colour is entirely due to Copper,[1] and Dr. Voelcker assures me, that all the examples of antient blue glass examined by him owe their colour to Oxide of Copper.

These facts seem to show that there is a real difference in chemical composition, in glass-fictilia from different sources, and that these variations cannot at all times be appreciated by a mere external examination; hence, then, it is probable that an extensive chemical investigation of these, may materially tend to throw light upon the origin of the different kinds of glass, brought under the notice of the archæologist, so as to show whether such objects were of native fabrication, or imported. Chemistry may also tend, in the matter of glass, as also in other remains of antiquity, to make us more intimately acquainted with the progress of Art and Invention in times past. Such knowledge moreover, would doubtless assist, in no small degree, in the recovery of lost Arts, or the improvement and advancement of modern manufactures.[2]

THE CASTLE, AND 'THE PROVISIONS OF OXFORD.'

When the Conqueror's survey was made, it does not appear that there existed any military building at Oxford. The mill has continued probably on the same spot down to the present time, from the days of Edward the Confessor; but the castle adjoining it, is the erection of a later reign. The town was walled round in the middle of the eleventh century, and so were some of the houses, termed *mansiones murales*, perhaps from being dwellings with the exterior protection of an enclosure by walls. As helping to contribute by this means to the general defence of the place, their occupiers were exempted from the payment of geld, and of all taxes excepting murage, or of attending the King in his expeditions. In endeavouring to ascertain the exact date of the castle, we must first of all inquire whether there is any official record of the Crown that will throw any light as to

[1] Several specimens of blue Roman glass have been examined by myself, and I am indebted to my friend Mr. Alexander Williams, M.R.C.S., for analyses of some other examples, the result in all being alike as regards the presence of copper.

[2] A very interesting series of antient beads, in the collection of Mr. B. Nightingale, is figured in Archaeologia, vol. xxxiv., pl. 5. This is almost the first attempt to display the beautiful variety of these ornaments.—*Ed.*

the precise time when it was built; and the absence of any mention of it in Domesday, where several are enumerated, and which would undoubtedly have named this had it been in existence, proves that it is a building of a lower period. The place was, however, of considerable strength and importance, since it was here that the Conqueror directed his first operations after he had heard of the alliance formed betwixt the Saxons, and Malcolm, King of Scotland. The citizens offered a vain resistance to his assaults; and the Normans entering through a breach in the walls, avenged themselves for the opposition they had encountered by destroying four hundred houses, and cruelly treating the inhabitants.

The castle must have been erected within the space of half-a-century afterwards, since we find allusion made to it in the Monkish Historians, who have written on the transactions of the period. For, as the Saxon chronicle states,—when the Empress Matilda had divided the allegiance of the English betwixt King Stephen and herself, her supporters carried her to Oxford, and put her in possession of the town. The King was then in prison; but as soon as he was liberated and heard of her success, he took his army and besieged her in the Tower, from which the soldiers inside let her down by ropes at night, and thus she stole away and fled on foot to Wallingford. The story of her escape is slightly varied by William of Malmesbury, who says that the townsmen being anxious for their own safety when Stephen besieged them, they allowed her, with four soldiers, to pass out through a small postern, and so reaching Abingdon on foot, she thence proceeded on horseback to Wallingford. This event, which happened in the year 1142, is therefore conclusive as to the existence of a castle at Oxford at that time. And, upon examining the earliest architectural remains of the present fortress, there is no reason to doubt that a considerable part is assignable to the same time. Nor is there anything to forbid the assumption, as far as its character is concerned, that the tower now standing is the tower the Empress Matilda lodged in during her short sojourn at Oxford. Judging too from the general inductions which architectural observers have laid down as a guide for determining dates, there is enough to be seen in that part of the building, erroneously

called Maude's Chapel, to show that it belongs to the end of the eleventh, or very beginning of the twelfth century (between 1087 and 1135.) The mound is unquestionably very much earlier, and before the Saxon period, but the remains within it belong to the time of Henry III., so that here may be seen what preceded the Mercians, and the latest remains erected by the Plantagenets. The crypt, commonly called Maude's Chapel, is a most interesting example of early Norman work.[1] The vaulting is bold, and the voussoirs carefully worked with stools. The capitals of the piers are highly curious. It was in all probability the crypt under the Great Hall. Before, however, opening the examination of the existing buildings, it will be well to go on gathering what few particulars we can of an authentic kind that have been recorded on official documents.

