FORGOTTEN THINGS.

LECTURE BY MR. R. HANSFORD WORTH, F.G.S., M.INST.C.E.

(Illustrated by Lantern Slides.)

(Given at 13 Alexandra Road, June 22nd, 1944.)

THE lecturer emphasised the danger of relying on human memory for an explanation of some of the interesting relics on Dartmoor and elsewhere. The unearthing of ancient maps, old deeds, and other records often upsets legend and local tradition, and proves man's memory false or his theories inadequate. The lecture was devoted to clearing up mysteries about certain matters which had been obscured by traditions of this kind working on imperfect knowledge.

FARDEL.

The first problem the lecturer dealt with concerned the descent of the Manor of Fardel, Cornwood. Whoever wrote an adequate story of the family of Hele of Cornwood would make a substantial contribution to the social history of at least two centuries. There is ample material for such work, but from the very success of the family in all its branches, and in very varied activities, that material is spread diffusely, and mere industry will not suffice for its recovery. Luck and opportunity are alike essential.

Elize Hele was a prominent member of the family. After a career as a successful lawyer, he died, leaving his very considerable property in the hands of trustees, by them to be devoted, at their discretion, to " pyous and charitable uses ". The lands of Fardel, in the parish of Cornwood, with other lands in the same parish, formed part of the estate vested in the trustees. The estate in general was devoted to the purposes of the Trust ; none the less, we find Thomas Hele in subsequent possession of all his late uncle's lands in the parish of Cornwood. How or why these lands should have been diverted from the general purposes of the Trust has been one of the things forgotten, and many guesses have been made, none of which had any but a semblance of accuracy. As will be seen later, the lands were in fact dealt with under the Trust and, in the eyes of the Law, devoted to its purposes.

The lecturer's friend, the late Mr. John Duke Pode, who owned Fardel, was of the opinion that the property remained with the Heles in consequence of its application to charitable uses having been frustrated by the Statute of Mortmain. Had this been the case, it is difficult to see how the other landed properties could have escaped the operation of that statute. After the death of Mr. J. D. Pode, his son, Mr. Cyril A. Pode, handed to the lecturer for examination a number of deeds connected with the estate. One of these, an inspeximus of the 14th March, 14 Charles I (1639), answers in detail the question which has proved a puzzle to so many. It is such a characteristic record of legal ingenuity applied to family matters, that a summary if necessarily long will, none the less, have interest.

Elize Hele was the elder, and Nicholas Hele the younger, son of Walter Hele of Fardel. Walter Hele died in or about the year 1613, being at that time lawfully seized of the capital messuage and manor of Fardel, and of the manors of Donaton, Brixton Reigney, Coffleet, Halwell and Clist St. Lawrence, lying and being in the County of Devon. To these properties Elize Hele succeeded as the elder son and heir.

Elize was twice married: by his first wife, Mary, he had a son, Walter; by his second wife, Alice, the widow of Nicholas Eveleigh, he had no children. The son died shortly after the death of his grandfather, Walter Hele. Being thus left without a direct heir, Elize, in 1633, conveyed the lands which he had inherited from his father, together with other lands which he had himself acquired, to Alice his wife, John Maynard, John Hele, and Elize Stert, upon trust to dispose of the said lands to pious and charitable uses, in such manner as they in their wisdoms and discretions should think fit. And by his last will he gave all his personal estate, amounting to the value of twelve thousand pounds or more, to his wife Alice, whom he made his sole executor. Shortly after this, on the 10th January, 1635, he died.

Now Nicholas, the younger brother of Elize, had also married, and when he predeceased Elize he left a family of two sons, Andrew and Thomas, and four daughters, Jane, Elizabeth, Mary and Honor, all of whom were yet living on the day of the death of Elize. The terms of the trust executed by Elize, and of his will, have all the appearance of assuring the complete disinheritance of this family.

