

# VARIOUS

NOTES AND QUERIES,  
NUMBER 29, MAY 18,  
1850

Various

**Notes and Queries,  
Number 29, May 18, 1850**

«Public Domain»

## **Various**

Notes and Queries, Number 29, May 18, 1850 / Various — «Public Domain»,

## Содержание

OLIVER CROMWELL AS A FEOFFEE OF PARSON'S CHARITY, ELY	5
DR. SAM. PARR AND DR. JOHN TAYLOR, OF SHREWSBURY AND SHREWSBURY SCHOOL	8
PROVINCIAL WORDS	9
FOLK LORE	11
QUERIES	13
NUMISMATIC QUERIES	13
QUERIES PROPOSED, NO. 2	14
AUTHORS WHO HAVE PRIVATELY PRINTED THEIR OWN WORKS	15
MINOR QUERIES	16
Конец ознакомительного фрагмента.	17

## Various Notes and Queries, Number 29, May 18, 1850

### OLIVER CROMWELL AS A FEOFFEE OF PARSON'S CHARITY, ELY

There is in Ely, where Cromwell for some years resided, an extensive charity known as Parson's Charity, of which he was a feoffee or governor. The following paper, which was submitted to Mr. Carlyle for the second or third edition of his work, contains all the references to the great Protector which are to be found in the papers now in the possession of the trustees. The appointment of Oliver Cromwell as a feoffee does not appear in any of the documents now remaining with the governors of the charity. The records of the proceedings of the feoffees of his time consist only of the collector's yearly accounts of monies received and expended, and do not show the appointments of the feoffees. These accounts were laid before the feoffees from time to time, and signed by them in testimony of their allowance.

Cromwell's name might therefore be expected to be found at the foot of some of them; but it unfortunately happens that, from the year 1622 to the year 1641, there is an hiatus in the accounts. At the end of Book No. 1., between forty and fifty leaves have been cut away, and at the commencement of Book no. 2. about twelve leaves more. Whether some collector of curiosities has purloined these leaves for the sale of any autographs of Cromwell contained in them, or whether their removal may be accounted for by the questions which arose at the latter end of the above period as to the application of the funds of the charity, cannot now be ascertained.

There are however, still in the possession of the governors of the charity, several documents which clearly show that from the year 1635 to the year 1641 Cromwell was a feoffee or governor, and took an active part in the management of the affairs of the charity. There is an original bond, dated the 30th of May, 1638, from one Robert Newborne to "Daniell Wigmore, Archdeacon of Ely, Oliver Cromwell, Esq., and the rest of the Corporation of Ely." The feoffees had then been incorporated by royal charter, under the title of "The Governors of the Lands and Possessions of the Poor of the City or Town of Ely."

There are some detached collectors' accounts extending over a portion of the interval between 1622 and 1641, and indorsed, "The Accoumpts of Mr. John Hand and Mr. William Cranford, Collectors of the Revenewes belonging to the Towne of Ely."

The following entries are extracted from these accounts:—

"The Disbursements of Mr. John Hand from the of August 1636 unto the  
of 1641."  
"Anno 1636."

After several other items,—

	£	s.	d.	
"Given to diverse Poore People at ye Worke-house, in the presence of Mr. Archdeacon of Ely, Mr. Oliver Cromwell, Mr. John Goodericke, and others, Feb. 10th 1636, as appeareth, Archdeacon of Ely, Mr. Oliver Cromwell,	}	16	14	0
Summa Expens. Ann. 1636	36	3	6"	
"The Disbursements of Mr. Cranford."				
"Item, to Jones, by Mr. Cromwell's consent	1	0	0"	

Mr. Cranford's disbursements show no dates. His receipts immediately followed Mr. Hand's in point of dates.

About the year 1639 a petition was filed in the Court of Chancery by one Thomas Fowler, on behalf of himself and others, inhabitants of Ely, against the feoffees of Parson's Charity, and a commission for charitable uses was issued. The commissioners sat at Ely, on the 25th of January, 1641, and at Cambridge on the 3rd of March in the same year, when several of the feoffees with other persons were examined.

