



<http://kentarchaeology.org.uk/research/archaeologia-cantiana/>

Kent Archaeological Society is a registered charity number 223382

© 2017 Kent Archaeological Society

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE ON EARLY KENT MAPS

BY CANON G. M. LIVETT.

SUBSEQUENT to the publication of my paper on E.K.M. in the 1937 volume of *Arch. Cant.* my friend the Reverend Herbert Poole has drawn my attention to the work of Laurence Nowell, whose claim to consideration as a cartographer has only recently been discussed by modern writers. The date of Laurence Nowell's birth is not known. He was the younger brother of Alexander Nowell, the Protestant Reformer, who was born about 1507 and became Dean of St. Paul's in 1559. In that same year Laurence became Dean of Lichfield. He was also Archdeacon of Derby, Rector of Haughton and Drayton Bassett in Staffordshire, and Prebendary of both York and Chichester. His ecclesiastical duties, however, weighed lightly upon him, for in the early 'sixties he spent most of his time in London. He acted as tutor to Edward de Vere, who in 1562 at the age of twelve succeeded to the earldom of Oxford and became a royal ward in Sir William Cecil's household in the Strand. This brought him into touch with Cecil (afterwards Lord Burghley), whose hobby was the collection of historical manuscripts and of MS. maps of the properties of dissolved monasteries. At that time Cecil was master of the Court of Wards, of which another brother of Laurence Nowell, Robert by name, a barrister of Lincoln's Inn, was attorney. Doubtless it was in Robert's chambers that Laurence became associated with William Lambarde, who in 1558 at the age of twenty had become a member of the Inn and was a pupil of Laurence in the study of Anglo-Saxon. Laurence Nowell was a diligent and erudite antiquary : his great aim was the revival of the Old English language and literature ; and there is no doubt that Lambarde based his *Dictionarium Angliæ Topographicum et Historicum* (" Alphabetical

description of the chief places in England and Wales—London, 1730, 4to”) largely, but without due acknowledgement, upon voluminous transcripts of Saxon and mediæval MSS. made by Nowell for a similar work.¹

A letter by Nowell written in Latin and addressed to “the right honorable and his singular good maister Sir Will^m Cecill Knight the Quens Maj’ties principall secretarie” is preserved in the British Museum (MS. Lansdowne, VI, f. 135), endorsed “June 1563—Lawrent Nowell to my master Proposing to frame an exact map of England.” There is no evidence that Cecil responded to this appeal for his patronage and support, but a small 8vo volume of assembled manuscripts in Nowell’s script, also preserved in the British Museum (MS. Cotton. Dom. A. XVIII), contains a series of twenty-six sectional maps on thirteen openings, covering the whole of England and Wales, on which a complete map of Saxon England might be based. As Dr. Robin Flower observes, the aim of this dissected map was to serve as an outline for the recording of Old English names of places. The county of Kent is comprised in two of the openings (113v./114 and 116v./117), and the relevant portions of these are here reproduced by the kindness of the editor. The series bears no date, but it may confidently be assigned to the later part of Nowell’s period of intense labour in London which seems to have ended in 1566. He died ten years later.

The first thing that strikes the eye in studying these charts is their division by lines of ‘squaring’. Such squaring is an old device adopted for purpose of reference or for copying a map or picture. The engraver of the “Anonymous” map headed “The Shyre of Kent . . .” (reproduced in E.K.M.) probably used it in copying the Kent portion of Saxton’s map of the four south-eastern counties. Remains of it are visible on Robert Glover’s MS. map drawn c. 1571 (also reproduced in E.K.M.). Glover must

¹ For full details of his life and work the reader is referred to a valuable Paper by Robin Flower, entitled “Laurence Nowell and the Discovery of England in Tudor Times”, read before the British Academy in 1935 and printed in the Academy’s *Proceedings*, Vol. xxi—published as a separate pamphlet by Humphrey Milford.

have worked upon an earlier map of the county, not improbably "The Carde of the Shyre" to which Lambarde referred in the first draft of his *Perambulation* in 1570, seeing that, with one exception (*Rother flu*), Glover inserted no river-names.¹ But in the case now under review Nowell may have used the device simply for the purpose of showing the relation of his sections to one another. The distance from Land's End to the longitudinal line of the east coast of Kent, as measured on a modern map, is 310 statute miles, and in Nowell's sections it is comprised in fifty-seven squares: this yields a measure of approximately $5\frac{1}{2}$ statute miles for each square. The lines of the squares are numbered from south to north and from west to east, carrying on from one section to another so that a complete map of the country could be built up of tracings. For the accompanying reproduction the relevant portions of photographs of the two sections were fitted together according to the numbering of the vertical lines; but for obvious reasons it was felt inadvisable to cut a strip off each section to make the two horizontal lines numbered 13 coincide.