It is in no way surprising that Andrew should have sought a remedy, appealing to the King on behalf of his brother and himself. The King, "being willing to be informed of the certeyntie thereof did recommende the examynacon thereof unto the right honourable the lord Keeper and to the lord Archbushopp of Canterburye his grace," who were pleased to appoint the one and twentieth day of October, 1636, to hear and examine the said cause. Andrew, meanwhile, was required to give notice to the trustees, with a copy of the petition. Before this notice could be delivered Alice Hele, the widow and one of the trustees, died. After her death the Defendants, the surviving trustees, "being conscious vnto themselves of the harde measure Offered vnto the saide Andrewe Hele and the rest of the discendantes of the said Walter Hele and taking into consideracion the great povertye of the said Andrewe Hele and conceaving that yte was as pyous and charitable a work for them to releive and in some measure to provide for the right heire at lawe as any other worke that they coulde doe did desire to prevent any further proceedinges uppon the saide peticion. And to that ende before the daye appointed by their Lordships for the hearing of the said cause did send for the said Andrewe Hele and after many protestacions of their love and fair intencions toward him the said Andrewe Hele and other the discendants of the said Walter Hele his grandfather and some expostulacion of the matter the said Andrew Hele and the said defendants did compound and agree together. Which was therevpon reduced and putt into writinge by way of Articles of Agreement." Then follows a transcript of the Agreement.

I am afraid that Andrew cast his uncle's second wife as the villain of the piece. He speaks of the "divers uniust and vndue means wherby

his uncle Elize was drawn to execute the deed of trust, and the disappointment of himself and his brother at finding that 'the tender and good disposicion of theire aged vncle had been abused.'" The agreement sets forth that the trustees were under trust to convert all and singular the real estate of Elize to some "Godly pyous and Charitable use and uses," such and in such manner as "in their judgements and discreacions they should think meete." That since the death of Alice the surviving trustees had "engaged themselves in the building of a Workhouse and other pyous works in the Castle of Exon, and intende to procede to other good and pyous workes." That debates, suits and controversies had fallen out with Andrew Hele, claiming the estate as heir of Elize Hele, and more were likely to fall out. And that the trustees had thought it a work pious and charitable to provide something for the said Andrew and other the descendants of the said Walter Hele. The details of such provision are then given at length, but the composition is only to be ensured by conveyance if the Trustees are "authorised directed and decreed by the order of the Lord Chauncellor or Lord Keeper for the tyme being vppon the reasons aforesaid or such other as shalbe propounded to his Lordship to make and lymitt such conveyance and assurance and that the same be thereby declared to be noe breach of the trust aforesaid." In default whereof the trustees were not to be obliged by the terms of the composition.

Andrew, for his part, professed that although the said agreement gave to him and the other descendants of Walter Hele too mean a recompense and advancement out of so great an estate, affecting peace, he was content to embrace the same.

The matter came before the Lord Keeper, who heard the cause on the 1st June, 1637, and decreed that the Articles agreed between the parties should be performed. It was, perhaps, unfortunate that Andrew, who could speak of his tender, aged uncle when he desired to plead undue influence, had a brother, Thomas, who for his part complained of divers particular wrongs and injuries offered to him by his deceased uncle, in the retention of divers legacies and gifts given to the said Thomas by his late grandfather, since this claim was reserved for consideration, which occasioned that the decree was not drawn forthwith.

Before the claim of Thomas could be considered and reported upon, and while the composition yet remained unexecuted, Andrew died, leaving a young widow, and a daughter, Johan, an infant, not fully a half-year old. This caused Maynard and his co-trustees to require that the agreed composition should be varied, and provision made for Andrew's widow and daughter, such provision as he himself might have made under the former agreement. To this variation Thomas agreed, and the whole proceedings for obtaining the consent of the court had to be repeated.

The final terms of settlement were as follows: The Trustees on their part agreed to convey to Thomas Hele and his heirs "all that the Barton of ffardell and the milles there that the mannors of ffardell and Denaton and all other landes late of the said Elize Hele . . scituate in the parish of Cornewoode aforesaid. And all landes tenements and hereditaments parcell of the said Barton or mannor." Always provided that the courts would declare that such conveyance to Thomas was indeed justifiable under the trust deed as a godly, pious and charitable use.

