon I. on Seriousness in Religion*, and now appears as follows:

"The turns which this levity usually takes, is in jests and raillery upon the opinions, or the peculiarities, or the persons, of men of particular sects, or who bear particular names; especially if they happen to be more serious than ourselves. And of late this loose, and I can hardly help calling it profane humour, has been directed chiefly against the followers of Methodism. But against whomsoever it happens to be pointed, it

has

shewn, that the Legislature had recognized the principle of laying part of these extraordinary burthens on the owners, as well as the occupiers, in the recent Acts for building the Durham and Northumberland Gaols.

It is also proper to state, that though the Legislature seems to have fixed one half of the amount of one year's County rate upon the average of the five preceding years, as the limit, when borrowing money on mortgage should commence, yet the amount of this estimate for the gaol only, without land, commission, and other incidental expenses, exceeds 33 times that average.

In the course of the evidence produced in support of the Bill it also appeared, that in addition to the Resolutions of the East Kent Bench upon the subject of the Kent Gaol, published in the papers during the last year, that Court, on the 12th of January last, upon taking the petition for the Bill into consideration, came to a resolution, expressing their conviction of the wisdom and policy of adopting some measure to collect the sentiments of the whole Magistracy of the County, upon the prayer of the petition, and appointed a Deputation to attend the West Kent Sessions, to adjust a mode by which that object might be speedily attained, and the honour and peace of the County preserved; and that this proposal was rejected by the West Kent Justices as an unnecessary interference, contrary to the practice uniformly pursued by the two Benches, with regard to matters arising within their respective divisions, and likely, if adopted, to lead to much future inconvenience and confusion; thereby establishing a principle unjust upon the face of it, that whatever concerns a whole community shall be determined upon by the Representatives of one half of the Magistracy to the exclusion of the other; and in opposition to that acknowledged maxim of our Constitution, that the publick shall not be taxed, but with the consent of those who represent them.

The principal evidence in opposition to the Bill consisted of Mr. ALEXANDER, who went into a long detail of the plan of the Gaol the result of which was, to shew that it was constructed, in his opinion, upon the best principle for separation, ventilation, security, and inspection; that economy was attended to in the construction of it, as far as consisted with those objects, and that the price of materials and labour had increased upwards of 100. per cent, in these last 25 years. It however appeared, that he had never built a gaol before; that he had visited and inspected a variety of gaols

and court-houses in England and Scotland, with a view to the formation of his plan, and that he had been paid for journeys on those occasions upwards of 470l.

Mr. Cockerell, an architect, who had seen the plan for the intended Gaol, for a short time, about three weeks before; Mr. George Saunders, another architect, who had seen the plan for a few minutes the first day of the sitting of the Committee; and Mr. George Lewis, the builder of the New Bethlem, who had seen the plan about three weeks before, for two hours; spoke in high terms of it as far as their short inspection and experience would admit, in the four requisites above mentioned; and their statements of the increased price of materials and labour within these last 20 or 30 years, corroborated Mr. Alexander's. But neither of these Gentlemen had ever built a gaol, or had, within the last 30 years, applied their attention to the construction of them; nor had either of them, except Mr. Lewis, ever been concerned in a work of this magnitude. They gave no evidence as to the amount of the estimate.

Mr. Hardwicke, an architect, proved that the estimate for the Penitentiary House, now building by Government at Millbank, calculated for 600 persons, amounted to 259,725l. in which are included the Governor's house, chapel, apartments for the chaplain and servants, fittings up for the Clerk of the works, 5000l., and stoves 8,400l. and that 16 acres of land are enclosed within the boundary wall.

There were some other witnesses who corroborated the preceding evidence, as to the increased price in materials and labour within these last 20 or 30 years; and amongst them Mr. Roberts, who upon his cross-examination, stated, that in 1789, he made the estimate of Dorchester Gaol at 10,209l. 18s. 11d. containing 144 cells, chapel, gaoler's house, courts, &c.