The custody of the County of Oxford, and the castle, were united from the earliest notice that mentions their existence. And hence the sheriff was the constable; and since every outlay, either for actual buildings that were necessary, or for the repairs of those existing, were made under precepts issued to him from the Crown, these expenses will be found entered on the Great Roll of his accounts, annually delivered into the Exchequer. I have looked through these from the thirty-first of Henry the First, to the end of the reign of Edward the Second, but only two entries have been discovered relating directly to the Castle of Oxford.—The first, 33 Henry II., 1187, states a small charge of 1*l.* 0*s.* 8*d.*, for repairing a certain house in the Castle of Oxenford, and is, therefore, also decisive as to its erection before this year. The two others belong to the second and third of Richard the First. In the former years, there is a charge of sixty shillings for covering the King's Hall; and in the ensuing one, 8*l.* 5*s.* 1*d.*, for general restoration.

But if these records are unusually deficient during its early state, it may be accounted for by the fact, that the castle being recently built, it would need but trifling renovation, or else no doubt the entries would have been as full as

[1] It has been asserted, on what appears to me rather vague authority, that the whole of this crypt has been rebuilt within the last half century; as I must confess I can discover nothing to favour this statement, beyond the ambiguity inseparable from every kind of hearsay testimony, I wish to leave it an open question for architectural observers to decide, and say how far existing appearances can be reconciled to the current tradition.

those on the Great Roll of the Pipe, concerning Dover, Bridgenorth, and Nottingham, or those relating to the King's houses at Clarendon, Marlborough, and Woodstock. And, indeed, after the Empress Matilda had made her escape from Oxford, and Stephen was dead, Henry the Second, upon whom the possession of the castle devolved, preferred living in his residence at Woodstock, where he is supposed to have been attracted by the charms of the fair, and perhaps the fabled, inhabitant of its sylvan bowers, and upon this place he made a considerable outlay. Yet, like his predecessors, he held a council at Oxford in 1177 (as Henry the First did, in the New Hall, 1133), when his youngest son John was created King of Ireland.

When this latter Prince ascended the throne, he ordered the fosse surrounding the castle, and the bretasches to be repaired, (Rot. Claus. 6 John); and he held councils here in the fifth, eighth, and fifteenth years of his reign. Considerable discussion has arisen respecting the constitution of the last two councils, but it will hardly be necessary to pursue the inquiry as to the points in dispute, since the difficulties respecting the one held in the eighth year of John's reign, relate chiefly to a nice definition of the title Magnates, namely,—whether the word was to be understood in an enlarged sense, as including all the tenants-in-chief of the Crown by military service, or simply those who held by barony. The investigation that the wording of the writ has received, is by no means unimportant, since its true interpretation determines the composition of our early constitutional assemblies. And if the appellation of Magnates admits of the extended signification it has obtained, it will show that not only military tenants included all the tenants-in-chief by military service, but sometimes Knights of the Shire, and such as became Magnates by subinfeudation, or as holding lands as escheats of the Crown. The convocation, therefore, of these increasing numbers, would be jealously regarded by the nobility; and on the other hand, the nobility themselves were now growing so formidable and hostile to John, that it became his policy to introduce into the Council men, who, in addition to their own natural popularity, would be able to neutralise the power of his opponents.

The council held in the fifteenth of John's reign, was called together under more distinctly recognised qualifications, as

the four knights for the counties were then for the first time expressly nominated to attend. The affairs of the nation had now taken a serious aspect, for this was the last council the King held before the Barons wrested from him at Runnymede the Great Charter of Rights upon which modern liberties are founded. There does not appear, indeed, any precedent for this innovation, but it is nevertheless undoubtedly clear, that the counties now possessed, whether in themselves, or by the writs of the sheriff, we know not, the first opportunity of returning freeholders to represent them in parliament. And we may from hence perceive how gradual was the introduction of changes in the mode of representation ; no alteration being planned with the particular object of enlarging or amending it, but every improvement taking its origin spontaneously, and flowing out of the current of circumstances.

John visited Oxford in nine different years of his reign, and passed here forty-five days of his life after he became king; which for so restless and wandering a monarch, was a considerable length of time, and shows that he must have been well satisfied with the accommodations his castle at Oxford afforded.