At the conclusion of the joint deposition of John Hand and William Cranford, two of the feoffees, is the following statement:—

"And as to the Profitts of the said Lands in their tyme received, they never disposed of any parte thereof but by the direction and appointment of Mr. Daniell Wigmore, Archdeacon of Ely, Mr. William March, and Mr. Oliver Cromwell."

"These last two names were inserted att Camb. 8 Mar. 1641, by Mr. Hy. C."

The last name in the above note is illegible, and the last two names in the deposition are of a different ink and handwriting from the preceding part, but of the same ink and writing as the note.

An original summons to the feoffees, signed by the commissioners, is preserved. It requires them to appear before the commissioners at the Dolphin Inn, in Ely, on the 25th of the then instant January, to produce before the commissioners a true account "of the monies, fines, rents, and profits by you and every of you and your predecessors feoffees received out of the lands given by one Parsons for the benefitt of the inhabitants of Ely for 16 years past," &c. The summons is dated at Cambridge, the 13th of January, 1641, and is signed by the three commissioners,

"Tho. Symon.  
Tho. Duckett.  
Dudley Page."

The summons is addressed

"To Matthew, Lord Bishop of Ely,  
Willm. Fuller, Deane of Ely, and to  
Daniell Wigmore, Archdeacon of Ely.  
William March, Esq.  
Anthony Page, Esq.  
Henry Gooderick, Gent.  
Oliver Cromwell, Esq.  
Willm. Anger.  
Willm. Cranford.  
John Hand, and  
Willm. Austen."

Whether Cromwell attended the sitting of the commissioners does not appear.

The letter from Cromwell to Mr. John Hand, published in Cromwell's *Memoirs of Cromwell*, has not been in the possession of the feoffees for some years.

There is, however, an item in Mr. Hand's disbursements, which probably refers to the person mentioned in that letter. It is as follows:—

"Ffor phisicke and surgery for old Benson,

£ s. d.  
2 7 4"

Cromwell's letter appears to be at a later date than this item.

John Hand was a feoffee for many years, and during his time executed, as was usual, the office of collector or treasurer. It may be gathered from the documents preserved that Cromwell never executed that office. The office was usually taken by the feoffees in turn then, as at the present time; but Cromwell most probably was called to a higher sphere of action before his turn arrived.

It is worthy of note, that Cromwell's fellow-trustees, the Bishop of Ely (who was the celebrated Matthew Wren), Fuller the Dean, and Wigmore the Archdeacon, were all severely handled during the Rebellion.

*ARUN.*

## DR. SAM. PARR AND DR. JOHN TAYLOR, OF SHREWSBURY AND SHREWSBURY SCHOOL

Looking at the Index to the *Memoirs of Gilbert Wakefield*, edit. of 1804, I saw, under the letter T., the following entries:—

"Taylor, Rev. Dr. John, Tutor of Warrington Academy, i. 226.  
— his *latinity*, why faulty, ii. 449."

But I instantly suspected an error: for it was my belief that those two notices were designed for two distinct scholars. Accordingly, I revised both passages, and found that I was right in my conjecture. The facts are these:—In the former of the references, "The Rev. John Taylor, D.D.," is pointed out. The other individual, of the same name, was John Taylor, LL.D., a native of Shrewsbury, and a pupil of Shrewsbury School: HIS *latinity* it is which Dr. Samuel Parr [*ut supr.*] characterises as FAULTY: and for the defects of which he endeavours, successfully or otherwise, to account. So that whosoever framed the *Index* has here committed an oversight.

In the quotation which I proceed to make, Parr is assigning causes of what, as I think, he truly deemed blemishes in G. Wakefield's Latin style; and this is the language of the not unfriendly censor:

—  
"—None, I fear, of his [W.'s] Latin productions are wholly free from faults, which he would have been taught to avoid in our best public seminaries, and of which I have seen many glaring instances in the works of Archbishop Potter, Dr. John Taylor, Mr. Toup, and several eminent scholars now living, who were brought up in private schools."

