

Notes and Queries.

NOTES.

WALL PAINTING AT HEMBLINGTON.

In July, 1925. I received a letter from the Rev. A. Shillito, Rector of Blofield, an adjoining parish and now held with Blofield. I went over at once and looked at them. They are on the north wall of the Church, which is a simple church of the usual early Norfolk plan—a nave and chancel, west tower (round) and south porch. They were not opposite the south entrance, but more to the eastward and extended, roughly, about 12 or 14 feet in length. The uncovering had been done, not too carefully, and the remains were very indistinct; moreover, two tablets, one dated 1830 and the other to the memory of men killed in the late war, have been fixed on the wall, and probably the paintings were not improved by their erection. The whole is extremely indistinct, and I can only give a short note of what appeared to me to be represented. Above the 1830 tablet was a fairly distinct figure of a man in a tunic, in the act of shooting an arrow from a bow—his attitude being lifelike: some distance to the east of him were traces of a figure, which seemed to be either standing in front of a tree or tied to it—and the archer was apparently shooting at the figure. Between the two tablets were traces of a large figure in red robe, with a blue girdle. I was told when first found it had a man's head, but that the plaster afterwards fell off—when I saw it, no traces of a head were to be seen. Beyond this figure to the west, were what appeared to be traces of a smaller figure with a long staff, and beyond that figures which might be soldiers, or torturers. In the bottom corner to the east and under the 1830 tablet were, what seemed to me to be a multitude of small figures.

Mrs. Bardswell has been kind enough to make two visits to the Church and has sketched as much of the painting as can be made out, and she has shown her sketch to Mr. Tristram, of the Royal College of Art, South Kensington, and they both agree that two martyrdoms, St. Edmund and St. Thomas of Canterbury are represented. The date is apparently 15th century.

FRED. JOHNSON, Assistant Secretary.

PALIMPSEST BRASS AT REEDHAM.

In *Norfolk Archaeology*, vol. xxii., p. 71, appeared an illustrated description of the palimpsest brass at Reedham, bearing on the reverse side an inscription to Nicholas Lathe and his wife Katherine. I there gave various suggestions for the rejection of the plate either by the Lathe family or the engraver. I now find in Blomefield, vol. iv., p. 357, an entry throwing some light on the matter. Under his description of St. Simon and St. Jude, Norwich, he gives the following inscription:—

“Orate pro anima Nichi Lathe Parchemyner qui obiit ~~XXXX~~ die Junii
 Anno dni ~~M^oCCCLII^o~~ & Katherine uxoris eius quorum animabus propi-
 cietur Deus Amen.”

It is thus evident that the cause of rejection was due to the engraver adding the word “Sen.” It often happens that the antiquarian has to hazard an estimate of a date. In the present instance I gave as my opinion that the obverse and reverse engravings were only separated by a short interval of time. We now see that the actual difference of time was only a matter of sixty days, *i.e.*, from June 18th, 1502, to August 17th in the same year.

I regret to say that the brass referred to by Blomefield is not now to be found, and in this respect St. Simon and St. Jude is acquiring an evil reputation, as of four brasses known to have been in the Church in 1890 only two are now to be found.

Since my original paper appeared I have received from Mr. F. T. S. Houghton of Birmingham the following:—“It is not quite correct to say that the trade of ‘parchemyner’ is unique. The ‘t’ in our word parchment is exerescent, the mediæval form was perchemin or parchemyn as in ‘Piers Plowman,’ 1390; and the ‘Promptorium Parvulorum,’ c. 1440, gives Parchemyn = membranum and Parchemyner = membranarius.”

Mr. D. W. Clark of Colchester also refers me to “Mediæval England,” where, on a deed relating to the transfer of land at Oxford, the witnesses include:—one bookbinder, three illuminators, one writer and two parchmenters.

In my paper I intended to have said that the term was unique as applied to brasses, but it is now certain that a trade is referred to, and that the making of parchment.

H. O. CLARK.

BRASS IN THE CHURCH OF BARNHAM BROOM.

The three-quarter figure of a civilian on the nave floor in the above Church is given by Farrer as for Edmund Bryghteye, who also states the inscription to be missing. I am pleased to report

that the Rector, the Rev. J. E. P. Bartlett, has found a portion of the inscription, which reads as follows:—

“Orate p̄ aīā Edmūdi Brightye.....
die ianuarii Ao dñi M^oCCCC^o sexa”

This definitely establishes the man's name as Brightye. In addition, upon examination, the plate proved to be palimpsest and shewed on the reverse a piece of a side shaft from a much larger brass. The mutilated inscription has now been relaid by the writer in the original stone. In Blomefield, vol. ii., p. 378, the inscription is given in full, but with the wrong name, and the date appears as 1467.

