
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

considering. Speaking generally, it is religious rather than ecclesiastical, as it is practical rather than doctrinal. Many other criticisms present themselves to the mind with a demand for expression in words. But it is high time that these "notes" should come to a close; and I will end them with what Bryennius himself quotes on his title-page from Clement of Alexandria: "It is not fair to condemn what is said because of the man who says it; but what is said ought to be examined, to see if it contains any truth."

J. S. Howson.

Art. II.—Mediæval Life among the Commons.

For an article on this topic, much wider research is required than for one dealing with the life of the nobles.[1] Very few houses left in England, exclusive of the aristocratic castles, are older than the fifteenth century, while of the furniture that belonged to them before the Reformation period scarcely a trace remains. Of the lowest class of house, indeed, no trace could well remain, for they were mere mud huts, made or destroyed by a few hours' labour. But of the better class of houses—the hall, the manor-house, and the inn—there are still a fair number left, of an age commencing with the fifteenth century. Many of the halls or manor-houses have been turned into farm-houses; the inns mostly remain such. Among the ancient inns of England yet existing are the Bear and Bell at Tewkesbury; the George at Salisbury; the Lion at Congleton; the New Inn at Gloucester (built to receive pilgrims to the shrine of King Edward II.); the Plough, Ely; and the Saracen's Head, Southwell. The Tabard, subsequently called the Talbot, in Southwark, whence Chaucer sent forth his pilgrims to Canterbury, was the most famous of all, and was taken down only a few years ago.

Several of the oldest houses in England bear the name of "the Jew's House;" and we find on record that the Jews usually built their houses of stone, which will account for their superior durability. Interesting examples of this are to be seen in the Jew's House at Lincoln, which consisted of two rooms, the upper being the principal one, and Moyses' Hall, Bury St. Edmund's; both these belong to the twelfth century. An elaborate example of the thirteenth century is the Monk's House at Charney, Berkshire, originally a grange belonging to Abingdon Abbey. The old manor-house at Cottesford, Oxford-

[1] "Mediæval Life among the Nobles," The Churchman, April, 1884.

shire, is of the same date, and contained five rooms. Two, or at most three, rooms are as many as are usually found in houses of the twelfth century; the thirteenth gives four or five. To a later period belong those fine old halls yet scattered up and down England, such as Blickling Hall in Norfolk, Loseley Hall in Surrey, Speke Hall in Lancashire, Stanley House at Chester, and a fine Elizabethan example at Southam, Gloucestershire. Many similar houses of less pretension survive in the neighbourhood of ancient cities, especially Chester, Shrewsbury, Leicester, Lincoln, Worcester, and Salisbury.

In the inventory of Lord Lisle's goods, taken in 1540, a list is given of the rooms in the farmhouse attached to his residence at Calais. They are described as "hall, parlour, buttery, kitchen, milk-house, the little chamber by the kitchen, the loft over the kitchen, the chest-house, the little chamber by the parlour, the stable, and the bakery." It will be noticed that no bedrooms appear in this list. The loft is pretty certain to have been used either for this purpose or as a store-chamber; and the little chambers by parlour and kitchen were doubtless bedchambers. In the sixteenth century the word *chamber* denoted any kind of private room; at a later period it became restricted to the bedchamber; but it was always used to indicate a private apartment as distinguished from the public reception-room.

Alike in palace and in cottage there was anciently one reception-room in a house, known as "the hall" in all but the meanest houses, in which latter it bore the name of "the house," or "house-place." In the reign of Edward IV. the parlour, or private sitting-room, was added. Drawing-room, anciently the "withdrawing chamber," is a word which for centuries was confined to palaces, originally meaning a room to which the sovereign withdrew from the hall of audience when he wished for rest and privacy, only a select few having the *entrée* to this chamber. The dining-room, as a separate apartment from the hall, took its rise about the time of the Reformation or a little earlier, and was the private room where the family dined alone if required. As to the bedchambers, among commoners only the heads of the family had one to themselves for a very lengthened period. The rest of the household, whether family or servants, were accommodated in two lofts, men in the one and women in the other. And we must remember that families used to be much larger than now. It was common for three or four generations to live in one house, while a number of widowed brothers and sisters with their children, if living anywhere near each other, drifted into one family as a matter of course. Those poor relations, of whom everybody has some, were also usually taken into some family to which they were

allied, in an unpleasant dependent position, being neither members of the family proper nor counted amongst the servants. But notwithstanding all unpleasantness and want of privacy, to say nothing of the serious risk of contamination to the morals and manners of their children, our ancestors do not appear to have thought of what we should deem the easy and natural alternative of separate households. It would have seemed to them quite unnatural.