But could Parr mean to rank Shrewsbury School among the "private schools?" I am not old enough to recollect what it was in the times of Taylor, J., the civilian, and the editor of *Demosthenes*. Its celebrity, however, in our own day, and through a long term of preceding years, is confessed. Dr. Parr's judgement in this case might be somewhat influenced by his prepossessions as an *Harrovian*.

N.

April, 1850.

## PROVINCIAL WORDS

In *Twelfth Night*, Act ii. Scene 3., occur the words "Sneck up," in C. Knight's edition, or "Snick up," Mr. Collier's edition. These words appear most unaccountably to have puzzled the commentators. Sir Toby Belch uses them in reply to Malvolio, as,—

### *Enter MALVOLIO*

"*Mal.* My masters, are you mad? or what are you? Have you no wit, manners, nor honesty, but to gabble like tinkers at this time of night? Do you make an alehouse of my lady's house, that you squeak out your cozier's catches without any mitigation or remorse of voice? Is there no respect of place, person, nor time, in you?"

"*Sir To.* We did keep time, Sir, in our catches. Sneck up!"

"Sneck up," according to Mr. C. Knight, is explained thus:—

"A passage in Taylor, the Water Poet, would show that this means 'hang yourself.' A verse from his 'Praise of Hempseed' is given in illustration."

"Snick up," according to Mr. Collier, is said to be "a term of contempt," of which the precise meaning seems to have been lost. Various illustrations are given, as see his Note; but all are wide of the meaning.

Turn to Halliwell's *Dictionary of Archaic and Provincial Words*, 2d edition, and there is this explanation:—

"SNECK, that part of the iron fastening of a door which is raised by moving the latch. To *sneck* a door, is to latch it."

See also Burn's Poems: *The Vision, Duan First*, 7th verse, which is as follows:—

"When dick! the string the snick did draw,—  
And jee! the door gaed to the wa';  
An' by my ingle-lowe I saw,  
Now bliezin' bright,  
A tight, outlandish Hizzie, braw,  
Come full in sight."

These quotations will clearly show that "sneck" or "snick" applies to a door; and that to *sneck* a door is to shut it. I think, therefore, that Sir Toby meant to say in the following reply:—

"We did keep time, Sir, in our catches. Sneck up!"

That is, close up, shut up, or, as is said now, "bung up,"—emphatically, "We kept true time;" and the probability is, that in saying this, Sir Toby would accompany the words with the action of pushing an imaginary door; or *sneck up*.

In the country parts of Lancashire, and indeed throughout the North of England, and it appears Scotland also, the term "sneck the door" is used indiscriminately with "shut the door" or "toin't dur." And there can be little doubt but that this provincialism was known to Shakspeare, as his works are full of such; many of which have either been passed over by his commentators, or have been wrongly noted, as the one now under consideration.

Shakspeare was essentially a man of the people; his learning was from within, not from colleges or schools, but from the universe and himself. He wrote the language of the people; that is, the

common every-day language of his time: and hence mere classical scholars have more than once mistaken him, and most egregiously misinterpreted him, as I propose to show in some future Notes.

*R.R.*

## FOLK LORE

*Death-bed Superstition.* (No. 20. p. 315.).—The practice of opening doors and boxes when a person dies, is founded on the idea that the ministers of purgatorial pains took the soul as it escaped from the body, and flattening it against some closed door (which alone would serve the purpose), crammed it into the hinges and hinge openings; thus the soul in torment was likely to be miserably pinched and squeezed by the movement on casual occasion of such door or lid: an open or swinging door frustrated this, and the fiends had to try some other locality. The friends of the departed were at least assured that they were not made the unconscious instruments of torturing the departed in their daily occupations. The superstition prevails in the North as well as in the West of England; and a similar one exists in the South of Spain, where I have seen it practised.

Among the Jews at Gibraltar, at which place I have for many years been a resident, there is also a strange custom when a death occurs in the house; and this consists in pouring away all the water contained in any vessel, the superstition being that the angel of death may have washed his sword therein.

TREBOR.

*May Marriages.*—It so happened that yesterday I had both a Colonial Bishop and a Home Archdeacon taking part in the services of my church, and visiting at my house; and, by a singular coincidence, both had been solicited by friends to perform the marriage ceremony not later than tomorrow, because in neither case would the bride-elect submit to be married in the month of May. I find that it is a common notion amongst ladies, that May marriages are unlucky.

