

EXETER, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 15th, 1890.

CONTENTS.—No 26.

Notes upon some Dartmoor Antiquities	17
Francis Fowne, Landscape Painter	17
The Local Termination "Hay"	18
Great Torrington...	19
A Soldier's Petition	19
Anti-Popery Speech	20
Gift of Vestments to the Church of St. Petrock, Exeter		21
Exeter City Muniments	24
Advertisements of an Old Exeter Tradesman	28
Sir Francis Drake and the Plymouth Corporation	28
Wall Painting at Axmouth Church	30
Ancient Travelling	31
NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS.	32

NOTES UPON SOME DARTMOOR ANTIQUITIES.

It has occurred to me, in view of the great and growing interest felt in all matters connected with Dartmoor, that it might be of some service to focus, as it were, the chief features of importance connected with the leading antiquities of that—in an archaeological sense—still pre-historic region. There has been no systematic attempt to review these antiquities since the publication of the *Perambulation*; and no effort has been made to bring together the large body of scattered facts that have since been ascertained by various observers. Something, indeed, has been effected in connection with the recently completed Ordnance Survey, the maps of which very fairly set forth the more prominent archaeological remains. Still, the work of the Survey in this direction has necessarily been imperfect and wanting in discrimination. Much has yet to be ascertained with regard to the facts of the moorland archaeology, quite apart from any theories; and the investigation could be greatly advanced if those who visit the moor clearly recognised what was worth their noting, and the chief details to be observed. It is with no higher purpose than of aiding in this necessary work that I have offered to the editors of *Notes and Gleanings* this short series of papers, in which it is intended to pass briefly in review the various classes of antiquities found upon Dartmoor, and to indicate their leading characteristics.

In the *Perambulation* the antiquities are

classified as follows:—1. The "circular temple or sacred circle . . . a rude patriarchal temple such as the feelings of the people and the genius of their religion demanded." 2. The "stone avenue or parallelithon . . . constructed for the purpose of some solemn Druidic ceremonial." 3. The "rock idol." 4. The "logan stone." 5. The "rock basin . . . part of the apparatus of Druidism." 6. The "cromlech." 7. The "kistvaen." 8. The "barrow and cairn." 9. The "rock pillar" or "maen hir." 10. "Huts or dwellings." 11. "Pounds or circumvallations." 12. "Trackways or roads." 13. "Tracklines or boundary banks." 14. "Forts and entrenchments." 15. "Mining remains." 16. Incidentally, the "tolmen" or holed stone.

Four of these classes we may dismiss from our consideration, as not antiquities at all. The "rock idol," touching which Rowe himself was more than doubtful, and of which the finest example, *Bowerman's Nose*, is clearly the result of natural weathering. The "rock basins," most of which Rowe accepted, as due to natural causes, but all of which are in the same category, the hollowed stones connected with ancient mining operations excepted. The "logan stones," whereto there is not the smallest pretence for giving other than a natural origin likewise. And finally the "tolmen" in the bed of the Teign, near Chagford, which has no claim to the name beyond the fact of its being a mass of granite with a hole in it—such a hole as may be seen worn by the attrition of pebbles in the bed rocks of many river courses, and notably in Devon on the lower course of the Walkham.

On the other hand, to these structural antiquities we have to add the stone and bronze implements, and other relics of ancient human handiwork, of which at present our knowledge is very imperfect.

R. N. WORTH, F.G.S.

✓ FRANCIS TOWNE, LANDSCAPE-PAINTER.

There is a notice of this artist in the revised edition of Mr. Samuel Redgrave's *Dictionary of Artists of the English School*, (London, 1878), and as he occasionally resided in Devonshire, and was buried at Heavitree, a

to Private Persons as to the Publick, by taking up such an immense Treasure on a Common Seal.

Sir, we all know what hapned some years since by the Bankers taking up such great sums on their Private Seals, how it proved a temptation for the committing of a great Violation on the Subjects' Property, which in all probability preceeding Parliaments would have prevented, if they had forseen; though I hope there is no danger that the like will ever be done again; yet, Sir, you may do well to secure it, either by making some Vote, if not a Law, to prevent it.

And I am the more forward to move you herein, because I have heard, since I had the Honour to sit within these Walls, that in the late Long Parliament there were Members who by Voting for Money, got shares to themselves. I have a good opinion of these Gentlemen that at present have the management of the Trade, but if a few such Persons as I have mentioned should succeed them, with the same privileged that these have, of taking up what money they please on a Common Seal, to what danger might the Treasure of this Nation be reduced, and how might it not be disposed of, by Dividends, Loans, or other ways. The taking up of so vast a Treasure on a Common Seal, must be attended with great danger, and therefore as well for that as for the other reasons alledged. I hope you will take this Affair into your speedy consideration, that so some Remedies may be applied thereto.

NOTES ON SOME DARTMOOR ANTIQUITIES.

II. HUTS AND DWELLINGS.

The most frequent form of Dartmoor antiquities is the "hut circle," the foundation of the dwelling of the earlier inhabitants. There are here and there rectangular ruins of very considerable age; but the oldest traces of habitations are invariably circular, or approximately so. Still this shape is no absolute proof of age, for even in modern

days rude shelters are occasionally built on this ancient plan.

The "hut circle" is the stone base of a superstructure which has long disappeared—a superstructure that in some cases may have been composed of boughs arched in towards the centre, perhaps rudely wattled, or else built of turves. They vary materially in size. Rowe in the *Perambulation* ranges them from 12 to 30 feet in diameter. Mr. Ormerod found them from 9 to 36 feet on the eastern side of the moor. Mr. Spence Bate put them at from 9 feet in diameter to 35. The average size ranges, however, between 20 feet and 30. Whether from the want of systematic exploration, or from the absence of contents, hardly any relic of antiquity has been recovered from the interior of these circles, which certainly ought to yield some traces of the mode of life of their residents. The probability is that the smaller huts were not dwellings, but played the part of store-places, or out-buildings to the larger, when found in association with them, or were used rather as casual shelters when isolated.

