

REVIEWS.

Antiquity. A Quarterly Review of Archæology. Edited by O. G. S. CRAWFORD, F.S.A. Vol. I., No. 1, March, 1927. Gloucester, John Bellows, 5s. 6d.

This new archæological quarterly, which is issued under the able editorship of Mr. Crawford, Archæological Officer to the Ordnance Survey, has for its object the bringing to the notice of the general public the most recent researches and discoveries and the interpretation of the epoch-making work which is being done throughout the world for the elucidation of pre-historic times.

To this first volume the Editor contributes a short article on the submerged "boulder hedges," which at low water are observable on Samson flats in the Scilly Islands. These indications of a former cultivation of land now covered by the sea, were noticed long ago by William Borlase, the Cornish Antiquary. Mr. Crawford is of opinion that the whole archipelago, at one period was one large island, and that the submergence of large tracts of once cultivated land was due to a gradual sinking of the levels and not to any sudden cataclysm. The title of the article "Lyonesse" will not be very illuminative to many people, and, we think, a somewhat fanciful one as applied to the Scilly Islands.

Mr. R. G. Collingwood writes on the *Roman frontier in Britain*, dealing, chiefly, with the investigations recently made in the neighbourhood of "Hadrian's Wall," in the light of which, some of the conclusions which have been arrived at as to its date and purpose may have to be revised.

Stonehenge comes under review in two articles, Admiral Boyle Somerville, writing on the *Orientation* of the stones, and Mr. A. P. Trotter on the monument as *An Astronomical Instrument*, in which the conclusions as to its date—based upon the astronomical observations of Sir Norman Lockyer come in for some exceedingly shrewd criticism. Mr. Trotter's

article is illustrated by a remarkably successful photograph, taken from an aeroplane, and further proof of the high value to be attached to aerial photography for the discovery and plotting of earthworks, is afforded by the photographs illustrating Mrs. M. E. Cunnington's article on the prehistoric circles lately discovered on the Wiltshire downs. In this case the whole area of the field beneath was covered by a flourishing crop of wheat, nevertheless, owing to the varied luxuriance of the crop, the camera was able to reveal the circles, though the surface of the ground was entirely hidden. Subsequent excavations showed that the circles contained six concentric rings of holes which had at one time held posts or tree trunks. Mrs. Cunnington calls the site "Woodhenge," and she believes the monument to be unique, as far as is at present known, either in the British isles or abroad.

Other articles in this first number are : *Some Prehistoric Ways*, by Mr. R. C. Clay, F.S.A. ; *Maori Hill Forts*, by Mr. Raymond Firth, and the *Danube Thorofare and the beginnings of Civilisation in Europe*, by Mr. V. Gordon Childe.

Further interesting and important matter is afforded by *Notes and News* and *Forthcoming Excavations*. There is also an extensive series of notices of recently published archæological books.

Printing, paper, and illustrations are all that could be desired, and the general excellence of this first number should make a successful appeal to all who are interested in the study of prehistoric times.

C.E.W.

Under Thirty-seven Kings. Legends of Kent and Records of the Family of Boys, by LILLIAN BOYS BEHRENS. St. Catherine Press, 1926.

A brief Publisher's Note tells us that this work owes its inception to a collection of notes which the author originally had no intention of publishing. In the preface, contributed by Sir Martin Conway, it is stated that all profits from sales of the book will be devoted to the enlargement of Jesus Hospital, Canterbury. If only for the sake of that institution,

founded in 1599, by the City's first Recorder, Sir John Boys, it is to be hoped that Mrs. Behren's somewhat bold venture—for the book has been excellently produced at considerable trouble and expense—will achieve her object and attract a wider public than that to which a family history on more orthodox lines would appeal.

It is most improbable that there is any connection to be traced between the Boys family of Kent and some influential families, bearing the same name or its earlier variants, which flourished during the middle ages in Leicestershire, Norfolk and other counties. Mrs. Behrens certainly makes no attempt to establish any such connection but, none the less, introduces into the main theme of her book, frequent references to mail-clad knights and other scions of these ancient houses. These references together with some digressions into episodes of English history, some legendary stories, and extracts from works of fiction, will seem to many to have encroached on space which might have been devoted more profitably to genealogical tables and evidence. Additional and fuller extracts of original records to which the author appears to have had abundant access, would also have been welcome.

It must not be inferred from the foregoing observations that the book does not contain much to interest the Historian and Archæologist. The chapter dealing with the exploits of Sir John Boys of Donnington Castle fame, reveals some incidents in his career which have escaped the notice of other biographers. How, for instance, in 1628, within a month or so of his twenty-first birthday, he became involved in a quarrel at Canterbury, with fatal results to his adversary, and was found guilty of manslaughter. Some two years later on the petition of his father, who pleads the provocation of "such unsufferable language as young men who have seen the wars can very hardly digest," a pardon was granted. The royal clemency was not misplaced, for Sir John Boys was one of the select few who were able to welcome Charles II. at his restoration with a record of unswerving loyalty throughout the civil war and interregnum.

Perhaps Mrs. Behrens is in her happiest vein when describing the many seats in Kent which have been the homes of the Boys family. In this direction she has ample scope, for during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the family was represented by seven distinct branches, each holding estates of some importance in East Kent. These descriptions are usually accompanied by illustrations from old prints and modern photographs. Other illustrations to the work are numerous and include photographs of original portraits, many of which are probably now reproduced for the first time.

A list of "authorities consulted" is given, but it is obviously incomplete, and some of the works mentioned are inaccurately described, whilst others, e.g., "Ancient Deeds" are of too vague a description to be of any real use. The omission to cite the authority for many of the author's statements is much to be regretted, especially as the mere process of inserting and revising references would have enabled her to have corrected many of the errors which have crept into the work. A case in point is to be found on p. 24, where a full abstract is given of the will of Thomas Boys of Bonnington, who died in 1479. The abstract appears to be perfectly accurate with the exception of the first clause, which reads: "To my eldest son I give Fredville and to Thomas I give Bonnyngton, giving the fairest estate to the former and the ancient seat to the latter." Mrs. Behrens is here giving, as a direct statement of the Testator, what is, in fact, a quaintly worded comment to be found in Philipot's "Villare Cantianum." But unfortunately Philipot's comment properly belongs to the Will of the son, William Boys; a fact which Mrs. Behrens herself demonstrates later, when she gives particulars of the acquisition of the Fredville Estate by him in 1485.

An amusing slip occurs on p. 20, where a grant (21 Hen. III.) is said to have been signed by *H. I. Jstesibus* (!) and by Johannes and Richard de Bosco.