Can any one inform me whence this prejudice arose?

ALFRED GATTY.

Ecclesfield, April 29. 1850.

[This superstition is as old as Ovid's time, who tells us in his *Fasti*,

"Nec viduæ tædis eadem, nec virginis apta  
Tempora. Quæ nupsit non diuturna fuit.  
Hac quoque de causa (si te proverbia tangunt),  
Mense malas Maio nubere vulgus ait."

The last line, as our readers may remember, (see *ante*, No. 7. p. 97.), was fixed on the gates of Holyrood on the morning (16th of May) after the marriage of Mary Queen of Scots and Bothwell.]

*Throwing Old Shoes at a Wedding.*—At a wedding lately, the bridesmaids, after accompanying the bride to the hall-door, threw into the carriage, on the departure of the newly-married couple, a number of old shoes which they had concealed somewhere. On inquiry, I find this custom is not uncommon; I should be glad to be favoured with any particulars respecting its origin and meaning, and the antiquity of it.

ARUN.

[We have some NOTES on the subject of throwing Old Shoes after a person as a means of securing them good fortune, which we hope to insert in an early Number.]

*Sir Thomas Boleyn's Spectre.*—Sir Thomas Boleyn, the father of the unfortunate Queen of Henry VIII., resided at Blickling, distant about fourteen miles from Norwich, and now the residence

of the dowager Lady Suffield. The spectre of this gentleman is believed by the vulgar to be doomed, annually, on a certain night in the year, to drive, for a period of 1000 years, a coach drawn by four headless horses, over a circuit of twelve bridges in that vicinity. These are Aylsham, Burgh, Oxnead, Buxton, Coltishall, the two Meyton bridges, Wroxham, and four others whose names I do not recollect. Sir Thomas carries his head under his arm, and flames issue from his mouth. Few rustics are hardy enough to be found loitering on or near those bridges on that night; and my informant averred, that he was himself on one occasion hailed by this fiendish apparition, and asked to open a gate, but "he warn't sich a fool as to turn his head; and well a' didn't, for Sir Thomas passed him full gallop like:" and he heard a voice which told him that he (Sir Thomas) had no power to hurt such as turned a deaf ear to his requests, but that had he stopped he would have carried him off.

This tradition I have repeatedly heard in this neighbourhood from aged persons when I was a child, but I never found but one person who had ever actually *seen* the phantom. Perhaps some of your correspondents can give some clue to this extraordinary sentence. The coach and four horses is attached to another tradition I have heard in the west of Norfolk; where the ancestor of a family is reported to drive his spectral team through the old walled-up gateway of his now demolished mansion, on the anniversary of his death: and it is said that the bricks next morning have ever been found loosened and fallen, though as constantly repaired. The particulars of this I could easily procure by reference to a friend.

*E.S.T.*

P.S. Another vision of Headless Horse is prevalent at Caistor Castle, the seat of the Fastolfs.

*Shuck the Dog-fiend.*—This phantom I have heard many persons in East Norfolk, and even Cambridgeshire, describe as having seen as a black shaggy dog, with fiery eyes, and of immense size, and who visits churchyards at midnight. One witness nearly fainted away at seeing it, and on bringing his neighbours to see the place where he saw it, he found a large spot as if gunpowder had been exploded there. A lane in the parish of Overstrand is called, after him, Shuck's Lane. The name appears to be a corruption of "shag," as *shucky* is the Norfolk dialect for "shaggy." Is not this a vestige of the German "Dog-fiend?"

*E.S.T.*

## QUERIES

### NUMISMATIC QUERIES

Can any numismatical contributor give me any information as to the recurrence elsewhere, &c., of the following types of coins in my possession:—

1. A coin of the size of Roman 1 B., of the province of Macedonia Prima.—*Obv.* A female head, with symbols behind, and a rich floriated edge: *Rev.* A club within an oaken garland: Legend in the field, ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΩΝ ΠΡΩΤΗΣ.