The resulting county map, if it may be so called, has little cartographic value: the plotting of place-sites is very inaccurate; the course of rivers and the lines of coast are very erratic. The north coast from Reculver to Margate is drawn a little above the latitudinal level of St. Paul's, London, whereas it really runs nearly ten miles below that level. This error occurs again in Glover's map; while in Saxton's and later maps it is only somewhat less pronounced. Again: Dungeness is plotted ten miles east of its true position, and the coast-line running up from the Ness towards Hythe and Folkestone is drawn roughly straight, so that the great bay of Dymchurch disappears—errors that are also seen in Glover's map, while in Saxton's the Ness is some

¹ In a recent visit to Egypt I was interested and astonished to find abundant evidence showing that from the earliest period onwards the painters of the scenes that decorate the tombs of the kings worked upon a system of squares marked upon the walls, which enabled them to follow certain canons of proportion in drawing the human figure. The whole subject is treated in detail in Miss M. A. Murray's *Egyptian Sculpture* (1929), and by Ernest Mackay in a paper entitled "Proportion Squares", published in the *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, Vol. iv, Part 2 (1917).

five miles too far eastward, though the bay is shown. But the difference between the Glover and Nowell maps in other respects is too great to suggest a common source.

The results of a careful analysis can be stated here only very briefly. The chief interest lies, as the author intended, upon the spelling and lettering of the place-names. In the original draft the names, with two or three exceptions (e.g. *Charing* and *Chart*), were inscribed in the Saxon or Old English form of letters. *Malling* (line 51) shows the capital initial *M*, and the *f* stands for either *f*, as in words ending in *ford*, or *v*, as in *Hever* (11) and *Dover* (12). *Ospring* (14) shows the old form of *s*, *r* and *g*. The *ge* has the sound of *y* in such names as *Gealdig* (51, for Yalding) and *Oxleage* (Boxley, on line 13 in both upper and lower sections). *Hithe* (57 and 11, for Hythe) shows the peculiar form of the voiced spirant, as in "*thine*", not always easy to distinguish from the Saxon *w* in *Wi* (for Wye, line 55), in *Witsh̄m* (for Wittersham, 10), and *Ewell* (57).

The author added to his original draft a few names in the script of his age. *S. Margaret* on the east coast (58) is a clear example. Much less carefully written are the names of the places in Thanet: *S. Nicolas*, *S. Jhon* (in error for *S. Thom*), *Margat*, *S. Petere*, *S. Laurence* and, in the mouth of the Stour, *Reptacest(er)* with *Rut(upiae)* underneath it (for Richborough), the coast-line of the North Foreland being cut off by the edge of the page. Below *Sandwic*, west of *Deil*, there is *Worboro*, which must represent Woodnesborough; and on the Little Stour (not named) there is *Wingh̄m*. Why was this part of the map so imperfectly drawn in the first instance? ¹ The clarity of the map elsewhere was ensured by the paucity of the place-names: in the space between the Medway and the Stour there are only fourteen as compared with more than forty on Glover's map. And one wonders what guided the author in his

¹ In the Welsh section, the fruit of a survey in 1564 in which Nowell seems to have taken part, the names are all written in his modern script, those of the counties and some districts in larger lettering like *Rumenea marshe* in the Kent section, while the adjoining parts of the English counties in those sections appear in the Old English script. One of the Welsh sections is reproduced in a paper on "The Map of Wales" by Dr. J. J. North (*Arch. Cambrensis*, Vol. xc, 1935).

choice of those he included. It may here be noted that the names *L. Mountague* and *Erl of Arundell* added to f. 113 appear through the paper in 113v.

There are only two river-names: *Medway*. *f.* written in the author's modern script on both banks of the river west of *Tunbrug* (Tonbridge), and *Dert*. *f.* (12) which was also an addition, as indicated by the modern *f.*, though *Dert* is in Saxon script.

