It is very gratifying when owners of historic sites take such an interest in them as has been so lovingly shewn by Mrs. Dent in her "Annals of Winchcombe and Sudeley." Few places have witnessed greater vicissitudes than Sudeley Castle. We will not dwell upon the pre-historic description of the district, and the evidences of Roman occupation so profusely found on the Sudeley estate, as illustrated by a Roman villa found on Wadfield farm in 1863, the ground plan of which, together with a fine pavement, is given by Mrs. Dent. Nor will we linger over the tragic history of the Saxon rule in Winchcombe, as the capital of the kingdom of Mercia, where Offa founded a nunnery in 787. This was soon afterwards superseded by a monastery of the great Benedictine Order, and the legends, traditions, and superstitions connected with its early history are very pleasantly related by our author, who prints, at length, the life of St. Kenelm, from the Saxon MS. in the Bodleian Library.

The early history of Sudeley Castle, in which our interest more particularly centres, is very obscure. It is not mentioned in the Domesday Survey, and hence it was, probably, one of the many adulterine castles erected in the troubulous time of King Stephen. No trace of works so early can now, however, be found, unless a portion of a low embattled tower, now forming a part of a cellar, be of that date, as it was considered to be by Sir Gilbert Scott when making a survey of the castle in 1854.

The number of castles erected for purposes of offence and defence
without license during the civil war between the Empress Maud and Stephen was very great, and many of them were dismantled and destroyed in the following reign. Hence it is not surprising that few remains of the original Castle of Sudeley now exist.

Mrs. Dent traces the devolution of the Manor of Sudeley from King Ethelred, who being thereof seized granted it to his youngest daughter Goda, whose husband, Walter de Nantes, held it "in right of the King." From the said Walter it descended to his son Ralph, called "the Earl," whose son Harold held it at the time of the Domesday Survey. From Harold it passed to his son John, who, by Grace daughter of William Tracy, had two sons, Ralph and William. Ralph succeeded his father at Sudeley, and William, the younger son, who assumed from his mother the name of Tracy, was one of the murderers of St. Thomas (Becket) Archbishop of Canterbury. Ralph died in 1192, and was succeeded by Otuer (usually called Otwell), his son and heir, who granted certain lands in Blakepitt to Winchcombe Priory, the charter of which is preserved in the British Museum with its seal appendant. Otuer, dying s.p., was succeeded by his brother Ralph, whose son Ralph succeeded him having livery of siezin in 1222. Mrs. Dent favours us also with the seal of this Ralph, as appended to a charter also in the British Museum.

From the last named Ralph the castle and manor descended to his great grandson John de Sudeley, who died in 1340, leaving by his wife Alianora (called by Mrs. Dent "Eleanor") daughter of the Lord Scales, an only son of his own name, and two daughters Joan and Margery. John died in 1367 s.p., when Thomas Boteler son of his eldest sister Joan, who had married William Boteler of Wemne, and Margery younger sister of the aforesaid John, were found to be his nearest heirs. In the partition of the estates, the Castle and Manor of Sudeley
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fell to the share of Thomas Boteler, who, eventually, by the death of his aunt Margery, became sole heir, but though inheriting the Barony he was never summoned to Parliament. Ralph son of Thomas and Joan, Mrs. Dent tells us, was one of the most illustrious owners of the castle. He greatly distinguished himself in the French wars, and held several high offices of state. In 1441 he was, by letters patent, created Baron Boteler of Sudeley. He rebuilt the castle, chiefly from spoils taken in the war. Portmaren Tower, according to tradition, derived its name from the French Admiral whom Boteler had made prisoner, and whose ransom was given to him by the king.

Lord Boteler was also a great benefactor to the neighbouring churches, and, among other works of charity, rebuilt the church of Winchcombe. He was, however, a stout Lancastrian, and after the result of the battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury, of course, fell into discredit, and eventually was obliged, at the demand of King Edward IV, to convey his castle of Sudeley, which he had with so much affection and cost re-edified, to certain persons who, the year following, conveyed the castle and manor together with the advowson of the church, to Richard Duke of Gloucester. Richard in 1478 exchanged them with the king for the Castle of Richmond, in Yorkshire, but on his accession to the crown they again fell into his hands. After the battle of Bosworth they passed to Henry, Earl of Richmond, and were granted to his uncle Jaspar Tudor, upon whose death in 1497 s.p., they again reverted to the crown.

