Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/englishhistorica10londuoft

P
Hist
E

THE ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW

EDITED BY

S. R. GARDINER, D.C.L., LL.D.
FELLOW OF MERTON COLLEGE, OXFORD

AND

REGINALD L. POOLE, M.A., Ph.D.

American Editor, JUSTIN WINSOR, LL.D., Librarian of Harvard College, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

VOLUME X.

1895

37631
22/5/96

LONDON
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
AND NEW YORK
1895

DA
20
E58
V.10
cop.2

CONTENTS OF VOL. X.

PAGE

THE EARLY HISTORY OF SYRIA AND ASIA MINOR. By *John E. Gilmore* 1

THE PASCHAL CANON ATTRIBUTED TO ANATOLIUS OF LAODICEA.
By *A. Anscombe* 515
By *C. H. Turner* 699

ENGLISH TOPOGRAPHICAL NOTES. I: SOME PLACE-NAMES IN BEDE. II: BANNAVEM TABERNIAE. By *F. Haverfield*. 710

THE 'DONATION OF CONSTANTINE.' By *Henry Charles Lea, LL.D.* 86

A WORCESTER CATHEDRAL BOOK OF ECCLESIASTICAL COLLECTIONS, MADE c. 1000 A.D. By *Miss Mary Bateson* 712

THE POPE WHO DEPOSED HIMSELF. By *Sir Frederick Pollock, Bart., LL.D.* 293, 536

THE OFFICE OF CONSTABLE. By *H. B. Simpson* 625

HENRY I AT 'BURNE.' By *J. H. Round* 536

KING STEPHEN AND THE EARL OF CHESTER. By *J. H. Round* . 87

THE HUNDRED AND THE GELD. By *J. H. Round* 732

THE MURDER OF HENRY CLEMENT, 1235. By *Professor Maitland, LL.D.* 294

EDMUND, EARL OF LANCASTER. By *Walter E. Rhodes* . . 19, 209

A BIOGRAPHICAL NOTICE OF DANTE IN THE 1494 EDITION OF THE 'SPECULUM HISTORIALE.' By *Paget Toynbee* 297

THE 'HERSE' OF ARCHERS AT CRECY. By *Lieutenant-Colonel E. M. Lloyd, R.E.* 538

THE ARCHERS AT CRECY. By the *Rev. Hereford B. George* . . 733

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE WYCLIFFITE BIBLE. By *F. D. Matthew* . 91

SOME LITERARY CORRESPONDENCE OF HUMPHREY, DUKE OF GLOUCESTER. By the *Bishop of Peterborough* 99

ERASMUS IN ITALY. By the *Rev. Edward H. R. Tatham* . . 642

THE AGE OF ANNE BOLEYN. By *James Gairdner* 104

PAGE

A SIXTEENTH-CENTURY SCHOOL. By *P. S. Allen* 738

THE CONDITION OF MORALS AND RELIGIOUS BELIEF IN THE REIGN OF EDWARD VI By the *Rev. Nicholas Pocock* . . . 417

THE CONSTABLE LESDIGUIÈRES. By *E. Armstrong* . . . 445

THE ASSASSINATION OF THE GUISES AS DESCRIBED BY THE VENETIAN AMBASSADOR. By *Horatio Brown* 304

VANINI IN ENGLAND. By *Richard Copley Christie* 238

AN ALLEGED NOTEBOOK OF JOHN PYM. By *S. R. Gardiner, D.C.L.* 105

HERALDRY OF OXFORD COLLEGES. By the *Rev. Andrew Clark* 333, 543

By *Percival Landon* . . . 541

TROUBLES IN A CITY PARISH UNDER THE PROTECTORATE. By the *Rev. J. A. Dodd* 41

CROMWELL'S MAJOR-GENERALS. By *David Watson Rannie* . . 471

AN ECCLESIASTICAL EXPERIMENT IN CAMBRIDGESHIRE, 1656–1658. By the *Rev. H. W. P. Stevens* 744

A LETTER FROM LORD SAYE AND SELE TO LORD WHARTON, 29 DEC. 1657. Printed by *C. H. Firth* 106

THE 'MEMOIRS' OF SIR RICHARD BULSTRODE. By *C. H. Firth* . 266

SIR EYRE COOTE AND THE 'DICTIONARY OF NATIONAL BIOGRAPHY.' By *Frederick Dixon* 336

AN IRISH ABSENTEE AND HIS TENANTS, 1768–1792. By *J. G. Alger* 663

THE PERMANENT SETTLEMENT OF BENGAL. By *B. H. Baden-Powell, C.I.E.* 276

DISPUTED PASSAGES OF THE CAMPAIGN OF 1815. By His Honour *Judge William O'Connor Morris* 55

THE WAR OF THE SONDERBUND. By *W. B. Duffield* . . . 675

JOHN ROBERT SEELEY. By *J. R. Tanner* 507

REVIEWS OF BOOKS 108, 339, 546, 754

CORRESPONDENCE 192, 400

PERIODICAL NOTICES 193, 401, 611, 818

LIST OF RECENT HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS . . 201, 408, 618, 826

ERRATA 208, 416, 624

INDEX 833

150

The English Historical Review

NO. XXXVII.—JANUARY 1895

The Early History of Syria and Asia Minor

THE countries in the interior of Asia Minor and Syria have never for long been the seat of one of the great oriental empires. Their populations include representatives of all the great races of mankind—Aryan, Semitic, Turanian (and, according to Genesis x. 6, also Hamitic—the Canaanites and Phœnicians). The internal history of one portion of this region is familiar to us all from our childhood, but of the mutual relations of the different divisions, before the foundation of the Persian empire, it is only recent investigations and discoveries that enable us to form any definite conception. The earliest record (to whatever date it may be assigned) which professes to deal formally with the ethnic relations of Western Asia is that contained in Genesis x. 2–4, 14–19.[1] In this document the nations of Asia Minor and Kappadokia are enumerated among the descendants of Japhet, kindred both to the Medes and the Ionians, while those of Palestine and Phœnicia are represented, like the Egyptians, as descendants of Ham, and the Syrians proper (Aram), and perhaps the Lydians, appear as Semites. This does not agree with the linguistic evidence, but it is well known that the latter cannot be depended on to determine ethnic affinities, while, in the absence of certain knowledge as to the principles on which the table of the descendants of Noah is constructed, it is, on the other hand, unsafe to base theories too exclusively upon it.[2] At least as early as the time

[1] Some Egyptian tribute lists (especially those of Thothmes III, recently examined by Mr. Tomkins in *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archæology*, ix. 227–280) are, indeed, of earlier date, but they deal with cities rather than nations.

[2] Compare F. Lenormant, *Histoire Ancienne de l'Orient*, p. 265 (9e édit.)

of Gudea, ruler of the Babylonian town of Zerghul, or Sirpurra (*Tell-loh*), in the third millennium B.C., regular intercourse existed between the civilised states of Babylonia and Egypt and the Sinaitic peninsula. Probably the channel of communication was across the latter and the gulfs at the head of the Red Sea; but Palestine was the object of Babylonian military expeditions at a very early period.[3] From incidental notices in the Pentateuch it would appear that at this time Palestine was still partly inhabited by a remnant of races—the Zuzim, the Rephaim, the Emim, the Horim, and the Anakim—of whom we know next to nothing and who were even then vanishing.[4] The bulk of the population from the earliest time of which we have any record consisted of tribes akin to the Phœnicians, who in the Pentateuch are included under the general name of Canaanites or Amorites, and in the Egyptian records under that of Khal (or Khar) or Amaur. The outlying nations of Moab, Ammon, and Edom were, like the Israelites, of trans-Euphratean origin, and perhaps at one time shared with them the name of Hebrews.[5]

Our chief sources of information as to the condition of Palestine at this period are the biblical notices, covering a period of somewhat uncertain duration from the migration of Abraham to the Israelite invasion, the inscriptions and other records relating to the conquests of the Egyptian kings of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties, and above all the mass of correspondence (written in cuneiform characters, usually in the Assyro-Babylonian language, and coming for the most part from Palestine)[6] addressed to Egyptian kings about the end of the eighteenth dynasty. From these various authorities, which agree fairly well together, it appears that the country was divided into a great number of petty states, often at war with each other when not restrained by the strong arm of a foreign conqueror, while the settled population was sufficiently sparse to allow space—as at the present day—for nomad tribes, such as that of Abraham and his descendants, whose position in relation to the petty settled communities is shown by such passages as Genesis xiv., xxi. 22–34, xxxiii. 6, xxxiv. The Egyptian kings of the eighteenth dynasty seem, on conquering Syria, to have in some few cases established an Egyptian governor, but more generally to have

[3] Genesis xiv.; Schrader, *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the O. T.* i. 122; Rawlinson, *Five Monarchies*, i. 219; Sayce, *Herodotos*, pp. 369–71.

[4] Genesis xiv. 5–6, xv. 20; Deut. ii. 10, 20, iii. 11, &c.

[5] Cf. Lenormant, *op. cit.* ii. 174–8; Brugsch, *History of Egypt*, i. 14, 336 *seq.*

[6] That this mode of writing was in use in Palestine, not only for international but also for local purposes, at this period appears from a fragment of a tablet containing a letter to the prince of Lachish from a neighbouring prince, discovered at Tell Hesy (Lachish) during the recent excavations. The derivation of the Phœnician alphabe from the Egyptian hieratic is assigned to the time of the Hyksos, or the eighteenth dynasty (Taylor *The Alphabet*, i. 145–6).

left the native princes in possession as tributaries, sometimes with the addition of an Egyptian commissioner. When the Egyptian power had become weak, as under the later kings of the eighteenth dynasty, feuds broke out between the various princes, as is shown by the Tell Amarna documents, which consist largely of complaints by certain rival rulers of neighbouring cities, each professing his own loyalty to the Egyptian government and imploring the help of the king or some Egyptian officer against his opponents.

The kings of the eighteenth dynasty had no powerful enemies to contend with in Asia, but with those of the nineteenth the case was different. Their opponents were a people called in Hebrew Chittim ('Hittites' in our version), in Egyptian Kheta, in Assyrian Khatti, and in Greek perhaps Keteioi.[7] Some references to this people have been supposed to occur in an Egyptian inscription of the time of the twelfth dynasty,[8] and in a work composed under Sargon of Agade, one of the early Babylonian kings; these, however, are very doubtful.[9] The original seat of the Hittites was probably Kappadokia, which placed them in relations with both Asia Minor and Syria. They seem to have had some settlements in the latter country at an early period, but it was during the weakening of the power of Egypt at the end of the eighteenth dynasty that they suddenly developed into a great power, having its chief seats at Kadesh, on the Orontes, and (perhaps at a later date) Carchemish, on the Euphrates, and Pteria, in western Kappadokia.[10] The Hittite power in Syria was already beginning to be formidable in the time of Thothmes III,[11] and the progress of the struggle which for a while made it paramount there instead of that of Egypt is seen in some of the Tell Amarna letters, dating from the time of his successors, those written from places in the north of Palestine complaining of the attacks of the Khatti, while those from the south make the like complaints respecting the Khabiri.[12] The Hittites at this period seem for a few generations to have submitted to the sway of a

[7] *Odyss.* xi. 521. Cf. Wright, *Empire of the Hittites*, p. 17; Lenormant, *op. cit.* i. 224.

[8] Brugsch, *History of Egypt*, ii. 405.

[9] See Sayce in *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archæology*, vii. 145.

[10] Kadesh and Carchemish had been amongst the dependencies of the eighteenth dynasty. Each had then its own king, but whether these were Hittites or belonged to races whom the Hittites afterwards subdued or displaced does not appear; probably the former was the case (see Brugsch, *op. cit.* ii. 2–8).

[11] Sayce, *ubi supra*, vii. 269–70; Brugsch, *loc. cit.*

[12] Conder regards the Khabiri as 'Hebrews,' and sees in them the invading Israelites under Joshua, thus placing the Exodus under the eighteenth dynasty, though all the evidence is in favour of its having been under the nineteenth. Sayce more probably makes it equivalent to 'confederates.' Even if Khabiri answer to עִבְרִי, the term is applicable to all the descendants of Abraham and Lot and not merely to the Israelites. Joseph speaks of Canaan as the 'land of the Hebrews' (Genesis xl. 15), where 'the Hebrews' cannot mean merely his own family. Even were Khabiri limited to Israelites, it appears that the latter sometimes took part in the local wars in Syria during their sojourn in Egypt (1 Chron. vii. 21).

single supreme king,[13] whose vassals included both the Hittite rulers of various cities, and foreign princes, and whose empire extended from Mysia and Karia, in Asia Minor, to the Euphrates on the east and the centre of Palestine on the south, as we learn from the list of those engaged against Rameses II at the battle of Kadesh. This included a great part of the Asiatic possessions of Egypt, but when that power revived under the nineteenth dynasty a determined effort was made by the great princes Rameses I, Seti I, and Rameses II to recover what was lost, thus leading to a prolonged struggle with the Hittites, which culminated in the defeat of the latter in the sixth and a treaty of peace in the twenty-first year of Rameses II.[14] Palestine at least was preserved for a time to the Egyptian empire, and the Hittite confederacy seems soon afterwards to have broken up. Probably it was much weakened by the attack of northern Asiatics with European allies, some of them, perhaps, its revolted vassals who were repulsed from Egypt by Rameses III, but who had previously overrun the land of the Kheta.[15] These invaders established a colony in Palestine itself, the Pelesta known to the Israelites as Philistines. The removal of the Hittite power paved the way for the Israelite conquest in the generation ollowing Rameses II, when Egypt had again become weak, and there was no strong local state. Egypt probably disregarded the destruction of Amorite petty states, which owed her only nominal allegiance, while her supremacy to at least as great an extent was probably acknowledged by the Israelites in the time of the judges.[16]

From the thirteenth to the eighth or seventh century B.C. central Palestine was occupied by the Israelites, with a few scattered Canaanite communities, such as Jebus. The Israelites were at first usually subject to some powerful neighbour, but in the eleventh and tenth centuries B.C., under David and Solomon, they rose to the position of an imperial state, ruling all Syria as far as the Euphrates, and afterwards always maintained a position of independence, and often of power, till subdued by the great Assyrian and Babylonian kings of the eighth, seventh, and sixth centuries B.C. East of them lay the territories of Ammon, Moab, and Edom, peoples who were

[13] The names of four such—Sapalili, his son Maura-sira, and his sons Mautenara and Khetasira, contemporaries of the first three kings of the nineteenth dynasty—are known.

[14] A curious memorial of the relations of Rameses II and the Hittites exists in his name engraved (incorrectly, and therefore probably by a foreign hand) beside a Hittite inscription, near the 'Niobe' of Sipylos (see *Trans. Soc. Bibl. Archæol.* v. 158). As this is not far from the 'Pseudo-Sesostris,' it affords some excuse for the statement of Herodotos (ii. 106).

[15] See Wilson, *Egypt of the Past*, p. 523; Brugsch, *op. cit.* ii. 154; Lenormant, *op. cit.* ii. 309 *seq.*

[16] This is nowhere expressly stated, but friendly relations with Egyptians are enjoined in the law (Deut. xxiii. 7), and good relations seem always to have prevailed between Israel and Egypt.

akin to them in race and language, but who never attained any political importance, and whose civilisation was probably low. The southern part of the coast was occupied by the Philistines, an immigrant tribe unconnected with their neighbours, who, in spite of their position, seem to have shown no aptitude for trade, their tastes being wholly warlike. North of them lay the Phœnicians, the great maritime traders of ancient times, who, shrinking from war, were always ready to pay tribute to their more powerful neighbours, obtaining in return facilities for their commerce, while at Carthage, where they had no such neighbours—though even there they at first paid tribute to a petty Numidian prince—they developed an empire of their own, but maintained it almost wholly by mercenary forces. Their commercial instincts led them to spread themselves over the known world of the day, and they carried the arts and civilisation of western Asia and Egypt to Europe, north Africa, and perhaps Arabia and even India.

In northern Syria, between the Euphrates and the Mediterranean, were two rival races, the Hittites and the Aramæans, each divided into a number of separate states; but while the importance of the former was declining that of the latter was growing commercially at least, if not politically, at this period. The Hittites formed one of the two great channels by which the civilisation of the East was transmitted to the West; their influence, however, unlike that of the Phœnicians, was exercised overland, and rather as conquerors or powerful neighbours than as traders; but the presence of Hittite merchants or settlers in foreign cities is shown from Genesis xxiii. (at Hebron), and from the seals of private individuals with Hittite writing found at Nineveh along with others inscribed in Phœnician.[17] After the final overthrow of the south-eastern power of the Hittites by Sargon, in the eighth century B.C., their commercial position was taken by the Aramæans, whose language became thenceforth, till it was in part supplanted by Greek, that of commerce and diplomacy in western Asia.[18]

[17] See Sayce, in *Trans. Soc. Bibl. Arch.* vii. 302. Their commercial importance also appears from the existence of the standard 'Mina of Carchemish,' one of the Hittite capitals (see Head, *Historia Numorum*, pp. xxxii, xlvii–xlviii). This was the origin of the lighter of the two standards of weight used by the Greeks; both came originally from Babylon, the lighter overland through Carchemish and Lydia, the heavier by sea through Phoenicia; the latter was the origin of the Æginetic, the former of the Euboic or Attic stater. The latter, that of Hittite derivation, ultimately prevailed. Of the two systems of writing used by the Greeks, one, the ordinary alphabet, was of Phœnician, the other, the Asianic or so-called 'Kypriote' syllabary, probably of Hittite origin. These, like the metrological systems, serve as indications of the two channels of commercial intercourse.

[18] As such we find it used on dockets on contracts of the seventh century B.C., the body of which is Assyrian, found at Nineveh (see Taylor, *The Alphabet*, i. 252–6), as the language which the ministers of Hezekiah expected an Assyrian general to employ in diplomatic negotiations (2 Kings xviii. 26), as that which (rather than the local idiom) the Jews adopted during their captivity in Babylon, and under the Achaemenidae

The Hittites disappear from Egyptian records after the time of Rameses III, and we never again hear of them as forming a state under a single ruler, but as governed by many different kings [19] and serving as mercenaries (1 Sam. xxvi. 6, 2 Sam. xi. 21, 2 Kings vii. 6). Except during intervals of Assyrian or Israelite domination the chief local power in northern Syria seems to have been an Aramæan one, at first Zobah, afterwards Damascus. The Hittite possessions in the Orontes valley had passed from them, Kadesh, the southern capital, disappearing from history after the time of Rameses II; [20] but Carchemish, on the Euphrates, continued the capital of a Hittite state till its capture by Sargon in B.C. 717, and traces of the local religion probably continued to survive in the peculiar rites practised at Bambyke or Hierapolis, the city which took its place and flourished down to the establishment of Christianity.

The Hittite power in Kappadokia, which formed the link between Syria and Assyria on one side and Asia Minor on the other, probably began earlier than in the south and east, and lasted longer; but of its history we know even less, since (except during the period when it formed a part of the great empire which contended with Rameses II) it did not come in contact with nations like Assyria and Egypt, whose annals have come down to us. The extent of the dominion of the Hittites is largely gathered from the localities in which monuments bearing inscriptions in their peculiar writing, or showing their characteristic art, have been found. The site of Kadesh, their southern capital, was certainly in the neighbourhood of the lake of Homs, on the Orontes, either at Tell Neby Mendeh, on the river about four miles south of the lake, where a mound and extensive ruins exist, as supposed by Major Conder, [21] or, as Mr. Tomkins thinks more probable, at the north end of the lake, where an ancient dyke and remains of a great platform with corner towers still exist; [22] but no excavations have been made in this district, and

as that of documents intended for the western part of their empire (Ezra iv. 7), and of the inscriptions on coins and weights intended for use there, even in Greek districts (Taylor, *op. cit.* pp. 256–9), while under the Parthian and Sassanian dynasties it became the vernacular of Babylonia, and supplied the Semitic element of the strange mongrel dialect known as Pehlvi (Haug, *Essays*, pp. 81–92; Taylor, *op. cit.* pp. 228–55). The important inscriptions found at Sindjirli, in North Syria, belonging to about B.C. 850–720, are mostly in a dialect which resembles Hebrew tinged with Aramaic; but one, addressed to Tiglath Pileser, king of Assyria (B.C. 745–27), is said to be in pure Aramaic, of which it is one of the earliest monuments (Nöldeke, *Z.D.M.G.* 1893, p. 99).

[19] So in the time of Solomon (1 Kings x. 20) and of Jehoram (2 Kings vii. 6–7), and in Assyrian accounts of invasions by Asshurnasirpal (B.C. 885) and his successors.

[20] Unless the reading 'the land of the Hittites unto Kadesh,' in 2 Sam. xxiv. 6, supported by some manuscripts of the LXX, be adopted for the unintelligible Tachtim-Chodshi. In this case it formed part of the immediate territory of Israel in the time of David.

[21] *Twenty-one Years' Work in the Holy Land*, pp. 151–56.

[22] Tomkins, in *Trans. Soc. Bibl. Arch.* vii. 393–406; Wilson and Edwards, *Egypt of the Past*, p 414.

consequently no Hittite sculptures or inscriptions discovered.[23] At present Hamath is the most southern point at which such have been found *in situ*. Further north, in or near the Orontes valley, Hittite rock reliefs have been discovered near Antioch, apparently beside a road leading from Carchemish to the sea, which was traced by Boscawen from the former as far as Tell Erfad (Arpad), where there is a large mound covering the remains of the ancient city. Similar reliefs exist in the mountains near Alexandretta.[24] Kilikia was probably occupied by either the Hittites or some cognate race. Monuments of Hittite origin have been found in this region;[25] representations which recall those of Carchemish and Boghaz-keui, or Pteria, occur on late Kilikian coins,[26] and Tarkutimme, the king whose name occurs on the famous bilingual Hittite-Assyrian silver boss, seems to have reigned in this district.

The eastern territory of the Hittites, near the Euphrates, has yielded many important memorials of their art and writing, found at Jerabis (Carchemish) and Birejik. The road connecting their possessions in this district with those in Kappadokia and Asia Minor is marked by the sculptures found at Merash and in the neighbouring passes on the route from Carchemish to the Halys; similar remains have been found at Ghurun, in eastern Kappadokia, on the road from Malatiyeh to Boghaz-keui.[27] In Kappadokia and Lykaonia their monuments are specially numerous and important; besides those already mentioned there are sculptures or inscriptions at Ibreez,[28] Tyana, and other places, and above all at Boghaz-keui, near the Halys, apparently the chief seat of Hittite power in the north; and at Euyuk, a few miles distant,[29] where the sculptures are the most extensive and important remains of Hittite art known. West of the Halys, in districts which were probably at one time dependent on the Hittites rather than a part of their immediate territory, examples of their art and writing exist at Ghiaour Kalessi, in Phrygia, and at several places on or near Mount Sipylos. The period of Hittite influence over the Pelasgic and other races of Asia Minor west of the Halys may be safely regarded as contemporary with the great development of their power in Syria when under a single supreme monarch. This is shown by the names of Dardanians, Mæonians (or Ilians), and other peoples of Asia Minor, which occur in the list of their vassals on the monu-

[23] The masonry of the dam across the Orontes, which forms the lake, is said to resemble that of the Dunek Tash at Tarsos, which is also in a Hittite district. The latter is described by Barker, *Lares and Penates*, pp. 132–4.

[24] Sayce, in *Trans. S. B. A.* vii. 269–306.

[25] *Ibid.* vii. 306.

[26] *Ibid.* p. 250.

[27] *Ibid.* pp. 305–6.

[28] Lenormant, *Hist. Anc.* i. 414.

[29] Sayce, in *Trans. Soc. Bibl. Arch.* vii. 249; Wright, *Empire of the Hittites*, pp. 59–61; Ramsay, in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, xv. 103 *seq.*; Van Lennep, *Asia Minor*, ii. 109–58. The last writer describes the ruins at both places in great detail, with illustrations.

ments of Rameses II, and is to some extent confirmed by the occurrence of the latter's cartouche with a Hittite inscription near Mount Sipylos. East of the Halys their power probably lasted longer, and they may have continued to exercise some control in Lydia.[30]

The Hittites made use of an elaborate form of hieroglyphic writing, in the decipherment of which little progress has been made. From it was probably derived at an early period the Asianic or so-called 'Kypriote' syllabary, which, after being largely used in Asia Minor and Kypros, was finally everywhere superseded by alphabets of Phœnician origin, though some characters borrowed from it were retained by the Lykians and Karians. The Hittites themselves (perhaps owing to the unsuitability of their own script for literary works) for certain purposes made use of the writing, if not the language, of the Assyrians and Babylonians,[31] and at last, in Kappadokia, they borrowed an alphabet (about B.C. 700) from some of their Greek neighbours,[32] which they then in their turn transmitted to Phrygia and perhaps other countries. Shortly afterwards[33] the advanced guard of the great Iranian immigration reached Kappadokia. While Armenia and Media became completely Iranianised both in religion and language, the process was less complete in Kappadokia. The royal power was seized by an Iranian dynasty, who retained it till the Christian era.[34] Zoroastrianism was well established as a native cult in certain cities and districts,[35] and the Kappadokian months in the Florentine hemerology have Iranian names. On the other hand rites and beliefs of non-Iranian and probably, in part at least, of Hittite origin continued to exist in many places,[36] and the name of 'Syrians,'[37] 'White Syrians,'[38] or 'Assyrians,'[39] given to the Kappadokians testified to the belief of the Greeks in their former connexion with Syria and the Euphrates. The diversity of race and language amongst the Kappadokians of the first century B.C. is attested by Strabo (xii. 1–2).

Asia Minor west of the Halys and of Lykaonia was divided amongst a large number of tribes—Lykians, Solymi, Pamphylians, and Pisidians on or near the south coast; Karians, Lydians,

[30] Whether the Tibarenians and Moschians, who occupied a part of Kappadokia and were dangerous enemies of the Assyrians, were of Hittite origin or not it is impossible to say The latter are connected with Mazaka by Josephus (*A. J.* i. 6, but see Moses of Chorene, i. 13, p. 39). Compare Lenormant, *Hist. Anc.* i. 299.

[31] We see this from some of the Tell Amarna documents, from inscriptions found at Kaisariyeh or Zela, in Kappadokia (*Proceedings of the Soc. Bibl. Arch.* v. 41–6, vi. 24), and from clay tablets also coming from Kappadokia (*ibid.* vi. 17–24).

[32] See Ramsay, in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, xv. 122–7; Perrot, *History of Art in Phrygia*, p. 9.

[33] About B.C. 650; see Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, i. 678–9.

[34] Diodoros, xxxi. p. 147. [35] Strabo, xv. p. 326. [36] *Ibid.* xii. p. 5 *seq.*

[37] Herodotos, i. 72; Eustath. *ad* Dionys. *Perieg.* 772; Nicolas of Damascus, fr. 49.

[38] Strabo, xii. 19; Ptolemy, v. 6.

[39] Dionys. *Perieg.* 772; Skylax, *Peripl.* p. 32; Apollon. Rhod. ii. 948; with th scholia *in loc.*

Phrygians, Mysians, Dardanians, Bithynians, and Paphlagonians on the west and north. The majority of these were of Aryan race, and were settled there probably long before the Iranian occupation of Kappadokia and Armenia. Greek writers represent the Phrygians as nearly related to the Armenians, whom they allege to have been their colonists, and to have spoken a similar language.[40] But if we are justified in regarding the Aryan Armenians, like the Aryan Kappadokians, as Iranians, which the Phrygians certainly were not, this view is untenable; and there is no special resemblance to Armenian in the language of the Phrygian inscriptions.[41] It is a matter of greater doubt whether the Phrygians, Bithynians, and Mysians reached Asia Minor by way of Thrace or overland. The former opinion is asserted by most ancient writers,[42] and amongst modern ones by MM. Perrot and Chipiez [43] and others; the latter, which is *prima facie* more probable, is adopted by Duncker and Rawlinson.[44] Perhaps the true explanation of these stories of migrations from Thrace to Asia is that fugitives from the Phrygian and other colonies in Europe returned to their native country when pressed by the native Illyrian or Makedonian tribes.[45] It is difficult to determine when the Phrygians and Mysians (whencesoever they came) first settled in Asia Minor. They were there when the 'Iliad' was composed, and were believed by the Greeks to have been there at the period of the Trojan war, and it is unsafe to assume, on the merely negative evidence of their name not appearing in Egyptian records,[46] that the Phrygians were not there in the time of Rameses II and Rameses III.

The Phrygians and their neighbours were, no doubt, at one time vassals of the Hittite rulers of Pteria. The earliest monuments existing in the country are those of a distinctly Hittite character, constructed by the suzerains in the days of their greatest power in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries B.C.[47] Native Phrygian art dates at least as early as 1000 B.C.[48] It is derived from the older

[40] Herod. vii. 73; Steph. Byzant. *s.v.* Ἀρμενία.

[41] See Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, i. 677–89, iv. 67–8; Lenormant, *Les Origines de l'Histoire*, ii. 323–9; Perrot and Chipiez, *Art in Phrygia*, &c., pp. 2–3.

[42] Xanthus, frag. 5; Herodot. vii. 73–5; Thukydides, iv. 75; Xenophon, *Anabasis*, vi. 2; *Hell.* i. 3, 2; scholiast on Apollon. Rhod. ii. 181; Strabo, x. 3, p. 363; Plin. *H. N.* v. 32, p. 80; Stephan. Byzant. *s.v.* Βρίγες, Βιθυνία.

[43] *Op. cit.* pp. 1–3.

[44] Perrot and Chipiez (*op. cit.* p. 222) regard the Phrygians as settlers from Thrace about the twelfth century B.C., in a space left vacant by the great migratory movement recorded in the Egyptian documents of the twentieth dynasty, and as establishing themselves first in the Sipylos district, a colony represented by the Tantalos legend of the Greeks. This state ceased to exist in the tenth or ninth century B.C., but had colonised the Sangarios valley, the later Phrygia, where the monuments date from the eighth and seventh centuries B.C., the period of the Midas-Gordios dynasty.

[45] Something of this kind is hinted at in the story in Nicolas of Damascus, fr. 71; Constant. Porphyr. *De Themat. Asiae*, pp. 11–13; Eustathios *ad* Dionys. *Perieg.* 326.

[46] As is done by Perrot and Chipiez, *op. cit.* p. 5.