In two cases a place-name is repeated, being inscribed on either side of the binding that separates the two sections of an opening: on f. 116v. *Eltham* is plotted in its true position SE. of *Grenwic* (Greenwich), and on 117 it appears on the bank of the Thames near the mouth of the Dart; and *Elham* is plotted on line 56 in f. 113v. and half way between 56 and 57 in 114. In two other cases a name on line 13 of the lower section is repeated on that line in the upper: *Ozleage*, which has previously been mentioned; and *Aeglesford* (Aylesford) on the lower section, which appears again as *Alisford* on the upper.

The more important places Nowell indicated by an elaboration of his usual little dotted circle. In the case of *Aeglesford* and *Lewe* (Lewes in Sussex) he surmounted the circle by a cross, and in other cases, by what can only be described as a scrawl—e.g. *Hrofceaster* (Rochester), *Medweastun* (Maidstone), *Loidis* (Leeds), and *Sondwic* (Sandwich). As to Canterbury, he plotted the symbol approximately in its correct position, but he omitted to inscribe the name. The charts were not based upon a personal field-survey—they were intended, as Dr. North suggests, for historical rather than geographical purposes, so that one may not be surprised at the errancy of the plotting of place-names. It does not call for analysis, though repetition of *Wardun* (Warden), at opposite corners of Sheppey, may be remarked. But considering the object Nowell had in view one would expect to find greater accuracy in his spelling of some of the old forms. *Lamberthurt* and *Godhurt* (Goudhurst) may be mere haste or carelessness, while *Wade* (under 15) for *Iwade* and *Hohtun* (55) for Boughton under Blean may be misreadings of his source—though he writes *Bohtun* (52) for

Boughton Monchelsea. On the other hand *Havochurst* (Hawkhurst) and *Rotherbrig* (Robertsbridge on the Rother) are instructive, as also is *Lime* (Lymne) with *Limemuth* at the mouth of the Rother, and *Oldfrestun* for Alfriston in Sussex. *Wudcirce* (55) and *Iuecirce* (56) may be mentioned—the latter (Ivychurch) supplying the only instance in which *u* the Saxon form of *v* is used.

Here this analysis must come to a close—with an expression of hope that someone more competent may be led to embark upon a comparison of the Old English place-names of Kent to be found in early maps and manuscripts.

.

ADDENDA AND NOTES TO EARLY KENT MAPS, VOL. XLIX.

p. 252. I have come to the conclusion that Glover did not make an independent survey, but that, as indicated by his squaring, he based his map on an earlier one, making perhaps some additions.

As to Saxton and his methods Mr. Lynam, in an article contributed to *The Times* of December 17th, 1932, wrote :—

Triangulation of a crude sort was known in England, and for instruments Saxton had the astrolabe, compass, and cross-staff (a kind of sextant) ; and possibly also the surveying instrument described in Cuninghame's *Cosmographical Glasse* (1559) or Leonard Digges's *Theodelitus*. The length of his base lines was probably paced or computed. No meridians or parallels are given on the county maps, but Saxton evidently followed Mercator, who drew his prime meridian through the island of St. Michael in the Azores.

Prof. E. G. R. Tayler in *Tudor Geography* (Methuen, 1930), has an instructive chapter entitled "Practical Surveying and Navigation in the Sixteenth Century". It is illustrated by six plates of the instruments then in use.

p. 257. "*Carte de l'Angleterre . . .*" This is an English version of a colophon which was engraved by Rocque on one of the six plates of the "Quartermaster's map" in 1752, when the map came into his possession and was published by him. As originally engraved by Hollar in

1644 and sold by Jenner it was accompanied by a separately-printed title, describing it as "Portable for every Man's Pocket. Usefull for all Commanders for Quarteringe of Souldiers, and all sorts of Persons, that would be informed, where the Armies be", showing that it was intended for the use of both Royal and Parliamentary Forces in the field, and was *not* made, as Rocque's colophon asserts, "by Oliver Cromwell's order for the use of his Armies" only. See a paper by Sir George Fordham in the *Geog. Journ.* for July 1917.

p. 265, line 23, for "must therefore" read "may perhaps".

p. 266. After line 13 read (with reference to the anon. map) "probably made by the device of squaring".

It may here be remarked that in the process of copying for engraving a map must be drawn so that "east is west and west is east"—this is the explanation of the footnote on page 254.