Thomas Hele on his part covenanted with the trustees, their heirs and assigns to "doe to them or any of them all and every such further Act and Actes thing and thinges devise and devises in the lawe, be ytt by ffyne Recoverye or otherwise as shalbe in that behalfe required for the setting establishing conveying and assuring the mannors landes tenements and other premisses whatsoever to them conveyed or intend or mencioned to be conveyed as aforesaid (other than the lands in Cornwood) to and under the trust and the same to be at the costes of the Trustees. The said Thomas nor his heirs not for the doing thereof to travel above five miles from his or their abiding place for the time being." This covenant fully excluded Thomas and his heirs from any further claim upon the trust estate.

In addition, Thomas undertook that he would "breede and maintaine" his niece Johan until she should attain the age of seventeen years, and if she were not by that time married he would pay her twenty pounds a year until she should marry. If she married with his consent he would pay 1,000 marks as her marriage portion (£666 13s. 4d.), but if without his consent, then £500 only. And to Mary, the widow of Andrew Hele, he would pay £200 in four equal annual instalments. And if Johan should die unmarried during the lifetime of her mother, Mary, then he, Thomas, would pay to Mary a further £200, within two years of the death of her daughter.

It appears that some variation was made in this agreement, the age of twenty-one was substituted for seventeen as regards Johan, and, married or not, she was to receive 1,000 marks on attaining that age. The court required that the widow of Andrew and the sisters of Thomas should have timely notice of the proposed order. These interested parties having consented, on the 11th February, 1639, "Thomas Lord Coventrye Lord Keeper of the great Seale of England and the Court of Chancerye" decreed that the settlement should be executed in all respects as presented. Thus it came about by the shrewdness of John Maynard, confirmed by the logic of the law, that the Cornwood properties remained in Hele hands as part of the distribution of Elize Hele's estate to godly, pious and charitable uses—an explanation which has very naturally never commended itself to the imagination of anxious enquirers.

As to Thomas's personal complaint against his uncle, that was referred to the Trustees and Sir ffrancis Glanville, who had previously been appointed referees, but of whom only Sir ffrancis Glanville, John Hele, and Elize Stert had returned a certificate. On this fresh reference they were instructed to join with Master Maynard and again consider the matter. The result of this conference does not appear in the Inspeximus.

VERMIN TRAPS.

The story of Fardel was lost, and irrecoverable save by documentary evidence. The lecturer's next example, the Vermin Traps on warrens in the valleys of the Plym and Meavy, should rather be cited a thing which might have been forgotten. The chance that he, as an interested enquirer, knew, and enquired from, the last living local depository of the secret, saved it from oblivion.

There are on Sheepstor, in the parish of Meavy, two curious arrangements of low walls, now ruined, and in the valley of the Plym, on Legis

Tor, Gutter Tor, and Trowlesworthy Tor, there are similar structures. The first printed reference to these is to be found in Mrs. Bray's *Borders of the Tamar and the Tavy*, First Edition, Vol. I, p. 234. She cites a note by the Rev. E. A. Bray, 1802. He wrote as follows : "We discovered near the top of the tor [Sheepstor] two stone ridges, almost covered with turf, that intersected each other at nearly right angles and formed a cross. In the middle was a flat horizontal stone. Measuring from this central point, the ridge to the east was twelve paces, west six, north seven, and south eleven. We afterwards discovered a larger one below, at the south side of the tor. At first we conjectured they were sepulchral monuments, and afterwards thought they might have been folds for sheep. . . . But after all, these conjectures are entitled to little attention." These last words express a very reasonable conclusion. From the fact that these walls were almost covered with turf, it would appear that 140 years ago they had already fallen into disuse. Twenty years ago, when, independently, the lecturer made the same discovery, he already held the clue.

But, in the meantime, Spence Bate, in 1871, had published a description of similar walls associated with a pound on the slopes of Trowlesworthy. He was prepared to see in them works of fortification, protecting the entrances to the pound, his view being that the whole plan was an interesting specimen of ancient military engineering. The lecturer, in 1889, accepted his authority, and with some industry added a number of further examples to the list of these structures.