[47] See Ramsay, in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, iii. 29; Perrot and Chipiez, p. 79

[48] See Ramsay, in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, iii. 257 *seq.*

oriental civilisation of the Hittites of Kappadokia (Pteria), but has a style of its own; monuments of this period are usually uninscribed.[49] The names of Phrygian kings which occur in the Homeric poems, such as Phorkys, Askanios,[50] Dymas and his son Asios,[51] Otreus and Mygdon,[52] show no connexion with the later dynasty of Midas and Gordios.[53] In the next period Phrygian art was at its best, and is an improvement on that of the Hittites. The most important works are a considerable number of rock-cut tombs, of which the most characteristic decoration is a sort of chessboard pattern on the façade, but there are sometimes sculptures in relief or in the round. There are also important remains of cities and fortresses largely cut in the rock near the 'tomb of Midas' (identified by an inscription), and at Pishmish Kaleh, and most, if not all, the few extant Phrygian inscriptions in an alphabet of Greek origin are of the same date. To this period we may probably assign the powerful dynasty of kings styled alternately Midas and Gordios, of which the Greeks had some slight knowledge.[54] Their greatest prosperity was probably between B.C. 800 and 670, when the Phrygian state suffered so terribly from the invasion of the Kimmerians that King Midas slew himself,[55] and Phrygia never recovered its independence, but became first a vassal state of the Lydians,[56] still under the house of Midas, and then a satrapy of the Persian empire. 'The Greek influence, passing over Lydia, affected the Phrygian art. The tombs

[49] See, however, Perrot and Chipiez, p. 94, where mention is made of a brief inscription in the Asianic or 'Kypriote' syllabary on a tomb at Delikli Tach (in Phrygia), which for artistic reasons may be attributed to an early date.

[50] *Il.* ii. 863.

[51] *Ibid.* xvi. 717–9.

[52] *Ibid.* iii. 185–7; *Hymn to Aphrodite*, 111–2.

[53] In Eusebios, however (*Chron. Armen.* ii. p. 123; *Chron. Lat.* fo. 36), Midas (Mindas in Armenian) appears as contemporary with Pelops, Rameses II, and the foundation of Troy; Tantalos appears as king of Phrygia somewhat earlier (*Chron. Arm.* ii. p. 119; *Chron. Lat.* fo. 34). Other writers make 'Midas' subsequent to Homer (Diogenes Laert. i. 89, p. 23); others attribute to Homer an epitaph written for 'Midas' and inscribed on the tomb of his father Gordios (Diog. Laert. *loc. cit.*; Ps.-Herodot. *Vita Homeri*, 2, p. 562).

[54] Midas, the founder of the dynasty, was the son of a peasant, and in consequence of an oracle was made king by the Phrygians (whose previous constitution is apparently regarded as a republic) to quell intestine disturbances, a story which reminds us of that of Deiokes (Arrian. *Exped. Alex.* ii. pp. 85–7). Justin, xi. 7, has a similar story, but in it Gordios himself is made king. To his son and successor Midas I is ascribed the foundation of Ankyra (Pausanias, i. 4, 5) and other towns (Strabo, xii. p. 57), and the introduction of the orgiastic rites which were so striking a feature of the Phrygian religion. Compare Diod. iii. 59. In Hyginus, *Fab.* 191, 274 Midas is made a son of Kybele. Konon, *Narrat.* i., gives another account of the elevation of Midas to the throne. The Greeks agreed in regarding the dynasty as very wealthy (Aelian, *V. H.* xii. 45, &c.); the temporary inclusion in their empire of some of the maritime cities of Asia Minor is, perhaps, indicated by the attribution of a thalassocracy for twenty-five (in Synkellos, p. 181 B, 25 or 6) years, by Eusebios (*Chron. Arm.* i. 321), though the date assigned, 289 years after the Trojan war, seems rather too early.

[55] See Ramsay, in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, iii. 30; Strabo, i. 3, p. 97; Plutarch, who (*De Superstitione*, p. 293) ascribes his suicide to superstitious fears caused by dreams; Euseb. *Chron. Arm.* ii. 181.

[56] Herodotos, i. 35.

at first show a mixture of Greek art with oriental sculpture, but the latter gradually disappears.' [57]

Of the history of the Paphlagonians before their conquest by the Lydians, along with the other inhabitants of Asia Minor, in the fifth century B.C.,[58] we hear little. In dress they resembled both the Kappadokians and Phrygians,[59] and their few remaining monuments are like the Phrygian, though with some distinguishing characteristics.[60] No Paphlagonian inscriptions are known to exist, but in race and language they were probably closely connected with their Phrygian and Bithynian neighbours, though their position near the coast, on the highway between the great Greek emporium of Sinope and the Kappadokian capital at Pteria, may have brought them earlier under Hellenic influence. Their religion had the same general characteristics as that of the rest of northern and central Asia Minor, but some points in which it differed from that of the Phrygians are mentioned by Plutarch.[61]

For the early history of Lydia our chief authorities are Herodotos and the native historian Xanthos, who apparently made use of official records,[62] but whose work is unfortunately only known to us in the shape of fragments from the recension of it made by Dionysios of Mytilene. Greek legends represented the region of Mount Sipylos, on the coast of Lydia, as occupied at an early period by a Phrygian race, and connect it with the story of Tantalos and Pelops, whom they placed in the fourth generation before the Trojan war,[63] and who had regular maritime intercourse with the Peloponnesos. Tantalis, the capital of their kingdom, was, according to the legend, destroyed because Tantalos had incurred the wrath of the gods.[64] Existing remains in this district are of two classes, one consisting of sculptures accompanied by Hittite inscriptions, such as the two figures near Nymphi, beside the road from Smyrna and Ephesos to Sardis, which Herodotos regarded as monuments of the conquests of Sesostris,[65] and the statue cut in the rock near Magnesia, called by most Greek writers Niobe, by Pausanias (iii. 22, 4) Kybele, close to which are both Hittite inscriptions and the cartouche of

[57] Ramsay, *ubi supra.*
[58] Herodot. i. 28.
[59] *Ibid.* vii. 72–3.
[60] Perrot and Chipiez, *Phrygia*, pp. 192–211.
[61] *De Iside et Osiride*, c. 9, p. 674.
[62] Nic. Dam. fr. 49.

[63] Eusebios (*Chron. Arm.* ii. p. 123) and Synkellos (128 B) make Pelops contemporary with a Midas, king of Phrygia, and Dardanos, king of Ilion or Troas. At p. 119 Eusebios makes Tantalos king of the Phrygians *qui etiam Maeones vocabantur*; Diodoros (iv. 74) makes Tantalos dwell περὶ τὴν νῦν ὀνομαζομένην Παφλαγονίαν, whence he was expelled by Ilos son of Tros.

[64] Strabo, i. 3, p. 17, p. 92; xii. 8, 1, pp. 63–4, pp. 77–8; Sophokles, *Antigone*, 840, and Schol. Triklin. *in loc.*; Aristoteles, *Meteor.* ii. 7, p. 67; Athenaeos, xiv. 625–6 (who makes Tantalos rule in Lydia, Phrygia being a portion of his empire); Pausanias, i. 21, 5; iii. 22, 4; v. 13, 4; vii. 24, 7; viii. 2, 2–3.

[65] Herodot. ii. 106; Sayce, *Herodotos*, pp. 180–81, 426, 434; *Soc. Bibl. Arch. Trans.* vii. 264–8, 439–40.

Rameses II.[66] Another set of monuments (but closely connected with the former) consists of the remains of a rock-cut fortress and a tomb which in the opinion of Ramsay has a close resemblance to those of Phrygia proper.[67] From the Greek legends and the character of these remains Professor Ramsay's conclusion that 'Sipylos was an early seat of the old Phrygian civilisation, of which the path westward is marked by the religious centres it established, that of Zeus Bennios and the Benneitai at the head waters of the Tembris, that of Coloe in the Katakekaumene, finally that of Sipylos,' appears justified, but there is less foundation for his further assumption that the Atyadae, the first Lydian dynasty, were the priestly suzerains of the district of Sipylos, the later rulers of it being contemporary with the earlier kings of the second dynasty, or Herakleidae, who represent the establishment of a central power at Sardis, having its relations rather with the Kappadokian power at Pteria, with which its capital was connected by the 'Royal Road' passing through Phrygia proper, than with Greece, with which the legends closely connect the rulers of Sipylos.[68] Sardis, according to Strabo (xiii. 4, p. 151), was founded after the Trojan war, and therefore later than the date assigned by Herodotos for the commencement of the Herakleid dynasty.[69] The Atyadae are not connected by ancient writers with Sipylos.[70] In the 'union of native Indo-European with oriental religions which produced the peculiar worship of Asia Minor,' of which the orgiastic rites in honour of Kybele and the existence of priestly sovereignties at the great religious centres were characteristic features, the oriental element was apparently immediately at least of Hittite origin, though it may have come ultimately from Babylon or Syria.[71]

Whatever may be said about the half-mythical Atyadae, the account of the dynasty of the Herakleidae given by Herodotos (i. 7) points to their oriental origin, and we may reasonably assume with

[66] *Soc. Bibl. Arch. Trans.* vii. 440, plate 5; *Proc.* v. 148; Ramsay, in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, iii. 39 *seq.*, 63; Stewart, *Ancient Monuments in Lydia and Phrygia*, pp. 1–2, plate 2; Van Lennep, *Asia Minor*, ii. 305–25.

[67] Ramsay, *Journ. of Hell. Stud.* iii. 33–68; Perrot and Chipiez, *Phrygia*, pp. 14 *seq.*

[68] Sayce, on the contrary (*Soc. Bibl. Arch. Trans.* vii. 273), regards the legends of the Atyadae as a reminiscence of the occupation of Lydia by the Hittites (*i.e.* the ruling power in Kappadokia), and the rise of the Herakleidae as coeval with the overthrow of Hittite domination in the country.

[69] 505 years before B.C. 687 = B.C. 1192.

[70] Xanthos (iv. *ap.* Steph. Byzant. *s.v.* Ἀσκάλων) regarded the house of Tantalos as vassals of the Atyadae, making Askalos brother of Tantalos and son of Hymenaeus leader of an expedition sent by Akiamos, the Atyad king of the Lydians and founder of Askalon, to Syria, an expedition which suggests a reminiscence of the invasion of Palestine by the Hittites in the time of Rameses II, or of the great invasion of the Hittite and Egyptian territories by the northern nations repulsed by Rameses III. (Compare Xanthos *ap.* Athen. viii. 346.) Xanthos (fr. 13 *ap.* Parthen. *Erot.* 33) made Niobe daughter of Assaon, not of Tantalos.

[71] Compare Sayce, *Herodotos*, pp. 430–1.

Professor Sayce[72] that they were at the outset 'Hittite satraps of Sardes, whose power increased as that of the distant empire declined, and who finally made themselves independent rulers of the Lydian plain.'[73] Herodotos places their accession early in the twelfth century B.C.; he tells us little of their history, and that little disagrees with the information given by other writers, who probably followed the native historian Xanthos. Their connexion seems to have been rather with the east than with the Greeks, who had closer relations with the more inland Phrygians, and their power was inconsiderable, no important conquests being ascribed to them even by the native historian.[74] With the overthrow of the dynasty of the Herakleidae and the establishment of that of the Mermnadae by Gyges early in the seventh century B.C., an event related by many Greek writers,[75] we reach firmer ground. Under the kings of this dynasty, which reigned probably between B.C. 687 and 545, Lydia, while on the one hand at first (as we learn from the annals of Asshur-bani-pal) occupying a position of nominal vassalage to Assyria, which had not long before overthrown the Hittite kingdom of Carchemish (and thereby, perhaps, weakened that of Pteria), and on the other cultivating close relations with the Hellenic cities not only of Asia but even of Greece proper, gradually reduced under its sway the whole of Asia west of the Halys. The progress of these conquests was, indeed, checked by the Kimmerian invasion in the reigns of Gyges and his son, but Lydia was not so much weakened by it as some of the neighbouring states, and availed itself of their greater distress to include them in its empire. By the time of Alyattes, to whose reign probably belong many of the conquests which Herodotos ascribes to Kroesos, Lydia was in a position to maintain a long war on equal terms with the great Median monarchy, which had in conjunction with Babylon overthrown the Assyrian empire and divided its possessions, and had now, assisted perhaps by the wave of immigration which about this time substituted Iranian dynasties, language, and religion in Armenia, and partly in Kappadokia, for those previously existing there, extended itself to the Halys. The two empires were very unequal in extent, but the Lydians had the advantage of greater wealth and

[72] *Op. cit.* p. 427.

[73] Herodotos (i. 7) represents them as at first ministers or viceroys of he Atyadae (ἐπιτραφθέντες), then obtaining the sovereignty ἐκ θεοπροπίου.

[74] A thalassocracy is, however, ascribed by Diodoros and Kastor (*ap.* Euseb. *Chron.* i. p. 321, ii. p. 137, to the Lydians for ninety-two years following the Trojan war (B.C. 1183–1091), falling just after the date assigned to the accession of the Herakleidae by Herodotos (see Müller, *Castoris Reliquiae*, p. 180). The narratives contained in Nic. Dam., fr. 49, imply regular intercourse of Lydia with the Greek city of Kume, the Phrygians and other neighbouring nations, the Syrians of Kappadokia (= Hittites), and even Babylon in the time of the Herakleidae.

[75] Herod. i. 7–13; Xanthos; Nic. Dam. fr. 49 *ad fin.*; Plutarch, *Quaest. Graec.* p. 538, &c.

somewhat higher civilisation. The decisive struggle was postponed by the intervention of the Babylonian king and Syennesis of Kilikia, but when it was renewed a few years later between the Persian inheritor of the Median empire and Kroesos the latter speedily succumbed, the Lydian monarchy ceased to exist, and all Asia Minor became part of the possessions of the Achaemenidae (about B.C. 545). The monuments of the Lydians are few, the most important being the tumuli in the necropolis of Sardis, near Lake Koloe, where the remains of the huge tomb of Alyattes, described by Herodotos, are still to be seen.[76] Of Lydian inscriptions there are only a few very brief and of doubtful origin,[77] and it is not even certain to what family the language belonged. The most important monuments the Mermnadae have left are their coins, and they were perhaps the first to issue money authenticated by the stamp of the state, their wealth in precious metals turning their attention in this direction.[78] Of the other peoples inhabiting the north of Asia Minor the Dardanians and Mysians, who were undoubtedly Aryan, included amongst their cities Ilion or Troy, which occupies so prominent a place in Greek legends. They were amongst the vassals of the Hittites in their wars with Rameses II, and the excavations of Schliemann have revealed to us the numerous destructions and rebuildings of the Trojan city on the hill of Hissarlik.[79] The style of art and civilisation revealed by these excavations is rude, but the inhabitants (in this respect apparently superior to their Mykenæan contemporaries) were acquainted with writing, some of the objects found by Schliemann bearing inscriptions in the Asianic syllabary.[80]

The Karians occupied the country between Lydia and Lykia. They claimed relationship with the Lydians and Mysians, and had common religious rites, these three nations being alone admitted to the temple of Zeus Karios at Mylasa, from which all others, even the Kaunians, whose language was the same as that of the Karians, were excluded.[81] They seem, like the Lykians, to have been united in a loose federation, with republican institutions. As in some other cases in Asia Minor the federal assembly was held not in

[76] Perrot and Chipiez, *History of Art in Phrygia, Lydia,* &c. p. 258 *seq.*

[77] One at Ephesos of a few letters, and one lately found in Egypt (Sayce, in *Academy* March 1893, p. 248).

[78] The relation of the Mæonians to the Lydians is obscure; Herodotos (i. 7) and Strabo (xiii. 4, p. 151) make Mæonians an earlier name of Lydians. Others regard them as a distinct though probably kindred race whom the Lydians conquered (see Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, i. 344).

[79] Schliemann, *Troy, passim*; Baumeister, *Denkmäler, s.v.* &c.

[80] It is possible that some interference of the Hittites on behalf of Troy is represented by the legend of Memnon and the Amazons. The former was represented as sent by the 'Assyrians,' whom later Greek writers regarded as then ruling Asia (Ktesias, *Pers.* iii. 23; Kephalion, frag. 1; Moses of Chorene, i. 18 and 31).

[81] Herodot. i. 171; Strabo, xiv. 2, p. 205.

any town, but at the temple of Zeus, called by the Greeks Chrysaoreus, near the place where Stratonikeia was founded under the Seleukidae.[82] Karia never formed a single monarchy till the time of the Achaemenidae, when the Greek dynasts of Halikarnassos established a regular kingdom, which lasted till the Makedonian conquest. Though the Karians do not figure in history as a powerful or conquering people, and were often vassals of others, they were much given to warlike pursuits, both by sea and land. In early times they carried on piratical expeditions over the Aegaean,[83] a fact attested by the discovery of remains of a Karian character in some of the Greek islands in ancient [84] and modern [85] times. The suppression of these expeditions was attributed by the Greeks to Minos of Krete,[86] the expulsion of the Karians from the islands to the Ionians and Dorians χρόνῳ ὕστερον πολλῷ.[87] They continued to be a maritime people under the Achaemenidae, furnishing seventy ships to the fleet of Xerxes.[88] Their roving propensities found scope in serving as mercenaries abroad; the Kerethite troops of David were probably Karians.[89] Herodotos (i. 171) says they served in the fleet of Minos when he required; Gyges of Lydia employed Karian mercenaries, according to Plutarch,[90] and their service in Egypt is attested by Herodotos,[91] and by Karian *graffiti* existing there.[92] Further evidence of their military tastes is to be found in the invention of various parts of armour ascribed to them by Herodotos (i. 171), Anakreon, and Alkaeos,[93] and in their titles for Zeus, Stratios, Labrandeus ('of the dull axe'),[94] and Chrysaoreus.

Considerable architectural remains, especially tombs, usually tumul , but in some cases built of blocks of stone, pottery resembling archaic Greek, and other objects, have been found in Karia.[95] These probably belong to the early period, before the rise of the dynasty of Mausolos, under whom the country became largely hellenised. The chief relics of the Karian language are *graffiti*, the work of Karian mercenaries or travellers in Egypt, which are written in an alphabet derived partly from the Greek, partly from the Asianic syllabary.[96]

[82] Strabo, xiv. 2, p. 207. [83] Thukyd. i. 8; Philip. Theang. fr. 3. [84] Thukyd. i. 8.

[85] Perrot and Chipiez, *op. cit.* pp. 328–30, 399–400; Bent, in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, v. 50, ix. 32–87). [86] Thukyd. i. 4, 8.

[87] Herod. i. 171. [88] *Ibid.* vii. 93.

[89] The scholiast on Plato, *Laches*, 187, says they were the first to adopt the profession of mercenaries, citing Archilochos (fr. 24), Ephoros (lib. i.), Philemon (*Gamos*, fr. 2), Euripides, and Kratinos.

[90] *Quaest. Graec.* iv. 538. [91] ii. 152, 154, iii. 11.

[92] Sayce, in *Trans. Soc. Bibl. Arch.* ix. 112–54. [93] *Ap.* Strab. xiv. 2, p. 208.

[94] Λυδοὶ γὰρ λάβρυν τὸν πέλεκυν ὀνομάζουσι, Plut. *Q. G.* p. 538, where he gives a strange story to account for the origin of the axe borne by Zeus Labrandeus. The double axe by itself or carried by the god occurs on a coin of Mylasa (Head, *Historia Numorum*, pp. 528–9; compare p. 533), and on buildings there (Fellowes, *Asia Minor and Lycia*, p. 277).

[95] Perrot and Chipiez, *op. cit.* pp. 309–30. [96] Sayce, *loc. cit.*

The relation of the Leleges to the Karians, like that of the Mæonians to the Lydians, is obscure. Herodotos (i. 171) regards them as the same people, but other writers[97] distinguish them. The native historian, Philip of Theangela,[98] represents the Leleges as serfs of the Karians, like the Helots in Lakonia and the Penestae in Thessaly. They are said at one time to have occupied a large portion of Asia Minor, the islands, and Greece.[99] The ethnic affinities of the Lykians are still uncertain. Herodotos (i. 173) makes them settlers from Krete in the time of Minos, afterwards reinforced by a Greek colony from Athens; but their language, unlike Phrygian, has very little resemblance to Greek. Greek writers call the people, as a whole, *Λύκιοι*, and the country *Λυκία*, and in the Greek version of the bilingual native inscriptions ΛΙΚΙΟΙ, ΛΙΚΙΑ, are found, and in the Egyptian records they appear among the enemies of Rameses III as Luku[100] or Leka; but in the vernacular inscriptions the people are called Tramelê, corresponding to Τερμιλαι,[101] which Herodotos says was their earliest name, and that by which their neighbours designated them even in his time.

The constitution of Lykia was a federal republic, and lasted almost without interruption till the first century A.D., though under the Achaemenidae the Lykian, like the Karian and Greek cities, were generally governed by local dynasts.[102] In later times at least the federal assembly met not always at one particular city or temple, as usual in such cases, but at a city selected for the occasion.[103] Another peculiarity unusual in ancient times was that the cities had a different number of votes, according to their importance. The Lykians took part in the great Asiatic invasion of Egypt, and are said by Kallistratos[104] to have joined with the Treres in a successful attack on Sardis; but they seem generally to have abstained from warlike expeditions outside their own country, though they furnished

[97] Homer, *Il.* x. 428–9; Philip. Theang. *Karika*, fr. 1; Strabo, vii. 7, p. 114 (who attributes the tombs and ancient habitations still existing in Karia to the Leleges).

[98] Fr. 1. Compare Plutarch, *Q. G.* 46, p. 530.

[99] See the passage cited by Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, i. 289.

[100] Wilson and Edwards, *Egypt of the Past*, p. 489.

[101] Hekataeos, iv. *ap.* Steph. Byzant. *s.v.* Τρεμίλη, calls them Tremilae. Stephanos derives the name (in the form Τρεμιλεῖς) from Tremilos, father, according to Panyasis, of Tlos, Xanthos, Pinaros, and Kragos (who are all eponyms of Lykian cities): *τούτους δὲ τοὺς Τρεμιλέους Λυκίους Βελλεροφόντης ὠνόμασεν.* Compare Menekrates, *Lykiaka*, fr. 2; Pausanias, i. 19, 4. Probably the true explanation is that of Fellowes (*op. cit.* p. 414, &c.), that Tramelê was the name of the chief tribe occupying Xanthos and its vicinity.

[102] Strabo, xiv. 3, p. 213 *seq.*; Head, *Hist. Num.* p. 571. From the inscription on the Xanthos obelisk it appears that the dynasts of that city, which had been remarkable for its obstinate resistance to the Persian conquest, were probably Persians or Medes. Some Persian as well as native names of dynasts also occur on coins. Lykian independence of the Achaemenidae is rhetorically asserted by Isokrates (*Paneg.* p. 82).

[103] Strabo, xiv. 3, 3, p. 214.

[104] *Ap.* Strab. xiii. 4, 8, p. 154.

fifty ships to the fleet of Xerxes, and were an important maritime power even in the time of Strabo, and when invaded made a desperate resistance.[105] The numerous Lykian monuments still existing, the earliest of which date probably from the seventh or sixth centuries B.C., show, along with striking local features, a gradually increasing hellenisation, the sculptures before the middle of the fourth century B.C. exhibiting all the characteristics of good Greek work of the time. Another evidence of Greek influence is found in the existence of theatres in most of the cities.[106] Though Lykian inscriptions are numerous, many (some as early as the fifth century B.C.) are also bilingual Greek and Lykian. The Lykian alphabet, like the Karian, was partly of Greek origin, partly derived from the Asianic syllabary. After the time of Alexander it, with the language, seems to have gone out of use, the later coins bearing Greek legends only. Of the early religion of the people little is known; but, to judge from the sculptures,[107] they seem to have adopted Greek myths as early as the sixth century B.C., unless, indeed, the borrowing was the other way.

Pamphylia, as its name implies, was occupied by mixed races, both Greek and 'Barbarian.' The coast towns seem to have been originally Greek colonies,[108] but during the Persian supremacy they tended to become barbarised. Inscriptions on coins of Aspendos of this period are in a local non-Greek alphabet, while on those of Side they are in Aramaic.[109] Arrian[110] says that in Alexander's time the Sidetans spoke a barbarous dialect peculiar to themselves.

The native religion of most of the peoples of Asia Minor was characterised by nature worship, the chief god being Attys or Sabazios, apparently a solar deity, whom in some aspects the Greeks identified with Zeus.[111] Superadded to this was the worship of the Asiatic goddess, Ishtar, or Nana, or Beltis, at Babylon, Ashtoreth in Phoenicia, Atargatis or Derketo at Bambyke, which the Hittites of Carchemish and Pteria borrowed from Babylonia, modified to some extent, and introduced into Kappadokia, whence it travelled to the west of the Halys and there became associated with the native orgiastic rites. The goddess was there called Ate or Kybele (Matar Kubile in a Phrygian inscription), and under the latter name was adopted into the Greek pantheon, while at Ephesos and Magnesia she was for some reason identified with Artemis, and at Lagina, in Karia, with Hekate,[112] while Attys was confounded with

[105] Herodotos, i. 176.

[106] The Ionians of Asia set over them as kings Lykians of the house of Glaukos, according to Herodotos, i. 147. Compare Pausanias, vii. 3, 4.

[107] Such as the 'Harpy Monument.'

[108] Kallinos *ap.* Strab. xiv. 4, p. 219; Herodotos, iv. 80; Theopompos, fr. 111.

[109] Head, *op. cit.* pp. 582, 586.

[110] *Exped. Alex.* i. 26, p. 74.

[111] Sayce, *Herodot.* p. 431; Ramsay, in *Journal of Hell. Stud.* iii 46, 56.

[112] Perrot and Chipiez, *op. cit.* pp. 304–5. The goddess of Bambyke in Greek eyes

her companion Tammuz or Adonis. This cultus survived the fall of the native dynasties and the disuse of the local languages on both sides of the Halys. Its ritual was carried on by wealthy priestly colleges, whose members were commonly, as at Bambyke, eunuchs (*galli*) and whose heads sometimes exercised sovereign power over the districts round the temples, as at one of the Komanas, where the high priest in the time of Strabo (xii. 2) ranked only second to the king of Kappadokia and was almost an independent prince. The high priests of Zeus in Morimene[113] and of Men and Selene at Kabeira[114] enjoyed similar privileges. In Phrygia, at Pessinous,[115] and at the shrine of Zeus Bennios,[116] and in Lydia, perhaps, at Sipylos and Koloe,[117] a similar state of things existed. Traces of establishments of the same kind are found in the priestly colleges attached to the temples of Apollo at Branchidae, near Miletos, and of Artemis at Ephesos, but here the Greek colonists, though adopting the local worship, deprived the priesthood of political power.[118] The legend respecting the flood, which was localised at Apameia-Kibotos, in Phrygia, where it is commemorated on coins as late as the third century A.D., may also have been originally an importation from Babylon, transmitted through Carchemish (where it formed one of the local traditions inherited by Bambyke[119]) and Kappadokia.[120] Kappadokia and Asia Minor formed one of the channels through which Babylonian myths (such as those relating to Herakles and those of Ishtar and her lovers, which in Asia Minor were told of Kybele and Attys[121]) were introduced into Hellenic mythology, which in its origin was of course Aryan, and therefore unconnected with them. The Iranian immigration in the seventh century B.C. led to the introduction of Zoroastrianism at certain places in Kappadokia and Pontos. It was still flourishing at Zela and elsewhere in the time of Strabo, but had adopted the corrupt local practices of Hierodouloi and priestly rulers.[122] Even in Phrygia[123] and in Lydia[124] some of the rites of Zoroastrianism were in use in Roman times.

JOHN E. GILMORE.

partook of the characters of Hera, Athene, Aphrodite, Selene, Rhea, Artemis, Nemesis, and the Moerae (*De Dea Syra*, 32, p. 248). Strabo identifies the goddess worshipped at the two Komanas with Enyo, or the Tauric Artemis (xii. 2, p. 5, pp. 40–41).

[113] Strabo, xii. 2, p. 8. [114] *Ibid.* xii. p. 39. [115] *Ibid.* xii. 5, p. 57.

[116] Ramsay, p. 47. [117] *Ibid.* p. 38 *seq.* [118] *Ibid.* p. 51.

[119] *De Dea Syra*, 12, p. 236.

[120] Hermogenes, fr. 2; Steph. Byzant. *s.v.* Ἰκόνιον.

[121] The latter, however, were also imported through Phoenicia in the more familiar forms of the legends of Aphrodite and Adonis; some of the Herakles legends were also of Phœnician origin.

[122] Strabo, xi. 8, p. 431; xii. p. 43.

[123] Nic. Dam. fr. 128, where the custom of exposing the bodies of the dead in the case of priests is represented as Phrygian. [124] Pausanias, v. 27, 3.

Edmund, Earl of Lancaster

PART I.

PERHAPS it has been the fate of Edmund, second son of Henry III, to receive less than his due of historical notice. The attractiveness of the character of his elder brother, the importance of the kingly position, and the scantiness of our information about him as compared with Edward are obvious reasons for this neglect. Yet as king designate of Sicily Edmund was a factor, and, despite his youth, probably not an altogether passive factor, in the crisis which brought about the provisions of Oxford and the barons' war. To the overwrought impatience of the baronage the demand for 135,000 marks for the expense of getting the crown of Sicily for Edmund came as the last straw. The solace which his father provided for his disappointment of the Sicilian crown made him lord of the three great earldoms of Derby, Lancaster, and Leicester, besides extensive lands in the marches of Wales, in which he ruled like a little king. He nearly succeeded in gaining another earldom and other extensive possessions by his first marriage, while by his second he was consoled for his disappointment by becoming for eight years count regent of Champagne and lord, through his wife, of the five *châtellenies* which formed her dower until the outbreak of the French war in 1294. In this capacity he had the strongest interest in preserving that peace with France which gave Edward I time for his legal and constitutional reforms, and for the reduction of at least one part of Wales to some semblance of order as an appanage of the crown, in which Edmund was always ready to place his resources as a lord marcher of Wales and lord of three earldoms at the disposal of his brother. Edmund's desire for peace, too, largely contributed to bring about the treacherous seizure of Gascony by Philip IV, which was the effective cause of the war of 1294, a war which in its turn gave origin to the claim of Edward III to the French throne, through one of the conditions of the peace which terminated it—namely, the marriage of Isabella of France to Edward of Carnarvon. Edmund has a more direct and obvious importance in history than

any to which these facts can give him claim, as the founder of the greatness of the house of Lancaster.