Mrs. Dent refers to the great festival in dedication of the Monastery of Winchcombe by King Kenulf when she supposes St. Kenelm was baptized, and when Kenulf at the high altar liberated Eadbert, who being of royal blood had become professed, but had left his cell and assumed the crown of Kent, and had been defeated and taken prisoner by the King of Mercia. On the morrow after the dedication there was a great hunting party, and according to tradition the king finally took leave of his guests on Cleve Down, where a stone was erected to commemorate the event. On this stone Camden says there was a rude inscription on the upper side, and Mrs. Dent states that there is now an inscription on the same side, "seemingly not long since cut with a tool, in Roman characters, called 'Huddlestone's Table.'" She does not, however, show any connection between the Huddlestone family and this district. This we can supply.

The manor and castle of Sudeley, &c., being in the hand of Henry VII by the death of his uncle, by letters patent, dated 4 Sept. 1503, a grant was made to John Huddleston, Knight of the Royal Body, for life of the manor and lordship of Sudeley, together with the advowson of the church, and lands, &c., in Sudeley, Todryngton, Stanley, Grette Gretton, Catesthorp, and Newton in co. Gloucester, described as late the property of Ralph Boteler and Alice his wife, and of a rent of one hundred shillings per annum, payable to the king for the herbage and pannage of Sudeley Park; also all the possessions of the king within the said manor and villes (the Castle of Sudeley excepted) with all courts and all other privileges. He was also exonerated from the repair and support of the castle, the custody of which was included in the grant. Sir John Huddleston died soon afterwards, and it was doubtless some incident during his brief occupation which led to the inscription referred to by
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Mrs. Dent. We may also add to Mrs. Dent's account the fact that the lands of Sudeley, as above described, being again in the king's hands, by letters patent dated 29th March 1508-9, were granted, in mortmain, to Richard Keddermynster the Abbot and the Canons of the monastery of St. Mary and St. Kenelm of Winchcombe, which grant was vacated and the patent surrendered on 15th November 1510, from which time the lands remained vested in the crown until granted, together with the then lately dissolved monastery of Winchcombe, to Sir Thomas Seymour, afterwards created Lord Seymour of Sudeley.

We must here briefly advert to the Abbey of Winchcombe. Among the most able of her abbots was Richard Kidderminster, the last but one, whom we have just mentioned, who was appointed in 1488. Willis says: "He was a learned man, and by his wise government and his encouragement of virtue and good letters made the Monastery flourish so much that it was equal to a little University." Abbot Kidderminster was an eloquent preacher, and he vehemently opposed the statute of 4th Henry VIII depriving the clergy of certain privileges, preaching against it at Paul's Cross. What, however, is more to our present purpose, he wrote a History of the Monastery from the time King Kenulph founded the Church to the Abbot's own day. The history of this work is very singular. After the dissolution of the Abbey it fell into the hands of a farmer, who produced it at an assize at Gloucester in support of some claim he had made. Sir William Morton, the then Lord of the site of Winchcombe Abbey, was present, who, by some means, got it out of the farmer's hands, and taking it to his chambers in the Temple it was eventually destroyed in the Great Fire of London, but fortunately Dugdale had previously made some extracts from it. To Abbot Kidderminster succeeded Richard Ancelme, who with his monks in 1539 surrendered the Abbey to the King, the revenues being valued at £759 11s. 9d. per annum. The Abbey being included in the grant to Sir Thomas
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Seymour, the whole of the buildings, except the Abbot's house, were by him taken down and destroyed, so that scarcely a fragment now remains to mark the site of this once famous house, one of the three mitred abbeys in the county of Gloucester.