The type is illustrated by Dr. Horne, in his *Introduction to the Study of the Bible*, in explanation of Acts, xvi. 11, 12. The specimen in my possession is in *lead*, finely struck, and therefore not a *cast*, and in all respects equal in point of sharpness and execution to the silver of the same size and type in the British Museum; and was dug up by a labourer at Chesterton, near Cambridge. How is the metal of which my specimen is composed to be accounted for?

2. A 3 B. coin apparently by the portrait of Tiberius.—Legend defaced: *Rev.* The type known by collectors as the altar of Lyons: *Ex.* (ROM)AE ET AV(G.)

3. A 3 B. of Herennia Etruscilla.—*Rev.* The usual seated figure of Pudicitia; and the Legend, PVDICITIA AVG.

According to Col. Smyth, Akermann, and other authorities, no third brass of this empress exists; but the specimen before me has been decided as undoubtedly genuine by many competent judges.

4. A 3 B. coin of the Emperor Macrinus, struck in some of the provinces.—*Obv.* A bearded portrait of the emperor: Leg., AVT. K.M.O.C.C. ΜΑΚΡΙΝΟC: *Rev.* An archaic S.C. in a laurel garland, above L and beneath C. I am anxious to know to what locality I may ascribe this coin, as I have not been able to find it described.

*E.S.T.*

## QUERIES PROPOSED, NO. 2

When reflecting on my various pen-and-ink skirmishes, I have sometimes half-resolved to *avoid controversy*. The resolution would have been unwise; for silence, on many occasions, would be a dereliction of those duties which we owe to ourselves and the public.

The halcyon days, so much desired, may be far distant! I have to comment, elsewhere, on certain parts of the *Report* of the commissioners on the British Museum—which I hope to do firmly, yet respectfully; and on the evidence of Mr. Panizzi—in which task I must not disappoint his just expectations. I have also to propose a query on the *blunder of Malone*—to which I give precedence, as it relates to Shakspeare.

The query is—have I "mistaken the whole affair"? A few short paragraphs may enable others to decide.

1. The question at issue arose, I presume to say, out of the *statement of Mr. Jebb*. I never quoted the Irish edition. If *C.* can prove that Malone superintended it, he may fairly tax me with a violation of my new canon of criticism—not otherwise. What says Mr. James Boswell on that point? I must borrow his precise words: "The only edition for which Mr. Malone can be considered as responsible [is] his own in 1790." [*Plays and poems of W.S.* 1821, i. xxxiii.]

2. I am said to have "repeated what *C.* had already stated."—I consulted the *Shakspeare* of Malone, and verified my recollections, when the query of "Mr. JEBB" appeared—but forbore to notice its misconceptions. Besides, one *C.*, after an interval of two months, merely *asserted* that it was not a blunder of Malone; the other *C.* furnished, off-hand, his proofs and references.

3. To argue fairly, we must use the same words in the same sense. Now *C.* (No. 24. p. 386.) asserts the *Malone had never seen* the introductory fragment; and asks, who *forged* it? He uses the word *fabrication* in the sense of forgery.—The facts are produced (No. 25. p. 404.). He is informed that the *audacious fabrication*, which took place before 1770, was first published by Malone himself, in 1790—yet he expects me to apply the same terms to the blunder committed by another editor in 1794.

4. As an answer to my assertion that the Irish editor *attempted to unite* the two fragments, *C.* proceeds to prove that he *did not unite them*. The procedure is rather defective in point of logical exactness. It proves only what was not denied. Malone refers to the *will of John Shakspeare, found by Joseph Moseley*, with sufficient clearness; and it is charitable to assume that the Irish editor intended to observe the instructions of his precursor. He failed, it seems—but why? It would be useless to go in search of the rationale of a blunder.

Have I "*mistaken the whole affair*"?—I entreat those readers of the "NOTES AND QUERIES" who may take up the affirmative side of the question to point out my errors, whether as to facts or inferences.

BOLTON CORNET.