One such example was admittedly puzzling, for if it defended anything, it was a military adjunct to the clitter of a tor. The lecturer, since finding it, has since found two others similarly placed. Comparatively few of these structures are complete in all respects. It was the completeness of the one near the summit of Legis Tor which troubled the lecturer with doubt. Four wing walls extend from a central stone, 3 ft. 7½ in. long by a little over 2 ft. in width, and with a mean thickness of 6 in. This stone lies flat, and three square holes are sunk in its upper surface. Two of the wing walls embrace the clitter and tie in with the natural rock, these are 26 ft. and 11 ft. long respectively. The other two are freestanding, their lengths being 19 ft. and 20 ft. From end to end under the central stone, and extending beyond it at either end, is a channel, 10 in. in height and 4½ in. in width, the sides and floor of which are formed by granite slabs. Just clear of the coverstone at either end the side stones of the channel are vertically grooved, in such manner that a shutter dropping in the groove would close the channel under the coverstone. It is in respect of this coverstone and channel that some of the examples are incomplete.

For further enquiries the lecturer had a most suitable informant in his old friend Mr. Richard Lavers, the warrener of Trowlesworthy. There was no one with a longer knowledge of the neighbourhood. Mr. Lavers died on the 15th March, 1914, aged 94. He was nearer 90 than 80 when the lecturer consulted him, and had known the warren from early manhood. He could tell the lecturer that the structures were the remains of vermin traps, formerly in use for the capture of stoats, weasels, and other small carnivores. He did not know how the traps were set, or by what means

the shutters which closed the ends and confined the prey were tripped. Obviously, the holes sunk in the stone covers have some connection with this matter. This much is known, the stoat is a very active animal, and wing walls of the trap he could surmount without difficulty; none the less, both stoats and weasels are willing to take the line of least resistance, and run round rather than over an obstacle. They run along the walls rather than mount them, pass through the tunnel at the intersection of the walls, and so forward. Ordinarily, the traps were left open for some time, and then after days, or perhaps weeks, they were set, and the unsuspecting animal was trapped on his next trip. The lecturer has often wondered of what material the shutters were made. Obviously it had to be capable of resisting sharp teeth.

It was only lately that the lecturer found, tucked away in a crevice of the wall at one of the traps, two roofing slates, shaped to fit the grooves in the sides of the tunnel, and perforated for suspension at one end. Since then he has found others, some complete, some broken, sometimes represented by no more than chips of slate. It is obvious that roofing slate is not indigenous to Dartmoor. Such slate as the lecturer has found came from quarries no longer worked. After the lecturer had learnt the nature of these traps he mentioned them to the late Mr. G. W. Dymond, who could say that something similar had been found at Worlebury, where he had been told by a warrener that the latter believed them to be traps. It is quite in accord with expectation that the arrangement should not be peculiar to Dartmoor.

BRENT HILL.

There are on Brent Hill, South Brent, the remains of a building which of late years has always been unhesitatingly accepted as dating from antiquity. It is usually known as "the chapel", and Crossing offers the alternative suggestion that it was a shelter for the watchers of the beacon. Its story affords a striking example of the sudden descent of the mists of oblivion. Admittedly, the lecturer was not prepared when he had the notes of John Andrews of Modbury placed in his hands to find that he knew the origin of this present building, and was a contemporary of its builder. Andrews gives a sketch of the building, drawn in 1789, and quotes the wording of an inscription which appeared on a slab built into the wall. The inscription ran:

"Monumentum Sui Aere perennius.

"To rescue from Oblivion and perpetuate the Memory of an Edifice
"which was erected on this Site this mural Monument was erected in
"Octr. 1781. At what Period of Time this Edifice was raised or for
"what Use can neither be ascertained by Tradition or Record; tho'
"with respect to the latter, as it retained the Name of Chappel, it
"is more than probable that it was originally designed for Religious
"Purposes; However that be it was constructed with so much Art
"as, notwithstanding its exposed Situation, enabled it to resist the
"Ravages of all-devouring Time thro' the ruthless Tract of un-
"numbered Ages, till some time in Feby, 1777, when by the resistless
"Power of the Artillery of Heaven, an instant Period was put to its
"Existence."