The remarks made in this paper, unless otherwise stated, will be understood to refer to the habits of commoners only—namely, of all persons below the degree of knight. They would frequently not be true if applied to the nobles.

The furniture of most houses was very poor and plain. Before the introduction of mahogany in the last century, the wood chiefly in use was chestnut for buildings and walnut for furniture; but for articles of a strong and heavy character oak was often preferred. The carved wood was nearly always oak. The articles of furniture in general use for a bedroom were the bedstead—of a tent form until about 1600, and after that the "old four-poster"—a large wooden chair, an enormous chest, and fire-irons, which consisted of fire-fork and shovel, the former of which served as a poker and the latter did duty for tongs. There were also likely to be a few stools, and perhaps a fire-screen. Large closets or cupboards were tolerably certain. The parlour would be furnished with settles, which if they had backs were called benches or banks, and if otherwise, forms; they might or might not be cushioned and adorned with bankers, the ornamental covering for the back. There would probably also be two or three chairs—chairs in mediæval days were reserved for the "upper ten" of family or guests—and a few stools and hassocks were likely. Both in parlour and bedroom there would be plenty of cushions, for there were no easy-chairs, and even the sofa (when it came in) was originally a wooden erection on which cushions required spreading. Stuffed furniture is of very modern date.

In the squire's house, the parlour might be in pretty constant use; but the yeoman's wife and all below her would live in the kitchen, and reserve the parlour as a dreary company-room, only to be thrown open on grand occasions. A large, cheery, pleasant place that kitchen was sure to be, with its blazing fire in the enormous chimney, and the chimney-corner where the old folks sat on the winter evenings, while tales, jokes, and gossip went round. From the rafters would hang flitches of bacon and hams, herbs tied up to dry in paper bags, and at various seasons black puddings and strings of sausages, salt and dried fish—chiefly stockfish, ling, and herrings. A rack at one end would hold (in the north) the large thin cakes of

oaten bread, and the Good Friday buns, warranted never to grow mouldy, and to cure all disease. On the dresser would be ranged the dishes and trenchers of wood or pewter, the latter being the superior article; while another large rack would find standing-room for all and sundry pans, kettles, pots, skillets, cullenders, spits, gridirons, ladles, pot-hooks, scummers, and flesh-forks. In the corner would be the little mustard-quern—the great quern, at which the rye and barley were ground, would lie in an outhouse—and a pestle and mortar. But oh, what extraordinary mixtures and queer compounds would be concocted over that kitchen fire! Collops (rashers of bacon) on Collop Monday; pancakes on Shrove Tuesday; furmety, simnel-cakes, and fig-pies on Mid-Lent Sunday; grey peas on Care Sunday (the fifth in Lent); the calf's head and tansy pudding on Easter Eve; the oysters on St. James's Day (July 25th); the furmety on the 11th of October; the soul-cakes on All Souls' Day (Nov. 2nd); the roast goose on St. Martin's Day (Nov. 11th); on Christmas Eve the frequently recurring furmety, and on Christmas Day the Christmas or mince-pie, the plum-porridge—afterwards tied in a cloth and called plum-pudding—the Yule cakes, and the wassail-bowl. And the goose on Michaelmas Day? No, gentle reader; that is of post-Reformation date, and must not intrude into the Middle Ages. But those soul-cakes must have been uncommonly tempting, of whatever they were made, for they left their impress upon English speech in the word *souël*, which yet survives as a Northern provincialism, meaning anything tasty eaten as a relish with bread.

The good folks dined at ten o'clock a.m. But when did they breakfast? Well, strictly speaking, they did not do it at all. Breakfast was the meal of invalids and weakly women, looked down upon by men as an effeminacy. They supped about four; and with dinner and supper the majority were content. The middle class (at both meals) had three dishes of hot or cold meat, extending the number to six when they had company. The bread must be quite new; stale bread was shabby. There were many kinds of bread, of which wassail and simnel were reserved for the nobility: commoners used cocket, brown, barley, rye, maslin (of mixed grain) and oaten. Gingerbread they had, and spice-bread (plum-cake) in all varieties of richness or plainness; also macaroons and biscuits of various kinds. Country rustics dined on pottage, and bread and cheese; and supped on bread and herbs. No commoner might have more than three dishes on his table in the fifteenth century.

