THE TAYLOR SISTERS (11 S. ix. 225, 297).—I have 'Original Poems,' published by George Routledge, 1868. It was given to me at "Xmas 1867" (according to a contemporary note on the fly-leaf), and is beautifully and profusely illustrated by many able artists of that day. No authors' names are given, but the 'Poems' are evidently by the Taylor sisters. The first verses are entitled 'A True Story,' and are headed by a picture, by J. Jellicoe, of a London square with an equestrian statue behind railings, and a lady and child walking in the square.

Little Ann and her mother were walking one day, Through London's wide city so fair, And business obliged them to go by the way That led them through Cavendish Square, is the opening stanza. What statue is thus represented? and where is it to-day? I think I have read somewhere of a statue of a Duke of Cumberland having stood somewhere near this site, which is associated in my mind with Thackeray's "Lord Gaunt."

In an advertisement at the end of the book there is mentioned another work, 'Original Poems for Infant Minds,' by Jane and E. Taylor. Ann, Jane, and Isaac Taylor are referred to by Mr. H. Taylor, ante, pp. 225–6. Who was E. Taylor?

WILMOT CORFIELD.

[For details about the Cavendish Square statue see II S. iv. 527; v. 58.]

LAW MAXIM: "SATIUS EST PETERE FONTES, QUAM SECTARI RIVULOS" (11 S. ix. 269).—Can this maxim not have been based on Cicero's "rivulos consectari, fontes rerum non vide" ("Cic. de Or.", 2, 17, 117)?

T. LLECHID JONES.

Yspytty Vicarage, Bettws-y-Coed.

HARWICH AND GEORGE I. (11 S. ix. 229).—The excursions of George II. to the Continent via Harwich are frequently chronicled in The Gentleman's and other contemporary magazines. For instance, in the volume of The British Magazine for 1750, the April number states under the heading of 'Domestic Affairs':

"Monday the 16th, a little before five in the morning, his Majesty set out from St. James's for Harwich, attended by the lord Delawar, and his Majesty's master of the horse, for Hanover; the next morning his Majesty embark'd at Harwich... and arrived safe at Hanover on Saturday."

His return to England is thus recorded:

"November 4.—At six o'clock at night, a messenger arrived at St. James's from Harwich, who brought an account that his majesty was within sight of the harbour there, when he came away. And about eleven o'clock his majesty passed through the city to St. James's, where he arrived in perfect health, to the great joy of his subjects; on which occasion the guns in the Park, and at the Tower, were fired, and bonfires and illuminations made."

R. Freeman Bullen.

Bow Library, E.

A "QUARREL D'OLMAN" (11 S. ix. 270).—No doubt "d'Olman" was the way in which Lord Arran pronounced the word "Allemand," "querelle d'Allemand" being a French expression for picking a quarrel without a cause.

Constance Russell.

Swallowfield Park, Reading.

PARISHES IN TWO OR MORE COUNTIES (11 S. ix. 29, 75, 132, 210, 273).—If the Thames has been recognized, throughout its length from the sea to Deptford, as the boundary between Kent and Essex, then North Woolwich was formerly a detached part of Kent; but if not, then Kent lay on both sides of the river, the part on the south side being of very much larger area than that on the north. There are various instances of a county being nearly separated from the adjoining county by a river. Flintshire is mainly south-west of the Dee, but there is a small part on the north-east side near Chester. Devon is almost entirely east of the Tamar, but there was a small area, viz., North Petherwin and Werrington parishes, protruding into Cornwall on the west side belonging to Devon, but recently added to Cornwall. This case is parallel with that of North Woolwich, excepting in the breadth of the respective rivers. Furness, a part of Lancashire, is a good example of a large area separated by a broad sheet of water (Morecambe Bay) from the main part of the county, but it can hardly be said to be a detached part in Westmorland and Cumberland.

A. Weight Matthews.

FEE-FARM RENTS (11 S. ix. 84, 157).—I have made the further inquiries promised, but can throw little more light on the subject. My successor tells me that there was voluminous correspondence, and that he and others offered that one of them should be taken into court and have the case argued. This offer not having been accepted, they refused to pay, and heard no more of the matter.

I have lighted upon one of my old receipts, on which notice is given that "the next audit will be held at the Beverley Arms, Beverley," on a certain day, and that the sum must be paid there or at the re-