VENERY—*continued*

delivered, and if not he shall abjure the Realm of England."

This was a great modification of the severe penalties imposed by the *Charta de Foresta* of Canute (1016) which seems to have been adopted and enforced by William the Conqueror and his immediate successors.

Indeed the whole of the Charter shows a tendency to protect the public from unjust suspicions and from oppression by the forest officials when carrying out the provisions for the protection of the king's game.

In the turbulent days of Richard II., Henry IV., and Henry V., poaching with violence was frequent and chases and parks and warrens were invaded by armed men, sometimes probably with some right on their side claiming right of chase within them. For estates changed hands frequently when the faithful adherents of one king were dispossessed as traitors by his successor and their lands given to his own faithful followers.

One instance of this in the 15th century is especially interesting: *i.e.*, the case of Sir Giles Dawbeney, whom we find in 17 Edward IV. receiving appointments and grants, being made a commissioner of the peace, in the following year (1479) having still further grants of money from the king, and in 1483 grants from the king's mother. At the close of this year Richard III. becomes king, and then we find all manors, lordships, lands, rents, and services, of Giles Dawbeney, knight, traitor, being distributed between the king's adherents, Gilbert Maners, Ralph Nevill, Robert Fitzburgh and others. But again the wheel of fortune turns and in 1485, the first year of Henry VII.'s reign, Sir Giles Dawbeney is made Master of the herthounds, Constable of Winchester, Master of the Game of the Forest of Kyngswode and Fullwode, of the Park of Petherton in our county of Somerset, &c. (Rolls of Parl. vii. 384).

The Abbots and the lesser brethren of the church as well as laymen seem frequently to have been convicted of poaching, although Priories and Abbeys, &c., seem to have been very liberally treated in the matter of licences to hunt the lesser game in the king's forests, and to enclose land and have deerleaps so that they could have well stocked parks (Pat. Rolls; Close Rolls, 13 Henry III., Pat. Rolls, 27 Ed. I.).

Licences to hunt deer in the king's forests were however very rare and generally limited to a certain time and to a small number. Such we find given to one Roger de Mortuo Mari to hunt with his greyhounds in the king's forest and chaces both sides of the Trent while on his way to join the king at York at the king's command, and to take or carry away one or two deer (Pat. Rolls, 26 Ed. I.), and such the Earl of Pembroke was given by Edward II. to hunt in all the king's forests on this side Trent through which he might be passing . . . and to take stags at his discretion provided he deliver the same to the keepers of the forest, stewards or foresters in whose bailiwicks the foresta shall be to keep until further orders (Pat. Rolls, 9 Ed. II.).

The grants for hare-, fox- and badger-hunting were much more frequent and liberal, but they generally carried the proviso that the king's deer were in no way to be disturbed by such hunting. Even those noblemen who had married into the royal family had to be content to take their licences subject to such a rider. Sir Hugh de Audeley, who married a niece of Edward II. Margaret, Countess of Cornwall, had a licence for life to hunt hare, cat and badger with his own dogs in all the king's forests in the counties of Salop, Stafford, Gloucester and Oxford, fence month excepted, and to stretch nets for their capture, and to carry them away without let or hindrance of the king's justices, foresters, verderers, regarders or other ministers of the forest. He is not by virtue of this concession to injure deer in the said forests (Pat. Rolls 8, 13 Ed. II.); and Hugh le Despenser, chief warden of the forests already mentioned of beyond Trent could hunt fox, hare and cat and badger but not deer without special royal orders (Pat. Rolls, 6 Ed. II.), but he no doubt could see some sport when the king's huntsmen came to his part of the country on their annual expeditions.

The owners of parks could of course hunt within the boundaries of the same, but they had to obtain a royal licence to make a deerleap (saltatorium) to enable them to replenish the stock of deer within the park from the royal forests without. Besides the park owners every man had the right of chase on his own ground, if it exceeded the value of 40s. a year freehold, but if he put up any game on his ground and it went into the forest he had to call his dogs off unless they actually had hold of the beast before he reached the boundaries of the forest.

WANLACE. Winding in the chase (Halliwell). In the sentence in which this word is used in the chapter on the Mastiff (p. 68) we are told that some of these dogs "fallen to be berslettis and also to bring well and fast a wanlace about." Which probably means that some of these dogs become shooting dogs, and could hunt up the game to the shooter well and fast by ranging or circling. *Wanlasour* is an obsolete name for one who drives game (Strat.). One must always remember that the M. of G.'s chapter on Mastiff is translated from G. de F.'s on the *matin* or household and domestic cur (*see* Appendix: Mastiff) which included a vast number of mongrel breeds, and it is probably such *mestifs*, *mestifs* or cross-breeds that the M. of G. had in view when he speaks of Mastiffs becoming good dogs to shoot over, and not the dog we now understand by an English mastiff (*see* Bibliography: "Craft of Venery").

In Brit. Mus. MS. Lansdowne 285 there is an interesting reference to setting the forest "with archers or with Greyhounds or with Wanlassours."