We must not omit to notice the tomb of St. Kenelm. Leland says that: "There lay buried in the east part of the church of the Monastery of Winchcombe Kenulphus and Kenelmus, the father and sonne, both Kings of Mercia." In 1815 Mr. Williams, then of the Abbey House, made extensive excavations on what was supposed to be the site of the ancient abbey. The foundations of the church were clearly traced, and several ponderous stone coffins, containing the remains of human skeletons, were discovered, but the circumstance which attracted the most attention arose from the examination of a small stone coffin at the east end of the interior of the church, close to the side of another of the usual size. Upon the removal of the stone which covered it there appeared a skull with a few of the other larger bones, and a very long-bladed knife, which was a mass of rust and fell to pieces on being handled. These were believed to be the remains of the young king Kenelm, murdered, as stated in the "Golden Legend," at the instance of his wicked sister Kenrida, and of the instrument with which the bloody deed was perpetrated; whilst the larger coffin was thought to contain the remains of his father King Kenulf, by whose side, some of the chroniclers tell us, the body of his son was buried.

There is no portion of the history of Sudeley of greater interest than the short time in which it was in the possession of Sir Thomas Seymour. Handsome, courtly, courageous, ambitious, bold, and, like most of his contemporaries, unscrupulous, he was one of the most prominent personages of the period in which he lived. A great favourite with King Henry VIII, he was entrusted, not only with important commands both by sea and land, but was also employed in difficult and delicate missions, all of which he accomplished to the entire satisfaction of his capricious master. So great was the king's favour towards him that in the dissolution of the religious houses, like other members of his family, he shared largely in the plunder of the Church, and the king not only designated him for a peerage, but appointed him one of the executors for carrying out the provisions of his will. In 1547 he was created Lord Seymour of Sudeley, and received, by the gift of his nephew, Edward VI, the Castle and Manor of Sudeley, and the possessions of the dissolved Abbey of Winchcombe. His ambition led him to aspire successively to the hands of the Princesses Mary and Elizabeth, and failing in this, he made advances to the widowed Queen Katherine, by whom, as appears from her letter to him, now in the Sudeley collection, which is given us in fac-simile by Mrs. Dent, he was more than readily accepted; the Queen avowing, "My mynd was fully bent the other tyme I was at libertye" (that is in her previous widowhood) "to marrye you before any man I know."

The marriage having taken place, great preparations were made at Sudeley by Seymour to receive, with fitting splendour, his royal bride. The neglected and delapidated castle was renovated, and suitable accommodation was carefully provided for the expectant infant. Here Seymour and the Queen lived in great magnificence, but the period of their felicity was very short. Katherine gave birth to a daughter, and died in childbed, and Seymour, though doubtless turbulent and
ambitious, without trial or proof of crime, was sent to the block by
his weak and jealous brother.

By the death and attainder of Seymour, Sudeley Castle again
reverted to the Crown, and though Mary, Seymour's infant daughter,
was restored in blood and honours, she was deprived of all the rich
possessions of her parents, much of which, including Sudeley Castle,
was secured to himself by her uncle the Marquis of Northampton, but
fell again to the Crown upon his attainder for the share he took in
the cause of Lady Jane Grey. By Queen Mary it was conferred upon
Sir John Bridges, who was created Lord Chandos of Sudeley in 1554,
from whom it descended to his grandson, Grey fifth Lord Chandos,
who died in 1621, leaving George his son and heir an infant of a year
old. He became of age upon the breaking out of the great rebellion,
and was very remarkable for his daring and valour in the cause of his
sovereign. Sudeley Castle was several times taken and retaken, and
was, at one period, the head quarters of the king, who, from "our
camp at Sudeley Castle," in 1643, addressed his famous letter to the
County of Cornwall. In the following year Sudeley was in the hands
of the rebels, and Lord Chandos, who had behaved with great loyalty
and bravery throughout the war, most unexpectedly, and without any
apparent cause, surrendered himself to the Parliament. He was
deprived of his seat in the House of Lords and compelled to take the
National Covenant and Negative Oath, and though he was admitted
to compound for his estates Sudeley Castle was not restored to him,
and in 1649 the Council of State ordered it to be "sighted," or
rendered untenable as a military post, and it was soon afterwards
totally demolished. Lord Chandos died in 1655, of the small pox,
s.p.m., and was succeeded by his brother William, but the Sudeley
estate was settled upon Jane his relict, who, by a second marriage,
carried it to George Pitt, whose great grandson, in 1776, was created
Lord Rivers of Sudeley Castle.