A plate is given, showing the armorial bearings of the family at different periods, and those interested in monumental brasses will find some good reproductions of memorials from

several churches, including those of Goodnestone-next-Wingham, and Deal, in Kent, and St. Mary, Oxford.

The Account Book of a Kentish Estate, 1616-1704. A Review by Capt. Herbert Knocker.

On the 24th November, 1680, there died at Godinton, in Great Chart one, Nicholas Toke, aged ninety-two. He left behind him a certain calf-bound volume in which he made notes of how he spent much of his money during a span of no less than sixty-four years, a period extended by another hand for a further generation.

This at once lifts him into the company of those Immortals of whom Samuel Pepys and John Evelyn are distinguished examples. And in the year 1927, Miss Eleanor C. Lodge, Principal of one of the Colleges of London University, presents us with an excellent reprint of Toke's book.

Our author calls the work "The Account Book of a Kentish Estate, 1616-1704."¹ a title rather too ambitious for its merits.

Toke, the recorder of the volume in question, was a Yeoman-Squire, owner of much of the land which he farmed, and he noted down his cash outlay, but the volume is somewhat of a medley. Items which could fairly be debited to capital, such as Bricks (303,000 in five items, pp. 89, 142, 220, 241, 242) are mixed up with details of clothes for one or other of the four last of his five successive wives. Moneys receivable for stock sold appear in the same column as his expenses (cf. pp. 258, 265, etc.). A record of some sort of yearly stocktaking appears in the earlier years. At the reverse end of the volume are a few pages of sales, commencing in December, 1616, and ending in July, 1620. Beyond this there is no Sales Ledger for the long period covered by the book. Save the stocktaking, no money column on any of Toke's pages is cast up. The book may be only one of a series, as our author suggests. By itself it can scarcely be

¹ Published for the British Academy, by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1927.

called an Estate Account Book. An "Expenses Book" would be a better name for it.

Our author's volume begins with an introductory summary of some thirty-three pages. Would that this were much longer! The Introduction is followed by the transcript on 489 pages of Toke's own entries down to 1680 and the continuation down to 1704, both with the author's footnotes. The few sales entries come next in order, with six prescriptions for curing sick beasts and three others for rat poisons. Half a dozen pages of Farm Terriers, most of them rather later than Toke's period, Toke's "Will" of 1680, a short glossary, an index, two maps and a pedigree complete the volume of 580 pages.

How can such a record be best utilised? The Statistician, the Student of Fiscal problems or Social History, the local Antiquary, the Genealogist, all would wish for some more detailed analysis than is placed at their disposal—though the last-named has but little of which to complain. It must, however, not be forgotten—first, that the book, though dealing with agriculture, emanates from a University, and secondly, that much of it may have been written in London. As regards the first point, there may be no need for such bitter comments as Inman¹ unloads on this class of writer. But as regards the second point, Round's advice² as to the wisdom of consulting "the intelligent *local* Antiquary" seems really needed. If our author had submitted her proof print to any intelligent *local* Manorial Steward, that part of her essay which deals with Kentish Tenures would scarcely have appeared quite in its present form.

It may be simplest to deal first with the concluding parts of the volume. Of the six *prescriptions* it only needs to be noted that three of them are to be administered to the sick beast in good ale, two involve also the letting of the beast's blood, and two of the mixtures must be given at blood heat. As regards blooding, there are other references in Toke's work. He pays (p. 38) 2s. for a case of fleames to

¹ A. H. Inman, *Domesday and Feudal Statistics*, 1900, pp. 8, 35, 139, etc.

² J. A. Round, *Feudal England*, 1909, pp. 150-153.

let beast's "blud," and also buys a "blud" rope (p. 38). He pays for letting his geldings "bloud" (pp. 12 and 26) and also for letting 20 beasts "blod" at one time, and six horses "blodd" at another (pp. 5, 17 and 44). The farm hands also have attention. He pays the Surgeon 2s. for letting Will Kinge's "blodd" (p. 168). Of the rat poisons, two are compounded with arsenic, the third is to be mixed in white wine!

The appendices are useful but the columns of the acreage of the fields in each farm might well have been added up.

Toke's "Will" is much more than the Will. It is a record of the Chancery Suit touching Toke's testamentary capacity, and includes the whole of the Petitioner's Bill, or statement of his claim, as well as the whole of the Defendants' answers. Toke's lands are referred to as lying in twelve named Parishes, but these possibly include Leaseholds. *The Glossary* which follows the Will is helpful but not exhaustive.

There are twenty-six pages of index, mostly names, and from the point of view of a student's reference book on agriculture, some words are missed. Such things as fish, moles, currants, hemp, working oxen, clothes, coach, tar and gloves, all present features of interest, and there are others. The subjects dealt with are not fully covered. The earliest references in Toke's Record of his paying Tithes occur on pp. 12, 13, 16, 17, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 and 35. The Index gives only three of these pages. Other omissions are noticeable.

There are two maps—Erse's map of Toke's three Sub-Manors dated 1621 (scale about six inches to the mile) and a sketch map (scale about two miles to the inch). Our author has some useful notes about variations shown in the modern 6-in. Ordnance Survey, which unfortunately, is not given. Erse's map of 1621 has its South point at the top. With the sacrifice of a little sentiment, this map could have been reproduced with the North to the top. The trees and some letterpress only would have needed re-arrangement. Mardoll is stated (p. 518) to be farm land North-east of Godington. To locate this, and a few more like it, first on the half-inch map and then on Erse's inverted map is a new experience.

some assistance is afforded by reversing Erse's map just as it is. Indicating Parish boundaries thereon in coloured ink, and adding a 6-in. Ordnance Survey map are both useful aids, as is the marking on the latter of Erse's hedgerows in red.

To return now to the Introduction. This commences with a treatise on Kentish Gavelkind Tenure. The general impression given to the reader is, first, that our Author is describing the condition of affairs in Kent while Toke lived and, secondly, that none of such conditions apply in 1927. Such a conclusion must not be drawn. As regards discontinuance, our author writes (p. 28, n.) that quit rents were small annual payments "*formerly* made by tenants of a Manor in commutation of customary services." The inference is that they are no longer payable. This hardly allows for the several thousands of quit rents still collected by Manorial Stewards, or for the Manor Courts which are still held and will continue to be held at least until 1936. In particular, the Manor Courts for Great Chart are still being convened and some of the quit rents due from the Toke Estate in the Seventeenth Century are still being paid.