## AUTHORS WHO HAVE PRIVATELY PRINTED THEIR OWN WORKS

Can any of your readers refer me to any source whence I can obtain an account of "JOHN PAINTER, B.A. of St. John's College, Oxford?" He appears to have been a very singular character, and fond of printing (privately) his own lucubrations; to most of which he subscribes himself "The King's Fool." Three of these privately printed tracts are now before me:—1. *The Poor Man's Honest Praises and Thanksgiving*, 1746. 2. *An Oxford Dream, in Two Parts*, 1751. 3. *A Scheme designed for the Benefit of the Foundling Hospital*, 1751.

Who was ROBERT DEVERELL, who privately printed, in 4to., *Andalusia; or Notes tending to show that the Yellow Fever was well known to the Ancients?* The book seems a mass of absurdity; containing illustrations of Milton's *Comus*, and several other subjects equally incongruous.

EDWARD F. RIMBAULT.

## MINOR QUERIES

*Seager a Painter.—Marlow's Autograph.*—In a MS., which has lately been placed in my hands, containing a copy of Henry Howard's translation of the last instructions given by the Emperor Charles V. to his son Philip, transcribed by Paul Thompson about the end of the sixteenth century, are prefixed some poems in a different handwriting. The first of these is an eclogue, entitled *Amor Constans*, in which the dialogue is carried on by "Dickye" and "Bonnybootes," and begins thus:—"For shame, man, wilt thou never leave this sorrow?" At the end is the signature, "Infortunatus, Ch.M." Following this eclogue are sixteen sonnets, signed also "Ch.M.;" in two of which the author alludes to a portrait painter named *Seager*. One of these sonnets commences thus:—

"Whilest thou in breathinge cullers, crimson white,  
Drewst these bright eyes, whose language sayth to me.  
Loe! the right waye to heaven; Love stooede by the(e),  
*Seager!* fayne to be drawne in cullers brighte," &c.

I should be glad to receive any information respecting this painter: as also any hints as to the name of the poet Ch. M. May I add, also, another Query? Is any authentic writing or signature of *Christopher Marlow* known to exist?

M.

*MS. Diary of the Convention Parliament of 1660.*—The editors of the *Parliamentary History* give some passages from a MS. Diary of the Convention Parliament of the Restoration, and state that the Diary was communicated to them by the Rev. Charles Lyttleton, Dean of Exeter (vol. iv. p. 73.). I am anxious to know where this Diary now is, and if it may be seen by—

CH.

*Etymology of Totnes.*—Can any of your readers suggest a probable etymology for Totnes, the "prime town of Great Britain," as it is called by Westcote<sup>1</sup>, who supposes it to have been built by Brutus, 1108 years before the Christian era. Mr. Polwhele, who supposed the numerous *Hams* in Devon to have owed their names to the worship of Jupiter *Hammon*, would, I imagine, have derived Totnes from the Egyptian god Thoth or Taut; or, perhaps, directly from King Thothmes. Westcote observes that some would have the name from,—

"The French word *tout-à-l'aise*, which is in English, all at ease; as if Brutus at his arrival in such a pleasant soil ... should here assure himself and his fellow-travellers of ease, rest, and content; and the *l*, in this long time, is changed into *n*, and so from *tout-à-lesse* we now call it *tout-à-nesse*, and briefly Totnesse. This would I willingly applaud, could I think or believe that Brutus spake so good French, or that the French tongue was then spoken at all. Therefore, I shall with the more ease join in opinion with those who would have it named *Dodonesse*, which signifieth [in what language?] the rocky-town, or town on stones, which is also agreeable with the opinion of Leland."

Totnes is denominated Totenais and Totheneis in *Domesday Book*

---

<sup>1</sup> *A View of Devonshire in MDCXXX.*, by Thomas Westcote, Esq., Exeter, 1845.

## **Конец ознакомительного фрагмента.**

Текст предоставлен ООО «ЛитРес».

Прочитайте эту книгу целиком, [купив полную легальную версию](#) на ЛитРес.

Безопасно оплатить книгу можно банковской картой Visa, MasterCard, Maestro, со счета мобильного телефона, с платежного терминала, в салоне МТС или Связной, через PayPal, WebMoney, Яндекс.Деньги, QIWI Кошелек, бонусными картами или другим удобным Вам способом.