Fish was restricted to Lent, and birds were considered more suitable to feasts than butcher's meat, though the latter was

also used. They ate conger-eels and porpoises, squirrels and hedgehogs, cranes, curlews, herons, swans, and peacocks, in addition to our own bill of fare. Their jellies included meat jelly, which was a dish by itself. The sweet dishes were usually few, in comparison with the meats: and what we call milk-puddings were absolutely unknown. They used dumplings, fruit pies, stewed fruit, creams, and caudle. Their soups and sauces were numerous, and they were particularly fond of what they expressively termed "poignant sauce." Apple soup was peculiar to spring: they had also egg, fig, bean, gourd, green pea, and rabbit soups, beside a great number with names which convey no ideas, and the receipts for which do not always sound appetizing. Those made dishes are few which can be identified with any of our own. Among them are *alaunder* (minced mutton), *garbage* (stewed giblets), *raffolys* (sausages), *chowettes* (liver-pies), *flampoyntes* (pork-pies), and *placentæ* (cheesecakes). Geese were either roasted with garlic or onions, or boiled with verjuice or leeks. Verjuice, vinegar, and lemon-juice were very freely employed; and cucumbers and melons were in great request. Fried beans were peculiar to Lent, and were eaten after the salad.

The popular drinks were cider, beer, and wine. Milk was used by delicate or especially abstemious people. There were a few total abstainers and vegetarians, but they were rarely to be found except among the religious orders, of which some members were not remarkable for abstinence from alcohol. The wines in common use were Gascony (Bordeaux), Rhenish, Rumney (a Spanish wine), Malmsey (Malvoisie); these were used through the whole period of the Middle Ages. During the latter half of the time, we find also in use Muscadel, a very rich wine; Alicant, a decoction of mulberries; Canary or sweet sack; Sherry or dry sack; and Bastard, a sweet Spanish wine, very hot and strong. We also read of "white wine of Berry" in 1243, and of "sweet wine called Greke" in 1390. English beer was considered the best in Europe; but there were no hops in it, and our forefathers drank it much newer than we do. Alehoof, or ground ivy, and ale-coast (a plant very rarely seen now) were used instead of hops. March beer was preferred to October; the family used it when a year old, the servants when only a month. Cider is the word always employed by Wycliffe to represent the "strong drink" of the Bible.

During the early portion of the Middle Ages, the dress of the commonalty was extremely plain and simple. They wore little or no linen, and both sexes dressed in long-napped woollen cloth, coat or dress being sent to the shearer after a year of wearing. A warm close hood of similar material completed the cos-

tume. The fourteenth century brought in a much more magnificent style, when knights' wives dressed like princesses, and gentlemen made themselves supremely ludicrous in long silk and velvet robes. The chief innovations among the ladies were the introduction of the sensible pocket, and the senseless horned or steeple caps, which continued in fashion for many years. The earlier half of the fifteenth century brought in a quieter style of dress, which gradually reverted to splendour and extravagance, until by the sixteenth the public blossomed out into trunk hose and Elizabethan ruffs, slashed sleeves and starch. Some among the commonalty aped their betters, and had to be kept down by sumptuary laws—good Queen Bess in particular was far from pleased when her farmers' and yeomen's wives approached the dimensions of her own royal ruff and august farthingale. But on the whole, the extravagant attire was restricted to the upper classes; and a farmer's wife in a mediæval picture looks much more like the same of our own day than the peeress or the princess. A warm woollen gown, with a linen apron of goodly size, and a comfortable hood, distinguish her more or less at all times; while her husband wears a homespun coat and hobnailed shoes, with a head-covering to some extent resembling the modern hat.

Fairs held a far more consequential position in our ancestors' estimation than in our own. The four grand fairs of the year —at Lady Day, Easter, Whitsuntide, and the Assumption— were the grand shopping-times of the mediæval ladies. They were anciently held in the churchyard; afterwards in the streets. At Winchester, when the fair was held, no shops were allowed to open for seventeen miles round. For the benefit of country people at a remote distance from the towns, pedlars went round with packs.

The four orders among the commonalty were the squire, addressed as *Master*, and his wife as *Mistress* (Sir and Madam were confined to nobles, priests alone sharing the former title); the yeoman and his wife, who were *Goodman* and *Goody;* the peasant, who had no title beyond his Christian name; and the priest, who might be recruited from any class, and whose appellation was *Father* when spoken to, while, when spoken of, graduated priests were termed *Master* or *Dan*, and ungraduated ones *Sir*. The University "Don" is a relic of this practice. The tradesman or artisan had no social status, but tradesmen and farmers usually belonged to the yeoman class.