Edmund, second son of Henry III and Eleanor of Provence, was born on 16 Jan. 1245, perhaps at Bury St. Edmunds, and was so named after the martyred East-Anglian king to whom Henry had prayed for a second son.[1] We hear nothing further of him until 1254, but meanwhile events were preparing for the first important incident of his life, his investiture by the pope with the crown of Sicily.

The acquisition of the crown of Sicily by the emperor Henry VI had added a new element of bitterness to the medieval struggle between the papacy and the empire. The papal power was at once threatened at its centre and lost one of its chief supports against the emperor. The papacy saw itself forced to fight for life itself. The death of Henry VI removed the immediate danger; but the papacy never forgot it, and this recollection was the secret of the implacable hostility which from 1225 onwards it displayed towards his son Frederick II, its early *protégé*, but when he became powerful and dangerous its most hated foe. For twenty-five years the struggle was intermittently continued, carried on very largely by papal exactions from the English clergy. At last by sudden and overwhelming disasters to Frederick II, and his death in 1250, the reigning pope, Innocent IV, the ablest and bitterest of Frederick's papal opponents, seemed on the point of gaining a decisive victory. Conrad IV, Frederick's son and successor in the empire, wished to make peace, but Innocent would have none of it so long as the emperor remained king of Sicily. All his efforts were directed to wresting Sicily from Conrad. As early as 1250 it was possibly offered by the pope to both Richard of Cornwall, brother of Henry III of England, and Charles of Anjou, brother of Louis IX of France and count of Provence since 1246, in the hope that he might gain thereby the assistance of one of them in men or money.[2] In August 1252 letters were addressed by him to St. Louis, Alfonse of Poitiers, his brother, and Henry III in almost identical terms, asking them to urge their respective brothers to accept his offer.[3] But Manfred, an illegitimate son of Frederick II, was very successfully defending Sicily against the pope for his

[1] Matt. Paris, *Hist. Maior*, iv. 406; *Ann. Winton*, ii. 90; *Ann. Dunst.* iii. 166; *Ann. Osn.* iv. 92; Wykes, iv. 92; *Ann. Wigorn.* iv. 437; John de Oxenedes, 174; *Contin. Flor. Wigorn.* (Taxster), ii. 179 (E. H. S.) *Alienor regina peperit filium, qui, ex nomine gloriosi regis et martyris Edmundi, Edmundus appellatur, domino rege, per literam suam domino Henrico abbati, hoc demandante, ut inter eos condictum fuit.* The continuator copied from a chronicle written at St. Edmunds for this portion of his work; and the abbot of St. Edmunds in 1245 was named Henry.

[2] Hugo Koch, *Richard von Cornwall*, i. 106; Richard Sternfeld, *Karl von Anjou als Graf der Provence*, p. 82.

[3] Rymer's *Foedera*, Record ed., i. p 284.

brother; so that neither Richard nor Charles felt very eager about the offer. Richard requested several fortresses and hostages as security, as well as the payment of a very large part of his expenses by the pope; 'otherwise,' he said, 'the pope might as well give him the moon.'[4] Charles of Anjou nearly accepted the crown on the somewhat stringent conditions on which it was offered to him on 10 June 1253. But he was not yet thoroughly master of Provence, and the offer of Hainault, which Margaret of Flanders made to him, along with the ties of kinship, induced him to refuse the somewhat shadowy boon for a more real advantage. So, though the negotiations do not seem to have been finally broken off so late as 27 Sept. 1253, the coming of this 'prince of peace and star of the morning, as Innocent IV called him, was not to take place for more than a decade.[5]

Disappointed of Richard and Charles, but still pursuing a double policy, Innocent, at the same time that he was negotiating a settlement with Conrad, on 6 March 1254 conferred the crown of Sicily on Edmund.[6] Henry III, 'lest he should seem to thirst for his own blood and the spoils of his kin' (Frederick II having married his sister Isabella as his second wife), still delayed accepting it, though the pope confirmed the grant on 14 May. But he had an influential ally to promote his schemes in Thomas of Savoy, the queen's uncle, who had married his niece; and the death of Conrad IV on 21 May 1255, preceded in December by that of Henry, son of Frederick II by Isabella, removed the English king's scruples, though Conrad left a young son, Conradin.[7] Innocent IV now commuted Henry's vow of crusade to the prosecution of his Sicilian claim in arms, and extended the tenth of ecclesiastical revenues levied for the crusade to the Holy Land, which was now to be turned to the purpose of a Sicilian expedition, from two to five years. Henry must curtail his expenses to raise money, get his son to have a seal made, and send a letter of acceptance, with letters patent naming Edmund king. If Henry only came with a good army, there would be no resistance.[8] But however much Henry might like to have his vow of crusade commuted, and however eagerly his ambition might accept the offer of the crown for his son, he was already in debt, and England was by no means the mine of wealth the papal curia believed it to be. So nothing was done; and, though he never revoked the grant to Edmund, Innocent made terms with Manfred, who had soon come to the front in spite of a provision in Conrad's will, probably dictated by an ignoble jealousy, which appointed the incom-

[4] Matt. Paris, *Hist. Maior*, v. 457.

[5] Sternfeld, pp. 92–6; *Registres d'Innocent IV*, ed. E. Berger, tome viii. introd. p. 278.

[6] Rymer, i. 297. [7] *Ibid.* i. 301. [8] *Ibid.* i. 302–4.

petent Bertold, margrave of Homburg, regent. The agreement, which ignored Edmund's claims altogether, was arrived at on 27 Sept. But the reconciliation was a hollow one. A certain Borello d'Anglone, after attempting to take Manfred in an ambush, was murdered by the inhabitants of Teano, who were devoted to Manfred and thought he had slain him. The papal party were only too eager to accuse Manfred of the guilt of connivance. Deserted by Bertold of Homburg, he fled for his life across the Apennines with a few followers, and after several hair-breadth escapes found refuge and support amongst the Saracens of Lucera.

Innocent now turned to Henry again. On 17 Nov. he wrote saying that the church, on account of its softness and suavity, could not long rule Apulia effectively, and threatening to revoke the grant if Henry did not send assistance.[9] Favours were heaped on Bertold of Homburg, who along with Cardinal Ottaviano Ubaldini was put in command of a papal army. But both armies were routed at Fezzia on 2 Dec., and Manfred began to make such alarming progress that in February 1255 Alexander IV, who succeeded Innocent IV on his death in December 1254, opened negotiations for peace with him, and sent a message to the relatives of Conradin, the young son and heir of Conrad IV, assuring them that if Conradin came to Italy he would receive him with fatherly kindness, and not only maintain his rights unimpaired but increase them.

By the beginning of April 1255 the whole of Apulia as far as Reggio was in Manfred's hands. But this did not prevent Henry's envoy, Peter of Aigueblanche, the Savoyard bishop of Hereford, from accepting a confirmation of the grant made by Alexander IV on 9 April 1255, on explicit and stringent conditions, which were, however, in some respects easier than those on which it had been offered to Charles of Anjou.[10] The kingdom was not to be divided, and was to be held by liege homage from the pope, at a rent of 2,000 ounces of gold per annum, and with the service of 300 knights for three months, when required, to defend the lands of the church in Italy. The kingdom was never to be held along with the imperial crown. Edmund was to govern his subjects well and maintain their liberties, rights, and privileges. The church was to retain Benevento, and be free saving the old rights of patronage which the kings of Sicily enjoyed. All the goods of the church taken from it by the Hohenstaufen were to be restored. Henry III was to take the oath and do homage in his son's name. Edmund himself was to repeat the homage when fifteen years old, Henry III, his son

[9] Rymer, i. 312.

[10] *bid.* 16–8; *Registres d'Innocent IV*, tome viii. introd. pp. 280–3.

Edward, and their counsellors standing surety for his doing so. In the event of his failure to fulfil the conditions at the age of fifteen he was to lose the kingdom, but if he performed them he could demand a renewal of the grant. He was to renounce the 100,000*l.* *tournois,* which Innocent IV had promised to lend or give in May 1254. His father was to pay 135,000 marks to the pope, being expenses incurred by the church in this matter of Sicily, including 21,000 offered by the pope. Ten thousand marks were to be paid before Christmas 1255, 10,000 more before Michaelmas 1256, and the whole sum by Michaelmas 1257. If the sums of money were not paid within the required terms, or the king did not come in person, or send a competent force, the pope reserved the right to revoke the grant. If Edward did not carry out the conditions on his father's death, he was to be excommunicated, and the kingdom laid under an interdict. To the fulfilment of the terms Henry pledged himself, his sons, and the kingdom of England. The revenues of Sicily were to be paid to Henry, the papal word being taken for their amount, and the right of Edmund to the throne was not to be invalidated by any composition with Manfred.

Henry had returned from Gascony in the previous December with a debt of 350,000 marks.[11] The hoketide parliament of 1255 met only to demand an elective ministry, making no response to the king's appeal for money.[12] So in May 1255 Alexander IV repeated Innocent IV's commutation of Henry's vow of crusade, and added a commutation of that of the king of Norway. The Scotch crusading tenths were added to the English crusading tenths, which were to be contributed towards the cost of a Sicilian expedition, under the pretext that Manfred had allied himself with the Saracens of Lucera. It seems as if Henry even tried to levy the charge on the Cistercian monks. At any rate the pope had to write a special letter, asking Henry to accept their prayers instead. All money destined for the crusade was to be devoted to Sicily. The archbishop of Canterbury and the papal envoy Rustand were empowered to compel those vowed to the crusade to join Henry's expedition. An appeal to Henry from the prince of Antioch to aid the Christians in Palestine was wasted on the air.[13] Yet, despite these efforts, on 18 Sept. 1255 Alexander IV had a long tale to tell Henry of misfortunes through treachery, expenses, labours, and want of money, and begged Henry to send a force to succour the places still holding out for the church, and money and a captain at once.[14] The real possession of Sicily and Apulia by Edmund seemed as far off as ever; but that did not prevent Henry from feeling as

[11] M. Paris, v. 521.

[12] *Ibid.* v. 493; *Ann. Dunst.* iii. 195; *Ann. Winton,* ii. 95; *Ann. Burton,* i. 336.

[13] Rymer, i. 320–3.

[14] Rymer, i. 328.

elated as if the kingdom were already in possession of his son when, on 18 Oct. 1255, the solemn ceremony of investiture took place. The bishop of Bologna, whom Alexander IV had promised to send as early as 13 May 1255, performed the ceremony by putting a ring on Edmund's finger.[15] All this show had to be paid for in the shape of rich gifts to the papal emissaries. The bitterness which their cupidity excited amongst the English is evidenced in the pages of Matthew Paris.[16]

Parliament met on 13 Oct., but the king got no money, not even a loan from his brother Richard.[17] Nevertheless, according to the Burton annalist, he was able to send 50,000 marks for expenses, and took an oath to set out for Sicily immediately after Michaelmas 1256.[18] Henry tried the plan of getting the various monasteries to stand security for various loans from Italian merchants, but only succeeded in getting the monks of Westminster to stand security for a loan of 4,000*l.* *tournois*.[19] In view of the discontent which his demands occasioned amongst the clergy he had, on 15 Feb. 1256, to issue orders that clerks leaving the Cinque Ports for Rome should not interfere in the matter of Sicily. The terms pressed so hardly upon him that he wrote asking for their modification, and again, on 27 March, asking for delay.[20]

Despite a letter which twenty-two magnates of the kingdom, mostly ecclesiastics, sent to Henry on 18 March, expressing their joy at having Edmund for their king,[21] the real effect of the news of Edmund's investiture in Apulia had been to cause every one to rally round the native Manfred against a foreign king imposed by the pope.[22] By 11 June the church was already losing the Terra di Lavoro. Henry failed to get money from the clergy in the Lent of 1256, on the pretext that they had consented to the acceptance of the crown of Sicily.[23] So the pope, to aid him, proceeded to issue a series of bulls, dated 21, 23, and 25 Aug., which ordered the payment to the king of the fruits of vacant bishoprics; of livings in which the incumbents were non-resident, and those held in plurality, one living to be reserved to the pluralist; of a tenth of ecclesiastical revenues, according to a new and more strict taxation; and of the goods of persons dying intestate. The tax on ecclesiastical revenue was in September extended to the goods of archbishops and bishops.[24]

[15] M. Paris, v. 515; *Ann. Burton*, i. 349; Rymer, i. 321.

[16] M. Paris, v. 499, 500, 681, 682, 722.

[17] *Ibid.* v. 520–1.

[18] *Ann. Burton*, i. 349.

[19] M. Paris, v. 682–7.

[20] Rymer, 337–8.

[21] *Ann. Burton*, i. 397–8.

[22] M. Paris, v. 531.

[23] *Ann. Burton.* i. 390–1. Perhaps Henry's pretext rested on a document dated 6 Sept. 1255, with the seals of seven bishops affixed, witnessing the acceptance of the conditions of the grant of Apulia by Peter of Aigueblanche, bishop of Hereford, in their presence, and their own consent to its acceptance (Muratori, *Antiquitates Italicae*, vi. col. 104, D).

[24] Rymer, i. 344–5.

On 2 Sept. Alexander ordered a day to be fixed for the king to set out.[25] Henry had fancied that after once obtaining Sicily he would soon be able to recover the lost possessions of his house in France. Between England and Apulia France would be crushed as between two millstones.[26] As a commentary on his optimism we have the two facts that the time for sending money, after being deferred from 29 Sept. to 6 Oct., and then to 8 Oct., had finally to be postponed till 1 June 1257, and that the Terra di Lavoro was lost by 9 Nov.[27]

At the mid-Lent parliament Henry tried a new piece of masquerading. He led forth Edmund, now twelve years old, in Apulian dress, and made a pathetic appeal for money to support his claim. But when they heard his demands 'the ears of all tingled and their hearts were vehemently astounded.' He only succeeded in wringing 52,000 marks from the reluctant clergy, 'to the irretrievable loss of the English church.'[28] The archbishop of Messina was sent by the king before 10 May with full powers for appointing a captain and providing money for the Sicilian expedition, and Henry declared his readiness to make peace with France in order to facilitate it. But on 28 June he felt so helpless that he gave instructions to the earl of Leicester and Peter of Savoy to rearrange the whole matter. Meanwhile he ordered the money collected for the crusade to be deposited in the Temple instead of being handed over to the Italian merchants in payment of the debts contracted by the pope in his name. Alexander IV ordered his agents to take no notice of Henry's commands.[29] The king's envoys were to treat for the following alternative terms, in the order given: (1) The taking away of the penalty of cassation, in the event of Henry's not fulfilling the conditions, especially as regards the payment of money. (2) The prolongation of the term, that in the meanwhile peace might be made with Manfred, on condition that Manfred should keep his principality of Tarento and other lands, renounce the kingdom to Edmund, who would marry his daughter, but hold the kingdom until from its revenues the debts owed by the king of England to the church were paid. (3) The repayment to the king of England of all the money he had paid, in return for a complete renunciation of the kingdom. (4) Release from all his debts to the church, and respite for his debts to the merchants until he should have gained possession of the kingdom, in return for the cession of the Terra di Lavoro to the church. (5) The continuance of his release from his vow of crusade, accompanied by his release from all obligations and penalties.

Henry pleaded as excuses for delay the resistance of the clergy

[25] Rymer, i. 347. [26] M. Paris, v. 516. [27] Rymer, i. 348, 350, 351.
[28] M. Paris, v. 623-4. [29] Rymer, i. 355, 360; Hardy's *Syllabus*, i. 60.

to his demands and a Welsh war which had broken out. He gave his proctors full power to renounce Sicily, if they should see fit, but left the matter entirely in the pope's hands.[30] Perhaps with the object of exciting Henry's flagging zeal, Alexander wrote to him in the course of the summer, warning him against an attempt which was going to be made to assassinate himself and his two sons, originating, of course, in Manfred. This somewhat suspicious fable was confirmed by a letter of Richard of Cornwall, the newly elected king of the Romans, who was then on a visit to Germany, which added himself and the young Conradin to the destined victims of Manfred's assassins. But the ecclesiastics were ready to believe anything of Manfred, provided it was bad enough, and it suited their purpose to spread such rumours.[31] But Henry had not perhaps the will, and certainly not the power, to do anything. On 12 Dec. 1257 the pope gave him grace till 1 June 1258, and on 19 Jan. wrote to Arlot, instructing him to delay the term for the payment of the whole sum still further, for three months from 1 June 1258. Henry could not even settle a small debt of 4,500 marks for which he had been asked on 1 Jan.[32] Arlot arrived between 17 and 24 March with bulls of interdict, and was followed by Mansuetus with still greater powers.[33] The pope wrote in May urging the payment of this small sum.[34] Henry, unable to get money from the monasteries, threatened with an interdict, and with the cost of a Welsh war which had just broken out to provide for, was obliged to meet his parliament and place himself entirely in their hands. The result was the provisions of Oxford, which placed the government of the country in the hands of a committee of the barons. In June the barons of England wrote a long letter to Alexander IV, in which, amongst other statements, they complained that the kingdom of Sicily had been accepted by Henry in opposition to their known wishes, and asked for an amelioration of the terms, if they were to proceed in the matter. But on 18 Dec. Alexander rescinded the grant, unless the conditions should be carried out, and refused to send a legate to treat about their revision.[35] Meanwhile such had been Manfred's success that, though since 20 April 1255 he had been acting nominally as the appointed regent of the young Conradin, by the desire of the Sicilians he was crowned king at Palermo on 11 Aug. 1258.

Helpless and hopeless as was his position, Henry was loth to give up the idea of seeing his son king of Sicily. He wrote to the cardinals on 16 March 1259, asking them to induce the pope to grant

[30] Rymer, i. 359–60. [31] *Ann. Burton*, i. 395. [32] Rymer, i. 366, 369.

[33] M. Paris, v. 673, 679, 682. The Tewkesbury annals give *circa* 23 April as the date of Arlot's arrival; those of Dunstable, iii. 208, immediately after Easter (24 March).

[34] Rymer, i. 373; Hardy's *Syllabus*, i. 62. [35] Rymer, i. 376, 379–80.

further delay; and on 2 Aug. of the same year a commission was appointed to treat for a legate on the affairs of Sicily. In November 1261 he wrote to the king and queen of France, and the king and queen of Navarre, asking them to intercede with the pope in Edmund's favour.[36] But at the beginning of 1262 Urban IV, the successor of Alexander IV, reopened negotiations with Charles of Anjou, who was now in a better position for undertaking the conquest of Sicily, and these advanced so near to an agreement that on 28 July 1263 he wrote to Henry to inform him that, as the English king could give the church no assistance, the papacy had determined to give the kingdom of Sicily to another. He added that the king ought to view the conduct of the holy see 'not only with complacency but with pleasure.' The last act of Henry, while under Montfort's control, was to commission the archbishop of Tarentaise, Simon de Montfort, Peter of Savoy, and John Mansell to renounce Sicily in his name and that of Edmund.[37]

Thus ended the first episode in the general history of his time with which Edmund was connected. Of his personal history during these years but little can be learnt. On 29 May 1254, being then nine years old, he sailed from Portsmouth with his mother, landed in Gascony on 12 June, and stayed there until the following December.[38] On 3 Oct., at Bordeaux, he granted the principality of Capua to his great uncle, Thomas of Savoy.[39] On 18 Oct. 1255, as related above, he was invested with the crown of Sicily by means of a ring, and was styled king by his father. On 13 Jan. 1256 he issued a grant to reward one of his Italian adherents. In April of that year a proposal was made for his marriage with the queen of Cyprus. At the mid-Lent parliament of 1257 he appeared in Apulian dress, and in the summer of that year his father meditated settling the Sicilian affair by marrying him to a daughter of Manfred. On 18 Oct. 1258 he was present at the dedication of the present Salisbury cathedral,[40] the main part of which was completed about this time, but the famous spire not until the following century (1375). He accompanied his father in the visit to France from November 1259 to April 1260, during which peace with France was finally concluded.[41] He was now fifteen years of age, and began to take an active part in public affairs. Fifteen was the age at which he was to do homage and personally fulfil the conditions of the grant of Sicily. So on 20 March 1261, perhaps as part of the general revolt from the baronial control which the king made in that year, Edmund wrote to his Sicilian subjects, asking them to prepare for his reception.[42]

[36] Rymer, i. 381, 388, 410–1; *Syllabus*, i. 67.

[37] Sternfeld, *Karl von Anjou*, 167; Rymer, i. 408–9, 457.

[38] M. Paris, v. 447. [39] Rymer, i. 308. [40] *Ann. Tewkesbury*, i. 166.

[41] *Annales Londonienses* (Stubbs, *Chron. Edw. I & Edw. II* [R.S.]), i. 53.

[42] Rymer, i. 405.

Henry's attempt proved a failure. But we find Edmund again busily engaged about Midsummer 1262, working with his father and brother for the annulment of the provisions of Oxford. On 22 July he accompanied his father on a visit to France, which lasted until 2 Feb. 1263, whose object was doubtless to gain the support of St. Louis against the English barons.[43] In the summer of that year open war had broken out between the two parties, and Edmund hastened from the Tower of London to Dover Castle. On 10 July the king wrote to him and Robert de Glaston, constable of the castle, requesting them to deliver up the castle to Henry of Sandwich, bishop of London, the baronial representative, as a preliminary to negotiations for peace. This they refused to do, pleading in a letter of 28 July that it would be a dereliction of duty on their part to do so until peace was properly made. It needed a personal command of the king to induce them to give it up finally.[44] Edmund met his brother Edward at Canterbury on 21 Sept. 1263.

On not very trustworthy authority Edmund has been included among the prisoners of Simon de Montfort taken at Lewes.[45] He went abroad, and was engaged during the summer of 1264 in assisting his mother to collect an army of mercenaries at Damme, in Flanders, to invade England. The queen's want of money to pay her motley army, however, soon led to its dispersal.[46] Edmund did not return to England until 30 Oct. 1265, when the royalist victory was already assured, if not yet completed.[47] The king and his advisers had already issued a most unwise and sweeping act of confiscation against all those who had fought at Kenilworth and Evesham on the side of Simon de Montfort. Edmund and his fellows, like most returned political refugees under such circumstances, came back burning for plunder and revenge. For these passions he and his companions found vent in helping his brother Edward to trample out the prolonged resistance from the 'disinherited,' which the act of confiscation, and the attitude assumed by the younger brother and those who thought with him, did very much to bring about.[48] Soon after Christmas 1265 he was given as one of the hostages for

[43] *Ann. Burton*, i. 500.

[44] Rymer, i. 427–8.

[45] *Continuation of Gervase of Canterbury*, ii. 219; Johannes Longus, *Chronica S. Bertini*, in Pertz, xxv. 851.

[46] Wykes, iv. 154, 155.

[47] *Ann. Winton*, ii. 103.

[48] Rishanger, *Chronicon de Bellis* (Camden Soc.), p. 49. After certain abbots had thought to appease the king by paying heavy fines to redeem their estates, the magnates rose on every side—'videlicet dominus Edmundus, G. comes Gloverniae, R. de Mortuomari, Iohannes Giffard, et multi alii, propriis emolumentis inhiantes, qui nichilominus pari ferocitate eos infestarunt, non obstante aliqua redemptione prius regi facta, nec littera protectionis obtenta causa quietis obtinendae. A qua flagitiosa inquietatione quidam abbates, sibi sagacius praecavere sperantes, et ex praemanifestiis injuriis certificati regis tuitione ad propria remearunt, sed postmodum per eandem viam inviti subire dissimularunt et regis injuriis affluenter onerati reverterunt.'

the safety of the younger Simon de Montfort, who came from his place of refuge at Axholme to treat. But there was some sharp practice somewhere, perhaps on the part of the hostages themselves, as the Waverley annalist says that when Simon saw the hostages who had been given for him in the royalist camp he knew that he was betrayed. Indeed, Simon was never allowed to go back to Axholme, but was kept a close prisoner until he managed to escape to Winchelsea, and thence to France.[49] During the summer of 1266 Edmund was stationed with an army at Warwick, to check the ravages of the garrison of 'disinherited' in Kenilworth Castle. Yet, in spite of his presence, they plundered the country, and even ventured to attack and set fire to Warwick. But Edmund attacked them, captured some, amongst them a certain Henry of Pembridge, and drove the rest back to the castle, to which the royalist army now laid siege.[50] During the siege, which lasted from 25 June to 13 Dec. 1266, Edmund commanded one of the four divisions which severally invested the four sides of the castle. The garrison did not surrender until they had suffered very great privations and terms had been granted, called the dictum de Kenilworth, by which they could redeem their lands for five times their annual value.[51]

Llywelyn of Wales had allied himself with Montfort, and still remained at war with England. So on 21 Feb. 1267 Edmund was associated with Robert Waleran in a commission to treat for peace with him. But it was not until the end of September that peace was made with Llywelyn at Shrewsbury, after Henry had threatened to march into Wales with an army.[52] On 4 and 5 June 1267 Edmund seems to have been at Paris, entertained by Robert of Artois, nephew of St. Louis, on the occasion of the knighting of Philip, second son of Louis IX and afterwards Philip III of France.[53] In the autumn of that year he co-operated with Edward and Henry of Almaine, eldest son of Richard, king of the Romans, in arranging a number of tournaments, which gave some outlet to the taste for fighting which the barons' war had stimulated.[54]

The close of the barons' war marked a period in Edmund's life, for it corresponded in time with the final disappearance of all his hopes of the Sicilian crown, which Charles of Anjou gained by his defeat of Manfred at Benevento in 1266, and of Conradin at Tagliacozzo in 1268, and led to the solace of his disappointment by the

[49] *Ann. Waverley*, ii. 368.

[50] *Ann. Dunstable*, iii. 241; *Abbreviatio Placitorum*, 182; Wykes, iv. 190–1.

[51] *Ann. Dunstable*, iii. 242; *Ann. Winton*, ii. 104; *Ann. Waverley*, ii. 373. *Ann. Bermondsey*, iii. 463, says 20 Dec. The negotiations for surrender began on 1 Nov. (Wykes, iv. 191).

[52] Rymer, i. 472, 474; *Syllabus*, i. 76; Rishanger, *Chronica* (R. S.), pp. 57, 58.

[53] 'Expensa pro militia Philippi,' in *Collection des Historiens de France par les Continuateurs de Dom Bouquet*, xxi. 395.

[54] Wykes, iv. 212.

gift of confiscated estates, which founded the greatness of the house of Lancaster, and deeply influenced the attitude of this younger branch of the royal house towards the crown. It would seem, therefore, a fitting time at which to break the course of the narrative, in order to give an account of the various grants made to Edmund, their nature and their date, so as to be able to estimate more fully his position and importance during the years of his maturity. The accompanying tables will indicate the position of his estates; and the detailed account which follows will serve to give an idea of their character and extent, the nature of the power he exercised in them, and the influence which all these circumstances were likely to have on the policy of their possessors.

Property held of Edmund, Earl of Lancaster, by Vassals.

County	K.	R.	J.	L.	Ch.
Bedfordshire	2	—	—	—	—
Buckinghamshire	8	—	—	—	—
Derbyshire	84	—	—	—	9
Hertfordshire	1	—	—	—	—
Lancashire	15	—	—	—	1
Leicestershire	72	4	2	2	2
Lincolnshire	73	6	3	—	2
Northamptonshire	43	—	—	—	—
Nottinghamshire	14	—	—	—	—
Staffordshire	30	—	—	—	7
Suffolk	24	1	—	—	7
Warwick	22	—	—	—	—

K.—Places in which his vassals held manors or land by knight service from him.
R.—Number of places in which his vassals held land by rent or a rent from him.
J.—Number of places in which his vassals held judicial rights from him.
L.—Places where his vassals held land of him, service or rent not mentioned.
Ch.—Number of churches which his vassals held of him.

Property held by Edmund, Earl of Lancaster, in Demesne.

County	Manors	Castles	K.	M.	R.	F.	J.	L.	Ch.	V.	Hun.
Bedfordshire	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Berkshire	2	—	9	—	—	1	—	—	1	1	—
Buckinghamshire	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Derbyshire	10	—	—	18	1	1	—	2	1	9	2
Dorsetshire	1	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hereford	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lancashire	3	2	4	—	42	7	—	30	—	—	1
Leicestershire	4	—	—	—	—	2	1	—	—	—	—
Middlesex	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Norfolk	3	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Northampton	4	—	17	5	—	1	—	3	3	—	—
Northumberland	2	—	8	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—
Staffordshire	12	1	—	2	—	6	—	2	4	3	—
Warwick	—	1	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—
Wiltshire	3	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Yorkshire	2	1	—	1	—	2	—	—	—	—	—

K.—Places in which Edmund held knights' fees or fractions of knights' fees.
M.—Members of a manor.
R.—Rents or places held by a rent.
F.—Forests or parks.
J.—Places where Edmund held a judicial right (such as a view of frankpledge, or a free court).
L.—Lands not reckoned by knights' fees, rents, or manors.
Ch.—Church or advowson of a church.
V.—Vills.
Hun.—Hundreds.

On 26 Oct. 1265 his father granted to him the earldom and honour of Leicester, along with all the lands and tenements formerly belonging to Simon de Montfort and Nicholas de Segrave.[55] On 6 Dec. in the same year he received a further grant of the castles of Cardigan and Carmarthen, and the manor of Down-Ampney, while on the 26th of that month letters patent of intendence and respondence were issued, commanding the tenants of the domains which were in the hands of the late earl of Leicester and Nicholas de Segrave to be henceforth answerable to him. On 8 Jan. 1266 letters patent were issued granting to him the demesnes of Dilwyn, Lugwardine, Marden, Minsterworth, and Rodley during pleasure.[56]

Robert de Ferrers, earl of Derby, seems to have been a sort of after-type of the great feudatories of the reign of Stephen. He is described as faithful to neither king nor barons. In the summer of 1263 he marched about the country plundering and burning indiscriminately.[57] His failure to appear in time at the battle of Lewes compelled Montfort to fight without him, and thereby with his inferior numbers incur great risk of a defeat.[58] Like the earl of Gloucester he incurred the hostility of Simon de Montfort after the battle of Lewes. Fearing his power, according to Wykes, Simon imprisoned him, as he would have imprisoned Gloucester if he had got the chance.[59] He had incurred Henry's hostility too deeply for the royalist victory to give him an immediate release as an enemy of Montfort. However on 5 Dec. 1265 he received a pardon for all the trespasses committed by him against the realm up to that date, in consideration of the payment of a fine to the king of 1,500 marks, and for a cup of gold, which he undertook to pay to the king on 18 Dec.[60] But after his release he placed himself at the head of the 'disinherited,' and was taken prisoner at Chesterfield on 15 May 1266.[61] On 28 June 1266 all his forfeited castles, lands, and tenements were granted to Edmund. This grant was supplemented by a further grant on 15 Aug. of all the lands and tenements of the king's enemies and felons in the fees of Robert de Ferrers, formerly earl of Derby, saving all bestowals of lands which the king had made prior to the grant.[62] The fourteenth clause of the dictum de Kenilworth, published on 31 Oct. 1266, fixed the amount for which Earl Ferrers could redeem his lands at seven

[55] Rymer, i. 465; *Calend. Rot. Chart.* (Record Commission), p. 92.

