

Abfurditities are expofed in the Arguments advanced for the Support of this Error.

4. The Third Chapter is a critical View of the Hiftories of *Hermaphrodites* given by feveral Authors ; fhewing that thofe fo reputed were either perfect Men or Women, having only fome Deformity or Difafe in the Parts of Generation.

5. The Conclusion describes the State of all Female *Fætufes*, with fome Observations which I laid before this moft Honourable SOCIETY ; which prove that every Female *Fætus* may as well be thought an *Hermaphrodite*, as any that were ever called fo.

By this Method I hope it will appear, that this fo long reigning Error is confuted ; and if this Learned SOCIETY, whole fole Bufinefs here is to inſpect into the true Nature of Things, think I have fucceeded, and give this Treatife, which I have the Honour to prefent them, a favourable Reception, it will be eſteemed a very great Honour by their

*Moſt obedient Servant,*

J. Parſons.

XXVI. *An Account of an antient Date in Arabian Figures, upon the North Front of the Pariſh Church of Rumſey in Hampſhire. By the Rev. Mr. William Barlow.*

AS the knowing how long the *Arabian* or *Indian* Figures have been uſed in the Weſt, may ſometimes be a means for diſtinguiſhing ſpurious from

from genuine Dates; so a wrong Hypothesis—fixing the Time later than it ought to be—may possibly induce us to suspect genuine Dates to be doubtful or spurious. To give some Light to this Subject, I have here sent a Draught of Part of the North Front of the Abbey (now Parish) Church of *Rumsey*, in the County of *Southampton*, with an Inscription on the same. That this Inscription is a Date, 1011, is evident from the Figures. That it is a genuine Date, the apparent Antiquity of the Building plainly demonstrates. A spurious Date in this Place would have expressed the Time when the Abbey was founded by King *Edward*, Grandfather of *Edgar*, above a Hundred Years before the Time here mentioned.


There is something very remarkable with relation to the Time when this Church was built. Not only during the Year of this Date, 1011, but for several Years before, many Parts of *England* were laid waste by the revenging *Danes*, justly incensed against the *English* by the inhuman Massacre of their Countrymen in the Year 1002. The *Saxon Chronicle*, p. 141. acquaints us, that the County of *Hants*, *Hamton-jcipe*, among others, was miserably harrassed by these cruel Invaders this Year of the Date \*. It is therefore very extraordinary, that so fine a Pile (according to the Age when it was built) should be raised at a time when every thing else, Sacred and Civil, was plundered and destroyed by these merciless Ravagers. But probably the Devastation was not quite so general as represented.

---

\* *Florence of Worcester* also observes the same. . . *Suthamptonensi, Wiltunensi* . . . *provinciis. à Danorum exercitu ferro flammaque demolitis.* *Ad An.* 1011. p. 613.

If this be a genuine Date, (and I see no Reason to question it) it is, I believe, the antientest, *Indian*, or other, that has yet been taken notice of in *England*, perhaps in *Europe*; and quite destroys the Opinions advanced by *Scaliger*, *Vossius*, *F. Mabillon*, *Dr. Wallis*, and other learned Men, concerning this Matter.

Now I have mentioned this Abbey of *Rumsey*, I take Leave to correct an Error in Sir *H. Savil's* (the only extant) Edition of *Roger Howeden, Frankf. 1601. p. 426. Anno 967. Rex . . Edgarus in Monasterio Ramefeie, quod Avus suus Edvardus senior construxerat.*—Here it is called *Ramefeie*, by Mistake, for *Rumeseie*; and again in the same Page. But *Ramefeie* was *Ramsay* in the County of *Huntington*, a Monastery founded by *Oswald*\* Bishop of *Worcester*, afterwards Archbishop of *York*, consecrated by the said *Oswald An. 991*†. This Identity of Name, unobserved, may occasion great Confusion in the History of these Two Places. I find *F. Cressy* (p. 860.) or the Authors he transcribed from, misled by this typographical Error. Possibly others may fall into the same Mistake, by the same Means. It is pity there is not a more correct Edition of that Author.



\* *Will. Malmesb. De Gest. Reg. Ang. p. 36. 291.*

† *Simeon Dunelm. ad An. 991.*