A great deal of light is thrown on the ways of our forefathers by noticing the various callings of their craftsmen, and especially by seeing how many of them have died out in the present day. The following list of London tradesmen has

been compiled from State papers, chiefly between 1380 and 1400:

John Clerk, apothecary (chemist and druggist, who always practised as a doctor), 1471.
John Creke, armourer, 1391.
John Arnold, barber (the barber was also a surgeon), 1396.
Walter Hoper, bladesmith, 1392.
John Douce, bookbinder, 1396.
John Aunger, bottlemaker, 1396.
John Knyf, bowyer (maker of bows and arrows), 1392.
Peter Swan, broiderer, 1387.
Walter Payn, at Holborn Cross, brygirdlemaker, 1392. (The brygirdle appears to have been the large girdle worn, not round the waist, but across the hips, which was in fashion during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries for both sexes.)
William Tadcastre, bucklermaker (maker of shields), 1400.
John Horkeslegh, capper, 1397. We also find Joan Champeneye, capmaker, 1381.
Robert Clement, cellarer (he probably kept what are now called "vaults"), 1400.
Richard Bray, *chapemaker* (maker of capes and cloaks), 1389.
Richard Fold, clockmaker, 1400 (when striking clocks were still a novelty).
John Costantyn, cordwainer (shoemaker), 1384.
William Calwer, digger, 1396.
Walter Falconer, falconer, 1375.
William Roberd, farrier, 1391.
John Poignant, of Distaf Lane, fishmonger, 1392.
Thomas Prentys, fletcher (the man who fledged, or feathered, arrows, at that time formidable weapons), 1394.
Lionel de Ferre, French baker, 1397.
William Wyrmestyr, fuller, 1397. (An important tradesman, who did much of the work now consigned to the laundress.)
Stephen de Fraunsard, girdler (girdles were worn for centuries by both sexes and all classes), 1389.
John de Mulslowe, glover, 1391.
Agnes Goldsherer, goldshearer (she sold such articles as gold foil, gold thread, and bullion fringe), 1387.
Herman Goldsmyth, goldsmith (this man, a German, was the "Hunt and Roskell" of the fourteenth century), 1380.
William atte Gate, hatter, 1388.
Richard Mase, haberdasher, 1396.
"Litel Wat," horsedealer, 1357.
John de Bisshopeston, *hosteler*, 1397. (Not ostler, but the keeper of an inn, or hostelry.)
John Warner, *ismonger* (ironmonger), 1393.
Robert Joynour, joiner, 1372.
Maurice Doubler, lapidary, 1381.
Luke atte Welle, *latoner* (he made the latten [metal] vessels then in great use), 1397.
John Morstow, *limner* (illuminator), 1392.
John Shyryng, *lorimer* (a variety of saddler), 1394.
Stephen Juell, *lyndraper* (linendraper), 1396.
Henry Malemaker, *malemaker* (trunkmaker), 1387.
John Mapilton, marbler, 1400.
Richard Norbury, mercer, 1384.

Thomas Conston, *patymaker* (confectioner), 1397.
Robert de Mildenhale, *pelter* (furrier), 1393.
Robert de Uffington, pewterer, 1393.
John Goman, pinner (dealt in pins, then new and expensive luxuries), 1389.
John Brodok, *pulter* (poulterer), 1400.
Andrew Smyth, of Candlewick Street, *pybakere*, 1392.
Robert Bryen, scrivener (this was the public letter-writer and book-copyist; before the invention of printing, he was an indispensable person), 1392.
William Hornyngton, *sherman* (he sheared the woollen cloth, and vamped it up for a second wearing), 1400.
Richard Ewayn, *shether* (archer), 1391.
Robert Markele, skinner, 1394.
Henry atte Hulle, spicer, 1396.
John Hanney, spurrier (spurmaker), 1400.
John Rycheman, stockfishmonger (there were two kinds of fishmongers, wholesale and retail), 1392.
William Staunton, tailor (women's tailors were separate from men's), 1397.
Edmund le Tanur, tanner, 1243.
Robert de Kelesey, taverner (keeper of a tavern), 1392.
James Toothdrasher (probably a dentist, who as a rule was not distinguishable from the barber-surgeon), 1358.
Maud Bailey, trimmer (she supplied gold foil, sewing silk, thread, etc.), 1387.
William Heygrate, *vinter* (wine-merchant), 1400.
John Pope, *wexchaundeler*, 1392. (One of the most important callings.)
Richard Depeden, weaver (this craft was considered to furnish especially good singers), 1397.
John Pecche, wire-drawer, 1399.
Edmund Dene, woodmonger, 1397.

To this list must be added the pattenmakers, cooks (who kept eating-houses), pepperers, butchers, paternoster-makers (who furnished roods and rosaries), herbagers (or keepers of inns of the meaner sort), bakers, blacksmiths, brewers, carpenters, masons, painters, cutlers, saddlers, drapers, and dyers; and the long roll of mediæval callings is not exhausted, though the patience of the reader may be approaching that limit.