These "circles" vary further in character with the quality of the material available. When the surface stones are large and fairly tabular they generally consist of a double row of stones, facing inward and outward respectively, and about two feet apart, the interval being filled in with smaller fragments. The entrance is commonly marked by higher stones used as door jambs, which in scores, if not hundreds of instances, are still in place, and usually face the south. In fact, the hut groups are generally found on the southern slopes. The width of these foundations ranges up to six feet and even more; and in some instances they are still four feet in height, though the average would not be more than two feet. In the construction they display considerable adaptation to circumstances, and the size of the stones available. Some of those formed of small "hard" stones, are now quite overgrown with turf and moss—low ring-like mounds that might easily pass unnoticed. Perhaps the greatest constructive skill is found where tabular masses of granite are handy. Mr. Ormerod describes instances in which the circle is lined with thin slabs, set on end, well bedded, and occasionally with pave-

ments adjacent formed by flat slabs of granite, laid horizontally. Very rarely in some of these huts the exterior stones are laid in courses. Such are the highest types of "hut circles" known. A unique form of variation noted by Mr. Spence Bate was the excavation of the ground within the circles at Kestor to make it level, and avoid the slope of the hill.

Less frequent by far than the hut circles are the rude stone structures, known from their shape as "beehive huts," the upper portion consisting of layers of stones, gradually converging into a rude dome. Of these Rowe appears to have known only of one example; but Mr. Spence Bate noted others and more have been found since. Probably they are yet more numerous; but when fairly perfect and overgrown they are somewhat difficult of detection. A sharp look out should therefore be kept for their occurrence. They are much smaller than the "hut circles." One on the Erme, described by Mr. Spence Bate, is only 6 feet long by 4 feet wide and 3 feet high; and from the fact of their frequent association with the "hut circles" he was inclined to regard them, not as dwellings, but as parts of the larger huts—store-places in fact. Still it has to be borne in mind that in other parts of the country we find beehive huts of larger dimensions, which were undoubtedly used as dwellings. The probability therefore seems to be that there may have been much the same range in dimensions with huts of the "beehive" type, as with the more ordinary form, but that the superstructures of the larger, more liable to fall into ruin from their size, have disappeared. If so this will account for the quantity of loose stones occasionally found within what would otherwise be regarded a "hut circle" of the usual character.

A third type of dwelling hitherto unrecognised on Dartmoor, is the "chambered hut." Of this there is a very fine example in the valley below Shell Top towards Lee Moor, now mentioned for the first time as such in print. When I discovered it I was under the impression that it was altogether unknown; but I find it has been mentioned by Mr. Spence Bate as a chambered cairn, which it certainly is not. Without entering

into disproportionate detail it will suffice for the present to say that it consists of a heap of small stones, some 80 feet by 60 feet, and probably containing at the least seven or eight hundred cart-loads. Five chambers, more or less oval in shape, are still distinctly traceable, with a long passage leading from the northern extremity of the heap, but there were probably twice as many. Portions of the internal walls are intact—rude dry masonry—to the height of $5\frac{1}{2}$ feet. So far as our present knowledge of Dartmoor is concerned this is unique, but I can hardly believe that it really stands alone; and it would be well that a watchful eye should be had for other examples.

R. N. WORTH, F.G.S.

CHARLES ROACH SMITH, Esq., F.S.A.

It is very gratifying to all who are interested in the antiquities of Great Britain to know that at a recent meeting held at the rooms of the Society of Antiquaries, John Evans, Esq., D.C.L., P.S.A., in the chair, it was resolved that subscriptions be invited for the purpose of striking a Medal in honour of Mr. Charles Roach Smith, and that the balance of the fund be handed to him, in recognition of his life-long and valuable services in the cause of Archaeology.

The veteran author of *Collectanea Antiqua* is almost, if not quite, as old as the century, and nearly the whole of his working life has been devoted to the elucidation of Archaeological questions. His earliest work is to be found in *Archæologia*, but he has also furnished a great quantity of matter for the early volumes of the *Journal* of the British Archaeological Association, of which important Society he was one of the founders. If only a few of those who have derived instruction from his painstaking and unselfish work respond generously to the appeal thus made to Antiquaries in general by the Society, the balance in his favour ought to be worth his acceptance.

Subscriptions should be forwarded to George Payne, F.S.A., Hon. Secretary and Treasurer, The Precinct, Rochester. A.W.

NOTES UPON SOME DARTMOOR ANTIQUITIES.

III. ENCLOSURES.

From the consideration of the remains of Dartmoor dwellings we naturally pass to the enclosures with which many of them—indeed the greater number—are associated or connected. These demand a much greater amount of skilled attention than they have hitherto received.

Rowe in the "Perambulation" distinguishes two classes of enclosures—"pounds or circumvallations," of which Grimspound is commonly taken as the type; and "forts or entrenchments"—the "camps or earthworks which are found on the skirts of the moorlands." With these, however, we must also class the greater number of his "track lines or boundary banks . . . numerous in every part of the moorlands . . . serving for bounds and pathways, and connecting and enclosing dwellings." Most of these track lines are really remnants of enclosures, but of a less individual and more industrial type, and, as they have come down to us, of a more obscure character.

A mistake that has frequently been made, is the attempt, tacit or avowed, to classify the ancient enclosures on and around Dartmoor by the character of their materials. On the Moor itself they are all but universally formed of the surface granite, supplemented by turf; on the verge of the Moorland they are as commonly earthworks. And it has become the custom to call the one set "pounds," and the other set "camps;" and to assume that this difference of name implies a difference in origin and purpose. We avoid much useless speculation if we hold that men in the past did very much what men do in the present, and, other things being equal, used indifferently the materials that lay nearest to hand. To draw any deductions as to the intention of any particular enclosure, we must look beyond the mere employment of stone or earth.

We find enclosures on the Moor in connection with single huts, and with groups of huts, and occasionally where traces of habitation are not apparent. We also find remains of hut circles, singly and in groups, without any traces of enclosures. Evidently the two are not indispensably associated.

Enclosures may be made with two objects—to "keep in" or to "keep out;" and the "keeping out" may have reference to men or to predatory animals, and in the latter case may be intended for the protection of stock or of crops. I do not think, however, that in early times any enclosures were made upon Dartmoor with the last object. The intention was either the protection of the residents against raiders, or the security of their sheep and cattle, by preventing them from straying, or by guarding them against the ravages of the wolves, which no doubt formed an important section of the Dartmoor fauna well within the historic era.

Nor should there be any great difficulty in assigning the special purpose to the bulk of the enclosures which remain. The *character of the entrance* as a rule will tell the tale. If the intention is simply the ordinary protection of stock, then the entrance will be found easy of access to cattle and sheep. If the object is defence, then the entrance is fortified, and at times with very considerable skill. Only one man will be able to enter at a time, and he through a passage exposed at great disadvantage to attack from within. Nor must we assume that the rampart was as easily scaled then as now. Most of the earthworks on the borders of the Moor, which are really the enclosures of defenced villages, were surmounted with stockades, and it is probable that a similar method of fortification was adopted with the walled hamlets of the Moor itself.