H. O. CLARK.

BRASSES AT ST. LAURENCE, NORWICH.

The collection of brasses in this Church is one of the most extensive and interesting in Norwich, but hitherto it has been difficult to examine them properly since the majority have been loose in the vestry for many years.

At the suggestion of the present Vicar, the Rev. G. E. Dawson, the writer and Mr. Glendenning have mounted these at the cost of the Society. In Farrer's list of Norfolk Brasses there is a list of fifteen, but this number is now reduced to twelve, and it has been possible to definitely allot inscriptions, etc., in several cases to their proper figures.

The complete list for St. Laurence should now read:—

1. The large figure of John Asger in mayor's mantle, with a semicircular inscription and a scroll. 1436. On the nave floor. Farrer 1.
2. Figure of Geoffrey Langeley, Prior, with portions of an inscription, bracket and side shafts. 1437. On a board in the north aisle. Farrer 2.
3. Skeleton figure of Thos. Childes, Priest. 1452. On a board in the south aisle. Farrer 3.
4. Figure of John Asger, jun., and inscription. 1436. On the nave floor. Farrer 4 and 10.
5. Figure of John Styllé, Chaplain, and inscription. 1483. On the nave floor. Farrer 5 and 11.
6. Figure of John Wellys, Mayor, with shield and part of an inscription. 1495. On a board in the north aisle. Farrer 6, 12 and 14.
7. Inscription for John Geney. 1375. On a board fixed to a pew in the nave. Farrer 7.
8. Inscription and merchant mark for Robert Asger. 1425. On the nave floor. Farrer 8.
9. Inscription for Richard at the Gates. 1427. On a board at the west end of the nave. Farrer 9.

10. Inscription for John Caster. 1493. On a board in the chancel.
11. Inscription for Margaret Leche. 1535. On the floor of the south chapel. Farrer 13.
12. Two pieces of a marginal inscription of about the date 1400—1450. On the nave floor. Farrer 15.

Nos. 4, 5, 10 and 12 have been relaid in their original stones. The stone for No. 6 exists, but in such a poor condition as to make relaying undesirable. The stone for No. 7 exists, but it is partly covered, thus making relaying impossible.

A popular account of all these brasses by the writer appeared in the *St. Laurence Parish Magazine* for May, June, July, Sept., Oct., and Nov., 1924.

H. O. CLARK.

ROUGHTON CHURCH.

The Church of St. Mary, Roughton, stands conspicuous on a stretch of rising ground to the east of the Cromer and Norwich main road. For many years the chief features have been hidden by a thick growth of ivy, but its recent removal has resulted in a two-fold discovery, partly good, partly bad. In the first place much Saxon and other interesting detail has been revealed, but on the other hand it was discovered that the structure had suffered serious injury by the growth of ages, and that an immediate restoration would be necessary if the Saxon tower was to be saved.

In the spring of 1925 Mr. Caroë, the eminent Church architect, reported on the building as follows:—

“This is a church of more than usual interest, both on account of its complete pre-Norman tower and of the beauty and completeness of its later masonry.

“There seems to have been a Saxon church of some extent here, the round tower of which survives in its integrity. The extent of the west wall of the nave can also be clearly seen, and it is probable that a portion of the north wall of the chancel extending some twelve feet east of the chancel arch, was part of the original structure. Probably in Norman times aisles were added to the original rectangular cell, and—after the usual manner of the earlier builders—these were under a continuous roof with the nave. The lines of the sloping roofs are still visible at the west end. For whatever cause, the then existing building was bit by bit almost entirely demolished in the early part of the 14th century. First of all the chancel was constructed with reticulated windows, characteristic of the post-geometrical period. Then followed the rebuilding of the south arcade and the south aisle, the west wall of which latter was maintained and raised to suit the flat pitched roof. By this time flowing traceries were in vogue, and these are

of interesting and unusual design. Still later, the north arcade was renewed in a form to match the south. This work is probably coeval with that of the two porches, which belong to that interesting period between the Black Death (1348-9) and the revival of architecture, when it took on the severely rectilinear form called Perpendicular.

