



in character with its nature and functions, the general effect would be more expressive, and so would be more artistic.

To make our meaning more clear, and to enable our readers the more easily to judge for themselves as to the justice, or otherwise, of our remarks, we give two rough sketch plans, in which the general idea of our suggestions is embodied. In making these suggestions we have endeavoured to avoid, as far as may be, the expression of personal likes and dislikes on such matters as may reasonably be considered to be matters of taste, and to confine ourselves to discussing the general character and treatment of the building on such lines as we deem to be reasonable and helpful.

Although this building has something of the general appearance of a town hall—possibly due to the presence of the clock tower, the treatment of the council chamber, and the adoption of a style which is, to some extent, traditional—yet we think, for reasons already given, that it does not express as truly, and as completely as it might have expressed, the nature and characteristics of this particular town hall, and, therefore, the character of this particular town; and we cannot but feel that no great enthusiasm has been felt on this point, and no great effort made. Yet from another point of view it does reflect—or rather, reflect on—the character of the town, for it shows that the town is content that it so should be; that it wanted certain accommodation arranged in a way that was sufficiently convenient, and given an appearance that was sufficiently imposing, and that there all feeling on the matter ended.

But it would have cost no more to have produced a lasting memorial of all that was highest and best in the life of the town, to its eternal honour and glory; a creation of living beauty which would render the town immortal. For when all things fade, beauty alone remains; and a beautiful building will, by the very vital power of its beauty, outlive the wreck of meaner things. So long as wood and stone will endure, so long will generations yet unborn tenderly cherish and preserve such a monument to the greatness of their fore-fathers—whilst all else is left to fall into decay.

When the seat of empire shifts, and Chatham, its dockyards and fortifications pass away, and become no more than a memory and a dream, of all that has there been suffered and done nought will remain but such things as have been conceived in a spirit of beauty. For beauty is the one immortal thing, and all else is of little moment.

NOTE.—The Editor begs to acknowledge his indebtedness to the town clerk of Chatham for his courtesy in permitting the photographs reproduced to be taken, as also for the use of the plans.

## MEN WHO WORKED IN PEWTER: BY H. J. L. J. MASSÉ.

THE men who worked in pewter banded themselves together for commercial as well as social reasons at an early date in the history of the craft, but no trace of any official recognition of a guild or fellowship is found before 22 Edward III., *i.e.*, the year 1348, when the workers in pewter petitioned the Lord Mayor to make, or rather sanction, certain ordinances for the protection of their mystery. The petition was drawn up with a view to protect the pewtermen from dishonest dealers and unscrupulous workmen who may have wished to undersell the petitioners, and secondly, to prevent wares of inferior metal being put on the market. Restrictions were to be placed on the making of the pewter itself (the idea being borrowed from the restrictions made at Poitiers only a few years before), as inspectors or overseers were to be chosen from amongst "the most lawful and skilful in the trade." The workmanship, too, was to be supervised with great care, and to prevent any possibility of carelessness it was proposed that no unqualified person, *i.e.*, no one who had not been properly apprenticed, and who had thus become a lawful workman, should presume to embark in the trade. No secret working, *i.e.*, work done without the cognisance of the guild, and no working at night was to be allowed, a restriction more probably framed more with a view of diminishing the chance of secret profits than with a paternal care for the eyesight of the brethren.

The chief safeguard of the quality of the wares seems to have been the preliminary assay of the metal or alloy before it was made up, and the occasional inspection of the workshops was the only check upon the workmanship.

Disobedient members of the fraternity were punished for their first offence by the confiscation of the metal, for the second by confiscation of the metal and by punishments to be inflicted after award by the Lord Mayor, and for the third offence by expulsion from the ranks of the pewterers.

A common device for fraudulent workmen was to send out articles manifestly too light and flimsy for the purposes for which they were required. To counteract this the articles in commonest use were standardised in 1430, and their weights fixed; articles of less weight were not allowed to be sold.

About 1438 the fraternity took it upon themselves to make some further regulations without troubling the authorities, but were promptly called to order, and their ordinances, temporarily at any rate, annulled. Subsequently due submission being tendered, the petition to the "full honour-

able Lords and Sovereigns, the Mayor and Aldermen," begging for sanction to the new ordinances, was granted.