In 1830 the bulk of the Sudeley estates became the property, by
purchase, of Messrs. John and William Dent, and subsequently they
acquired the castle and remainder of the land from the Duke of
Buckingham. Through the taste and munificent liberality of the Dent
family, the Castle and Church of Sudeley have, from an almost
shapeless ruin, been restored to something like their former beauty
and grandeur, and Mrs. Dent concludes her annals by saying: "Here
I end my pleasant task, for pleasant it has been to gather up the
records of the past, and retrace Winchcombe and Sudeley's many
historic paths so often trodden with equal pleasure by those who have
gone before. Equal did I say? Nay, that can never be! for who
among them all have had the pleasure and the privilege of building
up the waste places, and seeing life and beauty creep like sunshine
once more over her crumbling and fallen walls."

Mrs. Dent has exhibited in the compilation of her work, extensive
reading and a vast amount of research, and though we are unable,
wholly, to agree in some of her conclusions, and think the mass of
matter she has so industriously collected might have been somewhat
better arranged, we are gratified in being able to state that we have
read her interesting and superbly illustrated book with great satisfac-
tion, and consider it a very valuable and important contribution to local
history.
The book here printed embraces the period from 1577 to about 1700, though some few leaves are missing, and, notwithstanding that the parish of Madron, which is the mother parish of Penzance, was not of so much consequence during the period over which this Register extends as it has since become by the rapid growth and just popularity of this the Madeira of England, the Parish Registers are of considerable interest, and Mr. Millett has executed his self-imposed task in a very complete, conscientious, and satisfactory manner.

The volume is printed verbatim et literatim, except that the constantly occurring words, "was baptized," &c. are omitted. Great care has been taken to preserve the varying orthography of proper names. In his valuable preface Mr. Millett fully describes the MS. he prints, which was stated by the vicar of the parish, more than half a century ago, "to be decayed, worm-eaten, and perishing," since which time it has suffered much from damp, and still more from having been entrusted to an ignorant and unskilful binder, who misplaced the leaves and so cruelly cut the edges as to destroy many of the entries. Mr. Millett also mentions in his preface many unusual Christian names which occur in the Register, and points out that there is now a tendency to disguise the sound of Cornish names in such a manner that we (Cornishmen) do not know them with their "foreign ring," and he states, what is worth knowing, that, as a rule, in all Cornish names the accent is laid upon the second syllable in words of two syllables, and on the next to the last on words of more than two.

Besides printing the Registers Mr. Millett has added an appendix containing a large collection of the most important and interesting monumental inscriptions in the church; a list of the incumbents of the benefice from the middle of the thirteenth century to the present time; and extended transcripts of various original documents in the Public Record Office, relating to the parish; and he has also supplied, that which greatly enhances the value of a work of this kind, a very full index.

Mr. Millett deserves the thanks of all who take an interest in Cornish genealogy, and we heartily wish that his book may have such a sale as to compensate him for the time and trouble he has bestowed upon it, so that he may be encouraged to undertake to edit and publish in the same manner the Registers of some other Cornish parish.

The collection of Rembrandt's etchings, which was held this year at the Burlington Fine Arts' Club, formed a very remarkable exhibition, and one which every one ought to have seen. It is probable that, although it included several works of doubtful authenticity, a more complete collection was never brought together. By the juxtaposition of different "states" it was made specially interesting and instructive, and while it served to spread a better knowledge of Rembrandt's work amongst amateurs generally, a rare opportunity was afforded to experts of pursuing their study of the master. Any one of the more important plates of the great artist who "rendered even darkness visible" is, no doubt, sufficient to astonish and to fascinate, and to illustrate, in the fullest manner we can imagine, the capabilities of etching; but to study seriously the master himself it is necessary to trace the chronological order of his work. If Rembrandt had dated and signed all his works a great deal of time and labour would have been saved to his admirers; but, out of about 350 plates that have been attributed to him, at least half of them are undated; 152 are not signed, and three or four different modes of signature were adopted in the remainder. The comparison of works of dubious authenticity with those undoubtedly genuine, the examination of signatures, and the collecting of all available evidence in order to distinguish the work of Rembrandt from that of his followers, and originals from copies, and to fix with some accuracy the dates of the undated plates, is no light or easy task, and one which is by no means accomplished yet.