[56] *Appendix to the 31st Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records*, p. 9.

[57] Rishanger, p. 13.

[58] Fragment of a chronicle written at Battle Abbey, printed in appendix to Bémont's *Simon de Montfort*, p. 376.

[59] Wykes, iv. 160.

[60] *Appendix to the Deputy Keeper's 31st Report*, p. 9.

[61] Rishanger, p. 48; Wykes, iv. 188–9; *Cont. Flor. Wigorn.* ii. 197; *Liber de Antiquis Legibus*, p. 86; *Robert of Gloucester*, ii. 564.

[62] *Appendix to 31st Report*, p. 9; Nichol's *Leicestershire*, app. to vol. i. pt. i. p. 41.

times their annual revenue.[63] But Edmund still continued to hold the lands, and on 3 Jan. 1267 letters patent of intendence and respondence in his favour were sent to the tenants of the Ferrers estates.[64] On 1 May 1269 Ferrers pledged himself in his prison at Chippenham to pay Edmund 50,000*l.* on one day for his interest in his estates;[65] but he was unable to do so, and lost an action which he brought in 1270 to recover his lands, pleading that the promise was made under duress, as well as another in 1274.[66] On 7 June 1275 letters patent were issued by Edward I, granting that if Robert de Ferrers, whose lands were held by Edmund, the king's brother, until he should redeem them by payment of 50,000*l.*, should die leaving heirs under age, the wardship and marriage of those heirs, which properly pertained to the crown, should be transferred to Edmund.[67] Neither Robert nor his heirs could ever pay the money, and Edward I made the grant of the Ferrers estates still more complete by that of Chartley Castle on 26 July 1276, and by letters patent of 5 May 1277 releasing Edmund from the debts due at the exchequer from Robert de Ferrers and his ancestors, the former tenants of the castle and honour of Tutbury, and the honour of the earldom of Derby.[68]

On 2 June 1266 Edmund was appointed keeper of the Isle of Lundy. On 15 Aug. 1266 he received from his father a grant by letters patent of all the lands which he should be able to conquer from the Welsh, then at war with the king, except such as had been taken by the Welsh from those who had stood faithful to the king.[69] On 10 Dec. following he received Kenilworth Castle, saving the advowsons of Kenilworth Priory and Stoneleigh Abbey,[70] and on 28 Dec. the castle of Builth.[71] At London on 30 June 1267 Edward, his elder brother, surrendered to him the use of the castles of Grosmont, Skenefrith, Whitecastle, and Monmouth, which were granted to Edmund by a charter of the same date.[72] On the same day he received a grant of the earldom of Lancaster and of the honours of Lancaster, Newcastle-under-Lyme, and Pickering, and the manors of Scalby, Godmanchester, and Huntingdon.[73] A return of 12 Edward I mentions Edmund as accountable

[63] Stubbs, *Select Charters*, 6th ed. p. 422.

[64] *Appendix to* 31*st Report*, p. 10; Nichol's *Leic.* app. to vol. i. pt. i. p. 42.

[65] Dugdale's *Baronage*, i. 264; Knighton, col. 2438; *Chron. de Melsa*, ii. 132.

[66] Dugdale's *Baronage*, i. 264; *Abbreviatio Placitorum*, p. 187.

[67] *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 3 Edw. I, in *Appendix to Deputy Keeper's* 44*th Report*, p. 94.

[68] *Appendix to* 31*st Report*, p. 12; Doyle, *Official Baronage of England*, ii. 309.

[69] *Appendix to* 31*st Report*, p. 9.

[70] *Ibid.* p. 9; Nichol's *Leic.* vol. i. pt. i. app. p. 19.

[71] *Appendix to* 31*st Report*, p. 10; *Cal. Rot. Pat.* (Rec. Comm.), p. 40.

[72] *Appendix to* 31*st Report*, p. 10; *Cal. Rot. Pat.* p. 90.

[73] *Appendix to* 31*st Report*, p. 10; *Cal. Rot. Chart.* p. 94; Nichol, i. pt. i. app. p. 19; Doyle, *Baronage of England*, ii. 309.

to the king (in the capacity of hereditary sheriff) for the revenues of the county of Lancaster, for the last quarter of the 51st of Henry III, and also for the years 1–12 Edward I, *sed tantum de debitis regis.*[74] Supplementary to these grants are letters patent, dated 18 Oct., declaring that the rent of 10*l.* and the homage and service of Michael Fleming, due for his lands in Furness, first answered and paid by him to the king direct at his exchequer, and subsequently through the hands of the abbot and convent of Furness, by royal grant should hereafter be paid by the abbot to Edmund, as lord of the honour and county of Lancaster. Letters patent of respondence to the prior and convent of Trentham and the tenants of the honour of Lancaster are dated 30 Jan. and 15 Feb. respectively. On 18 Aug. 1268 letters patent were issued commanding the sheriffs of the counties into which the honour of Lancaster extended not to interfere in aught that concerned that honour; and on 15 Sept. letters patent promising to idemnify Roger de Lancaster, to whom the king had committed the custody of the county of Lancaster for life, for 100 marks yearly, payable at the exchequer.[75] The letters patent commanding the obedience of the tenants of the honour and forest of Pickering are dated as late as 6 April 1269.[76]

On 10 Sept. 1268 Henry granted to Edmund the manor of Ashby, which had escheated to the king by the felony of William of Ashby, who had slain a man in Catesby Priory.[77] On 22 April 1269 Edmund received a confirmation of the grant of the possessions of Simon de Montfort, with special mention of the lands lately held by John le Viscount in Northumberland, whilst on 9 May he received a grant for life of the office of seneschal of England, formerly held by Simon de Montfort.[78] On 7 July 1269 it appears that Edmund recovered twenty marks of land, which had belonged to the honour of Leicester, in the villages of Althorpe and Snaresdelf.[79] On 1 April 1270 Edmund was released by letters patent from a debt due to the king from the former tenant of the honour of Monmouth, the amount of which is stated at 1,777*l.* 14*s.* 5*d.*[80] Under the dates 15 and 16 June 1270 is a series of letters patent commanding the following tenants of Edmund to do homage to him: Pain de Chaworth, for lands held of the castles and county of Cardigan, and the castle and county of Carmarthen; Henry de Percy, for lands held of the honour of Pickering; Henry de Lacy, Robert de Stockport, Adam de Holand, the abbot of Furness, and William le Botiler, for lands held of the honour of

[74] *Appendix to* 31*st Report*, p. 301. [75] *Ibid.* p. 10; Nichol, i. pt. i. app. p. 20.
[76] *Appendix to* 31*st Report*, p. 11. [77] *Ibid.* p. 10; Nichol, i. pt. i. app. p. 20.
[78] *Appendix to* 31*st Report*, p. 11; Nichol, i. pt. i. app. p. 42.
[79] *Abbreviatio Placitorum*, 169.
[80] *Appendix to* 31*st Report*, p. 11. The amount is given in the MS. Calendar of the Duchy of Lancaster Charters in the Record Office.

Lancaster.[81] On 24 Jan. 1271 Henry III granted to him in tail the manors of Melbourne, Kingeslawe, Dilwyn, Lugwardine, Marden, Bere, Rodley, Minsterworth, and Easingwold with its member of Hoby, which were formerly in the tenancy of Simon de Montfort, to hold by the service of two knights' fees.[82]

On 20 Aug. 1274 he claimed the office of seneschal for life, conferred on him by his father,[83] and it was granted to him by Edward I on 27 Feb. 1275. On the 17th of that month Edward committed to him the manor of Chawton, late of Hamo l'Estrange, deceased, and by letters patent of the 27th exempted him from answering at the exchequer for the issues of the said manor.[84] On 5 May 1277 Edward I issued letters patent releasing Edmund, his brother, tenant of the manor, castle, and honour of Monmouth, from the debts to the king from the former tenants, John de Monmouth and his ancestors, saving to the king his recovery should the same pass into other hands than Edmund's or the lawful heirs of his body; similar letters of the same date respecting the debts, &c., due at the exchequer from Simon de Monfort, late earl of Leicester, and his ancestors; from Robert de Ferrers and his ancestors; Robert de Bellême and his ancestors, the former tenants of the castle, town, and honour of Lancaster (9 May); and from Hubert de Burgh and his ancestors, the former tenants of the castles of Skenefrith,[85] Grosmont, and Whitecastle (13 May). Similar letters patent for the lands late of John le Viscount, in Northumberland, were issued on 11 Nov. 1278, along with a reissue of the letters of May 1277, with the exception of those referring to the lands held by Hubert de Burgh.[86] On 29 Dec. 1278 Edmund and his second wife, Blanche of Navarre, received a grant (probably by purchase) from Roger de Meuland, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, of 'a plot of land which was of Robert de Cupere,' *in vico Westmonasterii*, 'near the church called Wytechurch, lying between the plot of land of the aforesaid Edmund, which was formerly of Peter of Savoy,' the grant being confirmed by the dean and chapter of Lichfield on 15 April.[87]

On 10 Nov. 1279 he received a grant from his brother the king of the manors of Wirksworth and Ashborne, and the wapentake of Wirksworth, in the county of Derby, in exchange for the counties

[81] *Appendix to 31st Report*, p. 11.

[82] *Ibid.* p. 12; Nichol, i. pt. i. app. p. 21. Edmund granted Bere to the Cistercian nunnery of Tarrant-Crawford (*Rot. Hund.* i. 100); Rodley to Edmund Talbot, after whose death it escheated to the crown; Minsterworth to Robert de Turberville. But, according to Dugdale, Edmund's second son, Henry, succeeded to both these manors on his father's death.

[83] Rymer, i. 515.

[84] *Cal. of Pat. Rolls*, 3 Edw. I, in *Appendix to Deputy Keeper's 44th Report*, p. 94.

[85] *Appendix to 31st Report*, p. 12.

[86] *Ibid.* p. 13.

[87] *Appendix to 35th Report*, p. 22.

and castles of Cardigan and Carmarthen.[88] On 10 June 1280 letters patent were issued declaring that Matlock-Underwood and Bradley should be deemed members of the manors of Ashborne and Wirksworth, and the wapentake of Wirksworth, notwithstanding their non-specification in the charter granting to Edmund the said hundred and manors, in exchange for the castles and counties of Cardigan and Carmarthen, saving to the said earl all the other members and appurtenances of the premises, although not specified either in the aforesaid charter or in the present letters patent.[89] On the same day too the king granted to him a toft and three oxgangs of land in his manor of Scalby, lately recovered as the king's right, by award of the justices in eyre at York, against William de Everley and others. On 14 Jan. 1281 Edward issued letters patent remitting to him a loan of 700 marks in compensation for the lands in the honour of Monmouth, given by Edward before his accession to Reginald de Grey and Richard Talbot, before he granted the said honour to his brother Edmund. These were accompanied by other letters patent, granting to him the homage and service of Reginald de Grey and Richard Talbot for their lands of Llandingat and Longhope.[90] On 23 May 1281 Edward granted him the homage and service of Roger de Clifford, due to the king for the lands and tenements hitherto held by him of the king in the vill and honour of Monmouth, and on 27 May issued letters patent commanding Gregory de Rokesley and Orlando de Podio, the keepers of the mint at London, to deliver to Edmund, the king's brother, 1,000 marks for certain lands in the honour of Monmouth, of which the king ought to have given him livery, and which Roger de Clifford held by the king's special favour. On 2 June 1281 further letters patent were issued, granting him the homage and service of Reginald de Grey, Roger de Clifford, and Richard Talbot, Llandingat (Carmarthen) and Longhope (Gloucester) in the honour of Monmouth.[91] On 8 Aug. 1284, at Kenilworth, Edmund received a grant in fee from William, son of William de Sadyngton, of all the lands and tenements with their appurtenants, which he had in Leicester, Bruntingthorp, and Ayleston, along with one of the service of William's mother, Elena, tenant for life in these lands, supplemented by a quit claim (undated) from Elena, widow of William

[88] *Appendix to* 31*st Report*, p. 13; Nichol, vol. i. pt. i. app. p. 23; *Cal. Rot. Pat.* (R. C.), p. 48. The wapentake of Wirksworth was valued at 260*l.* per annum (*Rot. Hund.* ii. 288).

[89] *Appendix to* 31*st Report*, p. 13; Nichol, vol. i. pt. i. p. 22.

[90] *Appendix to* 31*st Report*, p. 13.

[91] *Appendix to* 50*th Report*, p. 77; *Appendix to* 31*st Report*, p. 14. On 15 Jan. 1281 Edward I remitted to his brother 700 marks, being a loan lately made to him in West Wales by the hand of Radulph le Broghton, the king's receiver there, in compensation for the lands and tenements given by the king to R. de Grey and R. de Talbot, before he gave the said honour to his brother. Edward had made a promise to restore all that had been alienated, from which Edmund now released him.

de Sadyngton of Leicester, to Edmund, earl of Lancaster, of all her right in the piece of land which she held of him for term of life in the town of Leicester, 'situate at the corner of Appel Lane, over against the church of St. Nicholas.'[92] On 17 Aug. 1285 Edward I issued a charter confirming a grant made to Edmund and Blanche, his wife, by Thomas Wolf, of Dover, of a tenement within the liberty of Dover. Of the same date are letters of confirmation of several grants made to Edmund touching the manor of the Savoy, viz. Queen Eleanor's grant to Edmund of the estate of Peter of Savoy, purchased by her of the convent of Montjoux; the deed of sale of the manor to her from the provost and convent; King Henry III's confirmation, dated 9 July 1268, of the bequest of the estate to the house of Montjoux by will of Peter of Savoy, and the charter of Roger de Meuland, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, to Edmund and Blanche, his wife, of certain land adjoining the Savoy estate, with the dean and chapter's confirmation of the bishop's grant.[93]

On 15 July 1291 were issued letters patent granting him the homage of Theobald le Butiler, Margaret de Nevile, and Ingram de Guisnes for the lands which they held by knight's service of the honour of Lancaster. On 12 April 1292 he received letters patent pardoning him the arrears of service for his lands and tenements between the rivers Ribble and Mersey up to that date.[94] On 21 June 1293 he received license to castellate and fortify his mansion in the parish of St. Clement Danes, London, called the Savoy.[95] On 24 Sept. 1295 Edward I granted to him the homage and service of Richard le Waleton and his heirs for lands in Walton, Wavertree, and Newsham, the custody whereof, and the marriage of the heirs, the king had lately recovered by judgment of the court against Robert de Holland;[96] also the sheriff's tourn in Furness, lately recovered by the king by judgment of the court against the abbot of Furness; the wreck of the sea in Lytham, recovered against the prior of Durham; wreck of the sea and waif in Cartmell-in-Furness, recovered against the prior of Cartmell; and wreck of the sea in the manor of Nicholas Blundell of Aymulnedale, recovered against the said Nicholas.[97]

Edmund also received various grants of the right of holding fairs and markets at his various manors, besides those which he inherited from his predecessors. On 2 Nov. 1267 he obtained the right of holding a market and fair at his manor of Shapwick, in Dorset; on 10 Sept. 1268 of holding a market and fair at his

[92] *Appendix to 35th Report*, p. 38.

[93] *Appendix to 31st Report*, pp. 14, 15. See above, p. 34.

[94] *Appendix to 31st Report*, p. 14.

[95] *Ibid.* p. 15: Rymer, i. 789; *Cal. Rot. Pat.* (R. C.), p. 56; Nichol, vol. i. pt. ii. app. p. 23.

[96] *Appendix to 31st Report*, p. 17; Nichol, vol. i. pt. i. app. p. 23.

[97] *Appendix to 31st Report*, pp. 17–8; *Cal. Rot. Chart.* (R. C.), p. 126.

manor of Kenilworth;[98] on 18 Oct. 1270 of holding a market and fair at his manor of Bagworth (Leicestershire),[99] in 56 Henry III of holding a market at his manor of Skipsea (Yorkshire), and fairs at his manors of Hedon and Pocklington,[100] and on 5 June 1291 of fairs at his manors of Pickering and Easingwold.[101] All these fairs and markets would of course mean a considerable revenue to the earl in the shape of tolls. The grants of forest rights in his lands which Edmund received were also considerable. This, when we remember how jealous the crown was to maintain its forest rights, and how eager the nation to curtail those rights, which were the 'shrine and bower of kingship,' becomes a fact of considerable significance. On 24 Dec. 1266 he received a grant of free chase and free warren in all his demesne lands and woods belonging to the castle of Kenilworth,[102] and on 5 June 1291 a grant of free warren in all his demesne lands of Melbourne,[103] whilst a grant of 12 Jan. 1267 mentions the earl's free chase of Wisseby and Wimburgholt [104] (perhaps the one in the precincts of Kenilworth Castle, referred to above).

Edward I on 25 May 1285 granted to him justices to hold pleas of his forest at his request in chancery, and determine trespasses done in his parks and chases, together with the fines and amerciaments arising therefrom, as fully as the king would have them if the forests, parks, and chases were in his own hands.[105] In pursuance of this Roger Brabazon and Hugh de Brandeston were appointed, at the instance of Edmund, on 28 Feb. 1287, to be justices to hear and determine all trespasses committed in his parks and chases within the county of Warwick.[106]

The nature of the power and privileges enjoyed by Edmund in his lands is indicated by several royal grants. On 12 Jan. 1267 Henry III granted to him to have and to hold all his lands and fees, with all their liberties and free customs, free and quit from the suits of the shires and hundreds, and of the sheriffs, whether it be taken by hides or carucates of land; from giving money for murder or robbery committed in his lands whose author could not be discovered; and from the pennies pertaining to frankpledge, and from toll and theam, infangethef, and utfangethef, sac and soc; and from his demesnes throughout the royal demesnes of

[98] *Appendix to* 31*st Report*, p. 10.

[99] *Ibid.* p. 12. In 4 Ed. I he surrendered Bagworth manor to James Mesnille, who had brought an action to recover it for a sum of money. See the MS. Calendar of Duchy of Lancaster Charters in the Record Office, and *Cal. of Pat. Rolls* 3 Edw. I, in *Appendix to* 44*th Report*, p. 16.

[100] *Cal. Rot. Chart.* (R. C.), p. 105.

[101] *Appendix to* 31*st Report*, p. 16; *Cal. Rot. Chart.* p. 121.

[102] *Appendix to* 31*st Report*, p. 10

[103] *Ibid.* p. 16; *Cal. Rot. Pat.* (R. C.), p. 121.

[104] Nichol, i. pt i. app. p. 19.

[105] *Appendix to* 31*st Report*, p. 14; *Cal. Rot. Pat.* (R. C.), p. 52.

[106] *Appendix to* 31*st Report*, p. 15; Nichol, i. pt. i. App. p. 22.

pontage and passage, toll, pedage, stallage, cornage, and tallage, gelds and danegelds, bloodwite and fictwite; labour for castles, walls, bridges, parks, ditches, chalk pits, and houses; and the free chase of Wisseby and Wimburgholt, and the taking of venison in those woods which had lately been sworn to by lawful men in the royal court at Westminster, the aforesaid woods to be free from vast and reguard.[107] In his Welsh lands the power which Edmund enjoyed was regal, like that of the other lords marchers, as, for instance, that of the earls of Gloucester in Glamorgan. On 6 Nov. 1268 Henry III issued letters patent granting to him *jus regale* in his lands and castles of Cardigan, Carmarthen, Skenefrith, Grosmont, and Whitecastle—namely, that his writ should run in future there as the king's writ had been accustomed before to run, in like manner as the other lords marchers' had in their lands in the marches of Wales.[108] He even enjoyed in his lands, both in England and Wales, by grant of the king, a right similar to the royal right of purveyance. At Aberconway on 17 March 1295 were issued letters patent commanding that the officers and deputies of Edmund might be allowed to take the corn and victuals of his men and tenants to the use of the said Edmund, according to the king's charter, whereby it was granted that none of the king's officers might take corn and victuals from such tenants for the king's use.[109]

The extent of Earl Edmund's possessions and their scattered character may be realised from the fact that he held property in twenty-five out of the then thirty-nine counties of England, and in Wales for some time the castles and counties of Cardigan and Carmarthen, and permanently the lordship and castle of Kidwelly, the lordship of Carnwallon, and lands at Llandingat (all in modern Carmarthenshire), the castle of Builth (in what is now Brecknockshire), and the castles of Grosmont, Skenefrith, and Whitecastle, in what is now Monmouthshire, but which then formed part of the marches of Wales. An approximate idea of their distribution may be gained from the following statistics, compiled from the printed calendar of the 'Inquisitiones post Mortem'[110] and the various grants mentioned above. The number of places in the various counties at which he possessed property, generally a manor or land held in demesne or by a tenant of his, sometimes the advowson of a church, a rent, chase, right of fishing, view of frankpledge, free court, toft, forge,

[107] Nichol's *Leic.* vol. i. pt. i. app. p. 19, *de dominicis suis per dominica nostra.* Taken together with the nature of the dues mentioned the sense seems ambiguous.

[108] *Appendix to 31st Report*, p. 10; Nichol, i. pt. i. p. 20.

[109] *Appendix to 31st Report*, p. 17.

[110] *Calendarium Inquisitionum p r tem* (R. C.), i. 136–43. On referring to the original Inquisition I find that the printed calendar is in many respects unsatisfactory as a basis to work on, but it is the only one possible until the Inquisition be edited in full. The following is an extract from a rent roll of Edmund in Salford

or house, is as follows, those counties being given first in which there were the most places where he had property: In Derbyshire there were 125 places, in Lancashire 92, in Lincolnshire 79, in Leicestershire 72, in Staffordshire 58, in Northamptonshire 56, in Nottinghamshire 25, in Warwickshire 23, in Suffolk 21, in Berkshire 13, in Yorkshire 12, in Northumberland 11, in Buckinghamshire 9, in the marches of Wales 8, in Wiltshire 6, in Essex 4, in Gloucestershire 4, in Herefordshire 3, in Huntingdonshire 3, in Bedfordshire 2, in Rutland 2, in Dorset 1, in Hertfordshire 1, in Kent 1, and in Middlesex 1 (the manor of the Savoy). The total number of places in England and Wales at which he held property was 632.

town and hundred, in 10 Ed I (1281–2), taken from Harland's *Mamecestre* (Chetham Soc.), p. 172, note 5, as set forth in the survey of Lonsdale in 25 Ed. I (1297), preserved among the Harleian MSS. (Cod. 2085, fol. 528 b):—

'*Extent of the Lands of the Earl in the Wappentach of Launsdale, in co. Lancashire, 25 Ed. I, at the Death of Edmund, Earl of Lancaster, Salford Town in the aforesaid account by*

	£	s.	d.
'Rent of assize of the town of Salford, with the rent of one toft near the bridge	6	14	9
Farm of the water mill there	3	0	0
Toll and stallage of the market and fair there	2	6	7½
Small plots or places there		13	1¾
Pleas and perquisites of the court		2	0
Total	12	16	6¼
'*Salford Wappentach.*			
Assize rent of Broughton	2	8	0
Assize rent of Ordsall	1	12	0
Assize rent of Cadishead		4	0
Assize rent of 'Schoresworth'		2	6
Assize rent of Tonge		4	0
Farm of the land of Augustus de Barton	1	6	0
Farm of the land of William de Radcliffe		17	8
Farm of the land of Roger de Middleton in Cheetham		13	4
Farm of the land of Alice de Prestwich in Prestwich, Holland, and 'Scholesworth'	1	6	8
Farm of the land of Roger Pilkington in Rivington		10	0
Farm of the land of Geoffrey de Hulme in Hulme		5	0
Farm of the land of Alice de Prestwich in Pendlebury		10	0
Farm of the land of William Fitz-Roger in Reddish		6	0
Farm of the land of Richard Pilkington	1	0	0
Farm of the land of Henry de Trafford		5	0
Farm of the land of Richard de Byrom	1	4	0
Farm of the land of Hugh Mesnil in Worsley and Hulton	1	0	0
Farm of the land of William de Bradshaw in Blackrod (yearly)	1	0	0
Farm of the town of Clifton		8	0
Sake fee of the land of Richard Fitz-Roger		10	0
Moiety of the town of Flixton for sake fee		1	6
The same rent for the land of John de la Ware	4	3	6
Rent of Jordan de Crompton			1
Farm of the bailiff in sergeantry there	16	0	6
Pleas and perquisites of the court of the Wappentach there	4	7	3
Total	40	6	0'

His lands included 36$\frac{5}{24}$ knights' fees held in demesne and 227 and a fraction of which he was overlord, giving a total of 263$\frac{1}{5}$ knights' fees. Their annual value, exclusive of the Ferrars estates and others, amounted, according to the Inquisition,[111] to 1,193*l.* 18*s.* 1*d.* In August 1290 Edmund, in the course of some negotiations for the marriage of his son Thomas with Beatrice of Burgundy, asserted that the lands to which Thomas would succeed (which did not include the Welsh lands) were of the value of 18,000 black pounds of Tours annually.[112]

The order in which the counties arrange themselves, taking the knights' fees which the earl had in them as the standard, varies slightly from the order estimated by the number of places. The numbers are as follows :—

—	Knights' fees in the hands of tenants	In demesne	Total
1. Derbyshire	41$\frac{1}{2}$ (*circa*)	2	43$\frac{1}{2}$
2. Lincolnshire . . .	39$\frac{4}{5}$	1	40$\frac{4}{5}$
3. Leicestershire . . .	37$\frac{11}{12}$	—	37$\frac{11}{12}$
4. Northamptonshire .	21$\frac{1}{3}$ (*circa*)	6 (nearly)	27$\frac{1}{3}$ (*circa*)
5. Staffordshire . . .	17$\frac{4}{5}$ (*circa*)	—	17$\frac{4}{5}$
6. Lancashire	14$\frac{1}{16}$	3$\frac{1}{2}$	17$\frac{9}{16}$
7. Suffolk	17$\frac{11}{28}$	—	17$\frac{11}{28}$
8. Nottinghamshire . .	3	10$\frac{1}{12}$	13$\frac{1}{12}$
9. Warwickshire . . .	11$\frac{7}{10}$	—	11$\frac{7}{10}$
10. Buckinghamshire .	10$\frac{3}{4}$	—	10$\frac{3}{4}$
11. Essex	6	—	6
12. Berkshire	—	4$\frac{7}{8}$	4$\frac{7}{8}$
13. Northumberland . .	—	4$\frac{2}{3}$ (*circa*)	4$\frac{2}{3}$
14. Dorset	—	2$\frac{1}{20}$	2$\frac{1}{20}$
15. Norfolk	2	—	2
16. Bedfordshire . . .	1$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	1$\frac{7}{12}$
17. Wiltshire	—	2$\frac{1}{5}$	2$\frac{1}{5}$
18. Hertfordshire . . .	1	—	1
19. Rutland	$\frac{4}{9}$	—	$\frac{4}{9}$
—	227 (*circa*)	36$\frac{1}{5}$ (*circa*)	263$\frac{1}{5}$ (*circa*)

The total number of Edmund's tenants at the time of his death, reckoning all coparcenaries as one, was 199. Of these 9 were ecclesiastics or ecclesiastical corporations.

WALTER E. RHODES.

[111] Inquisitiones post Mortem, 25 Edw. I, No. 51A, f. 25.
[112] See Rymer's *Foedera*.

(*To be continued.*)

Troubles in a City Parish under the Protectorate

IT is well known that the years of Cromwell's protectorate were marked by bitter animosities between presbyterians and independents. The details of one such struggle, presenting some interesting features, have been preserved in the case of a large and important parish in the city of London, St. Botolph without Aldgate. The pamphlets of one of the chief actors in this extraordinary drama, and documents preserved among the State Papers, present a fairly complete picture of a state of discord which probably had many a parallel throughout England.

The last regularly appointed vicar of St. Botolph's had been Thomas Swadlin, a supporter of Laud. In 1642 he preached and published a sermon which gave so much offence to the puritan party that he was deprived of his living and imprisoned in Newgate. After his departure the living was held by a succession of obscure ministers, probably of extreme puritanical sentiments, until 1654, when it became vacant by the death or removal of Mr. Lawrence Wise. In August of that year Mr. John Mackarness was chosen minister,[1] apparently by popular election. Mr. Mackarness was a clergyman in Anglican orders, and his election was naturally regarded as a triumph for the cavalier party. Both presbyterians and independents were incensed, and it is probable that they combined to bring the matter to the attention of Cromwell. By his intervention Mackarness was dispossessed and a presbyterian minister, Zachary Crofton, appointed in his place.

Crofton was already a man of some note. His previous career had been varied and adventurous. Born and educated in Dublin, he had been driven from his home by the Irish troubles of 1641. On landing in England it is recorded that he 'had but a groat in his pocket, which he spent the first night at his quarters.' He tells us incidentally that he was in arms against the king in Lancashire and Cheshire in 1644.[2] But even before that time he had adopted the career of a minister, and his military experiences may have

[1] Note on the fly leaf of the register of St. Botolph, Aldgate.

[2] *Malice against Ministry manifested.*

been confined to exhorting the parliamentary soldiers. In 1647 he was pastor of Newcastle-under-Lyne, where he remained until September 1649, when he was appointed to the living of Wrenbury, in Cheshire. He there gave great offence to the government by refusing to take the engagement ('to be faithful to the Commonwealth as now established, without king or house of lords'), and very zealously dissuading others from doing so. As a presbyterian he held firm to the solemn league and covenant of 1643. The nation was bound by that instrument to maintain her lawful government and to repress the religious aberrations which threatened to become dominant under Cromwell's *régime*. The engagement could not be taken with a clear conscience by the subscribers to the covenant. Such an attitude, consistently maintained, brought serious trouble. On one occasion he vigorously defended one of his brother ministers who had been indicted at the Nantwich quarter sessions for non-compliance.[3] Probably by way of retaliation two agents of the Cheshire sequestrators, appointed to see to the carrying out of the engagement, swooped down upon his house at Wrenbury.[4] They violently entered his barn, drove out his servant then working there, and seized all his corn, the sole subsistence of himself and his family. He was obliged to take flight from Wrenbury, and at once made his way to London, with the object, it seems, of seeking redress.