As regards Kentish Tenures generally, our author has drawn freely from Elton ¹, but Elton was recording early peculiarities rather than the conditions prevailing in the last few centuries. Writing of Gavelkind our author says (p. xvi.) that in many cases the youngest child received the dwelling-house. Elton's own comment was (p. 41) that this was long since obsolete. Toke can have seen little or nothing of any such custom. Again we read (p. xvi.) that Gavelkind Tenure gave security of holding so long as the proper conditions were fulfilled. This suggests that if Toke had not paid his quit rents, he might have lost his land. Toke ran no such risk. Moreover, our author suggests that the land could be devised by will if—and apparently, only if—the old rents and services were properly secured. But Toke could have devised, and in fact did devise, his Gavelkind lands without mentioning any such provision (p. 497).

Our author further states that a widow who survived

¹ Charles J. Elton, *Tenures of Kent*, 1867.

her husband was allowed to keep half his Gavelkind property. This was, of course, only until her death or remarriage, and by Toke's time there were methods of circumventing this right. Again, partition amongst the children only applied when the parent left no will.

On page xviii. we find the statement that except those in the Marsh, the greater proportion of the Toke Estates lay in the Weald. Hasted's boundary of the Weald runs through the Parish Churches of Pluckley, Great Chart and Kingsnorth. If Hasted was correct, as he probably was, Toke's Estates at Godington, Swinford, Worting, Bearsland, Mardol, Leacon and much of Goldwell, as well as all land in Hothfield Parish, lay outside the Weald.

There are other statements needing comment. Our author defines the Kentish Weald as stretching from Hythe westward to the border of Sussex. This distance is about fifteen miles, and the statement does but little justice to an area measuring about 400 square miles in Kent alone, and extending westwards to Winchester. Moreover, she suggests (p. xix.) that the cultivation of the Weald had been brought about by "letting out" small portions at a time and always in return for rent. This distinctive practice for the Wealden, as opposed to the Upland Manors, but little accords with the writer's study of a large number of Manors in the two areas. She does not say what class of landlords did the "lettings out."

Our author may quote from Elton, and he from Robinson and Somner, but we gravely doubt whether anyone living in Toke's lifetime was establishing any claim to any Manorial Wastes in the neighbourhood of Godington as against the Lords of the various Manors. Research at the Ministry of Agriculture shows, in Great Chart Parish in 1841, roads and wastes, 275 acres. But this particular phrase may not carry the point any further.

Similarly in her quotations (p. xix.) from Hasted¹ about Tithe not being paid in the Weald, she omits to limit her rule to woodlands. Hasted's words are "their lands in general

¹ E. Hasted, *History of Kent*, 1778, Fol. Vol. I, p. cxxxiv.

pay no Tithe of wood." Research into the Parish Tithe Apportionment of 1841 for Great Chart discloses the following finding in the Commissioner's Award: "All the woodlands within the said Parish are and have been from time immemorial exempt from the payment of Tithes, and contain 152 acres." This customary exemption extends to many parishes beyond the geographical limits of the Weald.

Further, our author lays down a general dictum that Tithe was not paid in the Weald unless a special right to it could be proved by the Parson. Toke must have known better than this. His Parsons had a presumption by law that the produce of all land was titheable. It was on Toke as landholder that the onus lay of establishing any plea of exemption by custom or otherwise. The recorded payments to the Vicar of Ashford of 10s. for two acres of wood (p. 143) and of 8s. for one acre of wood (p. 50) are puzzling, unless they represent payments on young underwood then cut (p. 52).¹

At the foot of p. xix. we get an even more unfortunate statement, viz., that the Toke Estate was not held in Gavelkind and—apparently, therefore—Toke succeeded because he was the eldest son of his father. The first statement is almost certainly untrue. Everything in Toke's book suggests the contrary. The bulk, if not the whole, of the Toke freehold Estates was clearly of Gavelkind tenure. If Toke succeeded on his father's death, to the exclusion of his brothers, we must look for a Will or family settlement regulating the succession. And something we can find. The Chancery proceedings after Toke's death, printed in full by our author on p. 499 expressly refer to "the Manors, Messuages, lands and tenements settled" on Toke at the time of his marriage. Our author seems to have overlooked this. Is our author herself misled into believing that the rules of primogeniture or co-parcenary prevailed in Toke's time against a Testator's Will?

True it is that there were Kentish Manors called

¹ As to Tithe on Underwood cf. Stubbs *Const. Hist.*, 1903, Vol. III, pp. 336 and 352.

Goddington held by Knight Service Tenure. But research into the Book of Knights' fees¹ discloses that these lie in Chelsfield and Strood only. In 1543, John Tufton of Hothfield, and William Twisden of Chilmington disgavelled their lands, but there is nothing to show that Toke acquired any of these lands. The name Toke does not occur in any disgavelling statute, as searched, and our author explains (p. 113, n.) that the Swinford land which the Tuftons transferred to Toke was not acquired by the Tuftons until after 1603. Toke's purchase from Clark of 2 acres at Chilmington and possibly more (pp. 132, 251 and 384) does not carry us much further, though his descendant by 1841 had a larger area in Chilmington. This is clear from the Tithe map. London University has assured us that the Toke Estates in Kent were not held in Gavelkind. An appeal to Record suggests a contrary verdict, and the latter is to be preferred.

There are other points of comment. It is always a pity in a Reference Book like this to make statements such as "The Coachman was supplied with a livery" (p. xxxiii.) without assisting the student to verify the fact. The Index does not help. A long search is necessary in order to find on p. 157 that four livery cloaks with gold and silver lace cost Toke £8.

Footnotes are indicated on pages 110 and 134, but the notes are omitted.

Worting Farm is described on page xxv. as in the Parishes of Hothfield and Bethersden. The fact is that the principal part of Worting Farm lay in Great Chart parish.

Toke apparently died twice, once on the 24th and once on the 29th November, 1680 (pp. 384n. and xv.)! Page 498 probably supplies the correct date.

There is another point. A very little original search is often worth many quotations from earlier writers. Our author writes (p. xix.) "Goldwell was a very old Manor." This expression implies some pre-Domesday record for

¹ *Testa de Neville, Temp. Hen. III and Edw. I*, published by Authority, 1923, pp. 668 and 683.

Goldwell, just as exists for Chart and East Chart and many other Manors (cf. instances quoted by Elton, p. 70). Our author presumably knows. But the same words occur in Hasted's fol. Vol. III., and were no doubt simply copied out by her. Hasted's authority for his statement appears to be only a Domesday reference to a Manor called Godeselle. But a comparison of the location, tenure, values, and other factors, make this identification so unlikely that the whole thing must be set down as one of Hasted's not infrequent errors. The error is confirmed by research in the Court Rolls of Great Chart, kindly made by Mr. N. H. Wightwick of Canterbury, the Deputy Steward. The Manor of Goldwell (Great and Little Goldwell) extending to about 200 acres, was held of the Manor of Great Chart. The quit rent is given as £1 19s. 11d. None of this fits Godeselle.