Hence the first point for consideration in the examination of an ancient Dartmoor enclosure should be the character of its entrance. It is unfortunate that Grimspound, from its exceptionally perfect condition, should have been regarded as specially typical. There is really nothing about Grimspound to entitle it to be regarded as anything more than an ordinary settlement of simple shepherd folk, who may have had something to do with tin-streaming or peat-burning, but who certainly did not live in exceptionally disturbed times, or they would have taken more adequate measures for defence. The absence of such special measures, and the structural characters of the wall and huts, seem to point rather to the conclusion that Grimspound is of comparatively modern date, when compared with

such carefully fortified enclosures as those on and near Trowlesworthy Tor.

As with the remains of dwellings so with those of enclosures, we may as a rule assume that the rectangular are more recent than the rounded. Beyond this there is very little to indicate relative antiquity, or the reverse, in any constructional arrangements. Dry stone walls are made and hedges formed on Dartmoor at the present day, just as they were tens of centuries ago; and the remarks made upon the method of building the hut foundations apply to the walls of the enclosures also. They may be piles of small "hand" stones (not "hard," as casually misprinted in No. II); or reared of huge blocks; or formed, as at Grimspound, with two facings of granite with an internal space filled in with turf or soil; or there may be a rude attempt at "coursing."

Rectangular boundaries do occasionally, however, occur under conditions which appear to imply considerable antiquity. For example, at Torhill the eastern face of the slope is "partitioned into squares by the number of track lines intersecting each other;" and "many of these squares contain (hut) circles." So at Hen Tor, in the rear of some hut circles the "clatter" of the tor has been piled into rows marking out a number of narrow strips, curiously suggesting the idea of a series of disproportionately long narrow courtyards.

Some of the most interesting results of this branch of our enquiry—next to the identification of such enclosures as bear marks of special defence—may be expected to result from a full examination of the more individualized examples. At Trowlesworthy there is no difficulty in making out the remains of the ancient "weorthig,"—hut circle and enclosures; and the like, no doubt, is equally true elsewhere.

The most interesting specialised form of "pound" is that described by Mr. G. W. Ormerod in his notes on "Rude Stone Remains on the Eastern Side of Dartmoor"—the Round Pound near Batworthy and the similar structure at Bovey Coombe Head, in which a circle round the hut is divided into a series of segmental courts, the object of which has so far not been clearly ascertained.

Touching the tracklines, there is this more

to be said, that they appear, as a rule, to represent enclosures exterior to the immediate surroundings of the huts, and to belong to a more recent date than the so-called "pounds." Carefully traced, the majority will be found equivalent to the remains of hedges walling the little fields taken out from the Moor for the purpose of pasturing or protecting stock or raising hay in the immediate vicinity of huts or villages, when the moorland farming had begun to advance beyond its primitive original. Probably, therefore, they are among the most modern of the moorland antiquities. They are certainly among the least mysterious.

Pennabridge Pound is an enclosure which has been used as a "pound" in the modern sense for centuries, and which there does not seem any reason to believe ever had any other object.

R. N. WORTH.

INVENTORIES OF CHURCH GOODS, TEMP. EDWARD VI.

In the year 1552 a Royal Commission was appointed and sat at the Bishop's Palace, Exeter, to make enquiries as to the plate, jewels, and other goods belonging to the Cathedral and the parish churches in the City and County of the City of Exeter. The reasons for this enquiry are not far to seek. Twelve years previously (1540) an Act had been obtained for restoring the navigation of the Exe. Towards the expenses of the undertaking some of the churches in Exeter, had contributed portions of their plate, and the aggregate value of their contributions amounted to £22s 12s. 4d. (Act book No. 11 Corporation). Much money was expended upon the undertaking, but in the end it came to nothing and the large outlay was so much thrown away. Again, in 1549, the City was besieged by the Cornish rebels, and in the confusion which reigned supreme during the six weeks that it was invested, advantage was taken to conceal or appropriate such valuables, including church property, as could be conveniently carried off.

Interrogatories were administered to the Churchwardens of the Churches in order to discover what inventories of Church goods they had, what goods were in their possess-

admission and doe admitt the said Richard Bryan to the Rectory of Silferton aforesaid to be full and perfect Possessor and Incumbent thereof And doe hereby signifie to all persons concerned therein that he is hereby intituled to the profitts and perquisites and all Rights & Dues incident and belonging to the said Rectory as fully and effectually as if he had been instituted and inducted according to any such Lawes and Customes as haue in this case formerly beene made had or used in this Realme. In witnes whereof they have caused the Common seal to be hereunto affixed, and the same to be attested by the hand of the Register by his Highnesse in that behalf appointed. Dated at Whitehall the Thirteenth day of February One thousand six hundred fifty & six."

Seal attached, containing a shield with St. George's Cross and the following legend:

"Seale for approbation of publick preachers. (Signed) Jo: Nye Reg^r."

There is the following endorsement made after the Restoration:

"20th Novemb. 1662. Exhibitum apud Exon in visitacione speciali ibidem. Jos: Hall Reg^{ter}."

WINSLOW JONES.

NOTES ON SOME DARTMOOR ANTIQUITIES.

IV.—ROADS AND BRIDGES.

The ancient roads of Dartmoor commonly pass under the name of "trackways," and as a rule certainly were little other than accustomed routes which gradually became defined by use, and which when disused commonly fell back again into a close approach to their original state of Nature; though it has frequently happened that when the traffic was sufficiently great to wear a hollow, and form a rain channel, and where the subsoil was sufficiently deep, the neglected road became a surface gully. But many of the tracks never attained to this condition, and were merely, what some of them have been handed down by name as, "green ways." Still less defective in use were several routes, marked out by placing stones at intervals in what would otherwise have been a pathless waste. These stones were placed

at such distances that when one was reached another could be seen in ordinary weather, perhaps more; and where this method had reached its fullest development the stones were commonly inscribed on their opposite sides with the initials of the names of the towns between which the track led. Such stones were occasionally erected by subscription over a wide area, and the Corporation accounts of Plymouth give expenditure under that head in the early part of the seventeenth century. Stones are still occasionally used in the same way on the Moor, especially along tracks to isolated dwellings, and whitewashed for better distinction at night. Some of the ancient stone crosses which are more common in Devon on the borders of Dartmoor than elsewhere in the county, were erected at points where a track branched or forked—after the fashion of directing posts. This is very noteworthy on the routes between Plympton Priory, and Tavistock and Buckland Abbeys.