On his arrival in London he was unsuccessful in his immediate purpose, but his reputation as a zealous and able minister may have preceded him, and he was shortly afterwards appointed minister of St. James's, Garlickhithe. The sympathies of the city were at that time presbyterian, and he was doubtless welcomed as a valuable accession to the ranks of the ministers of that party. At St. James's he entered into a vigorous controversy with John Rogers, of St. Thomas the Apostle, on church discipline. This controversy gave rise to Crofton's first work, which he published, in answer to Rogers's 'Beth-shemesh; or, the Tabernacle of the Sun,' under the title of 'Beth-shemesh Clouded; or, Some Animadversions on the Rabbinical Talmud of Rabbi John Rogers.' Two years after the publication of this work he was transferred to the more important position of minister at St. Botolph's. As we have seen, he owed his appointment to the intervention of Cromwell; but his feeling towards the Protector was far from cordial. Shortly after his coming to St. Botolph's a friend expostulated with him on his supposed disaffection, and asked him by whose authority he came there. Crofton replied, 'By the Lord Protector's.' 'Why, then,' asked his friend, 'do you not observe the fasts appointed by the Protector's government?' It is alleged that Crofton replied, 'An honest man

[3] *Berith-anti-Baal*, p. 5.

[4] *Beth-shemesh Clouded*, Pref.

may accept the courtesy of a thief on the highway.'[5] Cromwell, however, could recognise merit even in an opponent, and his treatment of Crofton, now and afterwards, was generous and forbearing.

Crofton knew that his position at St. Botolph's would not be a bed of roses. 'Let me tell you fairly,' he says long afterwards, 'that I have reaped among you nothing but what I expected: I often said at my first coming, I must not think to rake in a wasps' nest and not be stung, or fight the devil in his own dominions and not be wounded.' His principal difficulty arose from the position of John Simpson, who for some time, it seems, had been afternoon lecturer in the church. Simpson had been an officer in the new model army; he was a noted preacher, an independent and an anabaptist. He had been a candidate for the living at the time of Crofton's appointment, and it was natural that the two men should regard each other with anything but friendly feelings. For a time there was no open rupture, but rising dissensions in the parish soon brought matters to a head. Crofton's position was a peculiar one. He was the minister of one body, the presbyterian; and the other two parties were probably as strong in the parish as his own. He gave offence to the cavalier or 'profane' party by an attempt to exercise spiritual discipline and bar unworthy persons from the Lord's table. The subject was debated soon after his coming into the parish. One Farmantle, a parishioner, constantly interrupted Crofton as he was speaking, and asked how he was going to distinguish between the worthy and the unworthy when he knew them not. Crofton being a hasty man replied warmly, 'What a strange busy man you are to meddle in what concerns you not! If I should consult the devil, what is it to you?' Thereupon the parish constable, who was standing by, replied, 'If you have such familiarity with the devil, you are no fit parson for us.'[6]

The baptists, on the other hand, were offended by the importance which Crofton attached to the sacrament of baptism and its administration to infants. He was in the habit of announcing after his morning sermon on Sundays, 'The sacrament of baptism is to be administered; your reverent attendance is desired.' The 'furious anabaptistical spirits,' as Crofton calls the more extreme among his opponents, were greatly enraged. With a view of convincing gainsayers, and inculcating what he believed to be the truth, Crofton laid much stress on the practice of catechising. It was an ordinance, he declared, which should be attended to both by young and old, as a means of spiritual edification. He published a little book—'Catechising God's Ordinance'—shortly after his coming, and distributed copies to all his parishioners. William Jellie, a

[5] *Malice against Ministry manifested.* [6] *Ibid.*

common councilman and independent, refused the copy which was offered to him. Simpson declared publicly, 'To learn a catechism is not to worship God; as well buy your children rattles or hobby horses as catechisms.'

On 10 Feb. 1657 we have the first indication that the quarrel had entered on an acute stage. The 'well-affected' inhabitants of St. Botolph's petitioned the Protector that John Simpson might be allowed to lecture in the church, as formerly, on part of the Lord's Day and one week day. Sixty-seven signatures were attached to the petition, which was considered by the Protector in council and granted in the terms desired.[7] Simpson's position as afternoon lecturer, which apparently had been disputed by Crofton, was now established. Crofton was forced to yield obedience to the order in council, but he made no secret of his dissatisfaction. The quarrel was carried on with great heat on both sides. Crofton's opponents found their best weapon in a curious and disagreeable scandal which had arisen against him. It was alleged that, more than a year before, he had chastised his maidservant, Mary Cadman, with a rod in an improper manner. Crofton denied the charge solemnly and particularly. Fifty of his parishioners, in a pamphlet published in April 1657, attested their belief in his entire innocence.[8] His friends asserted that the scandal had been concocted by his enemies at a tavern meeting, and that Mary Cadman had been suborned to make the charge against him. It is certain that she made affidavit before a master in chancery of the truth of the charge. Subsequently, at Crofton's instance, she confessed that she had sworn falsely. The other side declared, of course, that she had been bribed to make the confession. It is most probable that the charge was either trumped up or greatly exaggerated; but it clung to Crofton, as we shall see, for many years, and furnished his opponents with great occasion for ridicule. The matter was investigated at a public inquiry before the lord mayor at the Guildhall, on which occasion Crofton complains of having been treated with scant justice; it was also reported by two parishioners to the Lord Protector, who in a personal interview sternly rebuked the minister for his unseemly conduct;[9] but here again Crofton's friends alleged that the Protector's mind had been poisoned by the representations of his enemies.

Meanwhile the conflict between the two champions proceeded. At the beginning of 1657 the Humble Petition and Advice had wrought considerable changes in the constitution, and on 26 June Oliver had been installed as Protector with greater solemnity than before. On July 31 Crofton addressed the following letter to Simpson:—

[7] *Calendar of State Papers, sub dat.*

[8] *An Attest of the Householders within the Parish of Buttolph's, Aldgate, unto the Innocency of Mr. Zach. Crofton.*

[9] *Perjury the Proof of Forgery.*

Mr. Sympson. If the order (by colour of which you invaded my church, did give you (which I confesse I coulde never understand) any power so to doe, the late revolution hath made it voide and nulle: and the Lorde Protector having taken to his sworde a scepter, and consented and sworne to governe accordinge to lawe and not otherwise I conceive it to be my dutie to knowe and reenioye mine owne interest (and soe let you hereby knowe that I doe knowe it) as I am legall incumbent of the place. In pursuance whereof, I am resolved to returne on Lord's Dayes afternoone at the usuall houres of publique worship, to my owne Church; and there fore desire you to cease your future paines in that place; and signifie so much to your friends, that we may have noe disturbance: and if you conceive you have any right in the place, commence your action. You shall receive in any court of judicature a plea from him who is resolved to defend his owne just priviledge, and give an account of his reasons to the worlde. ZACH. CROFTON.

Aldgate July 31, 1657.

The next Lordes Day beinge the 2 of August I intend to preach at my owne Church between one and two of the clocke afternoone.[10]

In accordance with this notice, on Sunday, 2 Aug., Simpson's lecture was interrupted by Crofton and his friends. On the 4th [11] Simpson complained to the council of state, and an order was made that Crofton and the churchwardens should obey the mandate of Feb. 10 and allow Simpson to preach in the afternoon. Armed with this order, Simpson and his friends made preparations to assert their rights. Walden, one of the churchwardens, a cavalier, now in league with the independents, and Tench and Finch, the parish constables, held a meeting at the Fountain Tavern, in Aldersgate, and determined that if Crofton should insist on entering the pulpit they would pull him out by force.

On the following Sunday, 9 Aug.,[12] the old Gothic church of St. Botolph (not the present eighteenth-century edifice) saw a strange sight. After the morning sermon, instead of leaving the church when the congregation dispersed, Crofton remained in the pulpit, with the intention of holding it against all comers. He was attended and guarded by his friends, among whom were the constables of the Middlesex part of the parish, who supported Crofton against their colleagues of the city part. A crowd soon assembled. About one o'clock Walden and the city constables entered the church, presented the order, and asked whether Crofton was prepared to obey it. He asked from whom it came. 'From the Lord Protector and council,' answered the churchwarden. 'Nay, from the common council,' said Crofton, alluding to the fact that the common councilmen were among his opponents. Then, seeing that

[10] *State Papers*, Record Office, *sub dat.*

[11] *Calendar of State Papers.*

[12] *Malice against Ministry manifested.*

the order had by mistake been addressed to Mr. *Grafton*, he declared that it did not concern him. And then, according to their own story, the Simpsonian party were thrust forth from the church by the Middlesex constables. For the moment Crofton had been victorious.

Four days afterwards a petition was laid before the council of state from the majority of the common councilmen, the churchwarden, and other well-affected inhabitants of the parish. It set forth Crofton's conduct, and prayed that the former order might be enforced. A committee, consisting of Fleetwood and Pickering, was directed to examine Crofton and others on this charge and on the other matter alleged against him. On the following day the committee reported the result of the examination. Crofton pleaded his right, as incumbent by presentation of his highness, to preach on Sunday afternoon. He knew nothing in the church books of Simpson's being lecturer by election of the people. He excused his conduct on the previous Sunday by saying that he gave out that he should be done by three, and after that Simpson could preach. The council determined that Simpson should preach at two, and Mr. Crofton be required to permit the same. The order was approved by the Protector in person.[13] This was the end of Crofton's short-lived triumph.

His vexation now led him into a very unjustifiable action. He applied at the Old Bailey for a warrant against his three principal opponents, Walden, Tench, and Finch, for brawling in the church. According to his own statement the clerk accidentally omitted Walden's name in making out the warrant. However this may have been, Crofton took upon himself to insert the name after the warrant had been granted. The fact was undeniable, and Crofton is obliged to admit it, and to excuse himself as best he can. The three persons charged were taken before a justice and acquitted. Crofton asserts that they were subsequently convicted before the lord chief justice. On the following Sunday, yielding to the pressure of authority, Crofton allowed Simpson to preach; but he made a solemn protest from the pulpit, a protest which, contrary to his custom, he read 'syllabically' from written notes. The whole subject of Simpson's intrusion was treated in a full and particular manner by Crofton in a pamphlet entitled 'Right Re-entered,' which was probably published at this time, but has not been preserved.

On 2 Sept. Crofton, hearing reports that Simpson was preaching against baptism, and especially against infant baptism, which he derided as baby-sprinkling, went to hear the Wednesday evening lecture. The doctrine which Simpson preached was so little to Crofton's taste that he went at once to his study and wrote to

[13] *Calendar of State Papers*, 14 Aug. 1657.

Simpson, charging him with grievous error. The letter was sent by special messenger, but Simpson took no notice. A week after Crofton wrote the following curt challenge:—

> Sir,—I did this day seven-day signify my dissatisfaction in your doctrine, and dislike of that old familistical notion you published; I demanded your reasons, but have received none. Sir, think you not it is your duty to convince gainsayers? Or can I pass in silence baptism-annihilating notions? I cannot, I will not. Sir, I once more demand your arguments, and that as you are a man of any ingenuity, willing to give an account of your doctrine. ZACH. CROFTON.

'He passed this also in silence,' says Crofton, 'so I rejected him as a heretic.'[14] But though Simpson declined to meet his opponent on the point of doctrine he took other measures of retaliation. On 22 Oct.[15] a petition was again presented to the council, alleging that Crofton was a declared enemy of the present government, preached against it daily, and tried to render it odious and contemptible, thus preparing the rude multitude for insurrection. The petitioners desired that he might be removed, and the parish settled under a minister fearing God and honouring the government. The whole matter was now referred to the commissioners for the ejection of scandalous and insufficient ministers in London, to proceed according to the ordinance. This commission had been appointed in Aug. 1654, partly for the purpose of expelling malignants and securing a supply of well-affected ministers. Crofton appeared before the commissioners at Guildhall on Wednesday, 2 Dec. His enemies had prepared a list of six primary and five additional articles to be exhibited against him. The six primary articles were briefly as follows: (1) The expression above mentioned about 'consulting the devil;' (2) disloyal and offensive language against the Protector ('an honest man,' &c.); (3) a charge of prejudice on the part of the Protector in the matter of Mary Cadman ('he was an unrighteous judge, and made the law a nose of wax'); (4) 'uncivil' behaviour towards Mary Cadman; (5) refusal to obey the order of council on 9 Aug.; (6) the fraudulent insertion of Walden's name in the warrant.

The first four additional articles related to sundry disloyal expressions of Crofton's in reference to the late disturbances. 'He could prevail neither by prayer nor law.' 'The sword of his oppressors was the law, and therefore their tyranny the greater,' 'his judges were unrighteous men,' &c. &c. The fifth article was of a different kind. On 3 Sept., a commanded thanksgiving day for the victories of Dunbar and Worcester, it was alleged that he would not preach nor suffer any one else to preach in his church;

[14] *The Virtue and Value of Baptism*, Pref.
[15] *Calendar of State Papers, sub dat.*

and on 21 Sept., when thanks were annually given in Aldgate church for the Lord's mercies to the trained bands of Aldgate at the memorable fight at Newbury Wash, he was requested to allow Simpson to preach them a sermon, but refused, and the inhabitants were obliged to have their sermon at the neighbouring church of St. Katherine Cree.

Crofton, being called on for his defence, by the advice of his friends demurred to the jurisdiction of the commission. The court thereupon adjourned to consider his objection. Crofton's enemies declared that he was afraid to meet the charges, and, by way of reply, he published on 10 Dec. a pamphlet entitled 'Malice against Ministry manifested by the Plain and Modest Plea and Defence of Zach. Crofton, Minister of the Gospel at Botolph's, Aldgate.' He pours scorn and ridicule and abuse upon his assailants. One of these, John Levet, was 'a constant enemy of gospel ministry;' another, Captain Harrison, had taken lodgings in the parish only a fortnight before, to qualify for the part of the aggrieved parishioner. Two of the common councilmen are 'venerable carpenters in their taffety doublets,' the third was a 'tallow chandler gaping for a deputy ship,' and all five were 'profound sack-suckers' and 'substantial ale-house supporters.' Coming to the articles particularly, Crofton, while denying certain expressions, is obliged to admit the general accuracy of the language alleged. It was, he says, an expression of personal dissatisfaction in no way calculated to lead to rebellion. He would be submissive and silent under the government, if they would but remove the cause of offence—namely, the unjustifiable intrusion of Simpson into his pulpit. He denies the Cadman charge *in toto*. Compelled to admit the insertion of Walden's name in the warrant, he pleads that it was the hasty action of a man sorely tried by malice and persecution. With regard to the Newbury commemoration, he asserts that he was never duly requested to allow Mr. Simpson to preach. 'They did not desire me to let him preach; with their swords by their sides they brought him into the church, and I would not let him preach, nor will I let him preach one moment longer than I can help it.'

On the very day on which Crofton appeared before the commissioners at Guildhall a pamphlet was published, under the transparent pseudonym of 'Alethes Noctroff,' entitled 'Perjury the Proof of Forgery; or, Mr. Crofton's Civility justified by Cadman's Falsity.' The main body of the pamphlet is occupied by a defence of Mr. Crofton in the matter of the Cadman scandal, but the introduction gives an interesting account of the state of affairs in Aldgate parish during the time of Crofton's ministry. The writer narrates how at his first coming he had endeavoured to introduce the practice of catechising; how he offended the extreme men of both parties, the one by the importance he attached to baptism, the other by the

bar to the Lord's table; how he was reviled as priest, limb of antichrist, little Laud, &c.; how the two parties had combined to weaken his hands, and how he constantly refused to allow either party to have their preacher. When he was out of town they brought 'the Warwickshire Wild Oats' to preach; but the churchwardens (for 1656), Mr. Surbutt and Mr. Quick, withstood them, and he scattered his notions in the air from a tombstone in the churchyard. At the next Easter vestry they combined to elect a churchwarden of their own; and Mr. Crofton, being present at the meeting, was greeted with great uproar and ordered out, but finally allowed to remain on promising not to interrupt the proceedings. At last they chose William Carpenter, a 'profane' man and head of the faction which had supported Mackarness, to be churchwarden. Then they pretended that a Mrs. Man had left money to the poor on condition that Simpson should preach, and they procured an order of council permitting him to do so. They gave out that Mr. Crofton was a malignant and had kissed the king's hand at Worcester; and they met at the Green Dragon and devised the scandal about Mary Cadman, which they reported to the Lord Protector. Such is the story, from Crofton's point of view, of the persecution to which he had been subjected.

There is no record of any decision of the commissioners in Crofton's case. Anyhow he remained at Aldgate, and it is possible that the charge was kept hanging over his head as a security for his good behaviour to Simpson. Events soon happened which caused it to be forgotten. On 3 Sept. 1658 the great Protector died. Crofton's hopes seem to have risen, for on 14 Sept. the survivors of Newbury petitioned the council that Mr. Simpson might preach on the morning of their anniversary, 20 Sept., Mr. Crofton having declared that he would not allow it without such an order.[16] The State Papers do not record whether the order was granted. In January of the next year, however, an application asking that Simpson might be permitted to preach certain annual funeral sermons was allowed.

The next notice of Crofton is in connexion with the rising of the Cheshire presbyterians under Sir George Booth in July 1659. He had left town and gone into Cheshire, as he asserts, on domestic business. There is no proof that he was in any way privy to Sir George's enterprise, but his connexion with Cheshire presbyterians may have enabled him to know that something was in the wind. On 17 July he preached at St. Peter's Church in West Chester. At the beginning of August General Lambert marched from London, and totally defeated Booth at Winnington Bridge. These events delayed Crofton's return, and it was publicly rumoured in London that he had preached to the rebel army at

[16] *Calendar of State Papers, sub dat.*

West Chester. His family and friends were terrified. On his return to London he was summoned before the committee for the militia and the council of state. A member of the latter offered to produce a lieutenant who had heard him preach. Crofton, however, succeeded in clearing himself, and was discharged on the easy condition of promising to publish the sermons he had preached, as a refutation of the rumours. Accordingly in December the sermons were published under the strange title 'Felix Scelus, Querela Piorum, et Auscultatio Divina, or Prospering Profaneness Provoking Holy Conference and God's Attention,' &c.

Events had moved rapidly between the time of his appearance before the council and the publication of the sermons, or Crofton would hardly have ventured to use so bold a title, or to write, as he does in the epistle to the reader, in the following terms of the Protector's government:—

> Had not our eyes seen treason, rebellion, regicide, perfidy, perjury, pride, hypocrisy and violence break out into sad and sinful revolutions . . . violation of laws, invasion of interests, destruction of liberties, trampling on truth, devastation of the church, blasphemy of God, Christ, and his ordinances; contempt of gospel ministry, letting loose the devil in a boundless toleration, and unparalleled wickedness and confusion in church and state: had not our ears heard all this declared as a mark of God's favour I might not have written thus.

Very soon afterwards Crofton made a still more emphatic pronouncement, to which, however, he did not venture to add his name. He wrote and published a 'Letter to a Member of the Rump Parliament, on the Day of their Triumphant Return from Portsmouth,' 26 Dec. 1659.[17] From that parliament, once more restored by the caprice or the necessity of the army, nothing was to be hoped. Crofton in his anonymous letter vigorously demanded the election of a free parliament, on the understanding that its first measure would be the recall of the Stuarts. He expressed the same view publicly in a sermon preached at St. Peter's, Cornhill, shortly afterwards. According to his own account the effect of this bold declaration was so great that 'the whole city expected Mr. Crofton's bonds at the least.' Meanwhile General Monk was on his way to London, which he entered on 3 Feb. From that moment the power of the independents was gone. We hear no more of John Simpson at Aldgate; he vanished from the stage, and scarcely a trace of him can be discovered afterwards. On 29 March, at a 'solemn assembly of the parishioners of Botolph's, Aldgate, on the composure of their late unhappy and long-continued differences,' Crofton preached a sermon on the 'Pursuit of Peace,' which he afterwards published. It is his pæan

[17] Printed in *Berith-anti-Baal.*

of victory. God has given his enemies into his hands, but he will forbear to take revenge. He is content now that erroneous John Simpson is removed, and he is reinstated in all his rights.

Thus ended the quarrel between Crofton and Simpson. But the most vigorous and active period of Crofton's career was still to come. He showed great zeal and activity in promoting the restoration of the king, hoping, with the rest of his party, that considerable concessions would be made to presbyterian feeling, or even that presbyterianism might be established as a national system. But this hope was doomed to be disappointed. Shortly after the Restoration, on 12 June 1660, Dr. Gauden published a pamphlet entitled 'Analysis; or, the Loosing of St. Peter's Bonds,' in which he maintained that, so far as it related to episcopacy, the covenant was null and void. Crofton, who held by the covenant as his sheet anchor, at once replied in 'Analepsis; or, St. Peter's Bonds abide,' written in two days and published on 8 July. Three pamphlets at least were published on Gauden's side during the next three months. On 23 Nov. Crofton published an elaborate reply to all his assailants. The title of the work is 'Analepsis Anelepthe, the Fastening of St. Peter's Fetters, by Seven Links or Propositions; or, the Efficacy and Extent of the Solemn League and Covenant asserted and vindicated.' It is evident enough that the tone of public feeling had changed. Crofton admits that his position is almost hopeless, and that his present writing may bring him into trouble.

> I know quite well the current of the times, and the disposition of the court and country. In thus acting I expose myself to censure, and ruin all my hopes of preferment, which my constant loyalty to his majesty and my strong opposition to the engagement might justify me in expecting. When I consult a proud heart within, and a numerous family without me [he had a wife and seven children], I find sufficient arguments to determine folly against myself. But I hope that I have not so learned Christ.

The epistle to the reader from which these words are an extract is a high-minded protest against the rejection of the covenant. It is written in the spirit of one who risks his place or even his life. He speaks of the covenant martyr Christopher Love, and quotes the words he had uttered on the scaffold: 'I had rather die a covenant-keeper than live a covenant-breaker.' The controversy went on for some time. In March 1661 Crofton made his last contribution in a work entitled 'Berith-anti-Baal' ('The Covenant against Baal'), in answer to Gauden's 'Anti-Baal-Berith' ('Against Baal of the Covenant'). It is a vigorous and interesting work, with many personal allusions to his life and conduct in the past. The assertions of his loyalty are redoubled; his disaffection under the Commonwealth is dwelt upon with

emphasis; and his endeavours for the king's restoration are set forth in full. He probably relied on these assertions to protect him in the dangerous course on which he had entered. Encouraged by a revival of presbyterian feeling in the city, he had plunged into a crusade against the growing power of episcopacy. His sermons at St. Antholin's, where he was lecturer, were the talk of the city. Some quotations from intercepted letters preserved among the State Papers[18] show the notoriety which he had attained. The letters are from presbyterians in the city to their sympathisers in the country. The writer of one, dated 18 March, says, 'Z. Crofton, a subtle, witty man, is bitter against the bishops, and is a great vexation to them;' another, on 19 March, 'Mr. Crofton prosecuted his argument last Lord's Day, and there were more people than could get into the church.' Another states that little Crofton had the greatest auditory in London, and the anti-episcopal spirit was strangely revived; and, lastly, 'Mr. Graffen' (evidently for Crofton) 'had two thousand in the streets who could not get into the Tantling meeting-house [St. Antholin's Church] to hear him bang the bishops, which theme he doth most exquisitely handle.'

The effect of Crofton's efforts and those of his presbyterian colleagues was shown in the election which took place in Guildhall on the day on which these letters were written. Two presbyterians and two independents were chosen to represent the city in the new parliament. But before that parliament met Crofton's sermons had been brought to a sudden and disastrous termination. On 23 March[19] he was summoned before Secretary Nicholas, and examined on his two books 'The Fastening of St. Peter's Fetters' and 'Berith-anti-Baal,' with the result that he was committed to the Tower on a charge amounting to high treason. It was a severe blow to the presbyterians. 'The single imprisonment of Crofton,' says L'Estrange,[20] 'hath quieted that party more than all the multiplied and transcendent mercies of his majesty.'

At the very time of Crofton's arrest some of his enemies had been engaged in a scurrilous attempt to defame his character by raking up the details of the Cadman scandal. The whole story was embodied in a very singular comedy entitled 'The Presbyterian Lash; or, Noctroff's Maid whipt.' It is a production characterised by the coarseness of the period, but redeemed here and there by gleams of wit. The characters are all real persons, and their names can easily be discovered under the thin disguise in which they are clothed. As the sheets were passing through the press the news of the hero's imprisonment arrived. It is recorded in an epilogue, and the writer expresses a hope that Crofton

[18] *Calendar of State Papers*, 18 March 1661. [19] *Ibid. sub dat.*
[20] Quoted in Kennet, *Reg. Anglic.* p. 375, marg.

may soon share the fate of Hugh Peters, who had lately been hanged in Holborn.[21]

Crofton's imprisonment lasted for more than a year, and he was not released until 25 July 1662. In the course of his confinement he had given great offence to his presbyterian friends by petitioning to be allowed to attend the church of England service in the chapel of the Tower. His conduct gave rise to a controversy, and several writings passed on both sides. Crofton now took up the position which he maintained steadily till the end of his life. He refused to separate himself from the national church, though he could not himself use the Common Prayer as a minister. He wrote strongly against schism, declaring for 'reformation, not separation;' and he resolved 'to seek church purity by union with the church, and to abide in the house.' Once he preached a course of sermons on this subject in a London church; but he never solicited or received any preferment which might require him to be false to his convictions.

The remainder of his life, after his release, may be briefly told. He left London and made his way to Cheshire, where, according to a despatch of Lord Brereton's,[22] he 'turned cheese factor, and rode up and down the country sowing sedition.' He was arrested and again imprisoned in Chester Castle. Being released, apparently after a short confinement, he returned to London, and there set up a grocer's shop to maintain himself and his family. Then, probably under the pressure of the five mile act, he left London and took a farm at Little Barford, in Bedfordshire. Again he returned to London, after the plague year, and set up a school in his old parish of Aldgate, where he continued until his death. It was here that, at the invitation of Sir Samuel Starling, the lord mayor, he preached a course of sermons in St. James's, Duke's Place, which he afterwards published under the title 'The Saints' Care for Church Communion.' He died just before Christmas 1672, and his body was buried in the churchyard of his old parish on 26 Dec. The simple entry in the register under that date is, 'Zechariah Crofton, minister, Tower Hill.'

His name was remembered in the parish, but with little sympathy or respect, as is usual in the case of defeated champions. Twenty-eight years after his death White Kennet, author of the 'Registrum Anglicanum' and afterwards bishop of Peterborough, was appointed vicar of St. Botolph's. In his researches into the history of the Commonwealth and the Restoration he met with Crofton's name, and seems to have been specially interested in him as his own predecessor. He made inquiries about him among the

[21] It may be well here to correct the mistake in the *Dictionary of National Biography* (*s.v.* Crofton) which, strangely enough, gives this play as one of Crofton's own works.

[22] *Calendar of State Papers*, 26 Oct. 1663.

survivors of the Restoration period, with the following rather inaccurate results:—

> They who remembered him in that parish gave him the character of a zealous, weak man, who ran himself into many difficulties; and, among others, he was prosecuted in Westminster Hall for giving the correction of a schoolboy to his servant maid, and was bold to print his defence.[23]

He also hears that the school 'was rather his daughter's than his own, and he only assisted her in teaching the boys and girls to read.' Of the quarrel with Simpson Kennet records:—

> He [Simpson] was likewise a professed and busy anabaptist, and getting a party in the parish of Aldgate, he attempted to get possession of the church, and while Mr. Crofton was in the pulpit Mr. S. would be preaching out of the opposite gallery, to the great disturbance and scandal of Christian people. However he went off at or before the king's restoration.

Against Kennet's depreciating estimate it may be well to place the friendly testimony of Calamy, who characterises Crofton as 'a quick and warm but upright man, an acute, learned, and solid divine, and an excellent Christian.'[24]

J. A. DODD.

[23] Kennet, *Reg. Anglic.* p. 797.

[24] The following is a complete list of Crofton's extant works, so far as I have been able to ascertain them: *Beth-shemesh Clouded*, 1653; *Fraterna Correptio; or, the Saints' Zeal against Sinful Altars*, 1655; *Catechising God's Ordinance*, 1656; *The People's Need of a Living Pastor* (a sermon), 1656; *Perjury the Proof of Forgery; or, Mr. Crofton's Civility justified by Cadman's Falsity*, 1657; *Malice against Ministry manifested*, 1657; *Felix Scelus, Querela Piorum, et Auscultatio Divina*, 1659; *The Pursuit of Peace* (a sermon), 1660; *Analepsis; or, St. Peter's Bonds abide*, 1660; *Analepsis Anelepthe*, &c., 1660; *Preface to G[iles] F[irmin]'s Liturgical Considerator Considered*, 1661 (January); *Altar Worship, or Bowing to the Communion Table*, 1661 (February); *Serious Review of Presbyters' Re-ordination by Bishops*, 1661 (February); *Berith-anti-Baal*, 1661 (March); *Reformation not Separation*, 1661 (July); *The Hard Way to Heaven* (a sermon), 1662; *The Virtue and Value of Baptism*, 1663; *Defence against the Dread of Death*, 1665; *The Saints' Care for Church Communion*, 1871.

Disputed Passages of the Campaign of 1815

THE true student of war requires no apology for a short discussion on the campaign of 1815. It is not only that the contest was one of supreme interest from first to last; that, after opening with splendid prospects for him, it ended in the ruin of the modern Hannibal; and that it marks a great turning-point in the history of Europe. Nor is it only that national prejudice has perverted, distorted, or concealed the truth in almost every conceivable way; that, not to speak of historians and critics, the chief actors in the drama have erred in this matter; and that, after the lapse of three-fourths of a century, it is difficult to avoid biassed feelings as we approach Waterloo. Our information is still imperfect on some points of the first importance: for example, the operations of the two wings of Napoleon's army, under Ney and Grouchy, on 16 and 18 June, have not been completely explained; and considerable mystery still hangs over some of the arrangements of Blücher and Wellington. Even now we see the campaign darkly in some of its most momentous phases; and it is not easy distinctly to pronounce on these from the evidence that has as yet come to light. In addition to this, not a decade has passed without contributing largely to the store of facts, accumulated through various means, on the subject. For instance, Ollech's history has raised important questions as to the movements of the allies; and the memoirs of Marbot are suggestive in the extreme as to the judgment to be formed on Grouchy, especially as Marbot's report on Waterloo was discreditably suppressed by the Bourbon government. Moreover, able commentators have appeared in the field since those of the Napoleonic age and those of the peace; and if they have been in some cases unjust and one-sided they have finely illustrated parts of a great controversy.