With regard to matters specifically analysed by our author, she has much useful information about Rents paid by Toke. Unfortunately acreages are not, perhaps cannot always be, given. The same applies in part to Cesses, and other payments during the Commonwealth as well as to King's Cesses, King's Oats, Ship Money, Subsidies, Chimney money and other imposts, some of which, however, are not assessed on acreage. On these latter our author's remarks are particularly interesting.

In respect of Tithes, our author states (p. xlvi.) that they were always commuted for money. Is this correct? We doubt it. Toke may never have recorded Tithes paid in kind. But it seems scarcely credible that the small recorded payments really cleared so large a farming enterprise. As appears from the Tithe Apportionment of Great Chart Parish of 1841, the Rev. Nicholas Toke then held in that Parish 685 acres of which 649 acres were then liable to a total Tithe Rent Charge of £153, equivalent to an average of nearly 5s. an acre. This indicates a general high cultivation in 1841. The farms making up this total acreage are Godington with Worting, 303 acres; Prebble land, 14 acres; Daniel's Water, 21 acres; New Street, 103 acres; Little Chilmington, 100 acres; Chilmington Green, 78 acres and a few separately

assessed fields. Approximate figures only are given, but Toke owned or occupied a good deal of this 685 acres in Great Chart. Of course, his Tithe-free woodland may have been greater and he may have sub-let portions, leaving the occupying tenant to pay the Tithes. Prior to 1649, there seems to be no definite record of payment of any Corn Tithes in Great Chart. Toke paid £2 10s. p.a. (p. 79) to Parson Jackson, but this was for small Tithes (p. 224), being an amount fixed by prescription in lieu of all Tithes except corn (p. 492). The item is sometimes a quarterly payment of 12s. 6d. (pp. 12, 25, 26, and 36), sometimes half yearly at £1 5s. (p. 87). In 1627 (p. 87) Toke paid also on part of Rowbrooke in Great Chart and on grass land rented by Toke 3s. 2d., and 5s. 8d. The rest of Rowbrooke lay in Ashford Parish (p. 37).

In 1650 one, Lewes, is recorded as receiving the Tithes in Great Chart for the first time. Toke paid to him both the fixed amount of £2 10s., and apparently instalments of £2, £1 16s., and £3 0s. 6d. for Tithes on Corn (pp. 224 and 225). The composition per acre was 3s. for oats, 4s. for barley and 5s. for wheat (p. 230), as compared with a composition of 2d. an acre for pasture and 3d. or 4d. an acre for meadow in 1626-7 (pp. 79, 87, and 89). The figures for Tithe per acre on grass on p. 44 are faulty. The figures are clearly calculated at per field. As early as 1633 Toke paid in cash for Tithe on wheat and oats in Bethersden (pp. 145, 153, 160, 174 and 185), and to Starr, the Collector for Ashford, for wheat as early as 1637 (p. 173), and by 1644 Toke paid in cash for corn Tithes in Hothfield (p. 194). It seems hard to believe that Toke's total Titheable lands in Great Chart Parish were all grass, and were limited to the comparatively small area suggested by the £2 10s.

The Terrier referred to in Erse's map of 1621 is not furnished, but a test applied with the scale discloses a number of enclosures exactly 220 yards in width. This measurement is commonly accepted as indicating ancient common arable fields.

As early as 1617, Toke held large stores of unthreshed corn (pp. 8, 23 and 32), and was regularly paying out cash

for plough irons (pp. 13, 18, 20, 25, 36, 38, etc.). In and after 1618, Toke was paying for labour on corn land and arable (pp. 20, 37, 39, etc.), and he later possessed upwards of twenty working oxen (pp. 22, 33, 54, 92 and 123), as well as horses. In 1626 he was the owner of (p. 80) eight oxen or steers for work, a complete Domesday plough team. In 1618 (p. 18) Toke paid 6s. to the Smith for shoeing six of his oxen, which may have meant eight shoes apiece for each of the six oxen. The only inference to be drawn is that prior to 1650 in Great Chart, Corn Tithes were still being paid in kind, the Titheowner's Bailiff collecting the actual sheaves from the harvest field.

As regards Tithe on hops. In 1621 Toke paid on 20 perches of hops at 6s., apparently 6s. per acre (p. 44), but the arithmetic is faulty. After 1641 he was paying more. For $4\frac{1}{2}$ acres in Worting £1 2s. 6d. (pp. 188 and 207), and on half an acre in Pigbrookes, 5s. (p. 188), and on 2 acres 3 yards in Hothfield 17s. 10d. (pp. 216 and 222) and 18s. 4d. (pp. 239 and 243). The Tithe Rent Charge assessed in 1841, on Kentish Hop Gardens was usually about 15s. per acre. There are many entries about Hops in Toke's work. As early as 1620 he bought 9,000 hop setts (p. 43) and in Appendix A our author furnishes particulars of the cultivation in 1749 of 11 acres of Hop-garden at Godington. The account shows the satisfactory return of £407 on an outlay of only £142 for the year in question. The Tithe paid on this in 1749 was 10s. per acre (p. 492).

As regards general conditions prevailing in 1927 Mr. W. R. Biddell of the Boro High Street, has kindly furnished some particulars. He confirms that no figures have fluctuated more than those of the Hop industry during the past twenty years. As regards the crop, as much as 20 cwts. per acre has been known, but an average crop for 1927 may be 13 cwts. per acre. The yearly cost of cultivation may be anything up to £140 per acre, especially in small holdings upon which less capital outlay for permanent wiring and water supply has been incurred. The average selling price may be taken at £10 to £12 per cwt. and a reasonable profit is 15 per cent.

Applying these figures to the eleven acre garden in 1749, the crop might now be 7 tons 3 cwts., the cost of cultivation might be placed at £1,540 and the selling price at £1,753, the season showing a profit of £33 only. Toke also paid in 1671 for "6 Tithe Lams at 2s. 6d., 15s." (p. 323).

As regards Land Tenure. There are very many payments for Manorial incidents. In other words, Toke's Estates were originally nearly all held by prædial service of some great Manor. Some of his farms prior to the fourteenth century had evolved into small Sub-Manors. But they were of slight importance, and Toke had apparently solved any question of local Manorial jurisdiction in his own Sub-Manors by practically buying up his Tenant's holdings.