The most important of the old roads which have left considerable traces behind them are the "Great Central Trackway" and the "Abbot's Way." The Great Central Trackway was suggested some years since, by me, as a remnant of the ancient Fosseway running westward from Exeter to Tavistock. Acting on this hint, Mr. R. Burnard proceeded to investigate the remains, and succeeded in tracing the trackway for some seventeen miles, and in effect proving the identification. This trackway is really a well-formed causeway, which must have cost an enormous amount of labour, and could only have been made for purposes of arterial communication. Where its construction can best be seen it is about ten feet wide, and is "built in" with stone to a depth of two to two-and-a-half feet.

The "Abbot's Way," on the other hand, instead of being a causeway, or having anything elaborate about it, may be regarded as a typical example of an ancient track pure and simple. It originally led between Buckfast Abbey and (branching) the Abbeys of Tavistock and Buckland, and may be followed and utilized still for man miles over the open moors. The traffic must once have been considerable for it to have retained its character so well for so long a period.

The ancient "clapper bridges" on the

Moor have attained an archæological importance that does not really belong to them. The older antiquaries called them "Cyclopean," and gave them an unknown origin and an almost prehistoric date; and this example has been more or less followed ever since. That some of them are of considerable age is quite certain, but it is equally certain that they are of nearly all ages down to the present day. Mr. R. Burnard found that the "clapper" at Post Bridge, which is the most remarkable of the whole, had nothing whatever to do with the "Great Central Trackway," which passed the river at a ford hard by, and therefore did not date back so far. Fords and stepping stones no doubt did duty for many long ages before bridges were built, and these "clapper" bridges would hardly have been needed before the packhorse system came into vogue, and passed away as a rule when wheeled vehicles became common, though there is a capital example of very recent erection over the Meavy, near Lether Tor.

Nothing could well be simpler than their construction. They simply repeat in stone the principle and method of the wooden "clam;" only for the trunk of a tree or the rough plank thrown over the water, they substitute a granite slab, and where the stream is too wide to be spanned by one slab, pile blocks of granite to make a rude pier or piers. There is, in short, nothing whatever wonderful about them. The only difficulty of construction they present is the size of some of the foot-slabs, and the ready way in which uncivilised peoples move much larger blocks than any of these show that this is a difficulty more of imagination than reality.

R. N. WORTH, F.G.S.

A NORTH DEVON CAVALIER'S EXPENSES—1642-1646.

GEORGE YEO, of Huish, North Devon, was the eldest son of Leonard Yeo of the same place and of Collaton in the parish of Newton Ferrers, South Devon. His mother was Sarah, fourth daughter of Hugh Fortescue of Wear Giffard and Filleigh by Elizabeth, one of the numerous daughters of Sir John Chichester, of Raleigh, Kt. His great-grandfather, also called Leonard, was a scion of the elder branch of the old Devonshire

family of Yeo of Heanton Sachville whose estates ultimately came by marriage to the Rolles, and he was sometime a citizen and mercer of London and lived at the sign of the Unicorn in Cheapside. This ancestor married the presumably wealthy widow of another London citizen (called Beresford in the Heralds' Visitation of 1620, but Brock in the family MSS.) and retired to his manor of Huish aforesaid which, according to Risdon, he had purchased and on which he built a "proper house." Seven generations of his posterity flourished there.

George Yeo, the subject of this Note, was born at his maternal grandfather's house at Filleigh on the 20th February, 1577/8. Following a wise fashion of the young county gentry of those days, he entered in due time an Inn of Court, not necessarily for the pursuit of the Law as a profession, and was admitted of the Inner Temple in the year 1618. About the year 1624 he married Elizabeth, a daughter of Sir Robert Bassett of Umlerleigh, by whom he had three sons—Leonard, the eldest, who ultimately married Joan, a daughter of Colonel John Gifford of Brightley, (not mentioned in Colonel Vivian's pedigree of the Gifford family), and four daughters.

From an interesting family MS. in his own hand, with the loan of which I have been favoured, it appears that at the breaking out of the great Civil War, in 1642, Mr. Yeo, who had recently succeeded to the family estates, his father having died in May, 1641, adopted the cause of King Charles, and was subsequently engaged in most of the services on the Royalist side in Devonshire until the final disaster at Torrington in February, 1646. Early in December, 1642, he rode, I find, to Modbury, where the Sheriff (Sir Edmund Fortescue) accompanied by other Devonshire Royalists was raising the *posse comitatus* for the King. In the attack upon this party by a force from the Parliamentary garrison of Plymouth Mr. Yeo seems to have escaped, although his brother-in-law, Mr. Arthur Bassett, was one of those taken prisoners and sent to London to be dealt with by the Parliament. Mr. Yeo returned home. He is undoubtedly the same Mr. Yeo who, later in the month, in association with Colonel Acland and Mr. Gifford, occupied Torrington at the instance of Sir Ralph

NOTES ON SOME DARTMOOR ANTIQUITIES.

V.—BARROWS, CAIRNS, AND KIST-VAENS.

Three of our remaining classes of antiquities are admittedly sepulchral, and may, therefore, be treated together. The other four are more or less involved in controversy, and will require, therefore, to be treated at greater length, and independently.

Barrows, cairns, and kist-vaens are three forms of ancient interment, which in all probability indicate, at any rate in their origin, racial or at least tribal differences. But there is a much wider range of divergent practice in mound burial generally—whether the mound be of earth (a barrow) or of stones (a cairn); than in the interments of kist-vaens; and hence there is good reason to believe that the custom of mound burial continued for a very long period.

Dartmoor has yielded examples of almost every form of mound burial known. Some of the barrows and cairns are of very considerable dimensions, and when they are reared upon the high places of the tors, as is frequently the case, form very prominent features in the landscape. They will be found distinguished on the latest Ordnance Survey of the Moor by the general name of tumuli. They range in size from little heaps, so wasted as to be hardly distinguishable, to hillocks approaching 100 feet in diameter and still 15 to 20 feet in height, and evidently the result of considerable toil. Whether the use of earth instead of stone, or *vice versa*, in their construction, and the formation in the one case of a barrow and in the other of a cairn, really indicates more than the appreciation of the material which lay handiest, is, I think, a point fairly open to discussion.