Andrews' sketch is endorsed "Sketch of an Erection on the Top of Brent Hill, built at the Expence of Nichs. Tripe, Esq.", and the date of his note is 9th August, 1789.

There, then, is an authoritative statement of the origin of the present ruins. Thirty-seven years later Burt, in his Notes to Carrington's *Dartmoor*, wrote: "South Brent Tor has also been rather a place of note. On its summit there were large stones, attributed to the Druids, and by some supposed to be a military station, used in later periods as a beacon. In the dreadful storm of November, 1824, they were blown down and scattered far apart from each other." Yet another twenty years and we find Rowe, in his *Perambulation of Dartmoor*, stating: "There are no remains of a cairn or beacon on Brent Hill, and scarcely any vestiges of the building which formerly stood on the summit." To-day there is no remembrance of the pious efforts of Nicholas Tripe, and Crossing, a local man, had obviously never heard of his building.

It may well be that in 1824 Tripe's building shared the fate of its predecessor and perished "by the resistless Power of the Artillery of Heaven." But how came it that the origin of a building erected in 1781 was already forgotten in 1826, after a lapse of no more than forty-five years? Alas for the motto "Monumentum Sui Aere perennius"!

If such things be possible, how indeed are we to rely upon tradition?

HOBAJON'S CROSS.

Another example of human forgetfulness is Hobajon's Cross.

On an old map of Brent, Ugborough and Harford Moors, now in the Exeter Museum, there is shown a cross, standing in a row of stones which runs north from Butterdon Hill. It is shown as a Latin cross standing on a calvary, and a compass bearing places it approximately east of the south fence of Lower Piles enclosures. That map is not dated, but is certainly late fifteenth century, very probably 1478. It is just such a plan as was frequently used to illustrate the depositions of witnesses in contested suits.

Among the papers of Mr. John Andrews of Modbury there was found a map endorsed "Copy of an antient Map of East Harford Moor". This covers the same area. All that we know of its date is that it was regarded as being 'antient' in the year 1784. This has many features in common with the map in Exeter Museum, but gives more detail. Here the cross is shown in a precisely correspondent position, as a Latin cross, without a calvary.

The next evidence is a survey made by Andrews in the years 1799–1800. This shows the cross in the precise position indicated on the maps before referred to, as a plain Latin cross; but Andrews' notes describe the stone, and make it clear that it is the same as still stands, and in the same position.

Finally, we have the Ordnance Survey of 1884–5, which places Hobajon's Cross four hundred yards south-east of Left Lake Head, or more than a mile and a half north of its true position. The Ordnance Survey would not fix this location without local enquiry, so that between the year 1803, when Andrews and a fellow-arbitrator plan this cross and cite it as a known boundary mark, and 1884, there must have been a sad loss of local memory.

The matter is even worse. The actual cross is an incised Latin cross on a stone "like the Frustrum of a Pyramid, the Bottom being much broader than the Top" (Andrews, 1800). The bottom measurement is, to-day, 22 inches by 20 inches, and the top measurement 13 inches by 5 inches. The height of 46 inches, and according to Andrews the depth to which the stone is set in the ground is no more than 6 inches.

The case is analogous to that of the late Harry Caunter, of Princetown, who lost himself in Tor Royal Newtake, and being twitted that he, an old inhabitant, should lose himself so near home, replied: "A had not lost meself. A knawed where A were. A awnly did not knaw the way out." No one had forgotten Hobajon's Cross. What had been forgotten was only what it was and where it was.

Again, the matter is even worse. One of the oldest inhabitants of the parish of Harford, to whom the Moor is well known, did not, until recently, know of the stone with the incised cross.