In "Notes on the Etched Work of Rembrandt," published since the exhibition in Savile Row, by the Rev. C. H. Middleton, we find a very useful contribution to the fund of Rembrandt lore. This is we understand to be followed by a more complete work on the same subject now in progress; but we have in these "Notes" the results of much investigation of the disputed plates, and while awaiting the appearance of the larger work we content ourselves with a brief allusion to this first instalment. Amongst the independent theories regarding some of the plates we may mention the suggestion that the portrait of an old man in Jewish dress marked No. 15 in the catalogue may have been a portrait of the artist's father Harman. Concerning the "Resurrection of Lazarus" (No. 18) Mr. Middleton argues that, as also in the "Jacob Lamenting," we have "the design of Rembrandt, and
probably some of his actual work, but that the greater part of what we see is the work of Van Vliet.' "The Good Samaritan" he believes to have been designed and partly executed by Rembrandt, and finished by a pupil, differing from Mr. Haden, who attributes the plate to Bol. In his remarks on the plate traditionally called the "Great Jewish Bride," and which has generally been considered a portrait of his wife, the author remarks that Rembrandt's genius did not lie in accuracy of likeness. We confess we do not see that the fact of his so frequently idealising his models proved his incapacity for accuracy when that was the quality most to be desired. His large painted portraits were certainly accurate to the life.

The "Flight into Egypt" Mr. Middleton holds, with the catalogue, to be not a work in which Rembrandt has borrowed from another, but one in which he has taken an already engraved plate and altered it to his own purpose, the group of the Holy Family with some part of the foliage behind them, and parts of the foreground only being his. In reference to the peculiarity of the foliage in this print, consisting of "dots more or less thickly spread, differing in their form and tone, while the few strokes that can be discovered appear rather to have been added as an after-thought," Wilson's rather wild conjecture is quoted, namely—"If in spreading the varnish on a plate we bear hard with the dabber we find, on removing it, that the varnish has been penetrated, producing an infinite number of minute holes. . . . We may imagine that Rembrandt resorted to this manoeuvre with effect, and that the masses of foliage were expressed, in the first instance, by the movement of the dabber, and completed by a second operation, preserving the lights from the corrosion of the acid by a brush dipped in liquid varnish."—(Descriptive Catalogue, p. 21). It is by no means certain that Rembrandt resorted to this manner with effect, and that the masses of foliage were expressed, in the first instance, by the movement of the dabber, and completed by a second operation, preserving the lights from the corrosion of the acid by a brush dipped in liquid varnish. . . . We may imagine that Rembrandt resorted to this manoeuvre with effect, and that the masses of foliage were expressed, in the first instance, by the movement of the dabber, and completed by a second operation, preserving the lights from the corrosion of the acid by a brush dipped in liquid varnish. . . . We may imagine that Rembrandt resorted to this manoeuvre with effect, and that the masses of foliage were expressed, in the first instance, by the movement of the dabber, and completed by a second operation, preserving the lights from the corrosion of the acid by a brush dipped in liquid varnish. . . .

THE CHURCHES OF KENT. By Sir Stephen R. Glynne, Bart. 1877.
London : Murray.

It was said of Sir Stephen Glynne, that he had visited every church in England, and those who talked with him on this, his favourite pursuit, became aware that he had not only visited and accurately observed a vast number of churches, but that he remembered their particulars with a readiness and correctness that was little short of marvellous, and not unfrequently besides the architectural details of the building he knew the name and something of the character of the incumbent. The note books in which he recorded his observations were a part of the man. Probably he never left home without one, and it was understood that he had accumulated a vast number of these records of his experience. But, though all knew the extent of his range, and the acuteness and accuracy of his power of observation, it is probable that few supposed his records to be so full, or were at all aware that his notes upon above 5,530 churches were so entered up as to be fitted for publication. Whether he himself contemplated such
publication is not known, even to his family. He was a man of a
very shy and retiring disposition, very averse from any personal display,
and it is not improbable that he merely wrote up his notes, as he did
every thing else, with a sense that he ought to do his best. However
this may be, all will, we think, applaud his distinguished brother-in-
law, Mr. Gladstone, for the publication of the present volume, which
proves to the world that the reputation enjoyed by Sir Stephen as an
ecclesiastical antiquary, so far as church architecture is concerned,
rests upon a very solid foundation. The selection of the county of
Kent for the subject of the volume is judicious. Archdeacon Harrison
and the Rev. Scott Robertson have given it the benefit of their revision,
and have added the illustrations by which the work is graced. Mr.
Gladstone's introduction is just what was to be expected from so
loving and so accomplished a kinsman, and all, and no more, than was
suitable to the occasion.