A word or two must suffice for the prelude to the strife. Had not France been divided in mind and terrified, Napoleon would doubtless have awaited the onset of the coalition and its gigantic hosts, manœuvring between the Marne and the Seine, and resting

on the great entrenched camp of Paris; and, when we recollect his achievements in 1814, his ultimate success would have been not improbable. These operations, however, had become impossible, and he formed a plan altogether different, yet, with his genius in war, full of splendid promise. He was contending against a world in arms; but the allies, though nearly three to one in numbers—they disposed of about a million of men—were spread over the vast arc extending from the Scheldt to the Oder and the Po; and at the extreme right of this broad front of invasion lay the two armies of Blücher and Wellington, disseminated over the larger part of Belgium. It might be possible, therefore, as in 1800 and 1805, to make a sudden spring on this detached wing of the coalition's forces; and a triumph like that of Marengo or Ulm might extort a peace for France from discomfited Europe. To ordinary observers, however, as to the most experienced soldiers, Blücher and Wellington appeared secure from real danger. Their supports were approaching in hundreds of thousands of men; their two armies, if once united, would probably be nearly double in number any army which the emperor could array against them; and the French divisions which they might have to meet were scattered along the frontier, and thence south to Paris. The allied generals nevertheless were exposed to defeat, in the presence as they were of a master of war, pre-eminent in the art of stratagem, and of scientific and rapid movements, and in understanding leaders opposed to him. The armies of Blücher and Wellington stretched along a front of a hundred miles from Liège to near Ghent, and on a depth of almost forty from Charleroi to Brussels; they rested on wholly divergent bases, from the Rhine to the east, to the sea westwards; and their centre was especially vulnerable and weak, thrown forward on either bank of the Sambre. They were, therefore, perilously exposed, could an enemy make a sudden attack in force from the French frontier; and they might be divided and beaten one after the other, for they required two days at least to effect their junction. Blücher and Wellington, too, were of opposite natures, the one daring and rash to a fault, the other always circumspect and cautious. This difference would almost certainly make their movements ill-combined and disjointed; and as their headquarters, at Namur and Brussels, were separated by a wide distance, it was difficult for them to act at once in concert.

The operations of the emperor, in these circumstances, were as well planned and brilliant as any of his career. At the outset, however, a grave misfortune deprived him of a large part of his forces; he had calculated that 150,000 men would be required for the attack on Belgium, but a rising of La Vendée weakened him by 20,000; and if it was now too late to draw back, this greatly

lessened his chances of success.[1] His first movements were a masterpiece of war; they were rapid, and masked with his consummate art; and while four *corps d'armée* were directed, from between Lille and Metz, to the intended points of junction on the verge of Belgium, a fifth corps with the imperial guard and the cavalry marched from Laon and the capital to the general place of meeting. On the evening of June 14, 1815, 128,000 Frenchmen, comprising 22,000 horse and nearly 350 guns, brought together, so to speak, by enchantment, were assembled on the edge of the French frontier between Maubeuge and Philippeville, the main body, screened by the woods of Beaumont, being in front of and near the old town of Charleroi, the chief station of the allied centre, the operation as a whole having been one of the finest ever executed in the annals of war.

A remark or two must be made on the nature and quality of this army, and of the chiefs at its head. English and German writers have dwelt on its excellence, and described it as a perfect instrument of war; but really it was nothing of the kind. It was composed mainly, indeed, of well-tried soldiers, but it had been hastily arrayed and equipped; its organisation was very defective; it wanted cohesiveness and self-reliance; above all, its moral power had been greatly injured by disaster and revolutionary events. It was not to be compared to the old Grand Army, which had won Austerlitz, Jena, and Friedland, and though it was capable of heroic efforts it was not equal to the severest trials. As for its leaders, they were very inferior men to the best of the emperor's former lieutenants; and, with nearly all the officers in high place, they had lost the confidence of the days of victory, and had become timid and easily disconcerted. Soult, made chief of the staff for the first time, an indolent though an able man, was not fit for his arduous office; Grouchy, if a fairly good cavalry officer, had completely failed in independent command; Ney, marked out by the Bourbons for vengeance, and distrusted by Napoleon himself, had lost head and heart, and had become demoralised; Vandamme, Reille, and Erlon had not forgotten the memories of repeated defeats.[2] Even Napoleon himself was a different man from the warrior of Arcola and Rivoli. His intellect, indeed, was as powerful as ever, his unrivalled experience had been enlarged; his military conceptions retained their splendour. But his bodily strength had been in decline for years; he was suffering from inter-

[1] A writer in the *Edinburgh Review* (April 1894, p. 421), who carps at Napoleon's strategic dispositions in 1815, seems to be unaware that the great master was suddenly deprived of these 20,000 men. Had he known this he would hardly have blamed Napoleon for sending 20,000 troops to the eastern frontier of France.

[2] For the real state of the French army and its generals see Charras, i. 58, 59; Thiers, *Waterloo*; Ropes, *The Campaign of Waterloo*, 16 *sqq.*; Napoleon, *Comment.* v. 198, 9e édit. 1867.

mittent disease, which at times paralysed his great faculties; and he had no longer his wonted vigour and energy. If we reflect, indeed, on all that he had endured, and on his toils and cares, during the three previous months, we can easily understand how, at this crisis, he was not equal to his former self in the field.[3]

The emperor had set his army in motion by the dawn of the morning of June 15. His left wing, about 45,000 strong, composed of the second and first corps, and placed in the hands of Reille and Erlon, had been collected at Leers and Solre, at a distance of a few miles from Maubeuge; and it was ordered to cross the Sambre, and to overpower any enemies in its path. The centre, comprising the third corps under Vandamme, the sixth under Lobau, the imperial guard, and the division of cavalry commanded by Grouchy, in all perhaps 68,000 men, was moved from around Beaumont, straight upon Charleroi, and directly towards the centre of the allies; and it was to pass the Sambre, and to push forward, striking down the hostile bodies it would meet. To the right, Gérard, with the fourth corps, advanced from Philippeville upon the Sambre; and he was to cross the river to the east, at Châtelet, and to come into line with the main army. These operations were thus combined to bring the French in greatly superior force upon the centre of Blücher and Wellington, held by the single Prussian corps of Ziethen, widely scattered round Charleroi along the Sambre; but, curiously enough, there has been much controversy as to the ultimate objects of Napoleon for the day. Unquestionably he meant to reach the exposed corps of Ziethen, and if possible to crush it to atoms; and admittedly, as he has told us himself, his next move was to be against Blücher, whose forces were nearer the frontier than those of Wellington, and were therefore more open to immediate attack. But it has been contended that the emperor had a more comprehensive and larger purpose, and, notwithstanding difficulties in the way, this seems to be the more correct opinion. The paramount object of Napoleon was to strike the allies and to beat them in detail; this could be only accomplished with safety and success by preventing their junction upon their centre, the point he had selected for attack; and their main line of communication, in this direction, was the great lateral road from Nivelles to Namur, intersecting the main road from Charleroi to Brussels, and enabling Wellington and Blücher to unite at the two points of Quatre Bras and Sombreffe. It seems probable, therefore, that Napoleon's design for the 15th, was not only to overwhelm Ziethen, and then to make ready to assail Blücher, but also to advance to the road

[3] In addition to Dorsey Gardner, *Waterloo*, p. 36, striking evidence as to the state of Napoleon's health will be found in the lately published work of M. Houssaye, '1815,' p. 614.

from Nivelles to Namur, to occupy Quatre Bras and Sombreffe upon it, and so to interpose between Blücher and Wellington. Undoubtedly Napoleon, in one passage of his works,[4] denies that he meant to reach Sombreffe on the 15th; but in his formal narrative of the campaign of 1815 he indicates an intention inconsistent with this;[5] and as he certainly thought that part of his army was at Quatre Bras on the evening of the 15th,[6] it is difficult to suppose that Sombreffe, too, was not to be occupied at the same time. The great majority of commentators, it should be added, decidedly adopt the view referred to.[7]

The advance of the French army on the 15th was not so successful as Napoleon had hoped. To the left Reille and the 2nd corps had crossed the Sambre and filled the tract around Gosselies, but Erlon and a great part of the 1st corps still lay beyond the southern bank of the river. This wing, therefore, had been much retarded, and even its most forward divisions had not reached the positions which had been assigned to them. Ney, who had suddenly come on the scene, had received the command of this wing in the afternoon;[8] and there can be no reasonable doubt that he had been ordered to push forward, and to occupy Quatre Bras, so as to prevent Wellington from approaching Blücher. The marshal, however, though in superior force, had been held in check by a small detachment, ably moved forward by the Prince of Saxe-Weimar on his own initiative and without orders; and Ney had fallen back on Frasnes, a place about two miles from Quatre Bras, having thus failed to fulfil his mission. The whole French left was thus extended in disunited masses, and had not gained the point of vantage it was meant to gain; and if no serious mischief had as yet happened, it was not so well placed as Napoleon had wished. The operations of the centre, also, had been imperfect, and had not fully accomplished the emperor's purpose. Vandamme and the 3rd corps had been delayed by an accident; the advance on Charleroi, by bad roads, through an intricate country, had been slow; Ziethen, though exposed to attacks on all sides, had skilfully retarded the march of his enemy, and had made his way to Fleurus towards the main Prussian army, having suffered comparatively little loss; and Napoleon failed to attain Sombreffe, as probably had been his real object. This consummation had been furthered, too, by events that had kept back the right wing of the

[4] *Comment.* vi. 146, edit. 1867. Thiers approves of this.

[5] *Ibid.* v. 199, edit. 1867. See Charras, i. 95.

[6] See the *Moniteur*, 18 June; and Napoleon, *Correspondance*, xxviii. 288.

[7] Jomini and Charras are the most distinguished. But see for the opposite side Ropes, 9, 15.

[8] See the *Moniteur*, 18 June, and Napoleon, *Correspondance*, xxviii. 288. This evidence, I agree with Mr. Ropes, is practically decisive.

French. One of Gérard's divisions had not joined him by the night of the 14th, and he had to wait for it; the movement of his troops was impeded by the same obstacles which had beset the march of the centre; the villainous desertion of Bourmont caused a halt; and Gérard was unable to arrest the retreat of Ziethen, and crossed the Sambre with part of his forces only. As the general result, the whole French army was more in the rear than Napoleon expected; its divisions were not well closed up, and had not even all crossed the Sambre; the corps of Ziethen had not been caught and destroyed, and had effected its escape almost unscathed; and the line of the communication of the allies had not been seized at the two points of Quatre Bras and Sombreffe.

If the 15th, however, as Charras has said, had not yielded complete results, it had gained for the French an immense advantage, and Napoleon's profound strategy had been largely successful. By nightfall on that day the great mass of the French army had crossed the Sambre, leaving a fourth part only beyond, and at hand; it stood already almost between the allies, having driven away Ziethen, and his corps, their centre; and it held positions favourable in the extreme for the morrow. The left wing at Frasnes was close to Quatre Bras, in part, and could be brought together in a few hours; the centre had reached Fleurus, not far from Sombreffe, held the adjoining region back to Charleroi, and had mastered the great main road to Brussels, leading into the midst of the enemy's camps; and the right wing was in immediate contact with it. The allied armies, therefore, still scattered and apart, were exposed to defeat, in detail, and decisive; the line of their communication, if not seized, was threatened; and it would be well if they were not beaten one after the other, enormous as was their superiority in force. On the other side, Blücher commanded about 118,000 men, including some 12,0C0 cavalry, and more than 300 guns; his army, therefore, was, by itself, almost equal in numbers to that of Napoleon; but as, taken altogether, it was inferior in quality to the French army, for it was largely composed of rude levies, and as Wellington's army was in relation with it, it obviously would not be wise to commit it, unaided, to a precipitate movement. The ardent veteran, however, when made aware that the French columns had approached the frontier, gave orders as early as the evening of the 14th for a general concentration of all his forces, on, or at least towards, the important point of Sombreffe; and it is still uncertain[9] whether this was because he had agreed with Wellington that, in the event of an attack being made on the allied centre, the two commanders should draw near each other, and occupy Quatre Bras and Sombreffe,

[9] See Ropes, 70, 71, and the authorities cited in that book. On the other side see Charras, i. 72.

on the great cross road referred to before, or whether it was his own single purpose. But the Prussian army, we have seen, was widely divided; its 1st corps, that of Ziethen, was around Charleroi; its 2nd and 3rd, under Pirch and Thielmann, held Namur and Ciney and the districts at hand; but the 4th corps, that of Bülow, was far away at Liège: and thus, while the first three corps could probably reach Sombreffe in time to make head against the advancing enemy, the last could hardly possibly join hands with them.[10] Blücher, therefore, had resolved to confront Napoleon with three-fourths of his army only; and he had not as yet heard a word from his colleague. His passionate and unreflecting nature had led him to rush to fight without his proper supports—exactly what Napoleon had foreseen would happen.

On the opposite side of the great field of manœuvre, the operations of the allies had erred from contrary reasons. Wellington's army, reckoning his entire force, was about 106,000 strong—there were 14,000 horsemen and nearly 200 guns:—but it was a motley assemblage of many races; it had not more than 50,000 good troops; and most of the auxiliaries had served under the French eagles. It was disseminated, we have seen, over a wide space of country; it observed the main roads from the French frontier; and the settled conviction of its chief was that, if attacked at all, it would be attacked on its right. All this made it weak near the allied centre, and impeded a movement in that direction; the duke, too, at Brussels was far away from Blücher, and could not hear from his colleague speedily; and, as his despatches prove, he scarcely believed that Napoleon would dare to take the offensive against an enemy very superior in numbers. These considerations must be kept in mind, for they explain and illustrate much that followed. In the early afternoon of 15 June,[11] Wellington heard from Ziethen and the Prince of Orange that the Prussians had been attacked at Charleroi and Thuin; that is, that Napoleon had fallen on the allied centre, but this only induced the British commander to order his lieutenants to have their divisions ready. At about 9 or 10 P.M. the duke received a message from Blücher stating that the Prussian army was being directed to Sombreffe, and requesting assistance from his colleague; but Wellington, apprehensive for his right, and thinking that the French movement might be a feint, did not order a single man to Quatre Bras, to hold this point on the road from Nivelles to Namur, and to approach the Prussian army. On the contrary, he took an opposite course, obviously beset with the

[10] The distance alone indicates this. Besides, Bülow was only ordered first to Hannut, and then to Gembloux; and he informed Blücher he could not reach Sombreffe until late on the 16th. See Ropes, p. 73; La Tour d'Auvergne, *Waterloo*, 80. Ropes, p. 150.

[11] Charras, i. p. 107, is wrong in stating that Wellington was informed by Ziethen of this attack by 9 A.M. on the 15th.

gravest perils. At 10 P.M., or a short time afterwards, he gave orders that his divisions at hand should concentrate between Enghien and Nivelles, and even that the small force that was near Quatre Bras should fall back from that place on Nivelles; in other words, the mass of his available troops was to cover the roads that led to his right, was not to draw near the Prussian army, and was to leave the wide gap from Nivelles to Sombreffe open for his adversary to seize, to stand in full strength between the allies, and effectually to prevent their junction. Four or five hours afterwards—that is, probably about 2 or 3 A.M. on the 16th—the duke seems to have perceived that this was a mistake, and made tardily a step to get near his colleague. He ordered the divisions within reach to assemble at Quatre Bras, and moved his reserve from Brussels towards that place. These directions, however, were late in the extreme, and would have been not only too late, but disastrous, had Napoleon's lieutenants done what he had a right to expect from them.[12]

In these operations the duke had held back, and paused for hours at the decisive moment when made aware of Napoleon's attack; in his anxiety to protect his right, he had neglected to approach the Prussian army, and had left it exposed to Napoleon's strokes; and when he had come to a better conclusion, and made up his mind to move on to Quatre Bras, he ought to have found his enemy in occupation of that place, and ready to defeat him with superior numbers. His circumspection and caution had in truth been at fault and had led to the most perilous delays, as his antagonist supposed would be the case; and he was, besides, possessed by the notion that any effort made by Napoleon was made against his own right. He had been outgeneralled like Blücher,[13] and far more palpably; but, not the less, he has had many apologists, especially among the idolaters of success. One class of writers has boldly asserted that the duke ordered his forces to Quatre Bras, on the night of the 15th, as quickly as possible; but this view is false on the face of the evidence. Another class has contended that he was quite right in delaying for hours to make sure that his right wing was not being menaced, and in not attempting till then to join his colleague; in other words, a

[12] The conduct of Wellington on the 15th has been well explained by Hamley, Chesney, Charras, and La Tour d'Auvergne; and very fully and ably by Mr. Ropes, 74, 89.

[13] The duke knew that he was out-generalled, and practically admitted this to the late Mr. Greville: *Memoirs*, i. 40, edit. 1888. For the opinion of the duke of York —not worth much—see the same work, i. 49. More significant than all were the duke's own words uttered on the night of the 15th: 'Napoleon has *humbugged* me; by G— he has gained twenty-four hours on me.' It should be added that the duke's reply to Clausewitz as to the operations of the 16th, written in 1842, is full of errors.

strategic error excuses his conduct. A recent commentator has taken another line of defence—to my mind, at least, the weakest of any. Napoleon has shown with irresistible force [14] that, as affairs stood on the night of the 15th, Blücher should not have tried to concentrate at Sombreffe, and Wellington should not have tried to assemble at Quatre Bras; both chiefs were 'under the guns of their enemy;' and they ought to have fallen back on Wavre and Waterloo where they could not be attacked until 17 June. Colonel Maurice [15] appears to have inferred from this that Wellington was right in not concentrating at Quatre Bras at once, and even in making a delay at Brussels; and he leaves it to be understood that the duke was justified in adopting the notably false arrangements which placed his army between Enghien and Nivelles and exposed Blücher to complete ruin. But is it not self-evident that since, as Wellington knew, the Prussian army was gathering on Sombreffe, he should have instantly marched on Quatre Bras, and effected his junction with his colleague, and that, too, whether this very move had, or had not, been arranged beforehand? This apology is, I think, hopeless, and the latest commentator has disposed of it.[16] Wellington's strategy was, in fact, bad; but, in his actual situation, it was not unnatural. His army was much too widely divided; at Brussels he was too far from Blücher; he persisted in thinking his right imperilled: and these, added to his somewhat slow nature, were the real causes of the hesitations and delays that all but led to the failure and defeat of the allies.

The forecast on which Napoleon's plan had been formed had thus been largely realised. The allied generals, resting on divergent bases, and with forces scattered all over Belgium, had left their centre feeble and exposed; the French army had pounced on it, and nearly stood between them. Blücher and Wellington, men of opposite character, had, the first rushed forward with part of his army only, the second delayed for precious hours; and unable at wide distances to act well in concert, their operations had been at odds with each other. No doubt Ziethen had not been destroyed; part of the French army was still in the rear, especially part of the 1st corps of Erlon; Quatre Bras and Sombreffe had not been reached, and all Napoleon's objects had not been accomplished. But the emperor was even now in positions in which decisive success might be looked for, and the shortcomings of the 15th could be rectified. His arrangements for the movements of the 16th [17] have been much

[14] *Comment.* v. 205.

[15] 'Waterloo,' in the *United Service Magazine*, July 1890, pp. 345-6.

[16] See Ropes, 92, 98. Charras, i. 107, 113, explains the mistakes made by Wellington with great clearness.

[17] These arrangements have, in my opinion, been more fairly described and judged by Mr. Ropes, pp. 117, 142, than by any other commentator. He confutes the charge of delay made against Napoleon by a host of writers.

criticised, but were not the less admirable. He could not yet be fully aware of the exact positions of the hostile armies, and he seems at first to have thought that Blücher and Wellington, in conformity to strategic principles, would not attempt to stand at Sombreffe and Quatre Bras, but would fall back on a second line. But he not the less provided with masterly skill for every contingency that might happen, and his dispositions should have given him a great triumph. Knowing that some of his divisions were behind, he did not press forward to attack Blücher, as he doubtless would have done had they been in line, but he combined his operations in order to assure the defeat of the Prussian chief should he fight at Sombreffe, to keep Wellington away from Quatre Bras, and to advance further should the occasion offer. From his headquarters at Charleroi he sent orders to Ney, at about 8 A.M. on the 16th, directing the marshal, still at Frasnes, and in command of the French left, to push forward to Quatre Bras, to occupy that important point in force, and to send off a detachment to Marbais, a village a few miles west of Sombreffe; and Reille and Erlon, the last still backward, were informed they were to join in the movement with the united [18] 2nd and 1st corps. By these means Wellington would be made unable to send aid to Blücher should the Prussians stand, and the detachment at Marbais would be at hand to descend on the flank and rear of the marshal, and to assure his complete overthrow. Meantime, the emperor, with the centre and right wing, the 3rd, 4th, and 6th corps, the guard, and most of the cavalry, was to advance against the Prussians should they offer battle, and these, caught between two fires, would not improbably be destroyed. Should the allied commanders have fallen back, the French army was to move forward on the way towards Brussels.

Had Ney carried out his orders properly, Blücher must have been routed on 16 June; the duke could hardly have escaped a disaster next day, and the fortunes of Europe might have been changed for a time. When Ney received his instructions at about 11 A.M., he had 9,000 good troops around Frasnes; there was nothing at Quatre Bras but a weak division, 7,000 infantry with very few guns, composed in part of Saxe-Weimar's men, and sent forward without the duke's knowledge—a godsend for the cause of the allies [19]—and Ney knew that in about three hours' time he could receive the support of Reille and Erlon, and of Kellermann's heavy cavalry, in all, perhaps, 35,000 foot and horsemen. Had Ney, therefore, been the warrior of 1805, he could have overwhelmed the small hostile force in his path, have seized Quatre Bras, and sent a detachment

[18] One division of the 2nd corps had been already directed to the main army.

[19] Colonel Maurice, *United Service Magazine*, July 1890, p. 345, denies this inference; but he is contradicted by all the authorities. See especially Charras, i. 110, *sqq*. Ropes, pp. 102–4, *sqq*.

to Marbais by 3 or 3.30 P.M. at latest; and in that event the 16th would have seen a Jena, to be followed, perhaps, by a second Austerlitz. But Ney was wholly unequal to himself: demoralised, and with a halter round his neck, he hesitated[20] to take a decisive step; he allowed Reille to keep him back; he did not summon Erlon quickly to the field;[21] he did not even attempt to carry out his orders, and to advance in full force on Quatre Bras. The result of this fatal irresolution and delay was seen in the events that followed, and Napoleon's grand projects were largely frustrated. Ney fell on the division in his front at about 2.30 P.M., but he attacked with only a part of his troops, and though his immediate enemy was almost overpowered, time was afforded to Wellington to repair the hesitations and delays of the 15th, and to bring into the field sufficient men to hold Quatre Bras, and to keep the marshal at bay. After a bloody but not decisive combat, in which Reille's corps alone was engaged, in which Ney threw away Kellermann's horsemen, and in which, most important of all, the corps of Erlon took no part—that general and the marshal were both at fault—Ney fell back, defeated, on Frasnes, having not achieved what he might have achieved without difficulty had he been equal to his task. One result, doubtless, he had secured: he had prevented Wellington from sending help to Blücher, but he had failed to seize Quatre Bras and to detach to Marbais the troops required to make the defeat of the Prussians complete.

Meantime Blücher had arrayed his three corps—he knew that the fourth could not give him aid—in order to offer Napoleon battle. Whether Wellington had promised to send him help, and that he fought upon this assumption, has been a subject of much dispute; but the duke,[22] it is most probable, gave no distinct pledge, though German writers have charged the British general with a gross breach of faith. Blücher disposed his forces injudiciously on the field; his third corps was far to the left at Tongrinnes and Balâtre, to shield his communications with Namur; his first and second corps, stretching towards Quatre Bras, as if expecting support from Wellington, held a line of villages from St. Amand la Haye to Ligny; and his reserves, massed between Sombreffe and Bry, were greatly exposed to the fire of an enemy. The duke, who had ridden up from Quatre Bras, on seeing these arrangements,

[20] Colonel Maurice and Mr. Ropes to a certain extent, and fairly, excuse Ney on the ground that he really had no staff, and was given his command only in the afternoon of the 15th. But Ney made mistakes that were specially his own, and this is well pointed out by Napoleon, *Comment.* v. 199, 200.

[21] See Ropes, p. 191. 'What Soult told Sir William Napier, years afterwards, is without question the truth: "Ney neglected his orders at Quatre Bras."'

[22] This question has been ably examined by Colonel Maurice, *United Service Magazine*, June 1890, p. 257 *sqq.*, and by Mr. Ropes, pp. 106 *sqq.*, 146, 147. But see Charras, quoting Clausewitz, i. 122.

curtly dropped the words 'The Prussians will be damnably beaten;' and it should be added that Blücher's rear and right were laid bare to a crushing defeat, should Ney strike either or both from Marbais or from St. Amand, a village not far from St. Amand La Haye. Napoleon had reached the scene at about noon, and made preparations for attack; and, expecting aid, as he did from Ney, he felt confident of a decisive victory. He had about 68,000 men in hand, but the corps of Lobau was coming up from Charleroi; and this would make his army 78,000 strong against some 87,000 of Blücher, the French, however, being superior in horsemen and guns, and being, on the whole, the better soldiers. The arrangements of Napoleon have been censured;[23] but, taking the situation as it lay before him, they were masterly, and prove his insight on the field. He placed a small force only against Blücher's third corps, holding it in check by menacing its communications with Namur; and he arrayed the mass of his troops against the Prussian centre,[24] in order to pierce it, to cut it off from its left, and to leave it to be overwhelmed by Ney, who, he was confident, would fall on from Marbais. By these means Blücher's army would be destroyed. If his first and second corps were defeated it would be struck in front, and assailed in flank and rear, and even if the left, the third corps, should escape, it could not escape without heavy loss. This plan, Napoleon has shown [25] in a few pregnant words, was infinitely better than an attempt to defeat Blücher by simply turning his right; this, no doubt, would send Blücher away from Wellington, but it would not gain for the French decisive success, the emperor's object always in the field.[26]

The battle, famous by the name of Ligny, began at about 2.30 P.M.; Vandamme and Gérard advanced against Ziethen and Pirch, and a frightful conflict raged along the space extending from St. Amand La Haye to Ligny. The villages which covered the front of the Prussians were taken and retaken more than once, the troops on either side making desperate efforts; but Blücher's army suffered on the whole the most, for the French batteries ravaged the distant reserves. Meanwhile Grouchy paralysed Thielmann and the third corps, as the emperor had foreseen, with a few thousand men; and Napoleon made preparations for the decisive stroke. At 2 he had despatched a message to Ney, directing him to descend from Quatre Bras and to attack a body of hostile troops; and if, as seems probable, he had not then ascertained the full

[23] Rogniat, Davout, Clausewitz, quoted by Mr. Ropes, p. 164 *seqq.*

[24] *Comment.* vi. 146.

[25] *Ibid.* and see Ropes, p. 165, and *Comment.* v. 140.

[26] It is unnecessary to notice the remark of Clausewitz (Ropes, p. 167), that Napoleon would not have annihilated Blücher had Ney reached the rear of the Prussians. This is mere boasting, wholly disproved by the events of Ligny.

strength of the enemy in his path, this was reiterating the order made in the morning that the marshal should send a detachment to Marbais in order to fall in the rear of Blücher. At 3.15 P.M. the order was renewed by Soult, in writing, in the most pressing terms; but Bry and St. Amand, and not Marbais, are indicated as the points Ney was to reach, that is, he was to attack rather the Prussian right flank than the rear. A series of incidents ere long occurred fraught with the most important results. At perhaps 5.30 P.M.—that is, about the time when the troops to be sent by Ney might be nearing the field, and when Napoleon was making ready to break the centre of Blücher with his great reserve, the guard—a large column was descried towards the extreme French left; Vandamme declared that this was an enemy; and Napoleon, suspending the movement of the guard, sent off one of his best aides-de-camp [27] to ascertain what this body was. Before long, it had become apparent that this column was the first corps of Erlon, which advanced towards Quatre Bras with extreme slowness—it will be borne in mind that it had been backward, and Erlon had proved a laggard in Spain [28]—and had been directed towards Napoleon's battle; and at about 7 P.M. it gradually drew off, and marched in the direction of Quatre Bras. Erlon did not reach Quatre Bras till nightfall, and, as we have seen, did not support Ney; and a whole French corps, 20,000 strong, was marched idly to and fro on this eventful day, having failed to strike Wellington at Quatre Bras, and above all, having failed to join the French at Ligny, and to carry out the manœuvre which would have destroyed the Prussians, had it attacked them, as it might have done, in flank and rear. Nor was this the only disastrous result; [29] the delay caused by the apparition of Erlon, on the false assumption made by Vandamme, retarded Napoleon's attack on Blücher, and was most fortunate for the veteran marshal. Nevertheless the skill of the emperor triumphed; at about 8 P.M. he resumed his suspended effort; and, Blücher having greatly weakened his centre in an attempt to outflank his enemy's left, the imperial guard and a large mass of cavalry broke the Prussian army at the endangered point, and, aided by Lobau, now almost in line, carried the positions between Bry and Sombreffe, and drove their foe, defeated, from the greater part of the field.

The French lost about 11,000 men at Ligny, the Prussians not less than 30,000, including 10,000 disbanded fugitives; and Napoleon, therefore, had gained a victory. But he had not annihi-

[27] According to Napoleon this was General Dejean, a capable officer of great experience. *Comment.* v. 142.

[28] In the operations of Soult against Wellington in the autumn of 1813.