The fact that on the first map referred to the cross is shown on a calvary is without significance; on the same map Syward's Cross, as to the position and identity of which there has never been question, is also shown on a calvary, whereas it stands on a base at the ground level. It is a matter of convention, like the symbol that indicates churches in modern cartography.

The next two items might be properly described as things almost forgotten. The first is the use of spits as earth probes.

SPITS.

The late Mr. Fabyan and Mr. John Amery told the lecturer that they had heard that domestic spits were used as probes for the discovery of sunken boulders, when the large newtakes were constructed which robbed the Moor. They doubtless told others, so that the knowledge is probably still shared by several; but the lecturer does not know that it has ever been recorded. Here, again, Andrews provides the evidence of an eye-witness. He records that he visited Prince Hall, where Judge Buller was then making enclosures, on the 21st October, 1794. He saw "women examining the ground with spits to find moor-stones for walls". The discovery and removal of these stones not only provided material for enclosure walls but served also toward the clearance of the ground. This use of the implement of the kitchen was neither original nor confined to Dartmoor, since Harrison, in his *England*, written in 1577–87, speaks of the use of spits elsewhere in the kingdom as probes for the location of bog-timber in bogs and morasses (Camelot Series: *Elizabethan England*, p. 204).

PEAT CHARCOAL.

The lecturer had also some notes to give on Peat Charcoal.

Referring again to Andrews' notes, we find, 21st October, 1794: "Smith' shop at Two Bridges uses charred Blackwood for coal." And, in 1788, he had written: "It [Blackwood] is also made into a kind of Charcoal, and much used by smiths; and it is said to be better than any other coal for tempering edge-tools." It is to be noted that Blackwood was, in the eighteenth century, the usual term for that which we now call *peat*.

The charring of peat, like the use of spits as probes, was nothing new to the eighteenth century; it had found even earlier record in connection with the tinworks. Henry III (1219) issued a writ to William Briwere, commanding him to permit the men of Joan, Queen of England, to dig, burn, and lead away from the turbary of Dartmoor to her Stannary, as they used and ought. In which phrase, "dig, burn and lead away" no other interpretation can be placed upon the word "burn" than *convert into charcoal*, since no one would desire to burn peat and then take the ashes to the Stanneries.

The lecturer has found some old men who were aware of the former use of peat charcoal by smiths, but none who remembered its use within his time.

STONE GATE HANGERS.

There are things which cannot well be forgotten, since they are ever present in no inconsiderable number, but the former use of which is known to relatively few, and rarely to those for whose ancestors the objects were of daily import. Instances of these are holed-stone gate hangers, and the handquerns of which so many remain on the moorland farms.

Holed-stone hangers the lecturer has often described. Essentially, they are stones of much the proportions of gate-posts, and near one end a hole is formed, some four to five inches in diameter, and about four inches in depth. Rarely does the hole perforate the stone in Dartmoor examples, but in Cornwall the hole is usually a complete perforation. These stones were laid on the hedge top, somewhat overhanging a gateway, and the back style of the gate was prolonged to enter the hole, in which it turned as on a hinge. Such holed stones are very common, and are now usually found set upright and used as gateposts in the modern style. Three have been in use on Dartmoor in their former fashion within the lecturer's time. One is now disused; in another the gate is broken and decayed, and it remains to be seen whether the new gate will be hung in the old style; the third is still a perfect example.

There is no excuse for the forgetfulness which has lost count of the use and purpose of the stones. Rowe recorded that use in the first edition of his *Perambulation of Dartmoor* (1848), p. 89. None the less, the Rev. W. C. Lukis, when making archaeological surveys on Dartmoor, in the years 1879 and 1880, figured at least twelve of the holed stones under the impression that they were prehistoric in date. Similarly, in Cornwall, Mr. William Copeland Borlase figures three holed stones in his plan of the Merry Maidens, Rosemoddress. He obviously had no knowledge of their former use, since he writes: "No tradition attaches to the three holed stones." From this it would appear that the local farmers had no knowledge of the ways of their immediate predecessors. (*Naenia Cornubiae*, 1872, pp. 214 and 216.) The lecturer has seen the stones, and found them to be typical gate-hangers of the Cornish pattern.