In two main points the tumuli of Dartmoor, whether cairns or barrows, so far as I am aware, all agree. They are wholly of the *round* as distinct from the *long* type; and so far as is known, every interment in them is by cremation. Indeed, cremation is all but universal in the barrows of this county, which is in itself an exceptional feature.

Some of the barrow interments are exceedingly simple—the handful of ashes has only been placed in a shallow pit scooped in

the natural surface of the ground, and the mound heaped roughly over it. In other instances there has been a building over the remains before heaping began. In some barrows flint implements have been found; in others, again, remains of articles of bronze—the most interesting find being that of the amber pommel of a dagger discovered by the late Mr. Spence Bate, F.R.S., in a barrow on Hameldon. So far as the county generally is concerned its barrows furnish examples of every kind of interment associated with the Bronze Age. It is stated—but query—that Roman coins have been found in burial heaps on Haldon and elsewhere. Unfortunately most of the tumuli on Dartmoor appear to have been ransacked without the smallest archaeological care, and hardly a record remains of the results. It is the more imperative, therefore, that the fullest attention should be paid to any further investigation in this direction.

The kist-vaen is merely, as its name implies, a “little chest.” It is, in fact, a built stone box, consisting of four slabs of stone set on edge, with another slab covering the whole; and those who see the survival of the barrow in the grave mound will recognise quite as clearly the kist-vaen in the coffin. Kist-vaens are far more numerous on Dartmoor than is generally supposed, and we have good reason to believe that there are many still fortunately hidden from view, which have thus escaped being plundered, and remain to reward their lucky discoverer. In the Plym valley alone, my son, Mr. Hansford Worth, has ascertained the existence of twelve kist-vaens, the majority of which had been previously unrecorded.

The kist-vaen was originally buried beneath a mound or a cairn, though all traces of these have often disappeared; and around that mound there was erected a circle of stones, when the typical interment was complete. Several of the circles still remain, more or less perfect, about their respective kists. In some cases special care had been taken to keep these stones in place by a system of props. Such stone circles are not peculiar to kist-vaens; but occasionally they enclose simple barrows; and they evidently have a protective, or quasi-sacred, ideal in connection with the

dead. The interments in kist-vaens are either by cremation, or by inhumation in the contracted form; but no satisfactory record has been kept of any of the researches among the Dartmoor structures of this class. We have only to be thankful that they have not all perished with their contents.

Occasionally natural hollows in the tors seem to have been utilised as kist-vaens; and there appears evidence of this in the great ruined cairn which surrounds the highest crag of Ugborough Beacon. Here there may be one link between the kist-vaen proper and the cromlech (so called in the West, but the dolmen of antiquaries generally) which is merely a slab-built enclosure of the same type and with the same purpose as the kist, though differing greatly in size—in fact, a kist-*mawr* instead of a kist-*vaen*.

R. N. WORTH, F.G.S.

Queries.

THE REV. NATHANIEL BOUGHTON, OF LAUNCESTON AND PLYMOUTH.—According to an entry on the fly-leaf of the oldest Launceston Parish Register, "Mr. Nathanioll Boughton began his ministry heare ye 25th March 1699." His son George, when he matriculated at Exeter College, Oxford, in 1715, and another son, William, when he matriculated there in 1720, were described as sons of Nathaniel Boughton of Launceston, Cornwall, *clericus*; but when a third son, John, matriculated at the same College in 1729, the father is given as "Nathaniel Boughton, of Plymouth, Devon, *clericus*." (Foster's *Alumni Oxoniensis*, p. 136). From the fact that a memorial in Launceston Church declares that William Bedford and his two sons, Charles and John, the last-named of whom died in 1787, were "Curates of this Church successively 73 years," it has been assumed that Boughton's incumbency ceased in 1714; but this appears from the evidence of the Exeter College Registers to be inexact, and I should be glad of information concerning him, and especially of his origin and connection with Plymouth.

R.

Replies to Queries.

THE PREFIX "JESUS."—(N. & G., II., 127).—Two instances of the use of the prefix "Jesus" to a mediæval letter are to be found in communications sent in 1535-6 by John Shere, the last Prior of Launceston, to Thomas Cromwell, both of which are in the "Cromwell Correspondence" now in the Record Office. In the first, which is headed "Jesus," Shere desired to have Richard Carlian, Vicar of Stratton, "examined vpon certayn interrogatories touching the weale of the howse of Launceston"; and in the second, headed "Jhus," he complains that "myn olde mortall Ennymye Sr William Genys [one of his Canons] neuer seasith to ymagine my destruccōn And hath now of late mooste devillishe invented and surmysed a lie anyeste me." It may be remarked that in

another communication in which Shere told Cromwell he had sent him a fee, "for all my hope and truste consistithe in the cōtynuaunce of yo^r leanfull fauor and supportacōn," the Prior did not invoke the Holy Name.

A.F.R.

OLD RECEIPTS AND NOSTRUMS—(N. & G. III., 60).—In the interesting article with the above title from Mr. Cotton's collection in the April number of *Notes and Gleanings* a query is made of the word "Methredatum."

Now in all probability this word has been modernised or anglicised into Mithridate, as it occurs in this form associated with remedies for the plague.

There is a curious receipt book of 1668—"The Queen's Cabinet opened, or the Pearl of Practice—Acurate Physical and Chyrurgical Receipts." The first receipt in the work is "Dr. Butler's Preservative against the plague" wherein among other medicinals enumerated "two ounces of Methridate," and not in this case describing it. Again "To make water of Life"—"two or three ounces of Mithridate or Treacle" are to be introduced with other materials. And in "A Cordial Water in the time of infection, by Sir Thomas Mayner" "Treacle Venice and Mithridate" are recommended; and "Dr. Read's Perfume to smell against the Plague" includes Venice Treacle and Mithridate.

Referring to old Dictionaries for this word we obtain something of a description of it as in *A new English Dictionary*, &c., by J.K., 1752—"Mithridate, a strong Treacle or Preservative against Poison, invented by Mithridates, King of Pontus,"¹ and in "The complete English Dictionary" by F. Barlow, 1772, it stands "Mithridate, S. (Fr.) a kind of electuary; one of the capital or principal medicines of the shops, consisting of variety of ingredients, and receiving its name from Mithridates King of Pontus, who was its inventor." Bailey also refers to it in a similar manner.

