

## NOTICES OF RECENT BOOKS.

---

[*The Editor is prepared to accept for review books that may be forwarded to him for that purpose, provided such books either deal with subjects of special interest to the county of Surrey or are of general archæological interest. Before sending books, authors and publishers are recommended to communicate in the first instance with the Editor, Castle Arch, Guildford.*]

---

### THE GENEALOGIST'S POCKET LIBRARY.

---

Vols. V and VI. CHAS. A. BERNAU. Walton-on-Thames. 1909.

---

These are two more volumes in a series which we noticed last year.

In Vol. V, Mr. William Bradbrook deals first with the records of *Quarter Sessions*. He explains how he was led to interest himself in these neglected records by seeing some rolls which had been "handed over to the Buckinghamshire Archæological Society for what they were worth." Though, as Mr. Bradbrook says, the subject is too large to be treated of in a small space, he does a good work here in calling attention, as others have already done, to the widely-distributed mass of records which, though not of course of the first importance, are yet sufficiently interesting to the local historian and sometimes to the genealogist, to be worthy both of the most careful preservation and of frequent study. This Paper brings out well their points of human interest, and the way in which they may supplement other sources—Church Registers, for instance, or army records.

In the second part Mr. Percival Lucas treats of a more purely genealogical matter—*Seize Quartiers*. He is inclined rather to look at the subject from the point of view of the scientific student of hereditary influences, or, again, from that of the collector of ancestors: but his matter is well explained, and useful hints as to sources of information are given.

In the third part we have the *Records of Patented Inventions*, by Mr. Percy C. Rushen. Here, again, the description and explanation of the matter are concise and adequate, and the illustrations of its interest convincing. Mr. Rushen points out the places at which the subject

touches Genealogy. We notice that he also dwells for a moment on the hereditary-influence side of the latter study. There is nothing to be said against this point of view save that it enlarges the scope of a genealogist's work to a rather alarming extent.

The first and third of these three chapters carry on the study of the by-paths of genealogy already seen in Mr. Bernau's Paper on the genealogy of the "Submerged."

---

Vol. VI.—“*The Genealogist's Legal Dictionary*,” By P. C. RUSHEN. This volume will, doubtless, be found very useful by many students on account of its portability. It is a bold experiment to treat of such a large matter in so small a compass. As we have said, the book will probably be used by many; and by that it is justified: but we think it might be wiser to confine books of the size to smaller subjects (such as those well dealt with in other volumes of this series), which, while separate and capable of separate treatment, are yet definitely departments of a larger whole. The present subject stands rather more apart, and has, we think, suffered a little by compression and excision. It also shows, we are bound to say, some inaccuracy. The description of *gavelkind*, e. g., as “restricted to Kent” is, of course, strictly true: but the word is often used for similar tenure elsewhere, and the whole note is very incomplete.

To take one or two more instances. The explanation of “Patent Roll” as “the official record of grants of Letters Patent and of markets, etc., and Crown Licenses” (the last word should be spelt *Licences*) is not satisfying; “grant of letters patent” is misleading; all, or nearly all, early market grants are to be found on the Charter Roll—which, by the way, is not mentioned in this volume—and we think that the use of the vague “etc.” is to be deprecated. *Co-heiresses* and *amerciament* are examples of incorrect nomenclature; nor can we agree in the remark that “a name such as Fitz William should never be translated, for that is the name whatever that of the father was.” While in “*dedi, concessi et hac presenti carta confirmam*,” the last word is a misreading for *confirmavi*; nor could it, even as it stands, mean “I shall confirm.”