The notes themselves are a model of what such notes should be,
they are clear, comprehensive, show a thorough knowledge of church
architecture, a very rare accomplishment when Sir Stephen began his
work, and are besides brief. The following account of St. Peter's
church, Sandwich, is selected almost at random, as an example of the
style and general character of the notes:

"The church has undergone considerable mutilation, and has at
present a very unsightly, patched appearance. It consists now of a
nave and chancel, with a north aisle, and a tower placed between the
nave and chancel. The south aisle is destroyed, but part of its outer
wall is standing, and the arches are visible, built into the south wall
of the nave.

"The walls are mostly of flints; the tower is large, but the upper
part is modern and built of brick. There is a rectilinear north porch,
embattled; all the windows of the nave have been sadly mutilated.
The interior is spacious and lofty; and the nave is divided from its
aisle by three pointed arches with octagonal pillars. The chancel is
divided from its aisle by two similar arches, and those which support
the tower are of like character. There is no vestige of very early
work about the church. The chancel has a fine curvilinear window on
the north side, of three lights, but unfortunately walled up. In the
north aisle is an ogee arch for a tomb, flanked by buttresses with
pinnacles; there are also the effigies of a man and woman, and a slab
with a cross flory and inscription in Lombard letters. A small altar-
tomb is panelled with trefoils containing heads, and bears the muti-
lated effigy of a knight. There is one good carved pew-end. In the
west gallery is an organ."

HISTORY OF THE DUNMOW FLITCH OF BACON CUSTOM. By
WILLIAM ANDREWS. London: WILLIAM TEGG & Co. 1877.

The author of this little book has brought together with much care
some interesting notes upon this singular custom, and few persons are
perhaps aware that the custom of Dunmow has its origin as early as
the time of Robert Fitz-Walter, if indeed it was not actually instituted
by that famous opponent of King John. There is at any rate certain
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evidence that it was well established in the fourteenth century. Allusion
is made to the custom in the vision of Piers Plowman, and Chaucer's
Wife of Bath says:—

"The bacon was not fit for hem I trow
That some men have in Essex at Donmow."

Mr. Andrews gives some extracts from the Cartulary of Dunmow
Priory as to the delivery of the flitch to certain male claimants in the
fifteenth century; but the Dissolution seems to have put a stop to the
continuance of the custom until 1701. It would appear that the
character of the proceedings now became considerably changed, and
the boisterous hilarity exhibited in the picture by Ogborne of the
"Dunmow Procession" in 1751, may be contrasted with the simple
procedure when "one Richard Wright, yeoman, came and required
the bacon of Dunmow on the 27th April in the 23rd year of the reign
of King Henry VI, and was sworn before John Cannon, Prior." The
revival of the custom in 1855, and subsequently, is characterized more
by levity than dignity—such is the taste of the age—and we cannot
help thinking that it would have been better to have allowed the
Dunmow custom to remain, like its counterpart at Wichnor, obsolete,
and well-nigh forgotten, save in such interesting records as Mr. Andrews
has given us.

Like many other mediaeval observances, that of the Flitch of Bacon
has had its day, and we confess our dislike to this revival at Dunmow
as much as to the recurring and senseless travesty of history at Coventry.
The object of the author of this book is to obtain from existing monuments the standard measures used in ancient times. For this purpose he employs three or four modes to ascertain the ratios between the different measured lengths; and from these ratios he derives the probable number of units of which the lengths are formed.

It would seem, however, that, as a graphic method is employed in planning, and an analogous method in setting out for construction all buildings and monuments, that the standards of measurement used by the ancients would be more easily arrived at, especially by those who are not mathematicians, by adopting such a method in order to trace, from actual measurement of the monuments, the units employed. For instance, in the example of the Cypriote Tablet from Dali, the readiest mode of proceeding would be to mark off to scale, on a straight line, the measurements 1·45, 2·15, 2·92, 3·24, 5·77, 25·49, and 44·2 inches; then, it will be readily seen, by dividing off the lengths with a pair of compasses, as near as may be into multiples of the smallest measurement, that if 1·45 was the unit of measure used, there were respectively, 1, 1½, 2, 2½, 4, 17½, and 30½ units in the different measurements given; or, to do away with the fractional multiples, if 2½ was the unit, there were respectively 2, 3, 4, 4½, 8, 35, and 60 units.