In 1621 Godington filled an extended triangle of Great Chart Parish, bounded west by Hothfield Parish, East by Ashford Parish, and south by the River Stour. Sir John Tufton, of Hothfield, owned all that Toke had not acquired, including apparently the 38 acres of Rowbrooks which lay in Great Chart (cf. pp. 76 and 87). This Sub-Manor of Godington was held of the Lord of the Manor of Great Chart. Toke's Sub-Manor of Worting was similarly held so far as it lay in Great Chart. The two Sub-Manors may have covered less than 300 acres. Toke quotes the land held by him of Great Chart in 1637 as 117 acres in all (pp. 162, 173), the yearly quit rent paid by him being £3 18s. 8½d. This figure suggests an average of over sevenpence an acre, an abnormally high figure, but Toke's total of 117 acres may not be inclusive. Our author quotes (p. 106, n.) an Eighteenth Century account book seen by her which extends this quit rent of £3 18s. 8½d. to seven holdings, viz.: the farms called Yardhurst, New Street, Four Elms, Winterlands, and Beverden, as well as the Great Chart portions of Godington and Worting. This may be over 300 acres, and is the more likely, but Mr. Wightwick's researches into the Manor records in his hands are to be preferred. He finds that in 1696, Toke's nephew was paying a quit rent of £3 16s. 6d. on three holdings only, viz.: on Godington, house and land (arable 10 acres, meadow 20 acres, and pasture 30 acres), and on Worting, house and

50 acres of land; and on Daniel Waters, house and 20 acres of land, all in Great Chart Parish, and other smaller rents of a few pence. There may well have been attached woodland, of which the areas are not quoted. Mr. Wightwick finds that the Manor of Great Chart extended far beyond the limits of the Parish of the same name, itself over 3,000 acres. By 1841 the area of the Toke Estates of Godington and Worting in Great Chart is recorded in the Parish Tithe Apportionment at 303 acres. But by that date the Tokes had bought out the Tufton land in Rowbrooks previously only held on Lease.

Between these two Sub-Manors in Great Chart lay Toke's Sub-Manor of Swinford, in the Parish of Hothfield, but held of the superior Manor of Boughton. Erse's map suggests that in 1621 Sir John Tufton owned the Sub-Manor house of Swinford and most of the land, but that Toke had then the Seignory and part of the demense. In 1629 Toke paid (p. 113) to Boughton Manor a quit rent of 11s. 6d. for Swinford and a further quit rent of 16s. 10½d. for other lands. Mr. J. M. Poncia, of Ashford, is Steward of the Manors of Hothfield, Great Ripton, Little Ripton, etc., and has kindly furnished some information. Generally speaking the Godington and Hothfield Estates have been rounded off, the latter now including practically all the Swinford and Worting land, owned in the Seventeenth Century by Toke, and lying within Hothfield Parish.

The writer happens to hold a combined Rental for some nineteen Manors held by the Hatton (Winchelsea) Family in about 1720-30. This Rental covers Boughton (that is Boughton Aluph) and Wye as well as half-a-dozen other Manors, of which the writer is Steward. Research in this Rental shows that John Toke (apparently the second in succession from Toke) was then paying to the Manor of Boughton a total of yearly quit rents "for lands in Hothfield and Ashford, £3 0s. 8d.," and to the Manor of Wye a total of yearly quit rents of 15s. 11¼d. The Earl of Thanet is recorded as paying to Boughton Manor for the Sub-Manor of Ripton and Ripton lands a total of £1 6s. 5¼d., and "for

lands in Ashford and Hothfield heretofore parcel of Swinford, and had in exchange from Mr. Toke, £1 2s. 9d." This confirms the acquisition of further Estates by the Toke Family as well as the adjustments between them and the Tuftons of Hothfield Place. The Rental further records that the Earl of Thanet then owed 6 heriots on death in respect of his lands held of Boughton and lying in Hothfield Parish, and that John Toke owed one heriot on death in respect of his lands held of Boughton and lying in "the Parish of Godington." But, apparently, this refers to Toke's Swinford Manor lands, held with Godington and lying in Hothfield Parish.

There is no indication that Boughton Manor extended into Great Chart Parish. And no record has been traced in Toke's book of any heriot seizure or render. But Toke may have omitted anything except payments in cash.

Research in the Rolls in Mr. Poncia's hands, as well as those held by Mr. Wightwick, confirms Toke's record as to his tenure of his lands held of various Manors. He held in free and common socage by fealty and yearly quit rents, and each new Tenant on coming into the Estate paid a relief equivalent to the whole or part of one year's quit rent. No doubt he had also to acknowledge his tenure. Apart from his obligation by tenure to attend the various Courts Baron, Toke and all his farm hands and all other residents within the jurisdiction of any Manorial Court-Leet owed attendance at the Court in that capacity. Sometimes a payment was made for exemption from this Suit of Court. Payments for ameracements affeered at Manor Courts for defect of Suit are recorded as made by Toke. Instances are:—

To Great Chart (pp. 162 and 168) at 1s. 4d.

To the Royal Manor of Wye (pp. 195 and 257) at 1s.

To Ashford Manor (p. 246) at 8d.

As regards exemption fees called Essoins, payments of 1s. 6d. and 3s. 4d. are recorded on pp. 107 and 145, for Toke and his servants. Our author correctly points out that this must be in respect of liability to attend, as Residents, a Court Leet.

There are certain Quit Rents paid to one, John Kitchen, as recorded on p. 131. Toke's words "per acre" are clearly errors.

There is another point. In 1632, Toke pays (p. 136) to the Manor of Wall a quit rent of 3s. 10d. p.a. on his land called Marle in Bethersden. Our author's footnote places the Manor of Wall in Ashford, and she so marks her sketch map, locating Wall Manor to the North of Ashford, and Marle Farm near Bethersden Village about five miles distant. The Manor may lie thus severed, but in 1650 Toke appears to pay the same Quit Rent (p. 225) to the Manor of Ashford.

In our Author's footnote on p. 136 and in her note in Appendix H there is a quotation about the payment or receipt of a quit rent of 3s. 4d., and the one quotation contradicts the other. Probably the Appendix is correct. It may be noted that on page 246 Toke pays a Rent Service of two cocks and a hen compounded at 6d. apiece, as well as twenty years arrears of the cash quit rent of 4s. 2½d. Kentish Landowners generally hesitate nowadays to pay up twenty years arrears of quit rent!

As regards wages our author furnishes a very informing summary. Many of us would have liked some modern figures for comparison, but none are given. Toke apparently paid (p. xxxii.) to his farm labourers about £6 a year in wages with a maximum of £7, rising to £8 in exceptional cases. This means that the normal male worker received about 2s. 6d. a week, a figure which may well be considered with the last order made for Kent by the Agricultural Wages Board, taking effect from 2nd March, 1927. The Order stipulates for a minimum wage of 32s. 6d. a week for men of twenty-one years and over. The week is limited to fifty-two hours work in summer and forty-eight hours' work in winter. Meal times are excluded. Stockmen and Shepherds receive 6d. per week more. Women receive less. All receive an increased rate for overtime.