In the course of the investigation, it was found requisite to examine the Treasurer of West Kent, who it appears is a Magistrate, and was a petitioner against the Bill, with reference to the Act for levying County Rates, which directs, "That no new Rate shall be made till it appears by the Treasurer's accounts, that three fourths of the old Rate are expended." But, upon the Treasurer being requested to shew the balances in his hands at the periods the several rates were made, he stated that his accounts were never balanced, except at the annual Meeting of the Justices of the two Divisions of the County, at Sittingbourne,

bourne, for the purpose of arranging their respective proportions of the general expences of the County, and that he kept no cash, no cheque, no draft, no banker's or other book, or had any other means to shew the balances from Sessions to Sessions, and that he never gave into the different Sessions a Statement of the balance in hand. It also appeared from the account, that in July last, East Kent was indebted to West Kent, 11,375*l.* 5*s.*

From this short summary of the great mass of evidence produced before the Committee, which sat eighteen days, it must be left to the reader to form his own conclusion, how far he may think the allegations of the Bill were warranted in fact; but, as it is stated (in the publication before alluded to) that "Mr. Alexander gave, in his evidence before the Committee, such clear and forcible reasons for every part of the plan, as filled every impartial mind with conviction and admiration," it is necessary to remark, notwithstanding this conviction and "admiration," that out of 89 Members who voted in the Committee, 42 were in favour of the Preamble of the Bill, and on Mr. Calcraft's subsequent motion the majority against it was only 7 out of 117. Is it possible that these respectable Minorities were actuated by partial motives? Let it be remembered, that this Bill had little else but its own merits to support it against the GREAT PERSONAL INTEREST of its opposers, which was very indelicately, if not unconstitutionally, exerted in an extensive *daily* issue of cards during the sitting of the Committee.

The following is a correct copy of the printed Card, as distributed on this occasion:—

"OPPOSITION TO KENT GAOL BILL.

"The Earl of Romney, Viscount Sydney, the Honourable Colonel Stratford, Sir John Shaw, Sir Henry Hawley, Sir Egerton Brydges, Mr. Larking, the Rev. P. Rashleigh, Mr. W. A. Morland, the Rev. E. Barnard, Mr. R. Allnut, the Rev. A. Onslow, Mr. Harenc, Mr. T. L. Hodges, the Rev. William Hussey, Mr. T. H. Foote, the Rev. Dr. Foster Piggett, the Rev. G. Moore, the Rev. T. Cobb, Mr. G. Smith, Mr. R. Talbot, and the *Petitioners against the Bill*, earnestly and particularly request the favour of your attendance on the instant at o'clock, at the Committee upon this Bill, which deeply affects the Magistracy of the whole Kingdom."

Where numbers are so equally divided, every one must be left to his own judgment upon the *real merits* of a case of this nature. No adverse conclusion can

be drawn from a majority so trifling, especially when it is recollected of whom the minority were composed; nor will much attention be given, after the perusal of this statement, to any insinuation against the supporters of the Bill.

There was a sort of clamour raised against the Bill; an outcry that the authority of the Magistracy was attacked; whereas the supporters of the Bill had no wish to fetter the jurisdiction of the Magistrates; but, on the contrary, it will appear, by their having proposed to vest the execution of the Bill in the Justices, one of their principal objects was to remedy the evils which had arisen from the *etiquette* hitherto observed between the Magistrates of the two divisions, preventing their interference with each others' measures, even in matters of the most serious moment to the County at large; and upon the same principle a proposition was submitted in an early stage of the proceedings, on the part of the Petitioners, to a Nobleman holding the highest situation in the County, the basis of which was, to leave the business in the hands of the *whole* of the Magistracy, without any limitation as to expenditure.

The Committee, after the Bill was lost, caused the several orders and proceedings of the Justices which had been produced in evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons to be submitted to two eminent Counsel, who being decidedly of opinion that the Justices had not in their proceedings conformed to the Statute of the 24th Geo. III. cap. 54, and had therefore no authority to make the late orders for payment, advised an application to the Court of King's Bench for a Writ of *Certiorari* to remove those orders into that Court with a view to having them quashed. A motion was accordingly made to that effect by the Attorney General, and a Rule Nisi was granted, which, upon argument, on the 6th instant, was discharged; the Court decided, that the statute was not mandatory on the Justices, but only enabling them to make the contracts therein mentioned, and that the legality of the original orders could not now be questioned.