It may also be seen by setting the compass to the length of 5·77 inches, that the difference between 44·2 and 25·49 or 18·71 is very nearly equal to 3 × 5·77 + 1·45 and 25·49 is very nearly equal to 4 × 5·77 + 2·15 or in terms of units 44·2 = (3 × 8 + 2) + (4 × 8 + 3) units = 61 units instead of 60 as given in Mr. Petrie's results. If 44·2 is divided by 61 it gives the unit 0·7245, if by 60 it gives 0·7366 as the unit. The latter multiplied by 35, 8, 4½, 4, 3 and 2, gives the lengths 25·78, 5·89, 3·31, 2·95, 2·21 and 1·47, while the former gives 25·36, 5·80, 3·26, 2·90, 2·17 and 1·45, which evidently agree much better with the actual measurements; and as Mr. Petrie proposes that surveyors and others who have opportunities for measuring ancient monuments should furnish plans as accurately as possible of them, it would be well, in order to have their assistance in obtaining the different standards of measures, to add for their guidance in more detail than is possible in a short review, a description of such a method as that indicated above, and any result they might obtain could afterwards be proved by calculation, whereas on the other hand, where the units have been obtained by calculation, as in his book, they could easily be checked by the graphic method.

If the standards found by the inductive method are sufficiently
accurate, as they ought to be, they should, where any literary record exists, receive full confirmation.

The second and third chapters of the book give the application of the doctrine of probabilities in order to ascertain the limits of error, and treat also of the sources of error in the mean units found, and here the author very justly remarks that the number of mean units resulting from his investigations is not astonishing. Even in our own day, in works of a building or of a monumental character there would probably be a large number of mean units arising from any attempt to find theoretically the standards of measures used, and this would appear of necessity to be the case in all works which do not require in a high degree accuracy of measurement.

Mr. Petrie appears to have made his investigations with great care and precision, and the case of the Royal Egyptian cubit is worth noting, where the mean derived from twenty-eight monumental examples agrees almost exactly with the mean of about a dozen examples of cubit rods which have been discovered.

THE VISITATION OF THE COUNTY OF WARWICK IN THE YEAR 1619.
Edited by JOHN FETHERSTON, F.S.A. (Harleian Society).

This valuable Society has recently issued to its members another sumptuous Volume of more than 460 pages, inclusive of the full Index of Names, being the “Visititation of the County of Warwick” made by William Camden, Clarencieux King of Arms, and his deputies in 1619. The greater part of the MS. from which it is printed is in Camden’s own handwriting, nevertheless it does not appear to be the original record, neither is the official copy preserved in the Herald’s College. Both are transcripts. In the British Museum (Harl. MS. 1193) are some of the original loose papers signed by the representatives of the families whose pedigrees are recorded. Of these signatures Mr. Fetherston gives fac-similes at the end of his volume. The last Visitation of Warwickshire was made in 1682, the only MS. of which extant is in the Herald’s College. An alphabetical list of the pedigrees recorded at this last Visitation, made by the Editor some twenty years ago through the courtesy of a Herald now deceased, is printed in the Preface to the work before us.

The volume appears to have been very carefully edited, and all the Arms are engraved in outline, the blazon being supplied underneath. It would, however, we think, have been better had the tincture marks been shewn on the shields, so that the blazon of the Arms might have been read at a glance.

The same objection obtains with respect to the appropriation of the quarterings. If, instead of this information being given in a table preceding the pedigrees, the names had been inserted under the arms, or had been introduced, within parentheses, in the blazon, it would have been far more convenient. In some cases this has been done. We do not know, however, if, in this respect, the Editor has followed his MS. We annex the engraving of the arms of Digby (p. 16) as an example of the manner of treatment.
Arms—Quarterly of six. 1. Azure, a fleur-de-lis argent, in dexter chief a crescent for difference.
2. Gules, a fess ermine. 3. Argent, on a bend gules, three martlets or. 4. Argent on a fess between three birds sable as many mullets of the field. 5. Ermine, on a bend gules two chevrons or. 6. As first.
Crest—An Ostrich proper, in its beak a horse-shoe (untinctured).
In the very valuable series of "Calendars of State Papers," published under the direction of the Master of the Rolls, few, if any, exceed in interest the volume lately issued under the editorship of Mr. W. D. Hamilton. Mr. Hamilton acted, for several years, as assistant to the late eminent antiquary and historian, Mr. John Bruce, and upon the lamented death of that gentleman Mr. Hamilton was selected to succeed him as editor of the Domestic State Papers of the reign of Charles I.; and it would seem that Mr. Bruce's mantle has fallen on his successor.