Perquisites or extras there may have been in Toke's time as in ours. Edward Carter stipulated in advance (p.133) for "£6 10s. by the year and a 100 cabbages." Finn draws

(p. 182) cash and meat and drink also, and some workers may have had their cottages free of rent.

Among minor points may be mentioned Hemp. Our Kentish Manorial Records often contain references to Hemp plots. Toke's book but not our author's Index, does the same. Toke bought hemp seed (p. 87), valued his crop (p. 69), kept it enclosed (p. 99), and paid the Rope maker for making the hemp into ropes (pp. 87, 100 and 101). Manilla competition had not then extinguished the home industry.

Another item of interest is the Mole. In addition to rats and ants (p. 59) Toke suffered from moles. He paid for mole prongs (pp. 10 and 11) and he paid for killing. The price was nearly always 1s. 6d. per dozen moles killed. His entries occur as early as 1617 (p. 5), and as late as 1665 (p. 282). In 1620-1, the number recorded as killed is 258 (pp. 39, 41 and 43). In 1625, seven items (pp. 70 to 72) cover 185 moles, including 15 moles "about the house." In 1627, 300 are killed (pp. 91, 92, 94 and 95). Sometimes a regular mole catcher was employed (p. 134 and 154).

A few words must be devoted to "gloves." Our author writes (p. xxxvi.) "Harvest gloves were provided for the workers." Is this likely? Did Harvesters ever work with gloves? What is the evidence? The Index fails us, but the following are recorded: August, 1618 (p. 20) "Given to the servants for Harvest Gloves, 6s. 2d." August, 1619 (p. 30) "Given to our Menservants for Harvest Gloves, at 8d., 5s. 4d. Given to our maids and boys 6d. a piece, 3s. 6d." September, 1620 (p. 40) "Given to our Servants for Harvest gloves, 6s. 6d." October, 1628 (p. 105) "Given him (Thomas Carter) for Harvest Gloves, 1s." This entry is duplicated on p. 106. October, 1630 (p. 124) "Steven Beech, given him Harvest Gloves, 1s." "Dick Hauke, Given him Harvest Gloves, 6d." September, 1632 (p. 137) "Given to my men for their Harvest Gloves, men 1s., boys and maids 6d., 12s." October, 1633 (p. 144) "Thom Gillam. Given him for Harvest Gloves, when he went away, 1s." "Tom Carter. Given him for Harvest Gloves, 1s." In most instances, these entries follow a record of payment of wages. In the

last case, if not in others, the man Gillam was leaving. The entries are all just after the heavy extra work entailed by the Harvest. The actual cost of 1s. a pair is unlikely.

In 1644, Toke bought (p. 197) four pairs of shoes for himself for 13s. 4d., and three pairs for his wife for 7s.

Prices of shoes and gloves in 1927 in the High Street of the Borough of Croydon, a centre of a large semi-agricultural area, may be quoted for comparison. Farm workers' gloves to-day do not exceed 3s. a pair. Shoes for the squire and his lady to-day would not cost less than a guinea, say seven times as much as in Toke's time. On the same proportion, the actual price of farm workers' gloves in 1632 might have been about 5½d. Now, what really happened! The answer is obvious. Toke gave on certain occasions to every one of his farm workers a silver coin as gratuity, bonus—call it what you like. Toke called it "Harvest gloves," but he never expected the actual gloves to be bought, nor did the workers buy them.

Sheep Shearing figures frequently. As our author points out, Toke was a considerable Sheep Master. A minor point is the regular conjunction of expenses for sheep-shearing and the cost of tar and pitch. Three examples will suffice. In 1619 Toke pays (p. 28) for two days shearing of 1,270 sheep at Cheyncourt, £4 18s., and for five gallons of Tar, 6s. In 1620, the item is for two gallons and three quarts of Tar at shearing time, 3s. 8d. (p. 39). And in 1621, for Tar when he shore at Godington 2s. 2d. (p. 45). Tar is still used to stop bleeding and perhaps the quantities are reasonable. A payment in 1617 (p. 10) includes the shearing of Toke's nag. The quantity of tar used is not stated!

A less obvious purchase was made in 1619 and 1620 "Powder and shot in Lambing time" (pp. 27 and 39). If Toke poached his own partridges with nets—possibly by moonlight (cf. Items 8s. 6d., 2s. 4d., and 2s., on p. 150, and Item 9s. on p. 164), he might also have shot his foxes when his ewes were dropping their lambs. And probably this explanation is correct. We know that as early as 1726, a pack of Fox hounds was maintained as a business proposition

to keep down lamb-killing foxes in Yorkshire. Fox-hunting, as we know it, began about 1750 (cf. Harmsworth's Enc., p. 2,558). And in the wooded Wealden area fox-hunting as a sport must have developed later than in the open Shires. Toke no doubt shot his foxes.

Toke died in 1680. The reader may go to Great Chart Church and see a late Seventeenth Century Brass plate engraved with Toke's picture. Toke kneels piously on a footstool, clad in armour, holding before him an open book. He wears his own hair flowing well down on his shoulders. He recalls his martyred King. The picture—and the armour—may correctly represent him in his prime, half a century before he died. His three daughters kneel behind him.

The closing details are given in the extension of the book (pp. 386-388).

The coffin cost £3 10s., while £6 was paid to the Painter for the Hatchments; for the herse and pall, £3 6s.; to the Parish Clerk for grave digging and bell tolling, 9s.; to the Parson for his sermon, £1 10s. 6d.; for the burial suit and shroud, 18s.; and £5 1s. given to the Poor. Toke's Will leaves "£5 to poore people at my burial." His nephew must have added the 1s. And two years later occur the final items (p. 402). "Paid the Stone Carver for a tomb-stone for my Unkle, £4," and "Paid for the brasses and coats of Armes and the figures and other work, £12 12s." This, no doubt, is the existing brass; a poor brass—not like his Great Grandfather's, as Toke had directed in his Will; for the Brass makers had lost their cunning in 1680. All this outlay is due to the honoured memory of the late Squire, but meanwhile the work on the Estate must go on. Sums of 3s. 6d., 1s. 6d., and 7s. 6d. are paid (pp. 389-390) for the continued "ketching of" those persistent "moules," the true Terre-tenants of Godington; 19s. 6d. is expended on shearing 391 sheep (p. 392); tithes and other dues go on being paid; laces and ribbons are bought, as well as hemp seed (pp. 397 and 399); but, with his forefathers within his Parish Church, Toke sleeps on.

The Little Guides. Kent. By J. CHARLES COX, revised by PHILIP M. JOHNSTON. London, Methuen and Co., 1927.