In 1444 the Wardens of the Mystery of Pewterers acquired the right to search and assay, *i.e.*, to test all tin that was brought into the City of London, either by land or by sea, and to claim one quarter of the metal. This seems an enormous percentage to claim, and no doubt some methods of evading the imposition were speedily devised.

The Mystery of Pewterers became a company in 1473, receiving its charter from Edward IV., and confirmation of the right to search and assay all goods made in pewter.

Thirty years later an Act of Parliament forbade the selling of pewter elsewhere than on the pewterer's premises, or in an open market or fair. This same Act made compulsory (it no doubt was optional before) the marking of the wares by the manufacturer as a kind of written warranty of their goodness.

Further statutes of 4 & 25 Henry VIII. extended the privileges of the company, and on the petition of the latter showing that articles of inferior quality were being made abroad, *i.e.*, in Germany, France, and Flanders, and imported over here, it was enacted that such wares were to be forfeited. To make quite sure of scotching foreign competition no foreigners were to be permitted to practise the trade in England, even in the humblest capacity, and no Englishman was to exercise the pewterer's craft abroad, under penalty of becoming, *ipso facto*, an alien—a penalty which, considering the repute English pewter enjoyed over sea, seems heavy.

As might be expected, the compulsory marking led to abuses, the chief of which was the counterfeiting of well-known pewterers' marks by less clever workmen, and as late as the time of Queen Anne regulations stipulating "one man one mark" were made by the company, and establishing a penalty of forty shillings for disobedience. The same fine was to be awarded to pewterers who unduly puffed their own wares, or depreciated those of other workers with a view to supplanting them in business. How the Inland Revenue would rejoice were such a regulation—for other trades—in existence now.

In France the pewterers, or *potiers d'étain*—the tin potters or the potters of tin—worked under practically the same conditions, but with fewer restrictions. From Etienne Boileau's "Livres des Métiers" (1260), it appears that in Paris anyone could become a pewterer provided he did good and lawful work, and that he might have as many assistants and apprentices as he liked. Working at night or on fête days was forbidden. The use of unusual alloys and the selling of pewter goods by

unauthorised persons was forbidden under pain of forfeiture of the work and a fine. The workmen paid their taxes like other folk, and were liable, unless they were wardens of their corporation, to serve on the town watch till the age of sixty.

Early in the fourteenth century the payment to the Crown of entrance fees on admission to the guild or brotherhood was made compulsory except in the case of the sons of master-pewterers. These latter, even though not through their apprenticeship, could become pewterers provided that their workshop was managed by workmen who thoroughly knew the trade. Other towns in France were quite as important as Paris as centres of the pewter trade, *e.g.*, Troyes, Amiens, Poitiers, Rouen, Dijon, Limoges.

Paris pewter was not required to be stamped until the reign of Louis XIII. (1610—1643).

Parisian silversmiths were prohibited in 1545 from working in pewter, a regulation which was also made in Nuremberg in 1579.

In Germany, pewter work can be traced back quite as far as in France or elsewhere, the earliest record being an enactment made in 1324 at Augsburg, making provision for visits of inspection to the workshops by the sworn masters, who were empowered to test the metal for purity, and to fine those whose work was bad enough to be rejected and destroyed.

Nuremberg records, too, show that pewterers worked there, and that they formed the most important guild in that town. Equality and fraternity existed, but very little liberty, the guild rules settling every paltry detail of workshop practice ostensibly that only wares "in the eyes of all good, irreproachable, and without flaw" should be put on sale.

In Spain the headquarters of the tin and pewter trade seem to have been at Barcelona, a place well suited by its natural position for the purpose. No trace of any corporation or guild can be found before the fifteenth century, and the statutes closely resemble those of the more northern nations.

It is known that the Italians used large quantities of tin, but pewter work was done at Bologna, and in other towns, together with much tinning of other metals, which in many cases was done by workmen—tinkers as one might call them, who went about from place to place.

In Belgium and Holland the guilds go back to the beginning of the fourteenth century, though they no doubt existed long before the first official mention can be found referring to them by name. Bruges was perhaps always the headquarters, with Liège and Mons running it close as manufacturing centres. Bruges claims to have been an emporium for little porringers and flasks as early as 1303.

The caravan trade for tin from Britain to the Rhine, viâ Flanders, made Bruges an important centre.

The men of Mons, of Liège, and of Ghent can claim quite as early a date for the existence of the pewterer's craft. Of most of the early men who worked in pewter, and who are known to us by name, not much can be said.

