ERRORS—continued

In a recent "New History of England" (1902) the author in discussing terms of venery says: "This quarry is not to be confounded with quarry, a stone-mine. . . . Quarry comes from the French cœur, the heart. When the game was run down, the heart and entrails were generally thrown to the single statement in this passage is true. This dogs"! Could some old veneur arise out of his grave, he would give this historian a bad time for such incorrect and disparaging "history."

In a lately published interesting book on the pointer the author makes several slips which might disappear in the future editions to which this useful treatise, one hopes, may attain. Some we have already pointed out, and others are: Le Bon Varlet des Chiens is an excerpt of Gaston Phœbus made by some Grub Street scribe, and is not an independent work by Gaston Phœbus. On page 227 Ridinger's birth-year is given as 1695—it should be 1698; on page 49 Gesner's book appears as written only in 1620—the first edition of it appeared in 1551. On page 54 he makes Blome's Gentleman's Recreation as appearing in 1676, which is just ten years too early, and he spells Clamorgan with a G.

As to other authors on our theme let the following selection of mistakes serve as evidence in support of our criticism. Lord Wilton in his "Sports and Pursuits of the English," referring to the source of the Book of St. Albans, says (p. 105) that it was "written by the Master of the Games to Henry II. that some parts of Turbervile were taken from foreign for the use of Prince Henry his son, and is little more than an enlargement of the former tract," meaning Twici. As Henry II. reigned in the middle of the twelfth century, this author is giving others a good lead over the fences of historical facts. That Blaine, Jesse, Dalziel, Shaw, Wynn, and a number of others fall into the same mistake as does Lord Wilton as to Edmund of Langley being the author of the "Master of Game" has already been mentioned. That this is in most cases the result of copying slavishly from Strutt's pages is probable, but in some cases even the process of copying has been done carelessly. Thus Wynn makes Twici grand huntsman to Edward I.!

Other writers improve either consciously or unconsciously upon Strutt's errors. Thus in a recent article on the "Past and Future of the Thoroughbred" that appeared in a learned review, the writer states: "By the reign of Edward II. Gyfford and William Twety had already written two treatises

in rhyme on hunting and horses which remain in manuscript in the Cottonian collection. It was not till almost a century later that the first sporting publication ever issued in England was printed in 1481 for Dame Julyana Berners, the predecessor of a long line of lusty followers." Not a treatise was not written in rhyme; Twety and Gyfford did not write two treatises; what they wrote does not remain in MS. form, for it has been published; there is nothing about horses in it, and in fact the word horse or its equivalent does not occur once in the whole treatise. Instead of "almost a century" intervening between it and the Book of St. Albans, the interval was nearer two hundred years; and, lastly, the Book of St. Albans was not published in 1481! What possible good can such an agglomeration of misinformation do?

In the act of sending these sheets to press a "new, much enlarged, and corrected edition" of Strutt's "Sports and Pastimes" is published. Confining myself to the Hunting chapter, it is surprising to find that Strutt's misleading mistakes are not only again perpetuated, but a number of new ones added. The editor is apparently even more convinced of Turbervile's book being a description of English hunting than was the writer of the criticised nine articles, for while the latter does seem to have had an inkling sources, this editor appears to have none whatever, for he calmly asserts that "the best account of old English hunting of the wild boar is given in George Turbervile's liberally illustrated Noble Art of Venerie." The wide margins, good print, and fine art paper of the new edition cannot make us overlook such surprising mistakes as the ascription of the Book of St. Albans to the year 1406, just eighty years too early. Nor does it lead one to forgive the re-appearance of that eleventh century swine-herding picture as a wild boar-hunting scene of the ninth century!

Altogether this is a telling instance of the lack of individual research, and one would have thought that the exposure of so many of these mistakes in the pages of a leading review some years ago might have prevented their repetition in A.D. 1904.¹

If the literature of our good old national sport of hunting is to be purged of this engorging avalanche

¹ In the Fortnightly Review of August 1897 I published a lengthy indictment anent "the Shortcomings of our Sporting Literature" in which were set forth many of the mistakes I have here alluded to. As the correctness of my criticisms was challenged, the Editor published in the February number 1898 of his review a summarised rebuttal by the pen of an independent expert of wide fame, Baron Christoph Biedermann, in which this impartial authority supports me. The controversy did not remain confined to the pages of the review, but was made the subject of remarks in Land and Water of Feb. 20, June 26, Dec. 18 and 25, 1897, March 12, 1898; Academy, April 10, and May 1, 1897, and Field, Aug. 14, 1897.

That the sacrifices that have to be endured by those who believe in accuracy are often unexpectedly great the following amusing instance will show. In the above-mentioned Fortnightly Review article I criticised some very incorrect information regarding the measurements, weights, origin, &c., of certain trophies given in a book called Records of Big Game, mentioning among other instances that there were no less than ten mistakes in the details relating to the three largest existing red deer heads. In the subsequent fourth edition of this sportsman's vade mecum its compiler, while not above making use of my corrections (without any acknowledgment), has carefully expunged all reference to certain of my own Wapiti, Bighorn and Chamois trophies that formerly, at the invitation of the compiler, figured in his pages. As at least one of them is a record head, it shows that accuracy is not always the principal end to be striven for in "Records" of this sort.