With this decision (to which the Committee bow with respect) the duties entrusted to them are brought to a close; and although they regret that the hopes of the greater part of the County are disappointed, yet they trust it will satisfactorily appear, that no exertion has been wanting on their part to obtain the purpose for which they were appointed.

It now only remains for them to claim, and they feel they have a right *respectfully*

fully to claim, that protection which the Laws already in existence afford them, namely, the exercise of the concurrent Jurisdiction of the Magistrates, which can still secure them from any unnecessary expenditure; and they cannot close this statement without expressing an ardent hope that a General Meeting will be shortly held for that purpose, as the only means of giving satisfaction to the occupiers of the County. July 8, 1813.

DEANE JOHN PARKER, Chairman.
EDWARD SPENCER CURLING, Dep. Ch.

Mr. URBAN, Dec. 29.
M R. Henry Winstanley, the architect of the original Edystone Lighthouse, whose untimely fate is mentioned in your Review at p. 247, was also projector of a mechanical display of Water-works, which were exhibited at a house "at the lower end of Piccadilly, towards Hide Park." The usual period for opening was about Easter, and the time of exhibiting, four o'clock in the afternoon. In May 1696, it was announced "with great additions to what was last year," and in the following month the time for seeing it limited, in consequence of "Mr. Winstanley having undertook to build a Lighthouse on the Edystone, a very dangerous rock in the channel off from Plymouth." In April of the following year, they were advertised to be shewn a month only, "by reason of his going to Plymouth to carry on the building of a Light-house that was begun the last summer," and in a short period afterwards he must have been taken prisoner, as appears by the following paragraph from the *Post-boy* of July 15, 1697:

"Mr. Winstanley, the engineer, taken by the French, and carried into France from the Edeston rock, is brought over by way of exchange, but he has been very barbarously used by the Frenchmen that took him."

The Water-works were shewn at the same place several years after the decease of the Projector, and some of the features of the exhibition may be gathered from the following advertisement:

"The Water-works of the late ingenious Mr. Winstanley, is shewn every evening at 6 o'clock. The curious Barrel will perform its part, and Cupid will be there with coffee and tea. Apollo is bathing with his attendants, his beloved Daphne is chang'd to a Tree, and Narcissus to Flowers. Venus returns from Mount Ida with the Golden Apple, at-

tended by Cupids, Doves, and Swans, the Graces crowning her with garlands; Jupiter is there with his thunder and lightning, Gods and Goddesses, with Nymphs, Mermaids, and Satyrs, from woods, groves, hills, and fountains, with their purling streams, with incense burning. These waters fall into delightful cascades, mingling with fire. This is at the lower end of Piccadilly, going towards Hide-Park." *Daily Courant*, May 30, 1718.

Yours, &c. EV. HOOD.

Mr. URBAN, Dec. 30.
I N page 88, occurs the following passage: "To Canterbury this town (Reading) gave an Archbishop; to the High Church a Lord; and to Ireland, a Chancellor, the founder of the house of Mulgrave." The person alluded to here is Sir Constantine Phipps, Knight, Lord High Chancellor of Ireland in 1710. Any of your Correspondents would oblige me by the communication of any particulars relative to this eminent lawyer, who was (it seems) a Native of Reading; his widow, Lady Phipps, died in 1728, but none of the Peerages give her name or family, nor the name of the Lady of Sir William Phipps, the Chancellor's father. H. MILLER.

Mr. URBAN. Oct. 2.
W ITHOUT positively doubting the correctness of D. R.'s better source of information on Capt. Sir P. B. V. Broke's descent, I must confess feeling a reluctance to withdraw Chief Justice Broke from the gallant Captain's ancestry. I have direct proof that the Chief Justice wrote his name "Robt'm Broke," which signature is subscribed to a certificate on a deed acknowledged before him ("Robert Broke, Esq. Recorder of London") and an alderman on the 5 Feb. 3 Edw. VI.; and as this surname is very uncommon, I may be excused a suggestion that the two chiefs were related. Perhaps D. R. will indulge us with a transcript of the Pedigree and a description of the Portrait at Nacton Hall, particularly of the Judge's Robes. Sir Richard Broke had a singular mark of royal favour conferred on him by King Hen. VIII. that, he should not be assigned to the degree of Serjeant against his consent, and that if he were chosen, he might refuse that degree.