[29] This consideration—one of the greatest importance, for it postponed the result of Ligny for about three hours, and prevented a pursuit of the Prussians—has been noticed by many writers, and very fully by Mr. Ropes, pp. 173–4.

lated Blücher's army and placed Wellington in the greatest peril, as he had had a right to expect; and the results of the day had been very imperfect. This, we repeat, was mainly due to the shortcomings of Ney, who had attacked late, and, with troops brought up piecemeal, had been delayed by Reille, and had left Erlon behind; the marshal had not seized Quatre Bras and Marbais, and the emperor's left wing had been half paralysed. Erlon's corps, too, had been altogether useless. How this happened is not yet certain, though the subject has been debated for years. The admitted facts are very briefly these: a French aide-de-camp, probably Labédoyère,[30] one of Napoleon's most trusted officers, the bearer of a note in pencil to Ney, telling the marshal to send the 1st corps to Ligny in order to insure the defeat of Blücher, met Erlon, and directed that general's troops to the indicated point;[31] and Erlon's corps, we have seen, had approached the scene, mistaken by Vandamme[32] for a hostile force. Ney, however, who had not received the note, recalled Erlon peremptorily to Quatre Bras, being at this moment hard pressed by Wellington; and Napoleon, who, we have said, had sent an aide-de-camp to observe Erlon's corps,[33] had probably given him no other commands, and did not interfere with Ney's order. Erlon marched, accordingly, back to Quatre Bras, and did nothing effectual throughout the day; and the questions that arise are how this mischance occurred, and who are in the main to be blamed for it.

A number of writers have contended[34] that the pencil note carried by Labédoyère was either the order of 3.15 P.M. directing Ney to send troops to Bry and St. Amand, or perhaps a duplicate of that order; they infer, therefore, that Labédoyère was gravely in error in venturing to direct the corps of Erlon towards Ligny; and they draw the conclusion that, had Erlon not been interfered with in this improper way, he might have joined Ney and defeated Wellington, or have been moved by Ney to fall on Blücher's flank, or, more probably, that, as he had been very slow in his march, he would not have accomplished either task. The evidence, nevertheless, I think, indicates that the pencil note was an original document, sent after the despatch of 3.15 P.M.; that Napoleon, indeed, addressed it to Ney but ordered Labédoyère to show it to Erlon and to

[30] Another officer, Colonel Laurent, has been named; and it is not certain that he was not Colonel Baudus, attached to Soult's staff.

[31] See Erlon's report, quoted by Prince La Tour d'Auvergne, *Waterloo*, p. 170, and referred to by many writers. The prince seems to me to take the most correct iew of all this episode.

[32] Vandamme evidently had not forgotten Culm. Like the other French general, he was nervous.

[33] This must, I think, be inferred from *Comment.* v. 142. Napoleon is unsatisfactory on the Erlon incident; he felt an immense mistake had been made.

[34] Among others Chesney, Charras, Hooper, Maurice, and Ropes, with some differences of view.

move the 1st corps against Blücher at once; and that Erlon, therefore, marched in that direction, knowing that this was the emperor's settled purpose.[35] Erlon, however, we have seen, returned to Quatre Bras, obeying Ney, who had not received the note in question, but almost certainly had received the despatch of 3.15 P.M. enjoining him to descend on Bry and St. Amand, and to strike Blücher with decisive effect. If this be the real state of the case, we may perhaps determine who are responsible for a misadventure most disastrous to the arms of France. In all human probability, Napoleon did not send an order to Erlon to come up at once, when that general was known to be at hand; he allowed Erlon to fall back on Ney: and possibly we see here a want of the daring and vigour of the warrior of 1796–1809.[36] Ney and Erlon, however, must bear nearly the whole blame: the marshal, because he had left Erlon in the rear, and had made it possible that his lieutenant should be directed on Ligny without his knowledge, and also because, having been made cognisant of the despatch of 3.15 P.M., he assuredly should not have brought Erlon back to Quatre Bras when on the path of victory; Erlon, because he ought not to have marched back to Quatre Bras, but should have continued his movement towards Ligny, having been made aware that he was required on the spot to make the overthrow of Blücher certain.

If Ligny had not been a decisive victory, the Prussian army had been severely worsted, and the battle had gained for Napoleon a great advantage. The allied generals, having failed to unite, had been driven from their true line of junction, the broad lateral road from Nivelles to Namur; they were now forced to retreat into the intricate region of marsh, hills, and forests watered by the Dyle. What course should they adopt in these circumstances, considering the position of affairs on the theatre? They might fall back on their respective bases, as had happened in the campaign of 1794; and Gneisenau, Blücher's chief of the staff, who distrusted Wellington after his late delays, urged his veteran superior to take this very step and to leave the duke to shift for himself. Recollecting, however, Blücher's character, he would more probably try to join hands with his colleague; and Napoleon has indicated with cha-

[35] Prince La Tour d'Auvergne, *Waterloo*, pp. 173–77. Thiers is precise and emphatic on the point, and the testimony of Colonel Baudus, quoted by Ropes, pp. 193–195, seems to me almost conclusive. The well-known letter of Soult to Ney on the 17th points to the same inference; and the opposite view rests in the main on hypotheses and assumptions.

[36] Perhaps, however, Napoleon felt convinced that Erlon would come up without a fresh order; perhaps it was too late to send one; very possibly he did not interfere with the positive injunction of Ney to Erlon because he may have suspected from the roar of cannon at Quatre Bras that Ney required support. All that can be said is that this momentous episode has not yet been fully explained.

racteristic insight what ought to have been the allied movements. The Prussian army, defeated at Ligny, might have retreated at once on its British supports, making either for Quatre Bras or Waterloo;[37] and as Ney had fallen back on Frasnes, and night had come on when Ligny was won, there is no force in the objection that this would have been a perilous flank march within reach of the enemy. A better operation was, however, possible; and this would not only have placed the allies in safety, but have baffled the designs of their great adversary. As Napoleon has shown with his conclusive logic, just as Blücher and Wellington ought to have fallen back, the one on Wavre, the other on Waterloo, when they had been nearly caught by the night of the 15th, so, now that Blücher had lost Ligny, they should have steadily retreated on Brussels, concentrating their united forces; for in that event they would avoid all danger and they would be able to oppose at least 200,000 men to about 100,000 of the emperor, who could hardly venture to offer battle, and probably would be compelled to return to France, discomfited, and with the loss of his renown in arms.[38]

The allied generals followed a different plan, and exposed themselves once more to the gravest peril. Blücher had been seriously hurt at the close of Ligny, but he refused to listen to Gneisenau's counsels; and he resolved to fall back on a second line, in order to join hands with his British colleague. The Prussian army retreated in two main bodies; the 1st and 2nd corps, by Tilly and Gentinnes, the 3rd, that of Thielmann, from Sombreffe, late. It was shattered, and short of food and munitions, but it was not pursued or even observed; it was joined near Gembloux by the corps of Bülow, which had taken no part in the late battle; and ultimately it made good its way to Wavre, a town on the Dyle, about twenty miles from Sombreffe. Meanwhile Wellington had been informed of the defeat of the Prussians very late; but he, too, was followed by no enemy; and he fell back on the morning of the 17th from Quatre Bras to Waterloo, then an unknown village, about ten miles to the west of Wavre, a position he had selected for a great defensive battle. Blücher and Wellington, therefore, were placing themselves on a line behind Quatre Bras and Sombreffe; and they arranged to try to unite on this, and meanwhile to await the shock of Napoleon. This strategy has had many admirers, especially among the courtiers of fortune; but it was, nevertheless, ill conceived and hazardous. Wavre is further from Waterloo than Sombreffe from Quatre Bras, and, what is much more important, is divided from

[37] *Comment.* v. 205.

[38] This fine manœuvre would, to a certain extent, have resembled Napoleon's first operations in the campaign of 1809. With the reasons for it, it is fully explained, *Comment.* v. 210. The passage is too long to be quoted, but deserves careful study. English and German writers avoid it, for Napoleon's logic is irresistible.

Waterloo by a most difficult country; Napoleon was within reach of the allied armies and could assail either while still apart; it was most improbable that they could join hands, and probable in the extreme that they would be beaten in detail. Napoleon had from 40,000 to 50,000 fresh troops; he might call on his army to make a great effort, and fall, on the 17th, on either Blücher or Wellington, retreating, and unable to assist each other, and in that event he must have defeated either. Or, drawing together his whole forces, he might on the 18th attack Blücher at Wavre, or Wellington, where he stood at Waterloo, and in either case he must have gained a victory. Or finally, in accordance with the art of war, he might send off at an early hour on the 17th a restraining wing to hold Blücher in check, and to prevent him from even approaching Wellington, and then turn against the duke with the greater part of his army; and in this instance, too, he would have been successful.[39] The double retreat, therefore, on Wavre and Waterloo was a half-measure essentially faulty; and it placed the allies again in imminent danger.[40]

At this critical juncture, however, events were taking place in the French camp which saved the allies from what might have been their ruin. After Ligny, Napoleon had returned to Fleurus; the intense fatigue of two days had brought on the illness [41] which made him unfit for exertion at the time; and on the night of the 16th and the morning of the 17th he was unable to issue a single order. Meanwhile his lieutenants at Quatre Bras and Ligny, fashioned to servitude in the ways of the empire, and without the boldness of the days of victory, let things drift, and missed the occasion which might have made the triumph of the French arms certain. Ney, furious at the diversion of Erlon's corps, sulked at Quatre Bras, and made no report; Soult, the chief of the staff, did simply nothing, and Grouchy, in command of the French right, sent only a few horsemen, from near Sombreffe towards Namur, that is, completely away from the track of the Prussians. This negligence and remissness was the more to be blamed because Napoleon had given positive orders [42] that Ney and Grouchy were to exercise supreme

[39] Prince La Tour d'Auvergne, *Waterloo*, pp. 203–205, has shown better than any other commentator the enormous risk of the march on Wavre and Waterloo, and what an opportunity it gave Napoleon. See also Ropes, pp. 197–200.

[40] It is very curious that most of the soldiers who have attempted to justify the false march on Wavre and Waterloo, either directly or by implication admit that it might have proved disastrous. See Charras, i. 203, ii. 128; Clausewitz, cited by General Chesney, *Waterloo Lectures*, p. 260; Shaw Kennedy, *Battle of Waterloo*, pp. 155–8.

[41] Dorsey Gardner, *Waterloo*, p. 36. The illness was an affection of the skin and the bladder which caused prostration. Clausewitz, though not aware of the facts, saw that something was wrong, and says Napoleon was 'affected by a sort of lethargy.' See also Ropes, p. 200.

[42] *Corresp.* pp. 28, 290–1. Napoleon's language is clear and emphatic.

command, on the left and the right, when he should be absent; and no conceivable excuse can be made for such conduct. The general result of these disastrous incidents, in which hours beyond price were thrown away[43] and lost, was that, as we have said, the retreat of Blücher was not molested or even watched, and that its direction was not ascertained. Wellington, too, was allowed to fall back from Quatre Bras without an attempt being made to attack him; and the French army had not only failed to seize an opportunity to overthrow its enemy, but—what might obviously prove dangerous—had become ignorant of the real position of the Prussian army. By the forenoon of the 17th Napoleon had returned to Ligny; and there can be no doubt he was convinced for a time that Blücher was retiring on his base towards the Rhine, an error in itself natural, but one that could not have possibly happened had Ney, Soult, and Grouchy performed their duty. Impressed with this belief he devoted some hours to reviewing his troops and giving rewards; and his original intention certainly was to halt for the day on the positions he held, for he thought Blücher out of the account for the present, and that he would have ample time to turn against and defeat Wellington. On being informed, however, that a considerable part of the duke's army was still near Quatre Bras, he resolved to break up from Ligny at once, to pursue the enemy at hand, and to bring him to bay.

The French army was now divided into two groups, the first about 72,000 strong, comprising some 15,000 cavalry and 240 guns, the second about 34,000, with nearly 100 guns and 5,000 horsemen. The disposition of the two groups was to be this: the emperor, with the guard and part of the 6th corps, was to join Ney with the 1st and 2nd corps, and to pursue the duke from Quatre Bras; the 3rd and 4th corps, with the other part of the 6th, was to follow the Prussians, as a restraining wing; and the two other arms were, of course, to co-operate. Napoleon entrusted the restraining wing to Grouchy: he told the marshal that he would attack Wellington, should that general stand before the forest of Soignies, a great wood in front of Brussels and surrounding Waterloo; he ordered him to pursue Blücher, to keep him in sight, and to hold him in check; and there can be no reasonable doubt that he made Grouchy aware[44] that his

[43] Jomini, though ignorant of the real cause, was greatly impressed by the time and opportunity lost on the morning of the 17th. *Ce nouveau temps perdu sera toujours une chose inexplicable de la part de Napoléon: Précis de la Campagne de* 1815, p. 185.

[44] Grouchy has denied that he received an order in any such sense, but his own despatches contradict him, and he is not a faithworthy witness. Gérard positively asserts that the order was practically given; and Thiers says he had this repeatedly from Gérard himself. Jomini, *Précis de la Campagne* 1815, p. 189, remarks, after giving conclusive reasons, '*on ne saurait révoquer en doute qu'il* (Napoleon) *l'ait effectivement donné* (*l'ordre*).'

mission was to interpose between the hostile armies, and to prevent Blücher from joining his colleague. This strategy was perfectly correct in principle, and had secured Napoleon some of his most splendid triumphs; and the task assigned to Grouchy was not beyond the powers of a capable and intelligent soldier. But it had become much less easy than it ought to have been; the time that had been lost by negligence and delay had allowed Blücher to escape unscathed; the exact direction he had taken was not known; he had a start over his pursuers of more than twelve hours; and the operation of restraining him that could have been made a certainty had become one that might prove a failure.

Napoleon had joined Ney by about 2 P.M.; the main French army was brought into line; and it broke up from Quatre Bras to hang on the track of Wellington whose columns had been for hours in retreat. The emperor had ordered Ney to fall on the duke before his supports from Ligny had reached him; but the marshal had remained in his camp; and he has been severely condemned for this inaction.[45] It seems probable, however, that he could have done little more than accelerate the British retrograde movement; and I incline to think that he has been unduly blamed, because Napoleon had become conscious that, through the morning's delays the French had lost a most admirable chance, which he would not have lost in his early campaigns. The emperor directed the pursuit in person, along the great main road from Charleroi to Brussels, leading by Genappe to Soignies and Waterloo; and there has been much controversy[46] whether he conducted the movement with characteristic energy, or whether he was not remiss and sluggish. Be this as it may, the advancing French only harassed the rearguard of the duke, the mass of whose army was already safe; and, in fact, a tempest of rain that flooded the country brought military operations almost to a stand. As evening fell, the heads of the French columns reached the low hills near La Belle Alliance, in front of the slopes that lead to Waterloo; and the fire of many batteries gave Napoleon warning that a large army was in position before him. The emperor was compelled to postpone an attack, if, as seems probable, he had expected to attack Wellington on the 17th. He exclaimed[47] 'What would I give to have the power of Joshua, and to arrest for two hours the march of the sun!'

We turn from the main French army, now in front of Wellington, to the operations of Grouchy and the restraining wing. The latest commentator on the campaign has truly observed that these movements have not, as a rule, received the careful attention they de-

[45] See for the opposite views on this subject, *Comment.* v. 138–9, Ropes, p. 215, Charras, i. 198–9.

[46] Compare Ropes, p. 215, and Dorsey Gardner, p. 134 note. [47] *Comment.* v. 200.

serve;[48] and English and German critics, it should be added, have, with scarcely an exception, slurred the subject over, for a thorough examination of the facts condemns the false double retreat on Wavre and Waterloo, and especially the generalship of the allies on the 18th, who gained a triumph, decisive, indeed, but one which ought to have been a French victory. Before quitting Ligny Napoleon still believed that Blücher was making for his base towards the Rhine, and he probably held this belief for many hours afterwards. But on his way from Ligny to Quatre Bras, or, perhaps, even before he left Ligny, he had received a report that a large Prussian force —this evidently was the corps of Bülow—had been seen on the Orneau, one of the Sambre's feeders—that is, in the direction of the duke's army; and he instantly sent off a message to Grouchy, every line of which requires thought and study. In this important despatch the emperor still shows that in his judgment the mass of the Prussian army was probably in retreat eastwards; but he clearly foresaw that an attempt by Blücher to join hands with Wellington was not unlikely; and he made provision for this very contingency. Having directed Grouchy to ascertain the facts, and to report them to headquarters, he ordered the marshal to march on Gembloux, a village to the south-east of Wavre, and thirteen or fourteen miles from that place; and Grouchy from Gembloux was to scour the country with his cavalry, and 'to pursue the enemy.' As Gembloux is only a few miles from Ligny, and was distant nearly a march from Wavre, this injunction obviously did not assign the very best position to the restraining wing in order to carry out the emperor's purpose; but, whatever detracting critics have urged,[49] it was quite sufficiently correct to have enabled Grouchy, had he had the insight and power of a true soldier, to do what he had been appointed to do, that is to hold Blücher effectually in check and to keep the Prussian and British armies apart.

On the receipt of this important despatch, the restraining wing, now the right of the French army, was immediately led by Grouchy to Gembloux. The march of his columns was very slow, impeded by bad roads and the tempestuous rain; and they were not near and around their destination till night, parts being a short distance in the rear.[50] Grouchy, however, had pushed forward with an advanced guard; and at Gembloux he obtained intelligence which,

[48] Ropes, pp. 219, 221.

[49] Jomini is by far the best of the early commentators on the operations of Grouchy. Mr. Ropes is excellent on this subject and properly condemns English and German critics.

[50] Napoleon, *Comment.* v. 153, blames the slowness of Grouchy's march to Gembloux, but the charge is untenable. The emperor, writing at St. Helena, made a mistake in this matter, not necessarily a wilful mistake, as detractors have urged. Nor is the point of importance; Grouchy had time enough next day to make good any delays.

if not accurate in some respects, should have been amply sufficient to fix his purpose. He was informed that the Prussians were retreating in two main bodies, the one on Liège, the other on Wavre, and that a third column was making for Namur; that is, that part of Blücher's army was falling back on its base, and that another part was drawing towards Wellington. Upon this he wrote twice to his master,[51] apprising him of what he had ascertained; and he expressly declared that 'if the mass of the enemy's forces was moving on Wavre, he would pursue it in that direction, in order to separate Blücher and Wellington,' proving that he perfectly understood his mission. What in these circumstances was his plain duty, giving him credit for ordinary energy and skill? He might neglect hostile masses retiring on Liège and Namur, for these would be wholly out of the account; but he was bound to follow, without unnecessary delay, any hostile mass making towards Wavre, for that was already drawing near Wellington; and this was the more essential because he well knew that Napoleon intended to fall on Wellington, should the duke stand in front of the great wood of Soignies, distant only nine or ten miles from Wavre. Grouchy's conduct, therefore, was marked out for him: he should break up from Gembloux[52] at dawn on the 18th, and march towards Wavre as quickly as possible, in order to come up with the enemy; and obviously he should move on roads which would place him upon the flank of the Prussians, should they try to unite with the British from Wavre, and would, at the same time, bring him near the emperor. These roads existed and were even open; they led across the Dyle by the two stone bridges of Moustier and Ottignies, left intact, and not more than twelve miles from Gembloux;[53] and had the French marshal made this movement, dictated by the very nature of the case, it may confidently be asserted that he would have intercepted Blücher and prevented him giving support to Wellington during the great fight of 18 June.

We pass from Grouchy standing at Gembloux to the emperor and his army face to face with Wellington. Napoleon did not at first believe that the duke would venture to offer battle, a retreat to Brussels being much more prudent; and he spent the night of the 17th, under torrents of rain, apprehensive that his adversary would decamp. As the morning, however, began to break, he knew that the British army must await his onset: by this time he had heard from Grouchy—whose despatches, it should be borne in

[51] See these letters referred to by Prince La Tour d'Auvergne, *Waterloo*, pp. 230, 315.

[52] Even Charras, Napoleon's professed detractor, admits this, ii. 114, 15.

[53] Jomini, *Précis de la Campagne de* 1815, p. 222, says that Napoleon 'probably would have made this movement.' As we shall see, the emperor expected that Grouchy would make it. In any case I believe it would have been made by Desaix, Masséna, Lannes, or Davout.

mind, were calculated to make him feel secure from any possible Prussian attack;—and he looked forward to a decisive victory. The memoirs of General Marbot, lately published, have thrown fresh and striking light on what was occurring in the imperial camp, and also on the conduct of Grouchy at this most critical moment of the campaign; and they must largely affect our judgment on events. We know already, indeed, that Napoleon's detractors are wrong in asserting that he neglected to observe what was going on towards his right; he sent bodies of horsemen nearly to Wavre, and even ascertained that a Prussian column was not distant from that place, and beyond dispute he communicated this to Grouchy. But Marbot is really the first writer who has cleared up in any sense the facts as to the relations between Napoleon and Grouchy during the few hours that preceded Waterloo, and his disclosures are of the highest importance, his formal report—a most pregnant incident—having been, we have said, suppressed by the Bourbons. From Marbot's evidence [54] it is perfectly plain that the emperor expected Grouchy would make the movement from Gembloux which he ought to have made—that is, would cross the Dyle at Moustier and Ottignies, so as at once to reach Blücher's flank, should Blücher be moving towards Wellington, and also to approach the main French army, and it is impossible [55] to doubt but Napoleon sent a message to this effect to Grouchy. Marbot, too, indicates the true conclusion to be formed on another much disputed subject as to the operations of the night of the 17th. Napoleon positively asserts [56] that he directed Grouchy to send a detachment of 7,000 men to attack Wellington's left flank on the morning of the 18th; but this statement, though not without support,[57] has hitherto received very little credence. But if Napoleon expected Grouchy to march from Gembloux on Moustier and Ottignies, that is, directly towards the imperial army, the assertion in question is strongly confirmed; and the better inference must be that he made the order. On the whole it is difficult now to doubt but that Napoleon believed Grouchy would be at hand on the 18th to keep Blücher away, and to afford support to an attack on Wellington, and had given directions to that effect on the night of the 17th; and

[54] *Memoirs*, iii. 404, 408. The passage should be carefully studied. Thiers tells an anecdote to the same effect.

[55] That the message was sent is almost obvious; but it does not follow that it reached Grouchy. It probably did not. Thiers inclines to the belief that any orders sent to the marshal on the night of the 17th were intercepted.

[56] *Comment.* v. 154. It is improbable in the very highest degree that Napoleon would have made a purely false statement on this subject; and the movement, it will be observed, was the counterpart of that which Ney was directed to make on Marbais on the 16th. It was exactly in Napoleon's manner.

[57] For the opposite views on this subject see Thiers, *Waterloo*, and Charras, ii. 126 *seqq.* After the publication of Marbot's work there is not much room for valid doubt.

if this view be correct the charges made against the emperor fall to the ground as regards his conduct in this passage of the campaign.

During these occurrences in the two French camps, the allied generals had been carrying out their projects. By the night of the 17th Blücher had his four corps in hand, assembled in and around Wavre; they still numbered some 90,000 men, including perhaps 9,000 horsemen and about 270 guns; they had been rested and had obtained supplies, and they were ready for a great effort next day. Meanwhile Wellington had drawn together an army about 70,000 strong from Quatre Bras, Nivelles, and other points, to the position he had chosen in front of Waterloo; he had some 12,000 cavalry and 150 guns; and he might have collected a much more powerful force, had he not left 17,000 men near Hal on his right—ever apprehensive of an attack from that side—a strategic error that nearly cost him dear. The purpose of the allies was unchanged; they were to await the attack of Napoleon on their second line; and as the emperor was now before Wellington, that general was to accept battle at Waterloo, and Blücher was to march to his aid from Wavre. Recent commentators have raised very grave questions as to what their arrangements were to effect their junction It has long been assumed that Blücher had informed his colleague by the afternoon of the 17th that he would be in line with Wellington, with the whole Prussian army, at an early hour, probably, on the 18th; and it is difficult in the extreme to reject this conclusion. Ollech, however, whose book appeared only a few years ago, has contended [58] that the supposed message of the 17th was a letter written on the 18th only, that Blücher did not promise to march on Waterloo until about midnight on the 17th, and that Wellington, therefore, did not learn that he had a prospect of receiving Prussian support until the early morning of the 18th. Colonel Maurice has accepted this view as correct,[59] but, in my judgment, it must be erroneous. It can scarcely be reconciled with the text of the single despatch that can be produced; it is all but contradicted by a letter of the duke written at 3 o'clock on the morning of the 18th, and stating that the Prussians would join him 'in the morning;' [60] above all, it is hardly possible that Wellington would have made a stand at Waterloo on the evening of the 17th, and risked a battle with enormous odds against him, unless he then knew that Blücher was pledged to join him. There is, however, undoubted evidence, if the document really is genuine, that Gneisenau,[61] late on the morning of the 18th, was hesitating to direct his chief to march on Waterloo, at least in force; and the events of the

[58] Cited by Ropes, *Waterloo*, p. 238.

[59] *United Service Magazine*, September 1890, p. 534 *seqq*.

[60] *Despatches*, vol. xii See Charras, ii. 6, 7.

[61] Ollech, cited by Mr. Ropes, pp. 262–3.

day point to this conclusion. Bülow broke up from near Wavre by daybreak, indeed, but Pirch and Ziethen did not leave Wavre till noon, and Thielmann remained at Wavre behind. If this disclosure is in accord with the facts, nay, if Wellington did not know on the 17th that Blücher had given his word to join him, the strategy of the allies, bad at the best, was even much worse than has usually been supposed.[62]

Taking the case of the allies however at its best, these arrangements, flowing from the false movement on Wavre and Waterloo on the 17th, and from their resolve to stand on that line, were, nevertheless, essentially wrong. Assume that Wellington was convinced by the afternoon of the 17th that Blücher was bound to advance on Waterloo, and reach him at an early hour on the 18th, and that Blücher had decided to march early from Wavre, still the chances remained largely on the side of Napoleon, for a considerable part of the day at least, inferior as he was to the collective force of his enemies; and in fact the allied generals conducted their movements on suppositions that ought to have insured their defeat. Both Blücher and Wellington thought that Napoleon had five-sixths of his army in front of Waterloo, his whole army in fact, except one corps; yet Wellington was to await the emperor's attack until Blücher from Wavre should join his colleague; in other words the duke with an inferior army, containing not more than 40,000 good troops on the spot, weak in guns, and filled with doubtful auxiliaries, was to resist, for a period of five or six hours at shortest, the attack of 90,000 or 100,000 Frenchmen, superior in cavalry, and greatly so in guns.[63] This assumption was a radical mistake; it exposed the duke to a great disaster, and it might have involved his colleague in the same catastrophe. Again, extraordinary as it may appear, the allied commanders did not suspect that Grouchy had been detached, with 34,000 men, as a restraining wing to hold Blücher in check, and to prevent him from reaching Waterloo; they supposed, ignoring a whole set of precedents seen in Napoleon's splendid career, that Blücher would not be molested on his way from Wavre; and this supposition should never have been made, if it was vindicated by the event through Grouchy's conduct. Their strategy, in a word, was ill-judged and hazardous in the highest degree; and it ought to have made their discomfiture certain.

Napoleon, meantime, had been preparing a great and decisive

[62] I do not notice the story told by Colonel Maurice, *United Service Magazine*, January 1891, that Wellington rode from Waterloo on the night of the 17th, and had a conference with Blücher; it rests on the merest hearsay, and is scarcely credible.

[63] Clausewitz, cited by Mr. Ropes, p. 243, denies that this position of the allies was really hazardous; but this view is hopeless. Mr. Ropes says, with unanswerable force, 'It is foolish to contend that Wellington did not run a great risk of being defeated before the arrival of the Prussians.' Cp. Napoleon's *Comment.* v. 208–9.

attack on Wellington. He had intended to begin [64] this at 9 A.M. on the 18th, but the incessant rain had made the ground difficult; and, at the request of Drouot, one of his best lieutenants, he delayed the attack for nearly three hours, to enable his artillery to move more freely. This possibly was a mistake on his part; [65] all that is certain is that it gave the duke an unexpected and great advantage. The emperor next directed his thoughts towards Grouchy; and between the well-known letter of Soult, written at 10 A.M. on the 18th of June, and Marbot's recently published memoirs, we clearly see what were his views and hopes. Soult informed Grouchy that a Prussian column, in the direction of Wavre, had been heard of; he let Grouchy know that he was to make for Wavre; but at the same time he apprised the marshal that he was to draw near the main French army, the paramount intention of the whole despatch.[66] Marbot tells us that he received positive orders—he commanded a regiment of hussars at the extreme French right [67]—to send parties of horsemen as far as the Dyle in order to join hands with Grouchy's forces, expected to arrive by Moustier and Ottignies; and, after this testimony, it must be inferred that Napoleon believed Grouchy was not distant, and was approaching the scene of action by the true line of march.

At 11 A.M. the French army was ready for the attack, and it presented a noble and imposing spectacle. The plan of Napoleon, as usual skilfully masked, was to turn Wellington's left and to force his centre—admittedly the best possible plan—and the emperor had so arranged his troops on the field as at once to conceal and to carry out his purpose. His front was occupied by the 1st and 2nd corps, spreading from near Frischermont on his right, to Mon Plaisir on the left; in the immediate rear were masses of cavalry; and behind were the imperial guard and part of the 6th corps intended to deal the decisive stroke. The ground, though sodden and heavy, had become more fit for manœuvring; the main road from Charleroi to Brussels and a good cross road from Nivelles to that capital led into the heart of the duke's positions; guns had been admirably placed to facilitate attacks; above all the enemy was not given a hint from what point, and how, the tempest was to burst. The duke, however, had his arrangements made; and they revealed his peculiar skill in defence, the most conspicuous of his gifts in war. His lines extended from the right to his left, from

[64] Prince La Tour d'Auvergne, *Waterloo*, p. 251. He cites official documents.

[65] Charras, ii. 15.

[66] The despatch is somewhat vague in its language; but it should be studied with the comments on it of Thiers and Gérard. The common theory of English and German critics that it meant that Grouchy was to march directly on Wavre, and do nothing else, is quite untenable.

[67] *Memoirs*, iii. 405. The emperor's note was sent by Labédoyère, and was thus held to be of the first importance. This may indicate that it was Labédoyère who went o Erlon on the 16th.

Braine l'Alleud and Merbe Braine to Ohain—he expected the Prussians at this point—and his main battle was collected in the space beween the Nivelles road and thence to Papelotte. His front was covered by two great obstacles, the château of Hougoumont, and the large farm of La Haye Sainte; and these had been fortified and were strongly held, in order to break the fury of the French attacks. Exactly the opposite of the case of the Prussians at Ligny, his reserves were carefully screened and protected; and a road, running along the main position, enabled the three arms to move readily, and gave opportunities for counter-attacks.