The great number of Johns in the preceding list can hardly fail to strike the eye. While the popularity of other names fluctuated, John and William were always in favour, and their feminine companion was Joan, next to which stood Eleanor and Margaret. No other names approached these in popular esteem. Mary and Elizabeth, from about 1450 to 1850 the favourite female names, were comparatively uncommon previous to the earlier date. It is also worthy of notice that several of these tradesmen take their names from their callings, and have no other surname. Surnames first came into use about 1200, but it was not till long after this that they became universal. By far the largest number may

be referred to one of three classes—firstly, patronymics, such as John Robinson, or John, the son of Robert. We once had such names as Fitz-Mildred and Fitz-Amabel, Margaret Johndaughter and William the Vicarson. Of this class are Beattieson (Beatrice-son), Allison (Alice-son), Perkins (Peterson), Hewitson (Hugh-son), Edison (Edith-son), and Madison (Maud-son). The second class consists of place-names, such as John de Lincoln and William Melbourne; and to it are referable all such names as Thomas atte Kirkegate, Nicholas del Countynghouse, Nicholas othe Blakhalle, William atte Brook, or Adam del Wood. The third class is the trade-names, and many of our very commonest—Smith, Walker, Fuller, Wright, Spicer—come under this head. Among the most curious of these are John the Abboteschamberlayn, Henry Waterbailiff, Walter Botelmaker, and John Garlekmongere. Smith, now the commonest name of all, was much rarer in the Middle Ages.

So unsettled was the nomenclature, that when a man changed his residence, it was far from unusual that he should also change his name. An *alias*, therefore, was not at all disreputable. Alice Canterbury removed to Bermondsey, and thereupon became Alice de Bermondsey; and instances are not wanting of such complete changes as "William North of Cleye, otherwise William Blakene of Lenne," and "John Boynton, otherwise called John Pokthorp;" no less than of the more intelligible interchange of "John Smaleleghes, otherwise called John Sisson;" or William the parsonsyoman, *alias* William Wynter." For in many of these instances, and especially when the *alias* did not indicate a change of residence, it implied the conferring of an additional name by a man's neighbours, derived from some peculiarity of person or habits. These personal names descended to a man's children in few instances, which accounts for their comparative infrequency of occurrence in the present day; but in the Middle Ages they were extremely common, and they supply some curious information as to the customs of our forefathers. They may, therefore, be dwelt on for a moment in this paper. Some had to do with personal characteristics, whether beauties or defects; among these we find such as Greathead, Rednose, Sheepshead, Nutbrown, Whitehair, Gentilcorps, and a few indicating character, as Sweteman, Bonefelaa (good fellow), Gentleman. Some refer to eccentricities of dress, as Blackhat, Redsole, Le Ragged, Shorthose, Whitehood. But the most curious—and often the least flattering—are those which record a man's habits, or allude to some event in his life. In this respect our ancestors were very plain-spoken. A simpleton was greeted as Cuckoo, Milksop, or Shearhog. A teetotaler acquired the

sobriquet of Drinkwater, while men of the opposite type were styled Goodale. Those of dirty habits had expressive names —Foulbaron, Rankditch, Staingrease, and Holdgrime. Misers were saluted as Wi' the Gold, Goldhoard, Sevenpence, Twentymark, and Pennyfather. Epicures became Hatecale, Maungeour (eater), or Sweetfood. The brisk, light-hearted man was Jolypas (merry steps); the scrivener, Inkpen; the loquacious, Manyword; the quiet and timid, Sadmay (grave girl); the reprobate, Wildblood or Spendlove; the violent, Screech, Squeal, Hurlbat, and Stabworkman; the severe or sarcastic, Poignant and Trenchant; the erratic and odd, Wrongwish or Strangeways; the effeminate, Damoysel; while those whose relatives were better known than themselves, became William Packmanson, or John the Parsonsbrother. Awkward occurrences were kept in memory by dubbing their heroes Breakrope, Burndish, Huntplace, Nowhere, Strainbow, and Wildfowl. Quite as odd, but more difficult to classify, are Chauntemarle (sing-blackbird), Scrapeday, Southwind, Tuesday, Greyeyeson (son of blue eyes), Le Mop, and Bluebell.

In the present day, and for some centuries back, the plainer names have usually belonged to the commonalty, and the more elaborate or extravagant forms have been found among the higher classes. The cottagers' and farmers' children have been John and William, Elizabeth and Mary; the Hamons and Rolands, the Rosalinds and Ismenes, belonged to the rank above them. There are signs that we are about to revert to the custom of the Middle Ages, which was the exact reverse. Then the princess and the peeress were Joan, Margaret, Agnes, Isabel, or Anne: the daughter of the tradesman or the yeoman was Florianora, Amflesia, Sauncelina, Mazelina, Albinia, or Wynesia. The gentlemen did not share this taste for strange names; Deodatus, Aylwin, Godisman, and Percival are all the male eccentricities of this kind which I know. But no sponsor, during the whole pre-Reformation period, ever dreamed of christening a boy by such names as Newton, Davenant, or Mayfield. With our forefathers, a Christian name was one thing, and a surname quite another. Some Scripture names were in great request, such as Adam, Michael, and Bartholomew; others were entirely restricted to Jews, as Aaron, Moses, Solomon, and Rachel. Jews who were not called by Scriptural names bore extremely odd ones. Dieu-le-beneie (God bless him), Delecresse (God increase him), Chere (beloved), Emendant, and Ursel, were common among the men; Belia, Cuntessa, Floria, Licorice, and Rosia, were favourites with the women.