Nuremberg had its pewterer, tin founder, or zinngiesser—Karel, or Carel, in 1324, whose work was known far and wide; and later in the same century Sébald Ruprecht became famous as the originator of a method of giving pewter or tin the appearance of silver. Such a trade was certain to be remunerative. In the sixteenth century again, Martin Harscher obtained renown by the excellence of his metal, which was said to be far superior to English metal in quality. Candlesticks and water-pots were his specialities. Harscher died in 1523. Another workman, Melchior Koch, who died in 1567, found a method of making his pewter look as though gilded with pure gold. Hans Lobsinger, again, is credited with devices more ingenious still. He knew, or thought he knew, how to make tin as plastic as wax, and after working the most elaborate works, knew how to temper the metal and render it quite hard. These secrets no doubt caused the goldsmiths to look to their laurels and to procure, in 1579, the enactment of a regulation on the *ne sutor ultra crepidam* principle—that no pewterer might work in any metal but pewter, and, as a sop to the pewterers, that no silversmith or goldsmith might work in pewter.

Gaspard (or Kaspar) Enderlein (or Enderlein), also of Nuremberg, was the famous maker of hanging candelabra. He seems, like Briot, to have been a die-sinker originally, and to have applied to pewter ware the minuteness of detail appropriate to other metals. By birth he was a Swiss, but he worked in Nuremberg, and died there in 1633. His fonts at the church of St. Laurenz are perhaps his best work.

François Briot, who probably flourished from about 1560-1625, or later, was born at Damblain en Bassigny, in Lorraine. The dates of his birth and death are not known, but as some of his best work was copied by Bernard Palissy in 1580, and as he was certainly living in 1615 the above dates may be taken to be nearly correct. Like Enderlein, he was a die sinker and medal maker by trade, and lived probably at Montbéliard, a town about half-way between Basle and Besançon, as he was in the service of Jean François of Wurtemberg, Count of Montbéliard, from 1585 to 1601.

In this latter year he was in some pecuniary trouble, as we find that he deposited as security for a loan several moulds, "tant de bassin, aiguïère, vase, salière, qu'autres." The work

attributed to him is characterised as a rule by extreme delicacy, if not over-elaboration, and the wonderful detail would be more appropriate in works carried out in one of the precious metals. His works were much copied by Enderlein, who removed Briot's medallions and substituted his own. The original silver specimen of Briot's famous ewer and plaque seems to have been destroyed at Rouen in the troublous times of the Revolution.

THE LIFE AND WORK OF ROBERT ADAM: BY PERCY FITZGERALD, M.A., F.S.A.: PART TWO.

ANOTHER incident in Adam's method is his marked *penchant* for the pilaster, and in most instances for the decorated pilaster. Many have taken objection to this architectural element. There can be no doubt that the pilaster has suffered from its constant adoption as a form of *plaster* decoration, it being stuck here, there, and everywhere, merely to break the surface and supply detail. A course of brick projecting a few inches supplies a sort of core, which is copiously "plastered over." This sort of thing is as unmeaning as it is odious. But who can deny that where the pilaster is *constructive*, and introduced to do actual work, that the result is dignified and effective? In Adam's buildings where the pilaster is used we at once see its *raison d'être*, and it suggests the notion of movement. In a brick front, pierced with many square or oblong windows, there is an air of insecurity, owing to the frailty and poverty of the material. A bold cornice, supported on genuine pilasters imbedded in brick, becomes a firm stone framework, especially if the lower storey be well advanced forward to furnish a base on which his pilasters may stand. A good deal depends, too, on the relief. In Portland Place, for instance, and in Cumberland Place, the effect is most satisfactory, and even dignified. The brick becomes subsidiary and not too self-assertive. In the common pilaster formed of plaster or "compo" it seems one piece from top to bottom, and thus its poor inefficiency and supererogation is betrayed. But Adam's pilasters were regularly and serviceably built up in separate blocks and bound up with the bricks. Now they are usually painted over and have lost their effect.

To show that this refined treatment of the column is not fanciful or mere speculation I will illustrate what I have been saying by a very striking contrast. We know these so-called porticoes with which it has been the fashion to garnish the leading West-end mansions. All the old houses in the great squares and adjoining streets have had these disfiguring additions fitted