The latest tale which the lecturer has heard on Dartmoor is that these were "alms stones", the offerings of the charitable being dropped into the cavity. Were that true, it was well that in Devon we rarely took the hole through the stone, since a bottomless alms dish would prove somewhat inefficient.

QUERNS.

The Hand Quern, in days when home-grown corn (wheat, pillas, barley, and rye) was ground at the local mill, was really a necessity. The mill might be short of water, or in some conditions practically inaccessible, and then small quantities of grain fell to be ground at home for day-to-day use. For cottages a domestic mortar frequently had to suffice, the grain being merely pounded. Hence it comes that querns and mortars are still by no means rare. In the Isles of Scilly, where the even less reliable windmills were in use, many complete querns are still to be seen, but on Dartmoor the upper stone is usually missing; in fact, such upper stones are rarely found. No doubt this arises from the fact that, while the lower stone readily lent itself to use as a shallow trough, the upper, having once ceased to fill its first intent, could not be turned to any utilitarian end. The lecturer does not accept the suggestion that the lords of the manors seized and destroyed the upper stones and so rendered the querns incapable of competing with the manor mills to which their tenants owed suit.

On Dartmoor there is a fair constancy in the form of the lower stones. These are usually octagonal, with two sides produced to provide a lip, so formed that the flour could be bagged without being spilt or lost. The recess in which the upper stone moved was circular and usually about two and a half inches in depth and one foot in diameter. In the centre stood an iron spill.

Two examples are outstanding in Devon, the one with ornament of a severe type is to be seen as a coping or a gate-pier in the village of Axmouth; the other, with the adornment of a carved head and other decorative work, is to be found at Buckland Abbey, where is now does duty as part of a fountain. The material is usually granite, but at times Roborough Down elvan.

The lecturer has known households in which none but locally ground flour was used, and it may well be that querns have been in casual use even within his own time. But that use is now forgotten, saving where the knowledge has been revived by wandering archaeologists. And this although the quern was an article of domestic import, which was by no means confined to the farms and larger houses.

As usual, the textbooks have had a hand in confusing the issue. There is a work on the history of milling which claims these querns, mediaeval, Tudor, and later, as dating from and belonging to the period of Roman occupation.

This list of "Things Forgotten" is far, indeed, from being complete; its acceptance may be asked as sufficient evidence to justify the conclusion that alleged tradition should always be met with scepticism. Under test the collective memory of a community is found to be unreliable, even for the period covered by one generation. Country folk do a little guessing for themselves, and their grandfathers' guess is their tradition. But the greatest sinners against truth have been the early antiquaries. With a scholarship derived from the study of the works of yet earlier sinners, they placed their interpretations on all doubtful matters, they copied each other unblushingly, even verbatim, and when three of them had said the same thing, then it was held to be established by the mouths of many

witnesses. It was not only the Bellman who held as an article of faith that what he told you three times was true.

Unfortunately, these early antiquaries consigned their work to print, and the countryman's mind is not incurious, he read and absorbed the ready-made tradition, and he had an undue respect for the printed word. Thus the guess of the would-be archaeologist has become the tradition of the countryside, and the sceptic is expected to consent to it.

Fortunately, there have been men like Richard Carew, of Antony, who wrote of their own times with knowledge and sanity. Fortunately, also, many of the antiquaries were honest with their evidence of that which they had seen, although far too free with their interpretations. It has often occurred to the lecturer that we, in our days, are too apt to forget that much which is common knowledge and experience at the present time passes without record, and our successors will have reason to lament our negligence. Plain record of the minor details of the life of our time is needed, and Carew may be taken as our model workman. It would not even be necessary to abstain from all personal feeling, but it should be reserved for an occasional outburst. There are such in the *History of Cornwall*, to which they are at times illuminating contributions.

The President, Mr. Jas. L. Palmer, who was in the chair, emphasized the value of records, and Mr. C. W. Bracken showed how a mistake made by one author can be enthusiastically copied by others, until the false becomes accepted as the true.