Some words, now considered slang terms, were classical English in the Middle Ages. Such expressions as "Very

jolly," "He is a young party," and "Pitch it in the corner," were used as perfectly proper. Some of our favourite outrages upon grammar, too, may be traced back for centuries. "The Lord Privy Seal should have found means to *have had* him," writes Lord Lisle in 1536; and "every one to keep *their* turn" occurs elsewhere. The "first beginning" was also a term in use.

One phrase is a matter of importance, for it is often thought to have originated with the Reformation, while in truth its date is in this country prehistoric. People of all classes and creeds are apt to fancy that "the Church of England" never acquired that title before the reign of Henry VIII., and that previous to that period all the English were Roman Catholics. No Middle-Age Englishman ever thought thus. Peers and commoners were summoned to Parliament "to debate on the condition of the kingdom and Church of England;" and "Protector and Defender of the realm and Church of England" was the title conferred upon Richard, Duke of York, in 1454. Convocation also was called together "for the safety of the Church of England." The Roman Church was spoken of by that name, as a separate identity, "the holy and universal Church" including both. The Abbeys of Westminster, Waltham, and Bury St. Edmund's, were "immediately subject to the Roman Church;" and it was "for the honour of God and the holy Roman Church" that Peter, Bishop of Aix, was received as the Pope's Legate in Parliament in 1390. The epithet of "most holy" was restricted to the Church universal.

The state of education before the Reformation can scarcely be described, since among the lower classes such a thing did not exist. The squire's son received some information at the hands of the village priest, who usually gave his instruction in the parvoise, or room over the church-porch; but the yeoman or peasant, unless destined for the priesthood, was taught nothing except what pertained to his calling, with the necessity of pulling his hair when he met the priest or the squire. Even when he was destined for the clerical office, very little training was considered necessary to fit him for it. If he could "say his office"—that is, repeat certain sounds which resembled the Latin words in the mass-book, that he should understand what they meant was quite a secondary consideration. The traditionary origin of the word "hocus-pocus," used by conjurors, is said to be the attempts of these ignorant priests to pronounce the words of consecration, "Hoc est corpus meus." And very popular with the Gospellers of the sixteenth century was the story of an old priest who, being told that a word in the breviary was *sumpsimus*, not *mumpsimus*, replied that he had read it *mumpsimus* for over forty

years, and he was not going to give up his old *mumpsimus* for their new *sumpsimus*. The anecdotes themselves may or may not be true; but could such stories have arisen in a state of society where the clergy were "well-learned men"?

Music was very popular during the Middle Ages; everybody who had any voice at all was expected to sing. Their instruments were the spinnet and organ, the cither (guitar) and fiddle, the lyre (harp), the syrinx (flute), the rote (hurdy-gurdy), the trumpet, cornet, tabor, tambourine, and drum.

Favourite games and amusements were tournaments, archery, and wrestling, which were practised by the upper, middle, and lower classes respectively; tables (backgammon), chess, ball, football, and trap; throwing the bar, club-ball (a rude form of cricket), hand-tennis (fives), mall, battledore and shuttlecock, cross and pile (chuck-farthing), and prisoner's base.

Members of Parliament were always paid by their constituents. County members received four shillings a day, borough members two shillings; their travelling expenses being calculated at exactly double that rate. For the first day of meeting, the two Houses sat together in Westminster Hall. Then they separated for the remainder of the session, the House of Lords usually retiring to the White Chamber in Westminster Palace, the Commons to the Chapter-House of the Abbey. The mediæval session was generally much shorter than the modern, forty-seven days being about the average for the county members, and thirty-nine for the burgesses. The royal summons always commanded payment of fees and expenses, and stated for how long each member was summoned to sit. The "Merciless Parliament" of 1388, which sat from February 3 to June 4, is one of the longest upon record.

One of the most curious peculiarities of this time is the extraordinary tenures by which lands were held, instead of rent. Military service — namely, providing one or more soldiers, with their equipments, for a certain specified period, whenever called upon—was one very frequent tenure; so was a red rose to be paid on Midsummer Day. A snowball on Christmas Day also occurs. The manor of Benham, in Buckinghamshire, was held of the Crown by the service of keeping the door of the Queen's chamber on Christmas Day; and a messuage in Colne Wake by the presentation of a "wash" of oysters to the Lady of the Manor, wherever she might be, in the first week of Lent. One unlucky vassal had the pleasure, by way of rent, of holding the King's head between Calais and Dover! Another was bound to find two green geese and a bundle of straw for the King's supper and bed, whenever he passed within a given distance of the manor.