If the official documents have hitherto contained but meagre notices respecting one of the objects of enquiry, when we enter on the reign of Henry the Third there is no longer cause to regret the absence of information. For we have now an increased class of records to refer to, and the Close Rolls and the Liberate Rolls, but more especially the latter, supply most interesting and curious particulars about the royal buildings in England, the expense of their erection and reparation, the names of the different engineers who planned them, and of the artists who decorated their interiors. The Close Rolls, down to the tenth of Henry the Third, have been printed ; the Liberate, or Payment Rolls, are reserved to moulder away without the security of a transcript being made for the instruction of those who may succeed us, and who may too late discover in a few scattered extracts the importance of historical matter, which the present generation of inquirers look at with a degree of apathy difficult to understand. There are three valuable rolls of this description (2, 3, 5) belonging to the reign of King John, and forty-five to that of Henry the Third. During

the reign of the three Edwards they are still more complete.

The Liberate Rolls of Henry the Third commence in the tenth year of his reign, and, wanting three (15, 16, and 47), run on in generally indifferent condition to the close. During this space of forty-four years, there are entries under twenty-three relating to the Castle. Some of them, it is true, merely state the order for repairs, but others are curious for the insight they throw upon the domestic arrangements and the sort of social state that was observed within its precincts. It may hereafter be thought desirable to print these extracts entire, together with a list of the constables, from the Originalia and Patent Rolls, but our present convenience will be most favoured by bringing forward only those matters which present the most attractive features for observation.

It may be safely inferred, that besides the present keep, singular from its rude construction, and the unusual amount to which it batters, there was observable in the early arrangements various other buildings, such as the garrison chapel, the chaplain's house, the hall, the kitchen, the pantry, scullery, larder, the chambers of the King and Queen, and his private chapel, all of which were enclosed by the girdle of a lofty exterior wall; and without attempting to indicate the exact extent, for this is only what the careful observation of dwellers on the spot can fix by means of tracing the foundations, or by local knowledge, it is natural to suppose that works were continually needed to sustain these various buildings in proper repair. Such general expense of maintenance it will be advisable to pass over, as perplexing by its minuteness, and therefore the attention shall be confined to such entries as appear more deserving of notice.

We will commence with the chapel; it is now difficult to ascertain its site, but we gather from the Liberate Roll (11, Hen. III.) that the interior had open fittings, as the sheriff was ordered to have four forms (quatuor formas) made for it; that the chancel was plastered (28, Hen. III.), and that late in that king's reign (53, Hen. III.), there was erected near the gate, out of the old timber of the old kitchen, a good and proper chamber for the use of the royal chaplains and clerks. Their remuneration was small, if it consisted of nothing more than a

money payment, as the king's chaplain seldom took more than fifty shillings a year. Besides this, Queen Alienora had her private oratory, which was decorated with paintings before the High Altar (30, Hen. III.). There was a store-room made (11, Hen. III.) in the pantry of the king's hall, to keep the bread in for the royal table, and the hall, like the chapel, was plastered (28, Hen. III.). The windows of the Great Hall did not usually open. Those in the noble refectory of Battle Abbey had the upper part glazed, and the lower provided with a small shutter to let in air. But in 1244 (28, Hen. III.) a new window was inserted north and south of the hall at Oxford to admit of this convenience. In the same year a handsome porch was built before the door of the hall, on the south side; and subsequently (30, Hen. III.), an oriel beyond it. Its windows were altered and repaired two or three times during this reign. It was also furnished with light internally by two iron candelabra (34, Hen. III.), and most likely possessed a chair of state, similar to the carved one ordered by the King himself for his castle at Northampton. The kitchen underwent frequent reparation, till at last a new one was built for the king's family in a vacant area betwixt the old one and the larder (30, Hen. III.). And besides the store-room and pantry before mentioned, there was a salting-house, a scullery, and a meal-house; a brew-house, stables, wardrobes; and chambers for the king and queen, private chambers, the chamber of Prince Edward, and the outer chamber of the servants. In short, we gather from these twenty-three Liberate Rolls bearing entries on the subject, that the Castle of Oxford contained every convenience befitting the royal inmates.[2]

The Close Roll of the fifth of Edward the Second, mentions an allowance to Richard Damory, Warden of Oxford Castle, of the wages of six men-at-arms and twelve footmen, retained in the castle for its safe custody: and also thirty quarters of corn, sixty quarters of malt, four tons of wine, ten quarters of salt, ten carcases of beef, forty hogs, and five

[2] These extracts were made before the appearance of Mr. Hudson Turner's valuable contribution from the same records, to the "History of Domestic Architecture," in which he has given numerous interesting details regarding Oxford. I have, however, preferred leaving this paragraph in its original form, as the reader who desires to see these facts in a more extended shape, will naturally place himself under the guidance of that sound and accomplished historian.

hundred dried fish to be provided for the castle. The Fine Roll of the same year confirms the annual allowance to the said warden of 100 shillings out of the issues of his bailiwick, to be expended yearly in repairs.