Methuen's excellent series of Little Guides is too well-known to require attention to be directed to them in these pages. The scheme is admirable, and nothing could be more convenient for reference than the alphabetical arrangement adopted, in contrast to the clumsy and arbitrary classification by hundreds or deaneries, too often followed in topographical works. The Little Guide to Kent has recently appeared in a new guise, after having been re-written, or at any rate extensively revised, by Mr. P. M. Johnston, F.S.A., F.R.I.B.A., a well-known authority on Kentish places and buildings. The first version of this work was issued in 1903 from the pen of the late Mr. George Clinch, Librarian of the Society of Antiquaries, while the second was by Dr. J. C. Cox, F.S.A. The illustrations in the first and second editions were identical, but in the present one Mr. Johnston has selected a set of subjects almost all fresh, six of which are from his own camera, and two are drawn by his own hand.

In the note on Saltwood the writer goes out of his way to state that the words sculptured upon the font "Regina Maria . . . often misread, are not intended, as sometimes supposed, to refer to Mary Tudor." Who ever could be so misguided as to imagine that they do, particularly as the correct reading is "Jehsu Marya" ? This is probably an instance of a building which Mr. Johnston does not happen to have inspected personally. But this is but a small blemish. The writer's wide acquaintance with Kentish topography, together with his expert knowledge, has enabled him to produce a Little Guide to Kent much in advance of that of either of his predecessors. The work is further enriched by some valuable appendices on Pre-Conquest architecture in Kent, Kentish Church Towers, Kentish tracery, Portrait heads and grotesques and Kentish Timber Houses; while the Rev. R. V. Potts, Bursar of St. Augustine's College, contributes an appendix on St. Augustine's Abbey, a subject on which he is better qualified to speak than any authority living.

Kent Records. The Publications of the Records Branch,
K.A.S.

Now that the tenth volume of the series of Kent Records has been issued, it may not be inopportune to consider the work so far achieved by this branch of the Society and to give some account of its first beginnings. The moment seems the more appropriate in that many of the original members are no longer with us, and we should like to record our gratitude for the work they did while there are still some among us who know, by actual experience, its great value. For they builded surely, and it is to their efforts, especially to those of the first Chairman, the late Lord Northbourne, with those of the first Treasurer and of the first Secretary, that the Branch owes its present position. Fortunate in its first officers and Committee, the Branch has been no less fortunate in their successors, and having now reached its fourteenth year and survived the troublous times of the Great War, it may surely hope to have in front of it a long and prosperous course.

If any list of the publications of the Records Branch be examined, it will be noticed that volume I. of the Kent Record series, *The Parish Registers and Records in the Diocese of Rochester*, is issued by the Council of the Kent Archæological Society, while the other volumes that follow are issued by the Records Branch. That distinction commemorates the fact that the volume was issued before the Records Branch was in being. The book was published in 1912; the first circular of the Records Branch was sent out in June, 1913. But the Council had long wanted a records section, and with courageous optimism, when they issued the Rev. W. E. Buckland's volume, they decided on the general title of *Kent Records* in sign of their belief that other volumes would in due course be added to the series. At that time the Editor of *Archæologia Cantiana* was the Rev. Canon G. M. Livett, and he was one among the many ardent supporters who wanted to see a Records Society started. Another keen spirit was found in one of the Local Secretaries, Mr. L. M. Biden. The two met and discussed their schemes: Canon Livett had

persuaded Miss Churchill to help him in the editorial work, and Mr. Biden had induced Mr. John Churchill to help as Treasurer when in June, 1913, there was held a meeting under the chairmanship of the late Lord Northbourne of all those particularly interested in starting a records branch. The scheme was launched, rules were drawn up, and a prospectus issued. The relationship of the Branch to the mother society was regulated from the first on sound lines which have ever since been followed, and have contributed in no slight measure to the stability of the Records Branch.

The prospectus stated that the Council of the Society had appointed a Committee with power to inaugurate, as a separate undertaking, a Records Branch, on the lines laid down in the accompanying rules, for the purpose of printing such records as were deemed on account of their nature or length to be unsuitable for publication in *Archæologia Cantiana*. The first rule as given on the prospectus and one still in force, was as follows :—

The first object of the Records Branch of the Kent Archæological Society shall be to supplement the work of the Society by printing for distribution among subscribers to the Branch, under the general title of *Kent Records*, documents or other materials relating to church, parochial, manorial, and family history in the County. The Committee shall also endeavour to promote research work, particularly in town records, and to assist subscribers in preparing and publishing transcripts of Parish Registers and records of similar character.

Among the original members of the Committee no longer with us were counted Mr. Leland L. Duncan, the Rev. T. S. Frampton and C. I. Redshaw.

A survey of the works hitherto published will reveal how far the aim of the Branch as stated above has been fulfilled, and in what ways it has fallen short of the ideal set before it. Publications in such a series inevitably tend to fall under two main headings—the volume that is a mere reference book, the

biblia-abiblia of Lamb's pungent description, and the volume that can be taken up and read. Many of the series under discussion necessarily fall under the first head, yet dull as these may seem to the average reader, they are among the most valuable work done by the Branch. Nor are enthusiasts lacking who will read for entertainment an index of wills with its columns of names, places, dates and reference numbers. Of such indexes there are now three in the Kent Records series, namely

- Vol. III. *Sede Vacante Wills*, by the Rev. C. E. Woodruff.
 Vol. VI. *Index of Wills and Administrations at Canterbury*, by H. R. Plomer. 1916-20.
 Vol. IX. *Index of Wills proved in the Rochester Consistory Court*, by the late Leland L. Duncan. 1924-5.

The first-named contains within its covers an interesting introduction explaining why this jurisdiction of the Chapter existed in the matter of the wills proved before it, as well as transcripts of wills of many of the archbishops and some others. And the last-named has an introductory memoir to Mr. Duncan, to whose indefatigable energy the Index is due, together with an index of place-names mentioned, with their variant spellings, for the benefit of place-name enthusiasts. Perhaps, then, it is rather severe to class these as mere reference books. The index of Canterbury Wills was issued in conjunction with the British Record Society, and it is much to be regretted that it has no index of places. Is it too much to hope that some day it will be possible to remedy this and to issue one printed in a form that will slip within the covers of the book?

Another work of reference of a somewhat different type is Volume II. of the Series, entitled *A Handbook to Kent Records*. It was compiled by the Editor as a guide to the various classes of records to be found in repositories throughout the country, yielding information about the history of the county. The book was intended primarily as a help to the beginner, and to this end the first part is devoted to a brief

account, with examples relating to Kent, of the classes of records to be searched ; while in the second part the means of access to, and contents of, the different repositories having Kent material are set out in a classified order.