In a tract by Dr. Christopher Merrett, Fellow of the College of Physicians, and of the Royal Society (1670) written against some abuses among Apothecaries he says—"Whereas Apothecaries are bound to show publickly to the Censors of the College, and the Master and Wardens of their Company, Mithridate, Diascordium, Alkermes," etc. "Yet for all this some of them privately make a great deal more of the Composition than is shewed, of unsound Drugs," etc. Also that these persons pretended that "they were abridged wholly from their Trade, and might not sell a penny-worth of Mithridate, etc. without a Doctor's Bill, whereas there is not a word in the Charter to that purpose."

This Mithridate (now obsolete) was a confection made up of spices, balsams, myrrh, frankincense, honey, seeds, vegetables, etc.—and full details of it appear in Gray's *Supplement to the Pharmacopœia*. G.T.

¹ In Thomas Lupton's *Thousand Notable Things* is the following paragraph: "Whosoever eateth two walnuts, two figs, twenty leaves of rue, and one grain of salt, all stamped and mixed together, fasting, shall be safe from poison or plague that day; which antidote King Mithridates had used so much, that when he drank poison purposely to kill himself, it could not hurt him."

place; and I may add that he held the Rectory of Black Torrington together with the Vicarage of Ilington, and that he was instituted to that Rectory on 29 April, 1626, (*vide* Cary's *Register*, fol. 122 b).

WINSLOW JONES.

NOTES UPON SOME DARTMOOR ANTIQUITIES.

VI. CROMLECHS AND "SACRED CIRCLES."

The Drewsteignton cromlech (or dolmen) is the only perfect example of this class of antiquities left in Devon, and it has been *restored*. There are, however, remains of others elsewhere, as at Merrivale Bridge, and it is quite possible that more remain to be recorded. In the previous article the likeness of the cromlech to the kist-vaen, save in size, was pointed out, and there seems little reason to doubt that the purpose of each was the same—the cromlech, however, being the more dignified structure of the two—a "house of the dead," instead of a "bed of the dead." Moreover, it is by no means clear whether the more usual custom was to cover the cromlechs by a mound, or to leave them free standing. The latter is the almost invariable rule with the cromlechs as existing now; but it is impossible to say that it has always been so. These structures can be traced from the British Isles along both sides of the Mediterranean right away into Asia, so that the custom of cromlech building is equally ancient and wide-spread. Moreover, there are said to be cromlech builders—at least, cromlech users—now in parts of the East.

There is nothing peculiar about the cromlechs of Devon; unless it be that in two or three instances natural formations of rock may have been adapted in their formation—a point on which one would not care to pronounce too positive an opinion, and as the barrow has its modern analogy in the grave mound, and the kist-vaen in the coffin, so has the cromlech in the high or altar tomb.

Speculation has run riot as to the purpose of the cromlech. The most favourite idea with the Druidists, was that cromlechs were Druidic altars—for what would a Druid be

without an altar, and where are the altars if the cromlechs are not they? The absurdity of the notion should be self evident to anyone who pays a visit to Drewsteignton, to go no further. Then come the suggestions that they are sanctuaries, sacred chambers, shrines, or Arkite cells, (and the reader will find much curious rubbish touching Mithraic and Arkite ceremonial in the writings of antiquaries of the last century). But the palm of absurdity, so far as the Drewsteignton cromlech is concerned, is reached by Chapple, who declared it to be an astronomical observatory, so that modern pyramid-mongers have not even the small merit of originality.

The so-called "Sacred Circle" differs, so far as Dartmoor is concerned, in no respect, save in size, from the circles which surround barrows or kist-vaens. Rowe in the *Perambulation* gives the circumference as ranging from 36 feet to 360—the latter the size of the Grey Wethers, the largest in the county. The Scorhill circle, though not so large, is more striking.

Now when such circles enclose a cromlech or a barrow or a kist-vaen, there is no reason whatever to give them other than a sepulchral character; it is only a question of differing dimensions, and there may be cases in which the mound or structure enclosed may have disappeared. But there are other instances in which it is almost certain that the circle is independent of any indication of a sepulchral nature.

By almost universal consent of the elder antiquaries, these independent rings were dubbed "Druidic temples," and hence their trivial name of "Sacred Circles," and the very general belief in their religious character now. The entire subject is too large to be discussed fully here, but it must be borne in mind that the key to the origin and purpose of the "Sacred Circles" of Dartmoor, must also be the key to the origin and purpose of the stupendous structures of Avebury and Stonehenge. The explanation that will fit the one must fit the other. It must also account for the instances of concentric circles (but that may be merely a question of superior dignity), and for the occurrence of immediately contiguous circles,—sometimes independent, and sometimes within an outer circle; which

to my mind does not help the religious theory.

We are in all likelihood very far as yet from the last word on these structures, but I think these points can be clearly made out. 1. That there does exist a class of stone circle which has no unquestionable sepulchral intention. 2. That such circles are of much larger dimensions than the rings usually surrounding the barrow or the cairn. 3. That the difference is really one of magnitude, and that there are no circles so large that a barrow or cairn might not be found to match. 4. That where any evidence of origin or intention exists it is invariably sepulchral. 5. That there is no useful object gained—the circle simply marks out a space, but it keeps nothing in and keeps nothing out. 6. That there is not the slightest exterior authority for any statement made as to their use; but that all that has been written and said is purely imaginative. 7. That the purpose suggested by the distinctly sepulchral circles is that of “setting apart”—an *ideal*, as distinct from an *actual* protection. 8. That the “Sacred Circles” *may* have been meeting places of the village or tribe for secular or religious purposes, but that there is no evidence in support of any such hypothesis. 9. That the importance of such structures as Avebury and Stonehenge shows that the constructive impulse must have been equally general, strong, and widespread. 10. That it is by following out this last indicated line of inquiry that the clue will be found, if at all.

R. N. WORTH, F.G.S.

HENRY TRECARELL.

In the local chronicles of Launceston, no name is marked with more honour than that of Henry — commonly but mistakenly called “Sir Henry” — Trecarell, to whose munificence the erection of the splendid church, dedicated to the Magdalene, has customarily been attributed. It is not my present purpose to examine whether the tradition to this effect is substantiated by the evidence at our command, though that is a point worth enquiry by those interested in the ecclesiastical history of the West. My immediate desire is to set forth of what family Henry Trecarell was, and to supply

some fresh facts concerning his personal career.