Yours, &c. STE. NEWMAN.
Mr.

Mr. URBAN, *Essex, Nov. 9.*

GIVE me leave to inform A. N. (p. 16.) that there appears to have been several MSS. of the celebrated and excellent Treatise "De Imitatione" preserved in the Religious Houses previous to the calamities which have raged so long and so dreadfully on the Continent. The date of that at Antwerp is 1441; at Louvaine 1485; and that at Arone very antient, but with its date I am unacquainted. Kempis died in 1471; and in the first MS. of his Works there is authentic proof that the Imitation does not appear. The most probable supposition at this late period is, that *John Gerson*, Abbé of Verceil, the friend of Francis of Assise and Anthony of Padua, was the real Author. The Benedictines espouse this latter opinion; on the other hand, the Canons Regular of St. Genevieve assert that Thomas à Kempis was the real Author.

Possibly the Catalogue which follows, of English and Foreign Editions, may be acceptable to those who interest themselves in this controversy.

1501. Edition at Venice.
 1502. John Gerson's Three Books of the Imitation of Christ, translated into English by William Atkinson, D. D. Printed, at King Henry the Seventh's Mother's desire, by Wynkin de Worde*.
 1545. Prayers and Meditations by Catherine Queen of England.
 1546. A Boke newly translated out of Latin into English, called the Following of Christ, made and compiled in Latin by the famous Clerk John Gerson*.
 1567. The Imitation or Following of Christ, by Thomas Kempise, a Dutchman. Black Letter.
 1568. Translation by Edward Hake: dedicated to the Duke of Norfolk.
 1584. Translation by Thomas Rogers: dedicated to Ld. Chancellor Bromley*.
 1619. Translation into French by Bellegarde*.
 1639. By Wm. Page. Oxon.
 1652. By Dr. John Worthington*.
 1677. Second Edition of the same.
 1699. E. Redmayne.
 1714. By Dean Stanhope, 8vo.
 1719. Pere Camus, printed at Paris*.
 1748. By John Wesley, A. M. † Also an Edition in Latin by Sebastian Castalio.
 1757. Walter Ruddiman. in Latin, 24mo*.
 1763. By Valart. Paris*.

1763. By John Payne, Principal Accountant of the Bank, 8vo.*

1766. Translated into French by Valart.

1769. Edition in 12mo, by Payne*.

1792. Edition at York, printed for Mawman*.

1804. London Edition, by John Kendall. (Both these, old Translations and Abridgements.)*

1808. Nouvelle Edition, revue et corrigée par M. l'Abbé de la Hoges.

The copies marked * are in my possession; and if the Gentleman who professes to write the Life of Kempis will favour me with his address, I wish to give him all the assistance in my power.

Two distinguished Writers of the French Nation have bestowed liberal praise on this truly pious Work; viz. M. de Fontenelle, in his Biography of Corneille, and M. Leibnitz, in his Letters. An eminent Writer of our Country says, "that he had read it in his youth, and again at an advanced period of life; that on every perusal there always appeared something new, something tending to enlighten the understanding, and comfort the heart." ‡ J. C.

Mr. URBAN, *Lichfield, Nov. 16.*

AN Edition of "Thomæ à Kempis de Imitatione Christi," printed at Antwerp, "apud Viduam Joannis Cnobbaert, 1644," contains

"Certissima Testimonia, quibus Thomæ à Kempis auctor assertitur Librorum de Imitatione Christi."

"Vita Thomæ à Kempis ex variis auctoribus ab Heriberto Ros-weydo conceinnata."

"Vita Thomæ à Kempis, auctore incerto, ponè cœvo."

And the following,

"*Appropatio.*"

"Hos Thomæ à Kempis de Imitatione Christi libros quatuor, nunc denuo ad autographum anno M.CCCC.XLI. scriptum, per Heribertum Ros-vveydum recensitos, unâ cum certissimis Testimoniis, quibus solidissimè liber ille auctore suo vindicatur, necnon vitam ejusdem Thomæ ab eodem Ros-vveydo conceinnatam, dignissimè judico, quæ Typographiæ beneficio ad manus plurium perveniant. Datum i Junii, anno MDCXXVI.