Some of our most hackneyed proverbs date back to the Middle Ages, and not a few of them were old even then. "All is fish that cometh to his net," is quoted by Colin Clout; "Man proposeth and God disposeth," by Piers Plowman; "Silence gives consent" (not in those words); "Three may keep a counsel if twain be away," and "Every honest miller has golden thumbs," are alluded to by Chaucer; while Wycliffe gives us "Hold not all gold that shineth" and "Rob Peter to pay Paul." The last-quoted proverb is usually referred to a much more recent date.

Import duty, in the year 1397, was collected at the rate of three shillings a tun on liquids and one shilling a pound on solids. The price of various articles, about the same period, ran as follows: wax, about 6¾d. per pound; iron, 1¼d. per pound; hay, 5s. per load; peas and beans, 6s. per quart; lock and key, from 8d. to 1s.; padlock, 8d.; masses for the dead, 1d. each; linen, 1s. 6d. to 1s. 10d. per yard; ribbon, 1s. to 1s. 8d. per yard; gloves, 4d. per pair; a kirtle of camaca (a variety of woollen cloth), 4s.; a slop, or skirt of the same material, 2s.; a feather-bed and bolster, £2; a pair of sheets, 6s. 8d.; a linen pillow, 6d. A cart with six horses and two men cost 6s. 8d. per day. The wages of a dairymaid in 1388 were 6s. 8d. per annum; of a palfrey-keeper, 13s. 4d.; a "kitchen knave," 6s. 8d. A book bound in cloth of silver is valued in 1378 at 3s. 4d.; and in embroidered cloth at 5s. The price of wheat per quarter, from 1363 to 1390, never rose above 10s., nor sank below 8s.

Among imports at this time we find green ginger, lemonade, sulphur, writing-paper, white sugar, rice (these came from Genoa), satin (from Bruges), armour (from Bordeaux and Naples), linen (from Flanders and Rennes), silk goods and wines from various countries, and furs, which bear in one instance the expressive name of wildware. The exports were dye-stuffs, straw hats (commonly supposed to be much more modern articles), bows and arrows (which last are distinguished as broad arrows, mark arrows, bolts, and flights), beds, knives, woollen cloth, linen "of the manufacture of Essex," Irish cloth and Norfolk cloth.

Our ideas of mediæval life will be most imperfect unless we people the ancient streets in our imaginations not merely with the lady and the knight, the yeoman and the serving-man, the scrivener with his reed pen behind his ear, and the mercer crying "What do you lack?" to the passing women from his shop-door, but also with the numerous orders of monks and nuns—with the parish priest in his cassock, now and then uplifting two fingers in benediction as he meets one of his flock; the friars of the four orders, and their innumerable

offshoots—Black, White, Brown, and Grey; the nun with her rosary hanging from her girdle; the sumner on his way to bring recalcitrant sheep to order; the pardoner with his letters of forgiveness for sale; the limitour licensed to beg without fear of law. In 1404 one-third of the land in England was in the hands of a priesthood of whom not a twentieth part resided on their cures; and in 1406 the annual income of the Church was five hundred thousand marks and eighteen thousand ploughs of land. This money, brought up to its value in the present day, is equal to six hundred thousand pounds.

Of those religious ceremonies which were not special to the "Roman use," comparatively few have survived to our day. Sermons were then rarely preached in a pulpit in church. The steps of the altar, and still oftener those of the town cross, were a favourite place. Those old churchyard crosses that yet stand here and there, sometimes marked only by a stump left in the ground, have heard many a fervent invitation to sinful souls, and many a passionate diatribe against the men who turned the world upside down. In the churches, during the fourteenth century, when the Gospel was read, women, no less than men, removed their head-gear. In that century the clocks made their appearance, which "told the hour of day by the wonderful chimes;" and this sound, to us so familiar and unheeded, our fathers flocked to church to hear, for the earliest striking-clocks were set up in the churches. For this desecration, this turning of the worship of God into a mere tickling of the senses, John Wycliffe and his poor priests thundered against those who committed it.

They were not so euphemistic as we are in this nineteenth century, nor did they consider it fitting, as some among us do, that the spiritually-minded people should bear all the annoyance, and the sensuously-minded people should enjoy all the satisfaction. They scrupled not to write down the latter as "merely nominal Christians, men of an animal nature, dismissing all faith in spiritual things." This state of things has come round again—human nature is always going round!—but where are John Wycliffe and the poor priests?