ERRORS—continued

of misinformation, it is high time that a beginning be made. For if this slavish perpetuating of century-old mistakes and of gross newer blunders be continued very much longer, the student of the next generation who in the enthusiasm of youth may turn to this, for Englishmen, attractive field, will have reached a green old age before he has delved down through the overlying strata of encumbering rubbish and reached the dry bones of the real men who penned the records of ancient sport. If the present little attempt to reach the bed-rock of fact, and to bring into life the quaint old memorial penned by a Plantagenet prince, has cost more than ten years' work, the foregoing black-list will have shown the reader that some of this work was expended, and had to be expended, in clearing away the débris with which others had obstructed an otherwise clear and straight path.

In the eyes of many a keen, hard-riding sportsman, good and true, this dry-as-dust investigation into the customs and records of dead and buried sportsmen, whose bones have long crumbled into dust, will probably appear an idle waste of time. But so is, apparently, much that we make the object of diligent research; and why should an Englishman who wants to read a correct account of his Norman ancestor's hunting have to turn to a Frenchman's book, or if he desires to obtain an insight into the bibliography of ancient English literature on British sport, have to seek the works of German professors?

In learned circles abroad the importance of the "Master of Game" as the foremost treatise on English venery has long been recognised, and several philologists have come specially to England to study the various MSS. of it. I am not betraying secrets when I say that at least one of our English texts has been in type, awaiting the finishing touches, for nearly two years, and that but for an urgent call to one of the leading Japanese universities, its editor, a well-known German philologist, would have anticipated the present publication, with the result that the oldest English hunting-book would have been given to the world by a Berlin professor.

EXCREMENTS, fumes, fewmets, obs. term for the droppings of deer. From the Fr. fumées. G. de F. says that the droppings of all deer, including fallow and roe deer, are to be called fumées. The Master of Game, no doubt following the custom then prevalent in England, says the droppings of the hart only are to be called fumes and of the buck and the roebuck croties. The following names are given to droppings by—

GASTON DE FOIX AND MASTER OF GAME. Of the hart Of the hart—Fumes. " buck Fumées. " buck Croteys. ,, roebuck ,, bear ,, wild boar ,, wild boar Laisses. ,, black beasts and Lesses. wolves ,, hare and conies-Crotes. ,, hare and conies-Croties. stinking beasts Fiantes. ,, fox—The wagging. ,, grey or badger-The Ward-,, otter—Spraintes. ,, stinking beasts-The Drit. ,, otter—Spraintes.

Other forms of this term are: fewmets, fewmishin g, crotels, crotisings, freyn, fuants, billetings, and spraits.

FEAUT. In the vocabulary of olden hunting this was a general term which, like foin, signified the track of any beast whether by scent, footprint, or blood (also spelt feut). (Stuart, vol. ii. pp. 117, 158.) Stuart himself uses feut in this manner: having shot a stag, it gets away; he follows it and says, "There were great feuts of blood on each side" (vol. ii. p. 117).

FENCE MONTH. The month so called began, according to Manwood, fifteen days before and ended fifteen days after midsummer. During this time great care was taken that no men or stray dogs should be allowed to wander in the forest, and no swine or cattle were allowed to feed within the precincts, so that the deer should be absolutely undisturbed during three or four weeks after the fawning season. He tells us that because in this month there must be watch and ward kept with men and weapons for the fence and defence of wild beasts, for that reason the same is called fence or defence month (Man. p. 76, ed. 1598). In the many licences granted by the kings to their subjects giving permission to hunt the lesser beasts of venery and of the chase, abstinence from hunting during the fence month is always insisted on. There does not seem to have been, as one might have supposed, a fence month for all beasts of venery and the chase, varying with each kind according to their breeding time, but the fence month was solely for the protection of deer, the royal game. Manwood quotes the Assisa Forestae de Pickering and de Lancaster (fols. 20 and 7) in reference to the fence month, by which it appears that it was observed in the reign of Edward III. As midsummer was the height of the stag-hunting season (hinds were not hunted at this time as a rule), the royal hunts of the fat venison season must have created considerable disturbance also in the deer nurseries.

FEWTE, fuite, fute, (M. E.) O. Fr. fuite (voie de cerf qui fuit), track, trace, foot. Gawaine: feute. Will. of Palerne (90): foute. Some beasts were called of the sweet fute, and some of the stinking fute. The lists of the beasts which should come under either heading varies somewhat; some that are placed by the Boke of St. Albans under "Swete fewte" coming under the other category in the MS. Harl., 2340.

In Boke of St. Albans. In Harl. MS. 2340, fol. 50 b.

Beasts of "Swete fewte."

The Buck, the Doo, the The Buke, the Doo, the Beere, the Reynd, the Ber, the Reyne der, the Elke, the Spycard, the Elke, the Spycard. Otre, and the Martwn.