"The windowing of the north aisle and the renewing of both the west windows of the aisles did not take place until the Perpendicular manner was well established. This work we may attribute to Richard III.'s time. The transformation of the fabric thus occupied nearly a century of change, but it was the century when the masons of England were at their best. Stone from Rutland—probably from the Weldon quarries—was used and has stood admirably, and we thus have quite an admirable example of what well designed and schemed masonry should be. The final change came in the finishing of the tower. In early days this would have some form of conical finish. When this decayed, a flat roof was substituted. The present leading belongs to 1743 and has given good service. The parapet of brick and flint is probably from late Tudor or, may be, Laudian days.

"Some special points of interest should be noted:—

"The clerestories are remarkable not only for their transitional traceries, but for the delightful series of grotesques which carry the shaftings of the scotches arches. Here is an unusual display of fancy on the designer's part. On the south side of the chancel, adjoining the chancel arch, is a built-up archway. This probably belongs to a low side window. The treatment of the splay of the south-east window of the chancel to form a sedilia should not be overlooked. East of the modern buttress, on the north side of the chancel, are two external arches resting upon a corbel between them. Here was a sacristy,¹ furnished no doubt with an altar. The door to the sacristy is in place, though blocked, but the floors have been raised so that the proportions are lost."

Since the architect's report was written further discoveries have been made, notably of two curious circular Saxon openings in the tower. But as the work of restoration goes forward, its urgency becomes more and more apparent, buttresses and stone work are crumbling, the north porch is in ruins, many of the windows are on the point of falling in.

The parishioners have, with one accord, done their best to tackle the big task of saving their ancient Church. Through the initiative of the Rector (the Rev. C. Ivens), Churchwardens and Parochial Church Council, as cheme of restoration has been embarked upon. It is essentially a Roughton effort, for the contracting firm is Messrs. Girling & Smith of Cromer, the head of which is Mr. E. E. Smith of Roughton; the clerk of the works is Mr. F. Williams,

¹ Or chantry-chapel? (C.M.H.).

one of the Roughton churchwardens, and all the workmen employed are Roughton men. If goodwill and keenness and the best kind of parochial spirit count for anything, the restoration of Roughton Church ought to be carried through without hindrance. Unfortunately, material support is also a necessity when crumbling buildings are being dealt with. The Roughton people cannot bear the whole cost of the restoration, although they are glad to do their best, Norfolk Church people and archaeologists and historians ought to feel proud to take a share in the restoration of one of the few churches in the county which can still show in its masonry and construction a visible continuity and descent from the days of our Saxon ancestors.

The Rector (the Rev. C. Ivens), Roughton Rectory, Norwich, will be most grateful for donations towards the work of restoration.

CHRISTOBEL M. HOOD.

ENGLISH PLACE-NAME SOCIETY, Vol. II., THE PLACE-NAMES OF
BUCKINGHAMSHIRE, by A. Mawer and F. M. Stenton.
(Cambridge University Press, 1925.)

With the publication of this, the first of the annual county volumes to be issued by the English Place-name Society, the Survey of English Place-names is well under way. The short Preface, in which the editors express their indebtedness to a host of contributors, indicates the large measure of support which the new Society has received from scholars and from the general public. A welcome innovation introduced in this new volume is the inserton, in a pocket inside the back cover, of two loose maps, one a key-map to the county and on which the hundreds have been traced and labelled; the other an Ordnance Survey map on the scale of two miles to the inch. On this latter one would have liked to see a clearer delineation of the river-courses, and one regrets that the editors did not see their way to include contour-lines. The various influences that have been at work during the formative period of the Buckinghamshire place-names are discussed in the short Introduction that precedes the treatment of the individual names. Here the model has been Professor Eilert Ekwall's epoch-making work on the Place-names of Lancashire, which appeared in 1922. The names are collected by hundreds and within each parish some minor names worthy of treatment are added. Most of these minor names are taken from the large-scale Ordnance maps and not infrequently prove to be more interesting than the name of the parish itself. The early forms found for the Bucks river-names are collected at the beginning of the volume, but no information is given as to their origin or meaning. The Society has in preparation a volume on the river-names of all England from the pen of Professor Ekwall, of

