

consideration
mselves prove
 is scarcely ne-
 ing, that in re-
 t, they would
enti. Though
 d documents
 ion, the lan-
 f knighthood,
 with the sub-
 e phrase per-
 used to de-
 iii. p. 137);
 in Frobisher,
 In the dedi-
 , it is in like
 on the ' Ef-
 e first edition
 ly be deemed
 s of Honour
 been stated.
 as, who was

r must have
 stood before
 a tone,—and
 s which may
 mbination of
 his extraor-
 ls Miles Au-
 econdly, that
 s prove that
 fortunately,
 Gilbert was a
 s of Equites
 m to turn to
 the Heroolo-
 raits of the
 statesmen,
 in England
 65, vol. i., a

beautiful head of Sir Humphrey Gilbert, and around it the following inscription,—“*HEMERIDUS GILBERTUS, MILES AURATUS.*” Do these words prove here that knighthood had not been conferred? Again, we beg him to turn to another engraving in the same work, the portrait of the celebrated Sir Richard Grenville, of whose knighthood there is not the smallest doubt. It will be found at page 85 of the first volume of Holland’s work, and it is thus inscribed around the margin,—“*RICHARDUS GRENVILLUS, MIL. AUR.*” (*Miles Auratus.*) But the biographer has quoted the famous Sir Francis Drake, as illustrating his argument. He points triumphantly to him as an undoubted knight, being styled *Eques Auratus*, and to whom, therefore, the words *Miles Auratus* could not possibly be applied. Once more, we beg him to turn to the *Heroologia*, vol. i. page 105. He will there see a striking portrait of Drake, with his hand resting on the globe, and these words round the margin of the print,—“*FRANCISCUS DRAKE, MILES AURATUS.*” One other example may be given of the common use of those words to denote knighthood, which, according to the positive assertion of our author, are never found together, and which, if used, prove that this honour had not been conferred. It is the first sentence in Holland’s *Life of Sir John Harrington*, *Heroologia*, page 133. “*Joannes Harrington filius natu maximus Clarissimi Militis Jacobi Harringtoni de Exton, in Comitatu Rutlandie, Equestri seu Militis Aurati dignitate multis abhinc annis a beatissimæ memoriæ Regina Elizabetha insignitus fuit.*” It need hardly be pointed out to the intelligent reader, that this brief sentence of four lines, in its use of the word *Miles* by itself to denote knighthood, and *Miles Auratus*, as synonymous with the terms *dignitas Equestris*, overturns the whole argument of the biographer, who not only contends that the expression *Miles Auratus* is never used as descriptive of knighthood, but that, except in ancient deeds, the single word *Miles* never occurs. Had he taken the trouble to consult any friend who possessed even a superficial acquaintance with the language in which the inscription was written, he must have discovered that the words *Eques Auratus*, *Miles Auratus*, *Eques* by itself, and *Miles* by itself, are used indiscriminately in modern Latin to denote knighthood; and that the “absurd misconcep-