The Patent Rolls of the fifth of Edward the Third contain a petition from the Chancellor of the University, stating, that they, by charters of the King's progenitors (which would be those granted, 15, Hen. III.), had the power, if a layman committed any great damage on a clerk, or a clerk on a layman, or a clerk on a clerk, of sending the malefactor to the Castle, but that the sheriffs of the county and wardens of the castle had frequently refused to receive them. The King therefore commands the present and future sheriffs and wardens to receive the malefactors whom the Chancellor may send to be incarcerated in the Castle, and to keep them safely till the Chancellor demand them. But a multitude of scholars or laymen shall not be admitted into the Castle to visit the malefactors.

During the absence of the Court, it was left in the custody of the sheriff, who superintended all the necessary works, and so slightly were parts of it built, that there are precepts almost annually recurring which show that repairs were essential very soon after the buildings themselves were first raised. This slight and defective mode of construction was not, however, peculiar to Oxford, but must be rather regarded as a characteristic of the military buildings of the period; all of them exhibit sufficient evidence of the negligent way in which castles were built. And if the proof were not too frequently before the eyes, a glance over some of the Rotulets of the Great Roll of the Pipe would confirm the assertion, since it tells us that even the Castle of Oxford, which was commenced in 1166 (12, Hen. II.), and finished in 1173, substantial and perfect as it now looks, wanted reparation within the first fifteen years. Yet, notwithstanding the decay to which the sheriff's attention had been directed, when an inquisition was taken (51, Hen. III.), it was sworn before a jury, that during the whole of the thirty-seven previous years, the whole fortress had been gradually getting more dilapidated; the gaol had fallen down, as well as the brewhouse, and all the rest of the buildings threatened ruin. The three bridges, which had been repaired little more than twenty years before, had deteriorated under every

successive sheriff; and, in short, everything excepting the great tower and the enceinte, needed such renovation as could not be done under a cost of sixty pounds.

It will not be altogether irrelevant to show how some of the Liberate Rolls serve to illustrate the state of the arts in England during this reign, more especially as the extracts will be confined to the royal residence at Woodstock. The taste for painting was at this time fully recognised, and there are numerous entries showing how freely the regal palaces were adorned by the artistic talent of the time.

The great chamber of Henry the Third at Woodstock was adorned with pictures, and there was a representation of the cross, and of the Blessed Mary and St. John, in the great chapel. Over this were painted two angels like cherubim and seraphim. These could only have been executed in body colour, as there is an order to paint them again within seventeen years. There were also two pictures representing two bishops, and another of the Blessed Mary, in the chapel of St. Edward. Besides these tabulæ, we have an account of a design in stained glass for the new chapel, exhibiting the Blessed Mary: and some heavenly person was depicted on the window of the sacrarium. The old chapel showed the history of the woman taken in adultery, our Lord writing on the ground, the conversion of St. Paul, and the history of the Evangelists. We also find an order for representing a Majestas, or Maesta, of the enthroned Saviour, or Virgin Mary, of the four Evangelists, and St. Edmund and St. Edward, which were to be painted in good colours. Those who have examined the truly beautiful execution and purity of design exhibited in the early specimens of art in the Chapter House of Westminster, will readily form an idea of the merits of the paintings at Woodstock.

A council was held at Woodstock for the general dispatch of business in 1235 (19, Hen. III), and in 1247 (31, Hen. III.) the terms of a convention were arranged there betwixt the King, and Owen and Llewellyn, Princes of Wales, a question of considerable moment, because Henry was at that time endeavouring to annex the Principality to England.

There was also transacted at Oxford, during the long reign of Henry the Third, several matters of the greatest interest, for, independently of the councils held here in the sixth (1221, *a Curia*), thirteenth (1228, *a Curia*), when the

kitchen of the castle was ordered to be repaired against the King's visit at Christmas (Rot. Lib., 13, Hen. III.), seventeenth (1223), twenty-second (1238), thirty-first (1247), thirty-eighth (1254), forty-second (1258), and forty-eighth (1264), years of his reign, the barons who met here in the forty-second year, exacted those celebrated Provisions which, although impaired by arbitrary dictation to the King when he was incapable of vindicating the royal prerogative, were nevertheless the universal cause of extending the privileges of the community; and, notwithstanding a spirit of faction clouded the purity of their motives and rendered their patriotism doubtful, yet it must be confessed on all sides that their exertions greatly advanced the cause of national liberty.