The volume before us covers a period of six months only, viz.: from 1st October 1639, to 31st March 1640, but there is no epoch of English history fraught with greater consequences to the constitution of this country than the few years to which these six months were preeminently the prelude. The King's first hostile expedition to quell the insubordination of his Scottish subjects had come to nought. A treaty had been entered into at Berwick on 18th June, 1639, not one condition of which the Scots seem to have fulfilled, and the King, in the winter of 1639-40, was engaged in the preparation of another expedition with the object of bringing them into obedience. The difficulties with which the King had to contend, from the apathy of a large section of the English people, indeed, we may say, from their secret sympathy with the Scots and the spirit of hostility which was arising in England, and which, not long afterwards, culminated in the overthrow of the Church and the murder of the Archbishop and the King, are abundantly exemplified in the papers, many of them of a semi-private character, calendared in this volume; and it is indispensable that every student of this period of English history should master its contents. Mr. Hamilton's comprehensive and able preface contains an epitome of the contents of the volume.
slight remains of the original structure may be traced in the crypt. Having become much decayed and, withal, greatly damaged by fire in the reign of Henry VIII, considerable alterations and repairs were effected, so much so that externally, in general appearance, the building would seem to be a Tudor erection.

Again it had fallen into decay, and had become internally greatly disfigured by unsightly galleries and high mis-placed pews, so that Macaulay could not "refrain from expressing his disgust at the barbarous stupidity which had transformed this interesting little church into the likeness of a meeting-house in a manufacturing town." For these, and for sanitary reasons, a thorough restoration was determined upon in 1876; and it is a record of this work of restoration, and of the various discoveries and observations made during the operations, with reference to the remains of the illustrious and historical dead laid within its walls, which form the most interesting part of Mr. Doyne Bell’s volume.

The alterations were carried out by the Board of Works under the supervision of the Tower authorities and officers of the Lord Chamberlain’s Department, forming a sort of committee, of which Mr. Doyne Bell was a member. Upon an examination of the interments it was found that the remains had, at various times, been greatly disturbed, and, moreover, that it was essentially necessary that all the remains should be removed during the operations. The Queen reluctantly sanctioned this proposal, "with the express condition that the greatest care and reverence should be exercised in this removal, and that a careful record should be kept of every sign of possible identification which might come to light." It is needless to say that Her Majesty's careful injunctions were strictly obeyed. The whole committee was present on every occasion of the disturbance of the floor of the church, and a very circumstantial account is given by Mr. Bell, who was an eye-witness of all the proceedings, of the condition of the interments and of the identification of the remains discovered. In the latter process the committee was assisted by Dr. Mouat, whose description of the remains of Queen Anne Boleyn is here given:—

"The bones found in the place where Queen Anne Boleyn is said to have been buried are certainly those of a female in the prime of life, all perfectly consolidated and symmetrical, and belong to the same person. The bones of the head indicate a well-formed round skull, with an intellectual forehead, straight orbital ridge, large eyes, oval face, and rather square full chin. The remains of the vertebrae and the bones of the lower limbs indicate a well-formed woman of middle height, with a short and slender neck. The ribs shew depth and roundness of chest. The hand and feet bones indicate delicate and well-shaped hands and feet, with tapering fingers and a narrow foot.

"They are all consistent with the published descriptions of the Queen, and the bones of the skull might well belong to the person portrayed by Holbein in the collection of the Earl of Warwick."

To his account of the chapel and this sad cemetery Mr. Bell has added brief memoirs of those who suffered in the Tower and on Tower-hill, and were buried in the Tower Chapel, and details of some of the other buildings in the Old Palace Fortress, with illustrations of some of the interesting relics there preserved. The volume is one of great interest and considerable historical value.