HERBERTUS SPITHOLDIUS, S. T. L.
 Canonicus et Plebanus Antverpiæ,
 Librorum Consor."

Appropatio is so spelt in the work. as is *Conсор*: there is a list of Places

† Printed with little alteration from Dr. W.

‡ A former communication of mine on this subject may be seen in vol. XLII. 559. GENT. MAG. Suppl. LXXXIII. PART II.

in which the MSS. were kept, and of Learned Men who attribute the work to Thomas à Kempis. It had been claimed for Gesen, Gessen, Gersen, or Gerson, so early as the year 1521.

Editions not mentioned in page 120 are: Norimbergæ, folio, 1494; Parisiis 1520 and 1521. C. E. STRINGER.

MR. URBAN,

Dec. 16.

AN Edition of Thomas of Kempis, in my possession, is dated one year prior to the Antwerp edition mentioned by L. F. p. 232. There are two Tables, or Indexes, which, at the first glance, I thought were accidental duplicates; but, on looking again, I was struck with the difference; for that which is placed next to the short preface, describes the work as "written by Thomas of Kempis, Canon Regular of the order of S. Augustin;" and the one at the end of the fourth book, as "written by the venerable man John Gerson, Abbot of the most holy order of St. Benedict." This surely is a new mode of fixing on an Author!

"The Following of Christ: in Four Books, Written in Latin by Thomas of Kempis, Canon Regular of the Order of St. Augustin. Translated into English, and in this last Edition, reviewed and compared with several former Editions. Printed Anno Dom. 1685."

It may prevent trouble to your Readers, to notice an Erratum in pp. 16, 120: Vol. XLIII. should be Vol. XLII. where, p. 559, they will find the Letter referred to both by A. N. and T. Faulkner in yours of July and August last.

G. W. L.

"Monumenta quæ nos recorda vocamus sunt VERITATIS et VETUSTATIS vestigia." COKE'S LITTLETON.

MR. URBAN,

Nov. 20.

BEFORE I enter upon the subject of Thomas-à-Kempis, allow me to congratulate you upon the auspicious aspect of the present age towards the early and favourite theme of your publication. Antiquities, from having been the study of the elegant few, have by degrees grown up into a popular amusement, and have at this moment attained the honour of fixing even the eye of the Legislature. Under the patronage of Parliament, various persons, animating each other's emulation, have been employed in the

three ancient divisions of the United Kingdom in ransacking for some years past every Chartulary and Library, private or public, in search of records and valuable manuscripts; and they are publishing works that may vie with the once-celebrated Royal Press of Paris. It is now upwards of 300 years since the genius of the Learned was in a similar way excited to explore the monuments of former times: in the hopes to find some hidden treasure, they turned over every spot of soil in the region of Learning. And no sooner were Antiquities, those of writing especially, restored to light, than the greatest men, by a kind of simultaneous movement, appeared all at once. It is a remarkable fact, and never to be forgotten, that the revival of letters was the æra of the most important discoveries. And yet it is a pretty general prejudice that invention and erudition seldom meet together. Without, however, stopping here to refute that prejudice, or venturing from this great national undertaking to anticipate the dawn of a second revival of letters, it is easy to foresee the revolution it must effect in History and Literature; to say nothing of the more silent and regular, yet not less important improvements in Law, in Revenue, and Political Economy.

The fashion that prevailed some time ago is now over, that of affecting to doubt the truth as well as the importance of Antiquities. It was introduced into France by the sceptical Philosophy in the last century; and, like other French fashions, was too much admired in England, till all of a sudden its fatal purpose, was disclosed. That false Philosophy affected to decry Tradition, in order to undermine the venerable monuments of Religion, which are only a tradition of a higher nature. The Sacred Antiquities, a monument of the purest cast, convey in striking and luminous characters the only wise and practicable Philosophy: and, independent of their internal evidence, are universally interesting to the human race, as the only authentic record of its history. In order to shake this monument, a mine was laid, for the purpose of exploding all kinds of ancient learning. In the mean time it was industriously given out that erudition oppressed and encumbered genius! As if the experience