which he gave a foretaste to those who had the good fortune to be able to attend his lectures delivered at King's College, London, last winter. The new volume also has a note on the name of the well-known Icknield Way, but the editors are not prepared to hazard a premature guess as to its true interpretation. Most of the Bucks names have yielded up the secret of their origin and development fairly readily. Where cruces occur, no pains have been spared to get at the real meaning of the name, and the help has been called in of the two Scandinavian authorities, Professors Ekwall and Zachrisson. Even then one cannot always see eye to eye with the editors in their proposed solutions. Exception must be taken to the etymology suggested for Marlingford, co. Norfolk, which is introduced for the sake of comparison to explain the name Marlins Grove, in Medmenham (p. 191). Marlingford is explained as containing a personal name Mærel-, which is not found in Old English, from the evidence of the Domesday form *Merlingeford*. In giving this explanation no account has been taken of the alternative Domesday spelling *Marthingeforda* (D.B. ii. fo. 209b), a spelling worthy to be noted. Marlingford occurs in an Old English will as *Marþingford*, *Mardingford* (Thorpe, *Diplomatarium*, pp. 592, 593), and in later mediæval times as *Mearthingeforde*, *Merthingforthe*, (v. *Registrum Nigrum* of Bury, fos. 180, 167) Whatever may have been the original name lying behind these forms, it certainly was not Mærel. At p. 125 a place Ellington, co. Norfolk, is mentioned. This is a slip for Illington, co. Norfolk, as the discussion of names like Monks Eleigh and Ilmer, co. Suffolk, shows. To the note on the name Wolverton (p. 27), Wolferton, co. Norfolk, might have been added, in view of such early forms as *Wulfrington* (1267 FF, etc.). The volume concludes with lists of all elements found in Bucks place-names and field and minor names, as well as of all personal names that enter into the composition of them. Among these latter we note a very small percentage of names of Scandinavian origin, which is somewhat higher among the field-names, which date chiefly from the 13th century. Finally, there are full indexes of all Bucks names treated and of such names of other counties that are used for comparative purposes.

O.K.S.

WEST RAYNHAM PLACE-NAMES.

The origin and derivation of many place-names are so wrapped in mystery, or require the skill of an expert philologist to unravel, that it is refreshing to find one capable of simple explanation.

The extreme western point of the parish boundary of West Raynham marks the former meeting place of four parish boundaries, viz., West Raynham, West Rudham, Little Massingham and Weasenham All Saints, and formerly four cross roads. To-day only three roads

remain; the fourth, formerly running north-east to Helhoughton, has long since fallen into disuse and has been, in places, thrown into the large open fields, whilst since 1617, at some date posterior to the making of the map hereafter referred to, the parish of West Raynham has been curtailed of a small portion of waste land now belonging to the parish of Weasenham St. Peter. An old vellum map of the parish of West Raynham made in 1617, and now (1925) remaining, with the evidences of the Marquis of Townshend at Raynham, names this spot "The Fower Knightes Wayes." The locality, except for the modern railroad near by, is open and wild. The name, long since forgotten, is delightful English and calls to the imagination all the mediæval chivalry of the middle ages. One assumes it can only bear reference to the four knightly owners of the four parishes and that at a time before the parishes or any parts of them passed into the possession of various Religious Houses. Therefore it seems reasonable to assume the place-name to be post-Conquest in date; in fact, this would appear to be so as, at the Conquest Stigand, Archbishop of Canterbury, was lord of Weasenham "in his own right, as a lay fee,"¹ and King Stephen gave the Manor of Haviles, or Hauvils, in West Raynham, to the family of that name.² West Rudham, at an early date, passed partly, if not wholly, into the possession of the Priors of Cokesford and Castleacre.

"The Fower Knights," therefore, were probably members of the knightly families of de Havile of West Raynham, and now said to be represented by the Townshend family, who quarter the ancient Hauville arms; de Cheney of West Rudham; Wimerus of Weasenham All Saints, who became the de Gresenhales; and Angeviu of Little Massingham, which latter family afterwards took the name of Massingham.

This old place-name finds survival on the modern Ordnance map in the name of "Jockey Knights" given to the adjoining field in Little Massingham—perhaps it is reminiscent of the sporting prowess of "The Fower Knights"!

One other interesting fact this ancient map discloses. In 1233, Blomefield says, "Henry de Havile was Lord" (Havile's Manor in Raynham), "and held it by grand serjeantry, as Falconer to the King,"³ while in 1286, "Thomas de Hauvile held a certain lastage in Lynn, of the King, in capite, valued at 100s per ann. by the service of keeping a gerfalcon for the King."⁴ "Falconer's Arbor" is shewn on the map just east of an ancient roadway, now lost, from Helhoughton to Great Massingham, over Kipton Heath—the site is somewhere on the northern boundary of the young plantation now called Gravel Pit Wood.

H. L. BRADFER-LAWRENCE.

¹ Blomefield, vol. x., p. 75.

² *Idem*, vol. vii., p. 139.

³ *Idem*, p. 139.

⁴ *Idem*, p. 140.