The family of Trecarell, or Esse of Trecarell, in the parish of Lezant, had long been identified with Launceston and its vicinity. In a charter granted to the Priory by Earl Reginald of Cornwall (1140-1175), Jordan de Trekarl, described as Provost, figures as one of the witnesses.¹ In 1264, Bishop Bronescombe signed a document having reference to Richard de Trekarl as Keeper of the Wards in the episcopal manor of Lawhitton. Six years later, John de Trekarl was present at the execution of a deed by Sir William Wysa, of Greyston.² About 1385 Henry of Trecarl attested a deed by Roger Page, of Launceston;³ and he would appear to have died before 1405, in the May of which year the Bishop, staying at Lawhitton, granted or Robert Trecarl and his wife Joan, as well as to Christina, relict of Henry Trecarl, a licence to celebrate divine service in the Chapel of the Blessed Mary Magdalene, within their mansion of Trecarl, administering the tonsure on the same day to yet another Henry Trecarl,⁴ who would appear, from the family genealogy, to have been Robert's son. In 1445, John Trecarell, describing himself as cousin and heir of Robert Trecarell, executed a conveyance of some property “in the borough of Dounheved” (otherwise Launceston); at the same time Robert Trecarell himself executed another, touching property “in the borough of Dounheved and in Newport;” and in the next year the former witnessed a deed at Launceston;⁵ while with the witness by a Trecarell, with Christian name obliterated, of another Launceston deed in 1470,⁷ this portion of the record ends.

Henry Trecarell, to whom we now come, appears on the family tree as son of John Esse alias Trecarell of Trecarell, who married a “daughter of Vincent;” grandson of another John, who married a “daughter of Sweeting;” great-grandson of Henry

¹ Hingeston-Randolph's *Bronescombe's Register*, p. 200.

² *Ibid.*, p. 276.

³ Peter's *History of Launceston*, p. 305.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ Hingeston-Randolph's *Bronescombe's Register*, pp. 283, 437.

⁶ Peter, pp. 125-8.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 152.

Augustine's Order [was] founded at Launceston in ye County of *Cornwall* by *Reginald* Earl of *Cornwall* in y^e year of our Lord 1150. And dedicated to *St. Stephen*." Upon a parchment cover is inscribed in Old English text "*Regestrum Munimentorum*," and on the inside of this is the single line "*Theoricus*, native *Normannis*, primus Prior *Launceston*." To the fourth page two slips of paper (one of which is evidently torn from a boy's copy-book of two centuries since) are pinned; upon the one are some references to Robert de Dunstanville, John de Mutford, attorney to Edward I, and Reginald de Morteyn, "who was Earl of Cornwall, between ye time of Kg. *John* and ye 30th of Ed. I. viz. 1302," while on the other was commenced a list of the "Priors of ye Priory of *Launceston*," which extended only to the following entries:

a^o Xti. Regis.

1. *Theoricus*, a *Norman*;
see ye back-side of ye Parchmt. Title.

. . . 1271. H. 3. 55. Richard? See y^e Agreem^t between ym and ye Parishioners of *St. Stephen's* (p. 10^b.) concerng Mortuaries, &c.^a— He died in 1274. Ed. I. I. as appears by y^t King's Congé-d'eslire to ye Supprior and Convent to choose a new one after his decease; ye See of *Exeter* being y^e void in y^e Kgs hand. See pag. 9. b. lin. 14. and 10. a. lin. 2.

The book is made up of copies of charters, leases, documents relating to property, and other matters affecting the Priory, some of which have appeared elsewhere, but the most have as yet been uninvestigated. Even the extracts above given are curiously suggestive of the amount of information that may lie hidden within its leaves. "*Theoricus*, a *Norman*," as the earliest Prior, for instance, is an entirely new name to investigators of its history, Oliver, in his *Monasticon*, giving at the head of the list a certain Galfridus, who witnessed a deed in 1171, though Prebendary Hingeston-Randolph has named an earlier one in Robert, whom he notes to have died on June 24, 1149.

This, it should be added, is not the first attempt to call public attention to the volume, for, in 1875, Sir John Maclean issued a prospectus in the following terms:—"To

be published in quarto. From the archives of Lambeth Palace. As soon as the names of a sufficient number of subscribers shall have been obtained. Registrum munimentorum prioratus Launcestonensis, being a collection of charters and other instruments relating to the possessions of the Priory of Launceston . . . extending from the Conquest to the reign of King Henry VII., with an historical introduction. By Sir John Maclean." The project, however, went no further than the prospectus, and this interesting record remains to be thoroughly explored.

ALFRED F. ROBBINS.

NOTES UPON SOME DARTMOOR ANTIQUITIES.

VII. MENHIRS AND "AVENUES."

Stone "posts" constitute the last class of Dartmoor Antiquities which we have to consider and discuss. Erected singly they are the "menhirs" of the archaeologist—a word which simply means "long-stone," and which is often replaced by "monolith." Placed in rows they form the "avenues" or "parallelitha," touching which more nonsense has been talked and written than about any other class of antiquity whatever, "sacred circles" and cromlechs not excepted.

Some of the largest menhirs on Dartmoor are fallen. Among those which are still in place none is more imposing than the solitary Bair Down "Man" (man simply = maen = stone). But there is a very fine one near Merivale Bridge; and one of the finest of all was discovered by the Rev. S. Baring-Gould at Lew Trenchard, which originally stood 10 feet 10 inches above the ground line. The Bair Down Man stands 10 feet 9 inches at present, but Mr. Baring-Gould has shown that it must have originally had a height above the surface of at least 13 feet 9 inches.

It seems highly probable that menhirs have had divers origins. Some were doubtless memorial or boundary stones or landmarks; some have been assigned a phallic purpose: the bulk are unquestionably sepulchral. They are found in all countries, where suitable material is available; and most frequently in connection with interments. They connect themselves on the one hand with the gigantic monolith

Egyptian obelisks, and with the still more elaborate memorial pillars of Greece and Rome. On the other we can hardly doubt that the characteristic stone crosses of Devon and Cornwall are largely the result of an attempt to give the older menhirs a Christian aspect—a development in fact of the simple pillar.

I believe that in the great majority of cases, when due examination has been made, remains of interments have been traced in connection with the Cornish "long-stones," and that nothing is known to militate against such a conclusion for all but a very small minority—if any—of the remainder. Clearly the "inscribed" menhirs of Devon and Cornwall are of a sepulchral character—another form of development.