Volume VIII. also comes under this same category. It is *A Calendar of Institutions by the Chapter of Canterbury Sede Vacante*, compiled by the Rev. C. E. Woodruff, with some additional notes by Miss Churchill, and was issued in 1923. It is an important volume in the series and one of more than county interest, for it covers the province of Canterbury. The Archbishop, as Metropolitan, claimed and exercised the right of administering during a vacancy any see of his province. In a vacancy of the archbishopric, the Metropolitan Church of Canterbury claimed a like right. Hence there will be found in these Sede Vacante Registers records of collations and institutions by the Chapter of Canterbury in the different dioceses of the Southern Province, made in pursuance of such rights and powers. It is therefore of great service to all students of parochial and church history that this source of information should be available for them in the handy form of a printed calendar.

For the remaining volumes in the series issued so far, it may fairly be claimed that they are of the type that is intended to be read right through.

Volume IV, *Register of Hamo Hethe, Bishop of Rochester*, by C. Johnson, is being issued in conjunction with the Canterbury and York Society. That is to say that the actual work of transcribing and editing is theirs ; this society merely joins in the cost of publication, whereby the expense for the two societies is materially reduced. But such joint publications have some very real disadvantages. The Society that is joining in the publication has no means of accelerating the production, and so it has happened, that while two parts of the register have come out in 1915 and 1916, no more parts have been issued. Still there is hope that shortly further progress will be made with his important work. Another drawback to such joint publications is the overlapping of membership, and where this occurs, principally in the case of

libraries, the subscriber to the two societies has a real grievance. For this reason the Committee of late years has not favoured such a policy, but has preferred, when the work to be published is of a nature to interest another society, to give the members of that society an opportunity of acquiring the book on the same terms as its own members can. This is not such a satisfactory plan from the Treasurer's point of view, for he sees his hardly collected subscriptions locked up in the stock of a particular volume, which may or may not find a ready market outside the Society.

Volume V. *The Churchwardens' Accounts of St. Nicholas, Strood, and Bethersden.*

Of this work Part I. came out in 1915, and the second part only in 1927, while the third part, the Bethersden accounts, will follow immediately, and there will be indexes to the two sets. The delay in completing the work begun was occasioned by the War in the first place, and since 1919 there have been many unavoidable hindrances. These, however, have now been surmounted, and the volume when complete should be of interest and use. This class of record is too well-known to require further description, for it is agreed that these accounts furnish most fascinating and varied details of the everyday life of the people in relation to their parish church.

In Volume VII., *East Kent Records*, is given a picture of the everyday person from another angle. The book is a collection of deeds, court rolls and extracts relating principally to the manors of Knowlton, Sandown, South Court and North Court, brought together from many different sources, and covering, with gaps, a period of something like five hundred years.

There remains Volume X., the last issued work (1926) to be surveyed, entitled *The Twysden Lieutenancy Papers, 1583-1618*. It deals with an interesting aspect of county administration, namely that of the Lieutenants of the counties with their deputies, in regard both to the defence of the county and of the country. The central figure in this collection

is that of Sir Roger Twysden, who purposed to write a history of the Lord Lieutenants and Deputy Lieutenants, and to that end collected together his grandfather's papers as well as those relating to the time in which he was an actor. Unfortunately he never carried out his plan, for it would have been most valuable to have had his comments on a system about which much still remains to be learnt. But failing that, it is of importance to have such collections edited and published so that the material is available for comparison with that of other counties.

In addition to the main series of Kent Records, a fresh venture was made in 1919, when Mr. Leland L. Duncan printed and gave to the Subscribers to the Branch his transcript of the Monumental Inscriptions at Tenterden as Part I. of a series of Kentish Monumental Inscriptions. There have not been enough funds available to make further additions up to the present ; but now Mr. Arthur Finn has decided to print the Lydd Inscriptions, also Mr. Duncan's work, and the Branch is being allowed to take enough copies to supply its members. This will form Part II. of this series.

In other volumes in hand the material, diligently and carefully collected by Mr. Duncan, is being used ; in a volume of abstracts of Kent Wills from the archiepiscopal registers at Lambeth, and in one of Kent Chantries, which will incorporate his abstract of the Chantry Certificates for Kent in the Public Record Office. Another important work under consideration is the issuing of a list of Kent Manors, with details of the present whereabouts, as far as ascertainable, of their court rolls. This is in the expert hands of Captain Herbert Knocker. There are indeed many other works in hand, or in contemplation, that could be mentioned here were space available, but enough have been mentioned to show the lines on which the Records Branch is working.

Such being the work done and to be done it may fairly be claimed that the Records Branch has achieved a certain measure of success ; success which is perhaps the more surprising when it is remembered that subscribers have never numbered more than a hundred to a hundred and twenty

paying a subscription at first of ten shillings a year, which had reluctantly to be raised in 1924 to a pound, to cover the increased cost of printing. It is not sufficient to be publishing volumes with fair regularity to a fixed number of subscribers. Every volume issued should attract fresh members and further offers of help. The ideal that the Committee have ever had before it, as shown in the first rule, an ideal that was also in the mind of the parent Society when it launched the Records Branch, is that the branch should become the centre of activity for all interested in the history and records of the county. It was hoped to give a helping hand to those who wished to transcribe and publish their parish registers, or their churchwardens' accounts, or their municipal records. On this side of the work the Branch can not claim to have accomplished anything. It may be that the times during the last fourteen years have been sadly out of joint for this kind of work. What is really wanted is that each member in his or her district should stir up local enthusiasm to help in the publication of the local records. The Records Branch is willing and able to furnish advice and help with the transcription and arrangement for publication, but it cannot bear the whole burden financially. It would not be fair to the members as a whole if the money were spent on purely parochial records. The aim of the Branch in its publications must be to cover as far as possible the county as a whole, or, at least to illustrate by the publication of a particular class of record, of possibly a limited local interest, the value of that class for other districts. In other words, while it has published a volume of churchwardens' accounts relating to two parishes, to illustrate the value of this kind of record for the parochial historian, it cannot continue to publish such accounts to the exclusion of other material of more general interest. The same applies to parish registers. But the Records Branch would be willing to help in their publication or in that of similar classes of records provided it could be done without detriment to the main series.

It is hoped that this account of the doings of the daughter society will attract those not already members to make

further enquiries about its doings, and that it may possibly enlist their active co-operation in helping on the vast work of publishing and making available for the economist and the historian, as well as for the local antiquary, the wonderful records of the past, without knowledge of which the present cannot be understood, nor the future charted with surety.

I.J.C.,

An original Member of the Committee.

[Information reaches us, as we go to press, concerning a find at Westerham of gold coins, pronounced by experts to be of pre-Christian date. In spite, however, of its extraordinary interest the matter is unavoidably left over for a future volume of *Archæologia Cantiana*.—ED.]