

7246

JULY 2, 1932.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

9

Rainfred was Steward to Henry II, and Richard I. This Roger Fitz Rainfred had a second wife, Alice, sister of Ralph le Breton (?) of the Albini family of Belvoir. How can these two pedigrees be reconciled? I note the fact that the position of Steward was in both families. (See also my recent note on Malebisse, Steward to Roger de Mowbray, son of Nigel de Albini).

I realize that Burke cannot be taken as an authority, but there is rather a puzzling coincidence in names. In my notes on Maltby, in 1163-1170, William de Kime granted 30 acres in Elkington, Lincoln (near Maltby by Louth) which "Robert the Steward, father of Margaret his wife, bequeathed to the nuns of Appleton at his death." This Margaret on the accompanying chart is given as daughter of Robert and Rohaise the Countess. As Gilbert de Gant, first husband of Rohaise, did not die until 1156, is it not more probable that Margaret was daughter of Robert the Steward, son of Fulk, and Steward of William de Percy?

Under Kime, Burke gives: William de Kime had a son Simon, who married Roesse, daughter of Robert Dapifer (that is, Steward to Gilbert de Gant) called Roesse de Bulinton." (Could this be the same name as "Builli?") On my pedigree from old York Charters, a Rohaine is given as sister of Robert (de Maltby), who married Rohaine (or Rohaise) the Countess. Is it possible this Rohaine was a daughter and not a sister.

MR. RANSFORD shows that Gilbert, son of Roger Fitz Rainfred, married his cousin, Helwise de Lancaster. Ivo Tailboys, from whom the Lancasters derive, was brother of Fulk, Earl of Anjou. Could this be where Fulk came to be the name of a son of Reinfred? Ivo Tailboys held five carucates at Mavis Enderby, which place Malebisse were of as early as 1166, when Osbert Malebisse occurs on the Book of Exchequer as holding "4 op.t.fee of Fief of William de Romara, Lincoln., and Wilts."

I should greatly appreciate assistance in disentangling these seemingly conflicting statements and obtaining a correct record, regardless of whether or not it necessitates the removal of ancient names from the pedigree.

D. MALTBY VERRILL.

North Vancouver, B.C., Canada.

PEWTER POTS IN PUBLIC HOUSES.—

In this age of collecting, we have a cult which collects pewter, in various forms, but, to be "up-to-date," these good people should include publican's pewter pots, for they are rapidly disappearing, if they have not already gone altogether. I was reminded of this fact a short time ago, when I saw in the window of a second-hand dealer's emporium, in a court off St. Martin's Lane, W.C., an array of pint pewter pots, some of which bore names of hostelries which were familiar to me. On enquiry, I found the entire lot had been bought by the proprietor from a firm of brewers at Grays, Essex, who had called them in from their various houses, the reason being the great expense in renewing supplies when existing stocks were getting low. For many years these "pewters" were often purloined for the purpose of being converted into counterfeit coin, but as the present "silver" coinage is equally base, these forgers have moved with the times and have made other arrangements.

In any case, pewter, whether used for pots or any other purpose, is very expensive, and John Barleycorn has been forced to supply glass utensils in its stead. Formerly the sizes of pewter-pots in public-houses were quarts, pints and half-pints, but not very many of the latter. The former were always used for what was designated a "pot" of ale, or other liquor composed of malt and hops. Some of these measures had lips to them, enabling them to be used for filling two or more glasses, but usually the "pot" was handed round, and each participant had a "swig" in a sort of loving-cup fashion. Now, glasses take their place, the largest size being a pint, and one does not see the beverage being shared round as it used to be. Workmen "treat" each other, as heretofore, but there is a fresh and personal supply every time, sometimes in a clean glass.

However, the name still remains, for formerly a "potman's" duty was carefully to scour all the pewter pots with silver sand, and hang them on specially-constructed racks to dry, and one sees many advertisements in the licensed victuallers' journals of to-day for "potmen," who have never even seen a pewter pot nor some of their employers either.

Many publicans took a pride in the appearance of their pewter, not only in their drinking utensils, but in their public bars and counters, which were covered with sheets of pewter, and looked very bright. The "private" and "saloon bar" customers

were above "pewter," and usually asked for a "tankard," which is made of electroplate.