Before we go further we will consider the "avenue." Rows of erect stones, some of very great size, are found not only in England, but in other countries, notably at Carnac, in Brittany. Our Dartmoor examples are all small, but still it is only in size that they differ from their kin elsewhere; and their arrangement and associations are absolutely identical—pointing inevitably to a common purpose. Of the Dartmoor "avenues" the best known are those above Merivale Bridge, which run parallel to each other, the one extending 1143 feet and the other nearly 800. The stones here do not range more than two feet above the ground (elsewhere they run up to three and a half feet, and are about three and a half feet apart, though not regularly spaced. These "avenues" were pronounced by Colonel Hamilton Smith to be "constructed for the performance of some solemn Arkite ceremonial," while Polwhele treats an "avenue" at Drewsteignton as marking "a processional road of the Druids." Touching which we can only remark that these personages must have been content with very contracted ways—"strait" and "narrow" in verity. Still more ridiculous, if only because physically impossible, is the idea that they are *cursi*, or spaces marked out in which ancient races were run, since not only could no chariot, but no man, pass a competitor in these lists except by running over him! But all the absurdities connected with the "avenue" hypotheses are not ancient. None is more baseless than the suggestion

of the late Mr. Ferguson that they represented conflicting hosts drawn up in hostile array, and were in effect memorial plans of ancient battle fields, with the menhirs as chieftains.

It is needful for the investigation of Dartmoor antiquities to bear in mind that it is not every row of stones, whether single or double, that belongs to this "avenue" class. There are instances in which single rows of stones are used as boundaries, but these are always closer together than the genuine antiquity. There are other cases in which earthen hedges have been faced at the base with large stones, where the disappearance of the bank has given the stones a distinctive character; but here also they are placed closer together, and no confusion need arise. However the caution will be useful.

The most important fact to note in connection with the "avenues" is their *invariable* association with memorials of a sepulchral character, more or less direct, but commonly immediate. We find them again and again forming part of a complete series of structural antiquities, including the barrow with its circle, and the menhir. This association is seen in the gigantic monoliths of Avebury, no less than in the commonly insignificant kindred remains of Dartmoor. If we take the "rows" at Drizzlecombe in the Plym valley as typical, we find that small tumuli surrounded by stone circles are connected by lines of stones, mostly single, with menhirs. The barrow, the ring, the row, and the menhir, are not independent of each other, but simply component parts of one memorial group, each apparently necessary to the purpose and completeness of the whole. No spot can show more plainly the utter absurdity of either the processional or the battle plain theory.

What then is the solution of the problem? It may seem rash to offer even a suggestion. This, however, appears clear. The purpose of these stone "rows" is commemorative and connected with sepulture—their association with the barrows proves the latter point at all events; and as there is no reason for assuming (save on one assumption) that there would be any other interment in such a group than that connected with the "barrow," the menhir with which each line concludes can only have an indirect

sepulchral purpose, and may possibly have been intended merely to give a certain dignity and finish to the arrangement. It may also have had some connection with the status of the deceased. (The assumption above hinted at is the possibility of the barrow marking the place of burial of one sex and the menhir of the other, and the double arrangement as representing the interment of the two heads of an ancient tribal household—which is *pure speculation*!)

But what of the “avenues” or “rows.” Well, it has occurred to me that possibly they may represent the individuals of the family or tribe of the deceased. It is well known that one of the ways of honouring the ancient dead was to cast a stone on the cairn raised over his or her remains (though a precisely similar thing was also done by some ancient peoples with precisely the opposite intention, and is done in some primitive localities even now—of course the root idea in both is commemoration). It does not seem to me that there is a very wide gap between helping to raise a cairn by piling stones, and in placing more distinctly and individually memorial stones, to indicate the part taken in the funeral rites by each member of the dead person’s family or tribe. The length of the “rows” and the numbers of the stones would thus be some indication of the importance and following of the deceased. This is but an hypothesis of course: but it seems to me one that is worthy of consideration.

R. N. WORTH.

THE PRINCESS HENRIETTA.

As it is likely to interest Exonians, and as it is well to have it recorded in a local paper, the following account of the poisoning of the Princess Henrietta is copied out of the “Life and Letters of Charlotte Elizabeth.” [Chapman and Hall, 1889, p. 234]. This letter was written by one who was likely to be familiar with the true facts of the case, and one who spoke fearlessly at a time when others dared not tell the truth. The Princess Henrietta, daughter of Charles I., born in Exeter, was the first wife of Philippe d’Orleans, brother of Louis XIV. The writer of the letter was Charlotte Elizabeth, daughter of Louis, Elector Pala-

tine, and *second* wife of Philippe d’Orleans. George I. was her own cousin and this was addressed to Caroline of Anspach, his daughter-in-law. The description is the more interesting because many assert that Madame was not poisoned, relying upon the testimony of the *post mortem* examination; but after reading Charlotte Elizabeth’s opinion of the Court physicians of that age, few would hesitate to say that they were quite capable of rendering a verdict in accordance with “political exigencies,” especially if it was required in order to save the life of a powerful Court favourite.

“To the Princess of Wales.

“July 13, 1716.

“Many say here that Madame¹ was not beautiful, but she was so graceful that everything suited her. She could never forgive anybody. She managed to get the Chevalier de Lorraine banished, but he got rid of her son. He sent the poison from Italy by a man named Moul, whom he afterwards appointed his steward. . . . It is quite true that Madame was poisoned, but without Monsieur’s knowledge. Whilst these wretches were discussing poor Madame’s mode of death, they hesitated as to whether they should inform Monsieur, but the Chevalier de Lorraine said, ‘Do not let us tell him; he will never hold his tongue. If he says nothing the first year, he will surely hang us ten years later. . . . They persuaded Monsieur that the Dutch had given Madame a slow poison, administered in her chocolate. . . . D’Effiat did not put the poison into the chicory water, but into Madame’s own cup. This was intelligently done, for nobody but ourselves drink out of our cup. This cup was not found immediately, but was supposed to be lost, or taken away to be cleaned. One of Madame’s servants (who is dead now) told me that very morning, whilst Monsieur and Madame were at Mass, he had seen d’Effiat come to the sideboard, take up the cup, and rub it with a piece of paper. The servant said to him, ‘what are you doing, Monsieur, at our sideboard, and why do you touch Madame’s own cup?’ He answered, ‘I am terribly thirsty and wish to drink; seeing this cup dirty I began cleaning it with a piece of

¹ Henrietta of England, Monsieur’s first wife [“Monsieur” was Philippe, Duc d’Orleans].