WILD BOAR. These animals were denizens of the British forests from the most remote ages,

WILD BOAR—*continued*

and probably were still numerous there at the time our MS. was penned. For although the Duke of York has only translated one of the 11 chapters relating to the natural history, chase, or capture by traps of the wild boar, and does not give us any original remarks upon the hunting of them, as he has of the stag and the hare, still it was most likely because he considered these two the royal sport *par excellence*, and not because there were none to hunt in England in his day. If the latter had been the case, he would in all probability have omitted even the chapter he does give us, as he has done with those written by Gaston de Foix on the bear, the reindeer, and the ibex and chamois, which could be of no interest to his Royal nephew, as they did not exist within his dominions. Manwood tells us that "The Book called Antiquitas Britannica which was written before the conquest, mentions five wild Beasts of Venery which are called Beasts of the Forest (viz.) The Hart, the Hind, the Hare, the Boar and the Wolf" (p. 160). Mr. J. E. Harting says that Britons, Romans, Saxons, and Normans all hunted the wild boar in England in turns, and owing to his research into its history in the British Isles, the popular notion that it became extinct in the reign of Henry II., until Charles I.'s attempt to restock the New Forest with them, has been dispelled (although the Encyclopædia Britannica still makes this assertion). When Fitzstephen wrote his description of London in 1174, he says wild boars as well as other animals frequented the forests surrounding London, and it would certainly be a long time after this before these animals could have been extirpated from the wild forests in more remote parts of the country. It is likely that as the disafforestation of England proceeded, acorns and beechmast, the chief food of wild boars, would fail, and as serious war would be waged on them by those who were cultivating what had once been forest land, we may imagine that the boar would gradually become scarce in an absolutely wild state. But in parks they were preserved long after this, as here the lack of their natural food would be supplemented by those who wished to keep them for sport as well as for the table. The places where they were fed were called "Boar Franks."

To return to the fact that they were probably still plentiful in the time of Henry IV. and Henry V. (1399–1422), we find that Edward III. in the early part of the 14th century hunted them in Oxfordshire as is proved by an ancient tenure of land in that county. "Anno 1339, 13th and 14th Edward III., an inquisition was taken on the death of Joan widow of Thomas de Musgrave of Blechesdon, wherein it appears that the said Joan held the moiety of one messuage, and one carucate of land in Blechesdon of the King by the service of carrying one boar spear (unam hastam porci), price twopence, to the King, whenever he should hunt in the park of Cornbury; and do the same as often as the King should so hunt, during his stay at his manor of Wodestock" (Kennet: *Parochial Antiquities*, p. 450 and Blount's *Ancient Tenures*, p. 97, quoted by J. E. Harting Ex. Brit. An. p. 84). In 1450 and in 1454 "bore speres" were mentioned, first in a petition of John Paston to the King and Parliament touching his expulsion from Gresham by Lord Molyns, whose retainers held forcible possession of this manor with "*bore-speres*," swords and battle-axes; and again in a similar petition of Walter Ingham in 1454 (Harting Ex. Brit. An. p. 214). In the Privy Purse expenses of Elizabeth of York, wife of Henry VII., we find that some money was paid to a servant of Sir Gilbertes Talbottes as a reward for bringing a wild boar to the Queen on Nov. 23, 1502. Erdswick, who began his survey of Staffordshire about 1593, speaking of Chartley, says: "The park is very large, and hath therein red deer, fallow deer, wild beasts and swine." Mr. Harting quotes besides these interesting accounts from a Monastery at Durham, and from the Household Book of Edward Seymour Earl of Hertford, all showing that the wild boar was still fairly plentiful in the 16th century and that in the 17th century they were still hunted at Windsor by James I. For these details as well as much more information about these animals in the British Isles we must refer the reader to Mr. Harting's book.

In some doggerel verses which are prefixed to "Le venery de Twety and Gyfford" (in Vesp. B. XII.), the wild boar is classed as a beast of Venery:

"To venery y caste me fyrst to go,
Of wheche iiij bestis be, that is to say
The hare, the herte, the wulfhe, the wylde boor also,
Of venery for sothe ther be no moe."

In the Book of St. Albans the wild boar is also mentioned as a beast of venery.

Sounder is the technical term for a herd of wild swine. "How many herdes be there of bestes of venery? Sire of hertis, or bisses, of bukkes and of doos. A soundre of wylde swyne. A bevy of Roos" (Twety and Gyfford). In the French Twici we have also *Soundre dez porcs*. In the metrical romance of the Ritter van Horn we find: *un sundre de pors* (Horn, 4650–4662), showing that the old French and English terms were identical. There were different names given to the wild boar according to his age. According to Twety and Gyfford the boar was first called a "pyg as long as he is with his dame, and when his dame levyth hym then he is called a gorgeaunt, and the IIj yere he is called a hoggaster, and when they be IIIj yere of age they shall departe fro the soundre for age, and when he goth soole than he is callyd a boor." In Dryden's Twici the terms are "*purcel, goreaus, hogastres, and sengler.*" The Book of St. Albans, like Twici, says that it is in their fourth year that the pigs leave the sounder: And when he is IV year *a boar* he shall be, From *the sounder of swine* then departeth he. And that he is called the first year a *pig of the sounder*; second year *a hog*; third year a *hoggestere*, and fourth year *a singuler*. But our MS. distinctly says that the young pig leaves his mother when he is two years, and three