The overbearing conduct of Henry, his necessities, and his tyranny, had rendered him so extremely unpopular, that the discontented barons, yielding readily to the instigation of Simon de Montfort, assembled and demanded a redress of their grievances. Some of their wishes were sufficiently reasonable; for instance, their desire to have a confirmation of the Great Charter of his father, and fixed periods during the year for the meeting of Parliament; but when the Council of Twenty-four sought to reform abuses, they usurped an unconstitutional power over the whole kingdom, not unlike that exercised by the thirty tyrants at the close of the Peloponnesian war, and as long as the Provisions remained in force, the kingdom was kept in a state of disquietude and confusion.

This is the first time the term Parliament occurs in any official document, and, in allusion to the strong measures introduced by the barons, it was subsequently called the Mad Parliament.

Very little need be said about the Parliament held at Oxford in the forty-eighth of Henry the Third. The custom of assembling knights from every county had been previously adopted, but at this meeting, instead of being nominated, as formerly, by the King or the sheriff, they were summoned to be chosen by the assent of the county, thus originating the modern practice. In the interval between the two Parliaments, the King of France had been called in to mediate betwixt Henry and the Barons, but his award was indignantly rejected, the nobles declaring that the Provisions of

the former convention were grounded on the Great Charter, and they resolutely determined to maintain them to the end of their lives, as equally conducive to the good of the King and the nation at large. Very soon after this memorable declaration, a contest ensued, fatal, in its immediate consequences, to the King's personal authority, by his defeat and capture at Lewes. He was still further humiliated by the treaty called the Mise of Lewes, and by the use made of its conditions. So that the royal prerogative was almost suspended, in the exercise of its proper functions, till after the Battle of Evesham. The prejudice of the age attributed his disasters to an ambiguous act of devotion he showed towards the relics of St. Frideswide, which, for five centuries, it had been forbidden for any monarch to approach; but although he was not stricken with mortal blindness, like the Mercian Prince Algar, when he pursued the Saint into Oxford, there were many persons found who considered his misfortunes to have been sent as an act of Divine retribution for his indiscreet intrusion upon the sacred shrine. Yet in the dispassionate view we are now capable of taking of these transactions, in spite of the innovations, the rude overthrow of power, and its abuse, together with the bad faith of the King in subsequently resisting the Provisions he had accepted, the spirit of the articles themselves led the actors generally to take a wise and temperate estimate of the conduct of the two contending parties. The leading actors at this remarkable crisis were unconsciously preparing the way for popular representation, and for a full adoption of those principles which, in the next reign, modelled the frame of a British House of Commons. The King was, for the remainder of his life, obliged to use his undeserved success with a higher respect for the rights of his subjects, whilst a salutary dread affected thinking minds that the establishment of an aristocratical legislature was but a change of servitude, as fatal to the true interests of the people as were the exactions and oppression of the Crown.

It is extremely difficult to pourtray these memorable events in a clear, and yet succinct manner. The whole of the constitutional questions of this long reign are perplexing in themselves, and our difficulties are increased by the want of official documents, so that we are often obliged to depend upon the doubtful testimony of a monkish historian. In a short

sketch like the present, it would be impossible to unravel their obscurity. Those who are desirous of tracing the rise and progress of these various changes must enter upon a field of investigation, which would be too wide for one who now merely professes to indicate slightly the points best worth consideration.

I have already quoted from original documents with a tedious diffuseness, because they not only serve to cast some fresh light on the internal arrangements and decorations of the palaces of the Plantagenets, but also because they relate to buildings wherein these important questions concerning the expanding liberties of the English nation, were either checked in their growth, or fostered by the wisdom of the Crown. It is impossible we should ever look coldly upon scenes hallowed by so many striking incidents! They solemnly remind us of the struggles or perilous achievements of our forefathers, of their deeds of valour, their patriotism, or their devotion; and they should serve to increase in the affections an admiration for their generous and lofty principles, mixed, though they may be, with much that is incompatible with modern notions of political justice or even humanity. We may knit together the noblest impulses of the past, with the refinement of the present age, and thus embody the fleeting shadows of antiquity with vitality and existence. Nor are they to be envied who would suffer such associations to remain inactive in the heart, who would teach us to deny the natural instinct of political sympathy, and by bidding us consign to oblivion the serious grandeur of historic recollections, efface all those marks of our progress which have been sheltered under the hallowed wings of time.

CHARLES HENRY HARTSHORNE.