Our ancestors were great in symbols. Colours were symbolical with them: not only black for sorrow, and white for purity; but blue denoted remembrance, lilac stood for love, and yellow indicated jealousy. Their associations with flowers were a mixture of symbolism and superstition. That the rose should be chosen as the emblem of silence, the parsley of victory, the lavender of affection, and the columbine of unfortunate love, was innocent enough; but this was only the outside of the matter. These credulous people also unfeignedly believed that betony placed under their pillows preserved them from bad

dreams, laurel gave them prophetic ones, plantain enabled them to see their future husbands, and purslane prevented visions altogether. Betony was also held to impart holiness to the bearer, daffodils to portend death when they hung their heads towards the spectator, fern-seed to make its wearer invisible if gathered on Midsummer Eve, ivy to prevent intoxication, laurel to preserve from lightning, the rowan or mountain ash to avert fascinations and evil spirits, the rosemary to drive away devils and the plague. The teazle, when its down flew off, indicated a coming shower; and the pea-pod manipulated on Care Sunday, or the hemp-seed sown, informed a damsel whom she was destined to marry. Bees might only be bought or moved on Good Friday; and if they were not informed of a death in their owner's house, they showed their sense of the incivility by deserting his service.

A chapter on the superstitions of the Middle Ages would fill a volume, and that of no small size. Superstition entered into everything, from the priest who imagined that he drew down God's severest wrath by accidentally dropping the consecrated wafer (though he rarely expected it to follow any amount of profanity in language) to the girl who spent the night of Midsummer Eve in the church-porch, with the full anticipation of seeing a procession of the wraiths of all persons in her village who were to die during the ensuing year. Our ancestors foretold the weather for the year on the 25th of January; they prayed cross-legged for luck on St. Valentine's day; they ran about with firebrands on the first Sunday in Lent, thence termed Firebrand Sunday; they put out all their fires on Easter Eve, and lighted them anew; they ran through the fire on May Day—literally, had they known it, through the fire to Moloch; they washed their faces in May-dew to make them "beautiful for ever;" they practised divinations on Midsummer Eve with orpine roots and mugwort coals; they ate oysters on the 25th July, and turned their money when they heard the cuckoo, in order not to be in want of money during the year; they found matrimonial omens in nuts on All Saints' Day; they nailed horsehoes over their doors to keep away witches; they burnt the Yule-log on Christmas Eve, and hung up the misletoe on Christmas Day. Very many of those customs were relics of old heathenism. Lastly, on New Year's Day and May Day they deemed it most unlucky to meet a woman, and they not unfrequently arranged to have "the New Year brought in" beforehand, with some person of the orthodox sex, and of the requisite dark colours. Many of these originally heathen superstitions are known to ourselves, though the majority of us look on them merely in the light of fun. But among the uneducated class they keep a far deeper hold

than with the educated, and it can scarcely be needful to add, they are much more observed by those who have no practical religion than by those who have. To this day, some who ought to know better are alarmed to sit down thirteen at table, and do not feel altogether easy if they break a looking-glass. It will always be found that long after a heathen religion is dead as a form of faith, it remains alive as a root of innumerable superstitions, not always to be traced to their source with certainty.

EMILY S. HOLT.

ART. III.—A RESEARCH INTO ORIGINS: A SCIENTIFIC INVESTIGATION AS TO EVOLUTION.[1]

OF late, all of us, scientific and unscientific, have had evolution on the brain. The enemies of revealed truth were jubilant, hoping to be rid of a hated Book, the holiness it commanded, and the judgment of which it warned. Those who accepted revelation, and regarded evolution merely as a part of the manifold Divine process, began to be doubtful both as to the comprehensiveness and minute correctness of the sacred record; and whether, in future, physical science ought not to be considered, rather than Scripture, as the special revelation of God to man.

The growing lawlessness of men who boasted that they were without God in the world—did not know Him, would not, could not; and the evidence of common-sense and past experience that, apart from a recognised Divine authority, there can be no security for the continuance of morality nor safety of life, made thoughtful men hesitate as to accepting evolution. Scientists whom we delighted to honour, at whose feet we sat gladly as learners, and whose verified statements we were thankful for, declared, again and again, "the arguments against evolution are not worthy of thought." Nevertheless, as by instinct, most of us, charmed they never so wisely, would not believe.

Dr. Darwin, great as he was diligent and humble, told us of "The Origin of Species;" and as to "The Tendency of Varieties to depart indefinitely from the Original Type," Mr. Alfred

[1] For fuller statement of the process of reasoning, see "The Mystery of the Universe," Theme V. Kegan Paul, Trench, and Co., 1, Paternoster Square, E.C.