E. E. NEWTON.

Hampstead, Upminster, Essex.

DATE OF DEATH OF AUBREY DE VERE THE CHAMBERLAIN. — The purpose of this note is to correct a mistake (of six days), which I copied (quite inexcusably) from Dr. J. H. Round, who wrote that: "We learn that Aubrey de Vere was killed on the 9th of May, in the course of a riot in the city." ('Geoffrey de Mandeville,' p. 81). In a footnote he cites:—"Idibus Maii Albericus de Ver Londoniis occiditur (M. Paris, *Chron. Major*, II, 174)," and I remember looking up that passage, so I really had no excuse for copying Round's date in a paper on "King Stephen's Earldoms" printed in the Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 4th Series, xiii. 70. As I noted there, Ralf of Coggeshall assigns Aubrey's death to 1140, without mentioning the day or month; "Comes Albericus de Ver a civibus Londoniæ peremptus est" (ed. Stevenson, p. 11). As Aubrey was not an earl, Ralf seems to have been ill-informed, unless there has been confusion between "com[es]" and "cam[erarius]." Roger of Hoveden assigns Aubrey's death to 1141: "Eodem anno Albericus de Ver occisus est Londoniis seditione civium" (ed. Stubbs, i. 205). It was Aubrey's son who became first Earl of Oxford.

G. H. WHITE.

222, South Norwood Hill.

CHANGING DUBLIN — BUTT OR SWIVEL-BRIDGE. — Erected 1878-79 and named after Isaac Butt. Its design allowed shipping to go up to the centre of the city at O'Connell (Carlisle) Bridge, but the building of the ugly Loop Line Bridge (1891) put an end to that. Butt Bridge has been reconstructed, in ferro-concrete, from an artistic design by Mr. Mallagh, Port and Docks engineer. Congress Bridge was the suggested new name, but this has luckily been abandoned. The new bridge was opened by the Archbishop of Dublin on 8th June, and it will reopen the access to the docks and relieve traffic congestion at this busy point.

J. ARDAGH.

RETRIBUTION FOR IMPIETY.

IN Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes's 'Professor at the Breakfast Table' (ch. viii) is the account of two young men who indulged in irreligious practices in a college dormitory and were visited by some ghostly apparition. Blackened patches were known as the "devil's footsteps," and as a result one of the participants became epileptic and the other took Orders as a priest of ascetic sanctity.

In the Counter-Reformation novel 'Temno (Darkness), by Alois Jirasek (known as "the Walter Scott of Bohemia") there is a somewhat similar story. I translate from ch. vii. The narrow-minded, intensely Romanist estate steward of the local regent, Czermak, who spies on and denounces latent Husites, is in converse with a monk, his guest. Thus Czermak describes his master, the minor noble Mladota, a kind-hearted pre-Voltarian:—

Our regent . . . an old man, but frivolous and impious, perhaps does not believe in hell. At least he says that there it is not like what the priests preach. And he throws "deuce devil" about.

"Unless he wants him to appear he had better stop swearing at once: he would no sneer at death."

"The devil is terrible."
"Terrible." The monk groaned. "The sight of him—Once it was . . ."

The steward bent eagerly over the table, so as to be near the frater. The latter began:—

"It happened in Paris. Three students there had with them a *spiritum familiarem* i.e., a demon, a devil. They employed him as a lackey. The demon served them for some months in human form and very diligently and willingly. On one occasion however, as these students were sitting together in a room and this infernal servitor waited on them, they entered into conversation with him. They asked him about various things, and in their wildness desired him to assume his own figure and thus appear to them. The demon demurred, they should not ask this, human weakness could not endure such a sight, a man would die of this directly. But the vain revelers would not desist, and forcibly persuaded him that probably they could gaze on all the devils and doomed souls. Well then, since they would not refrain, the demon put off his human form and showed himself in his own likeness."

The steward, excited, strained, and eager groaned and shuddered.

"And lo," said the monk gently as though grieved, "scarcely did they behold him, when they were so terrified that one expired immediately, another in alarm tried to flee, leaped from the window and shattered his skull."

"And the third . . ." cried the steward with eyes rolling.