I can only glance at the main incidents of the great day of Waterloo. The battle began at about 11·30 A.M.; and Reille's divisions advanced against the British right, a feint to conceal the real attack on the left. The onset of the French, however, was ill combined—a defect in their tactics throughout the day—and the defenders of Hougoumont maintained their post. Ere long a threatening apparition rose on the field; Napoleon learned that Bülow was at hand with nearly 30,000 men gathering on his right flank; he detached Lobau with 10,000 to hold this foe in check; and he despatched a messenger to summon Grouchy to the scene. Meanwhile the main attack had begun; the corps of Erlon, sustained by the fire of batteries extending to Papelotte and La Haye from La Haye Sainte, was directed against the British left and centre; but it was repulsed after a desperate struggle, remarkable for a noble charge of the British heavy cavalry. The emperor's first great effort had thus failed, and Bülow was making his presence felt, advancing on his flank from Chapelle St. Lambert; but Napoleon turned fiercely against the duke's centre; and at about 4 P.M. La Haye Sainte was stormed. A gap was now opened in Wellington's line; the French cavalry sweeping away thousands of the weak auxiliaries, reached the crest of the main British position, between the two roads leading to Brussels; and Napoleon, it seems certain, intended to follow up this partial success by an attack of the guard.

The situation of the duke had become most critical; [68] his army, in fact, was no match for its much more powerful and better trained foe; but, fortunately for England, Blücher had reached the spot; the old marshal hastened the advance of Bülow; and that general fell on Napoleon's right flank at about 5 P.M. The emperor was now fighting two battles and in a position of grave difficulty; he was compelled to suspend the movement of the guard; and, in fact, the Prussian attack had become so weighty that a large part of the guard was required to stem it. Ney meanwhile had been making furious efforts to break the British centre with his cavalry alone:

[68] See Blücher's official account of Waterloo, which though little regarded by almost all English writers, was never questioned by Wellington.

the hot fit of rashness succeeding the cold, he wasted his troops against his master's wishes; noble courage was displayed on both sides; but the French squadrons were at last beaten, unsupported as they had been by infantry. The battle, however, was far from decided; by 7 P.M. Bülow was driven back; and Wellington's army had been so severely stricken that it seemed unequal to a great final effort. Napoleon formed the guard into two large columns, and launched it against the British centre, sustaining it by the remains of his forces; but Wellington, who had admirably maintained the fight, and had husbanded his army with great skill and forethought, had still a reserve for the decisive moment, and had carefully protected the endangered point. The guard was repulsed, and as it swayed backward a sudden transformation passed over the scene. Parts of the corps of Ziethen and Pirch appeared on the field; a mass of British horsemen was let loose; and the duke moved his army forward a few hundred yards to prove that he had won the battle. The French were assailed in front, flank, and rear; the guard fought heroically to the last; but the rest of Napoleon's routed army was soon a mere horde of disbanding fugitives. Ill conducted as its efforts had been, the French army had shown remarkable valour; but it gave way under the extreme of misfortune—a sign how really inferior it was to the best armies Napoleon had led.

The emperor's plan of attack at Waterloo has been justly admired by all critics; but his conduct of the battle showed want of energy. He was but little on horseback during the day; he did not direct the operations with his wonted care; he perhaps missed an opportunity to strike with the guard when the capture of La Haye Sainte exposed Wellington's line. His position, doubtless, was difficult in the extreme, after Bülow's attack had begun in earnest; but his apparent remissness, we now know, was really due to a return of illness.[69] The tactics of his lieutenants were faulty too; they revealed impatience and want of prudence; the corps of Erlon was badly arrayed; Ney 'massacred' the fine French cavalry; and the day, as Napoleon has himself said, was one of 'manœuvres essentially false.' On the other hand, Wellington was the soul of the defence; apart from the error of leaving on the right a great detachment distant from the field, his arrangements were, in the highest degree, excellent; he expected the Prussians at an early hour, but he continued to stand successfully until night was at hand; he showed remarkable skill in protecting his troops; he had a reserve ready at the last moment; notwithstanding the weakness of his auxiliaries, his unflinching constancy never gave way. His activity and vigour stand in marked contrast with the seeming sluggishness

[69] Dorsey Gardner, pp. 36–7. Soult also noticed that Napoleon was ill.

of his great antagonist, and largely redeem the grave strategic mistakes into which he fell in the course of the campaign.

The result of Waterloo, nevertheless, is to be ascribed to operations outside the field; it was due to the fact that 45,000 Prussians were thrown on the right flank and rear of Napoleon; and for this Grouchy is almost wholly responsible. The marshal, we have seen, ought to have left Gembloux at the first peep of dawn on 18 June; and he should have moved as quickly as possible on Moustier and Ottignies, in order alike to reach the flank of Blücher should he be seeking from Wavre to join Wellington, and in order to draw near the main French force at Waterloo. After the revelations of Marbot's 'Memoirs,' Napoleon, we have said, it can hardly be doubted, at some time on the night of the 17th, gave Grouchy directions in this very sense; but even if, as seems extremely likely, this important message did not reach Grouchy, his true course ought to have been obvious to him. Grouchy, however, did not break up from Gembloux until 8 or 9 A.M. on the 18th; he crowded his divisions into one huge column, thus rendering their advance unnecessarily slow; and, having squandered irreparably the most precious hours, he did not make for Moustier and Ottignies, or attempt even to approach the Dyle. He marched, instead, directly on Wavre, that is towards the rear and not the flank of his enemy, and keeping entirely away from Napoleon; nor was this his only or perhaps his worst error. At about noon he heard the thunder of Waterloo, at a place shown by the latest historian [70] to have been Walhain, not Sart les Walhain, that is nearer Waterloo than has been hitherto thought, and he rejected the admirable advice of Gérard to move at once on Moustier and Ottignies so as to menace the Prussians in flank, to turn Wavre should an attack be required, and to communicate with the emperor now fighting Wellington. Grouchy continued his ill-starred movement on Wavre; at about 4 P.M. he received the despatch of 10 A.M., approving, no doubt, a march on Wavre, but ordering the marshal to approach Napoleon—both objects, it should be borne in mind, would have been gained by taking the true course, that is by crossing the Dyle at Moustier and Ottignies—but again he would not listen to Gérard's counsels, and he attacked Thielmann at Wavre a short time afterwards. The Prussian general had only 18,000 men; but he contrived to keep Grouchy in check for some hours; and meanwhile Bülow, Ziethen, and Pirch had made their way to Waterloo, and had overwhelmed Napoleon. At 7 P.M. Grouchy was given the despatch, sent off, we have seen, from the emperor's lines at the intelligence of the approach of Bülow; the marshal crossed the Dyle, and endeavoured to draw near his master; but the movement was altogether too late; the French army had been destroyed. The

[70] Ropes, p. 286.

34,000 men of Grouchy had detained a fraction only of the Prussian army; the marshal had not threatened or stopped Blücher and given support to Napoleon, as he might have done had he acted with ordinary judgment and skill.

The right wing, therefore, of the French army, detached to pursue and restrain Blücher, had failed to accomplish its allotted task; and owing to his feebleness and delays, and to the wrong direction given to his march, Grouchy had been worse than useless on the great day of Waterloo. The latest commentator [71] has ably disposed of the apologies made for this worthless soldier. It has been said that Grouchy was too far from Moustier and Ottignies to be in time to threaten the Prussians and check their advance; but even the partisan Charras rejects this view; [72] and Jomini, who knew what a French army could do better than any other critic,[73] has not a doubt on the subject. Still more untenable is the position that, as Napoleon directed Grouchy to Wavre, he has to thank himself for his own overthrow; the emperor did not assume that the marshal would throw time away and move at a snail's pace; and there were two ways of getting to Wavre, the direct roads and those to Moustier and Ottignies, the line Napoleon believed that Grouchy would take.[74] We may also dismiss the shallow statement that Grouchy would have been too late to operate with effect on the 18th, as the Prussians from Wavre reached Waterloo late; the marshal should have left Gembloux at daybreak; the march of Bülow was timid in the extreme, and Ziethen and Pirch did not move till noon; and this argument therefore falls to the ground. The reasoning of Charras is more plausible,[75] that, as Grouchy had only 34,000 men, and Blücher had certainly 90,000, the French could not have stopped the Prussians; but this ignores the facts that, at Moustier and Ottignies, Grouchy would have been on the flank of his enemy; that the Prussian columns were widely apart, and that the question was only to keep them in check a few hours. Most of these arguments, too, make too much of the distance between Gembloux and Wavre; an army drawing on the flank of a foe, especially on a perilous flank march, arrests him even when far away; [76] and this was the position of Grouchy as respects Blücher. On the whole, there can be little ground for doubt that Grouchy would have kept the Prussians from Waterloo had he marched early and quickly on Moustier and Ottignies, and made his way towards his expecting

[71] Ropes, pp. 244, 288. I do not agree with all he says, but he is very clear and able. See also Prince La Tour d'Auvergne, pp. 367–387.

[72] Charras, ii. 115, 120.

[73] *Précis de la Campagne de* 1815, p. 261.

[74] See Marbot, iii. 405, 408, and Prince La Tour d'Auvergne very good on this point, pp. 373–4.

[75] Tome ii. 112 *seqq.*

[76] See Quinet on Waterloo, one of Napoleon's libellers.

master; and in that event Wellington would have been defeated. It deserves special notice, too, that the emperor has said that, had Grouchy advanced on Wavre, even by the direct road, but only in time,[77] he would have arrested the march of the Prussians; and the events of the day confirm this assertion. Grouchy had not approached Wavre until 1 P.M.; yet his apparition checked Thielmann, Pirch, and Ziethen. Out of an army of 90,000 men, only 45,000 reached the field of Waterloo. The latest historian has besides insisted that[78] had Grouchy marched on Moustier and Ottignies even when he heard the roar of the strife at Waterloo, he would have kept back the great mass of Blücher's forces; Thiers has sustained this opinion with characteristic skill; and it was that of Gérard, a true soldier, who clung to it to the last day of his life. There is, therefore, no valid defence for Grouchy;[79] Napoleon simply expressed the truth, that 'he could no more conceive that the marshal would fail him than that he would be swallowed up by an earthquake.'[80]

The truth, though still not wholly ascertained, has thus come out by degrees as regards a campaign ever memorable in the annals of war. Napoleon undoubtedly made one real mistake; he believed that Blücher was falling back on his base, completely defeated after Ligny, and this aggravated the effects of the delays of the 17th, though it is only just to observe that he could not have made this mistake had his lieutenants on the spot been fairly active. He would also have been gravely to blame for the tardiness of the French on the 17th, and for not striking his enemy down, had not illness made him almost prostrate; and the same remark applies to his conduct at Waterloo. More than once, too, perhaps he missed a great chance, especially in the case of Erlon on the 16th, and when he did not attack with the guard after the fall of La Haye Sainte; in these instances he may have been unequal to himself. But in the campaign of 1815 he was not the less a consummate warrior, and his superiority was distinctly manifest. Nothing can have been finer than his first operations, whether in selecting the true point of attack, in the concentration of his army upon the frontier, and in his estimate of the men he had to deal with; and his success at the outset seemed assured by Fortune. He outgeneralled Blücher and Wellington on the 15th, all but checkmated them the next day, and, had he been seconded as he

[77] *Comment.* vi. 149. This passage, ignored by English and German writers, should be perused. See also *Comment.* v. 209.

[78] Ropes, 258 *sqq.*

[79] The incapacity of Grouchy was well known in the French army. Pasquier (*Memoirs*, iii. 232) relates that Soult, as representing the other French generals, warned Napoleon not to give Grouchy an independent command before the campaign opened.

[80] *Comment.* v. 209.

ought to have been, would have made an end of the Prussians at Ligny, and have afterwards defeated the duke's bad army. On the 18th his chances were less; but still, had his right been well directed, he must, humanly speaking, have gained Waterloo, for Wellington's army, fine as was its defence, was not strong enough unaided to contend against him. And these great and splendid results were nearly attained, though Napoleon's forces were but 128,000 men against 224,000; in short, the supremacy of his strategic genius was seldom more magnificently displayed.

Why, then, it may be asked, did the modern Hannibal find a second Zama on the field of Waterloo? Due weight should be assigned to minor causes: Blücher and Wellington gave proof in different ways of admirable vigour and resource as soldiers, though as strategists they showed badly from first to last. The emperor's army, too, was not sufficiently large; he had reckoned, we have seen, on 20,000 more men; enough allowance could not be made for accidents; and he underrated the moral power of the Prussian army, which he thought could not rally after its defeat on the 16th, and perhaps the indomitable constancy of the British squares at Waterloo. But all these were subordinate causes only: the paramount causes of Napoleon's defeat were directly due to his own lieutenants. Had Ney and Erlon acted as they should have done, the emperor must have triumphed on the 16th of June; and he must have been victorious on the 18th also, had Grouchy shown a sign of insight and vigour. But his instruments failed him, and his ruin followed, and the great exile at St. Helena is confirmed by History when he said: [81] *Je les écrasais à Ligny, si ma gauche eût fait son devoir. Je les écrasais encore à Waterloo, si ma droite ne m'eût pas manqué.*

William O'Connor Morris.

[81] *Corresp.* pp. 32, 275

Notes and Documents

THE 'DONATION OF CONSTANTINE.'

In Dr. Zinkeisen's instructive paper on the 'Donation of Constantine' in the last number of the English Historical Review he states that the decision of Baronius against its authenticity 'hushed its defenders.' Error is not so easily silenced. Nearly a century after Baronius, Christian Wolff, one of the most learned ecclesiastics of his time, still alludes to it as an undisputed fact.[1]

To the rejection of the claim by Otto III Dr. Zinkeisen might have added that not long afterwards St. Henry II, in confirming the previous gifts of the emperors, makes no allusion to that of Constantine, showing that it was the settled imperial policy to disregard it.[2] He might also have alluded to Geroch of Reichersberg[3] about 1150, who relates that when he was in Rome a lawyer hostile to the church (possibly one of the Arnaldistae) argued with him that the 'Donation' was void, because Constantine was baptised in the Arian heresy. Training in the civil law apparently rendered impossible a belief in the genuineness of the 'Donation,' while prudence suggested that scepticism should be justified by reference to the Arianism of Eusebius of Nicomedia, who administered clinical baptism to the dying emperor. This Geroch confutes with the assertion that the Nicomedian baptism is a heretic falsehood and that Constantine was baptised in Rome by Sylvester I; besides, laws favouring the church are confirmed by God, even though they may have been issued by pagans.

Aeneas Sylvius (Pius II) did not only, as Dr. Zinkeisen states, in 1443 urge Frederick III to have the matter decided by a council, but in 1453 wrote a tract in which he showed the falsity of the 'Donation,' and argued that the holy see owed its territorial possessions to Charlemagne and its supremacy over monarchs to the power of the keys and the headship of Peter.[4] This may, perhaps, explain why there is no reference to the 'Donation' in the bulls of Nicholas V and his successors granting and partitioning the newly

[1] Chr. Lupi Append. ad Concilium Chalcedonensem, *Opp.* ii. 261.
[2] Lunig, *Cod. Ital. Diplom.* ii. 698.
[3] Exposit. in Ps. lxiv.
[4] 'Opera inedita,' in *Atti della R. Accademia dei Lincei*, 1883, pp. 571–81.

discovered lands. It was safer, as Boniface VIII had done in the bull 'Unam Sanctam,' to base the papal domination on divine authority than on the grant of an earthly potentate.

HENRY CHARLES LEA.

KING STEPHEN AND THE EARL OF CHESTER.

THE attitude of Randulf, earl of Chester, in the great struggle under Stephen would seem to have never been made the subject of systematic study. Dr. Stubbs truly says that 'the earl of Chester, although whenever he prevailed on himself to act he took part against Stephen, fought rather on his own account than on Matilda's.'[1] His policy could not be expressed more tersely or more accurately. But, as I have urged in my 'Geoffrey de Mandeville,' the great feudal magnates displayed a method in their madness; they took advantage, when unscrupulous, of the anarchy to sell their support in turn to the two contending factions, in the well-grounded hope that they would outbid each other. Of this policy Geoffrey himself affords the most perfect illustration; but the devious career of the earl of Chester has much in common with his own. Nor will it be unprofitable to attempt some explanation of the tangled skein presented through the whole reign of Stephen by the actions of a man who, as the 'Gesta' reminds us, held for a time beneath his sway about a third of the realm. For Randulf's power, it is essential to remember, was by no means limited, as some might suppose, to his own earldom of Chester. In Lincolnshire he inherited the great fiefs of his own father, Earl Randulf, and of the latter's kinsman and predecessor Earl Richard. In the same county a great estate had been held by his father in right of his wife, and was now held by his half-brother and close ally William de Roumare, her son. In the north Carlisle, with its honour, which his father had formerly held, was a special object of his desire. The real springs of his policy are found in Carlisle and Lincoln. Stephen's concession of the former, at the very beginning of his reign, to the Scottish king and his son threw the earl into discontent, while the geographical disposition of his strength between Cheshire and Lincolnshire set him, as it were, *à cheval* across England, and made it the special object of his ambition to reign at Lincoln as he reigned at Chester, and unite these strongholds by a string of fortresses securing his dominion from sea to sea. It was jealousy of Henry the Scottish prince that made Randulf withdraw from court in the spring of 1136, and, according to John of Hexham, it was his failure to waylay Henry and his wife, on their way back from Stephen's court in 1140, that led him, in despair, to surprise and seize Lincoln castle at the close of

[1] *Constitutional History* (1874), i. 329.

the year.[2] It is necessary to remember the relative wealth and importance, at that period, of Lincoln, in order to understand the importance attached by the king to its recovery and by Randulf to its retention.

The real *crux* is the elaborate charter of which an abstract is preserved among the duchy of Lancaster records, and englished in Dugdale's 'Baronage' (i. 39). As neither the place at which it was granted nor the names of its witnesses are preserved, there is no certain clue to its date, on which, however, much depends. The one thing that is quite clear is that Stephen wore his crown at Lincoln, Christmas 1146, having forced the earl that year to surrender the castle and city by seizing him, somewhat treacherously, at Northampton, and making the surrender of his castles the price of his liberation.[3] Mr. Howlett implies that the charter I have spoken of, by which Lincoln *inter alia* was given to the earl, was of earlier date than this, and that it accounts for Randulf, when arrested, being in possession of the castle.[4] My own view, on the contrary, is that Randulf had held Lincoln ever since he surprised the castle at the close of 1140. I can find no evidence of his losing possession within that period; and he was certainly in possession in 1144, when Stephen tried in vain to recapture the city.[5]

What happened, I believe, was this. After Stephen's re-coronation, Christmas 1141, at Canterbury, his resolve to go north to York compelled him to pass through the spheres of influence of the earl of Chester and his half-brother the earl of Lincoln. He was anxious not only to secure his communications, but also to win over, or at least to neutralise, now that he was once more on the throne, these two magnates. If he had tried to enforce their submission, or had insisted on the surrender of Lincoln, he would only have thrown them into the arms of the empress, which is precisely what he wished to avoid. On the other hand, her fortunes for the moment seemed at so low an ebb that the two earls would be glad to temporise and meet Stephen's overtures half-way. I assign, therefore, in my 'Geoffrey de Mandeville' (p. 159), to this date—the beginning of 1142—the interesting Stamford charter of Stephen by which he granted to the earl of Lincoln the great manor of Kirton-in-Lindsey, held, in 'Domesday,' by the crown, and confirmed him in possession of Gainsborough Castle, part of the forfeited fief of Geoffrey de Wirce, important from its bridge over the Trent, on which several Lincolnshire roads converged. On the other hand Miss Norgate[6] and Mr. Howlett[7] both

[2] Sym. Dun. ii. 306. [3] *Ibid.* ii. 325; Hen. Hunt. p. 279; *Gesta Stephani*, p. 126.
[4] *Chronicles, Stephen*, &c. III. xlii. [5] Hen. Hunt. p. 277
[6] *England under the Angevin Kings*, i. 336.
[7] *Gesta Stephani* (Rolls edition), p. 117.

independently assign to 1146 the meeting of Stephen at Stamford with the brother earls. The chronology at the close of the Peterborough chronicle is, unfortunately, so confused that one cannot positively say to what date it assigns the Stamford meeting, which it places just after Stephen's release (1141), and before his seizure of Randulf (1146), but also before the siege of Oxford in 1142. All I contend for is that my charter must be assigned to this meeting, and that the charter, from the names of its witnesses, certainly seems to belong to the beginning of 1142.

From this date I pass to 1146. This was another turning-point in the struggle, the fortunes of war inclining very definitely in Stephen's favour. The supporters of the empress were losing heart, and Randulf clearly thought it was time to make terms with Stephen, who, it seemed likely, would be soon in a position to call him to account for his usurpations. My view is that during the period since the beginning of the year 1142 the earl had occupied a position of armed neutrality, not siding with either party, and with no wish to oppose the king so long as he was left in possession of Lincoln and the other portions of crown demesne of which he had obtained possession. He now (1146) openly embraced Stephen's cause, and even gave him active support. By this means, doubtless, he hoped to keep all that he had wrongfully acquired.[8] Are we to assign to this occasion Stephen's great charter to him, of which I have already spoken? I shall not do so, first, because it expressly stipulates for his recovery of his castles, which he had not yet lost; secondly, because it grants him the honour of Lancaster, a provision I shall explain below; thirdly, because its extravagant concessions prove it to have been given on some occasion when Stephen was hard pressed. This brings me to my special point—namely, that I believe we have in this treaty the cause and explanation of Randulf's conduct in 1149, when he so suddenly and so mysteriously abandoned his allies King David and young Henry of Anjou.

The earl's determination not to part with any of the castles or lands he held had brought matters to a crisis in 1146, and ended in his seizure at Northampton, while at Stephen's court. Regaining his liberty by the surrender of his castles and by undertaking to keep the peace, he broke out at once, like Geoffrey de Mandeville when in similar plight, into wild revolt, hurling himself, on one side, against Lincoln, from which he was repulsed by its citizens, and on the other against Coventry, which, I suspect, was, like

[8] 'Comes siquidem Cestrae, qui tertiam fere regni partem armis praevalentibus occuparat, supplex et mansuetus regem adivit, crudelitatisque et perfidiae, quam in eum egerat, cum et manus in Lincolnensi captione in regem et dominum extendit, et regales possessiones sibi usurpando latissime invasit, tandem poenitens, veteris amicitiae, renovato inter eos foedere, in gratiam rediit.'—*Gesta Stephani.*

Lincoln, one of the royal castles he had seized and had now been obliged to surrender.[9] John of Hexham is here altogether at sea. He places the earl's seizure and the surrender of his castles *after* the knighting of Henry at Carlisle in 1149, and makes him, in his fury and despair, appeal to 'Duke' Henry to come over and espouse his cause, which Henry accordingly did.[10] Yet his story may well preserve this much of truth: that when Henry came, in 1149, it was on the understanding that Earl Randulf would join him against Stephen heart and soul. This would explain why the earl brought himself to give up at length the claim on Carlisle he had cherished so many years, and to receive the honour of Lancaster in its place. He was even reconciled with his old opponent Henry of Scotland, undertaking that his son should marry one of Henry's daughters.

The triple alliance then formed at Carlisle between the Scottish king, Earl Randulf, and young Henry of Anjou is known to have seriously alarmed Stephen, who hurried north to York and prepared for action. For the moment the prospects of the Angevin cause had undoubtedly revived, and the earl, by throwing his weight into the scale, had not only enabled Henry to recommence the struggle, but had connected David and his son in the north with the Angevin party in the west. If Stephen could but detach him from his allies, the whole scheme would at once collapse. Randulf certainly was detached, for he failed to join his allies, as he had promised, at Lancaster, and they consequently found themselves forced to abandon their design. That some sudden and strong motive must have caused this change of plans is evident enough; he would not have lightly thrown away the revenge for which he had schemed, and which seemed at length within his grasp. I believe, therefore, that Stephen must have offered him, at this crisis, the terms embodied in the charter I have so often referred to. These included, first and foremost, the castle and city of Lincoln, which he was to hold as a pledge for the restoration of the castles he had lost and of his lands in Normandy. He was further to receive Tickhill Castle, with the honour of Blythe and all the (escheated) honour of (the 'Domesday') Roger de Busli; Belvoir Castle, with all the lands of its lord, William de Albini; all the fief of Roger de Poitou, with the lands 'between Mersey and Ribble' (this was to be his compensation, we have seen, for the honour of Carlisle); Torksey, in Lincolnshire, above Gainsborough, on the Trent (of which it commanded the passage), an important royal borough in 'Domesday;' Grimsby, which gave him a port on the east, corresponding with Chester on the west; Newcastle-under-Lyme, another stronghold, in Staffordshire; the extensive soke of Rothley,

[9] The curious treaty (see Dugdale) between the earl of Leicester and himself implies that, when it was made, Coventry was in his possession.

[10] Sym. Dun. ii. 325.

in Nottinghamshire; the even larger one of Mansfield (both of them crown demesne in 'Domesday'), in Warwickshire; Stoneleigh and its appurtenances—also crown demesne—near Coventry. Among the other lands conceded to him was 'Derby,' which Dugdale identifies with West Derby, in Lancashire; but, as that place would certainly be included in his Lancashire grant, one is tempted to see in it nothing less than the borough of Derby itself.

Study of the map of England reveals his sphere of operations. It was, broadly speaking, a triangle, with Chester at its apex and Lincoln and Coventry at the extremities of its base. Halfway on the line between them stood Belvoir Castle, of which he had obtained possession. Derby, indeed, was as a wedge driven into his territory; but the terms of his treaty with the earl of Leicester imply that Earl Ferrers, of Derby, was his friend and ally. Now, just as, in 1149, Stephen had, on my hypothesis, won him over by concessions, so in 1153, when Henry of Anjou came again, and parties were evenly divided, Randulf once more held the scale, and Henry had to lure him back by grants exceeding even those of Stephen. The Devizes charter of the young duke does not, indeed, mention Lincoln, but the castle and town of Nottingham are now added, and, more important still, Stafford and all Staffordshire, with a few specified exceptions, clearly as an addition to his palatinate of Cheshire, to be held on similar terms. In Normandy likewise the Avranchin was to be made a kind of palatinate for him, evidently on the ground that he was great-nephew of Hugh of Avranches, earl of Chester, while in England fief after fief was promised as an addition to his dominion. Among them was that of William Peverel, which proved a fatal acquisition, for to poison at his hand was attributed the death of the earl this very year.

No one can study the extravagant character of Henry's grants in this charter without feeling well assured that the young duke had no intention of observing a day longer than he could help conditions which he must have felt were extorted from him by force, and were only intended to secure, as they did, the support of the earl at this crisis. That he joined the duke is proved by his presence with him, at this period, both at Gloucester and Wallingford.[11]

J. H. Round.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE WYCLIFFITE BIBLE.

It has hitherto been accepted without question that we owe the first English Bible to Wyclif and his followers. It has come down to us in two versions, which have been printed in parallel columns in the monumental edition of Forshall and Madden. According to the editors the earlier translation was mainly the

[11] *Geoffrey de Mandeville*, p. 419.

work of Wyclif and his friend Hereford, Wyclif translating the New Testament and Hereford the Old. The style of this version was too literal and stiff, and a revision was carried through by another Wycliffite, John Purvey. This revision may have been begun under Wyclif's auspices, but was not finished until some time after his death. That this account is generally true has not been doubted till, in the July number of the 'Dublin Review,' Dr. Gasquet set forth an entirely new view of the matter. He maintains that these versions are not Wyclif's or even Wycliffite, but are authorised and semi-official. Wyclif, Purvey, and Hereford may have been admitted to some share in the work of translation (on this point Dr. Gasquet is not very clear), but the inception and direction of the enterprise were in no way due to them.

We might be inclined to dismiss this new theory as a humorous paradox, but Dr. Gasquet is evidently serious, and we turn to review the evidence which, according to him, has misled all previous inquirers. Here we notice that the novelty lies in the inferences drawn and not in the facts on which they are based, as to which he has little, if anything, to add.

The first question is naturally, What contemporary authority exists for attributing the translation to Wyclif? and on this point Dr. Gasquet affirms boldly that there is 'an absolute silence of all records, both ecclesiastical and lay, as to any Wycliffite version of the Bible.' With laudable candour he proceeds to quote the authorities cited by Forshall and Madden on behalf of Wyclif's authorship. First we have the words of John Hus: 'It is reported among the English that he' (*i.e.* Wyclif) 'translated the whole Bible from Latin into English.' We know that in the judgment of Wyclif editors this report goes beyond the truth, since they attribute a large share in the work to Hereford. Yet this is hardly enough to justify Dr. Gasquet in airily waving away Hus's testimony with the remark, 'It is now allowed by all that there is not even a probability that he did anything of this kind.' We still speak of Pope's 'Odyssey,' although Fenton and Broome had a good hand in it, and the report recorded by Hus is witness that Wyclif was regarded as the person responsible for the English Bible. Still more direct evidence is furnished by Knighton, who tells us, *Hic magister Iohannes Wyclif evangelium . . . transtulit de Latino in Anglicam linguam;*[1] and again, *Magis tamen congruunt istis novis populis Lollardis, qui mutaverunt evangelium Christi in evangelium eternum, id est, vulgarem linguam et communem materiam.*[2] It seems hard to imagine anything more clear and decisive than this contemporary evidence, but the utmost concession it brings from Dr. Gasquet is that, while he does not consider it impossible

[1] Knighton, col. 2644. [2] *Ibid.* 2646.

to explain away Knighton's words, he is 'inclined to think there is some ground for holding that Wyclif may possibly have had a share in some translation of the New Testament.' Finally, as if to show that Wyclif's part was not the subordinate one thus assigned to him by Dr. Gasquet, but that he was the moving spirit, we have a letter from Archbishop Arundel, in which it is said that Wyclif 'filled up the measure of his malice by devising a plan of translation of the Holy Scriptures into the mother tongue.'

Against this weight of positive testimony what has Dr. Gasquet to allege? Only negative evidence in the supposed silence of Wyclif and his opponents.

> On the other hand [he says] it is difficult to account for the silence of Wyclif himself, who in none of his undoubted writings, so far as I am aware, lays any stress on, or indeed in any way advocates, having the Scriptures in the vernacular, except in so far as he claims that the Bible is the sole guide in faith and practice for all.

The exception is a considerable one, since Wyclif is never tired of insisting on the use of the Bible as the supreme and sufficient rule of life. We need not, however, press this point, because there is no lack of passages in which he directly advocates the spread of the English Bible. A reference to the word 'Bible' in the index of the 'Select English Works' directs us to this passage, which certainly implies the authorship of Wyclif or some associate of his. 'One great bishop of England, as men say, is evil paied that God's law is written in English to lewd men; and he pursueth a priest because he writeth to men this English, and summoneth him.' [3] A similar index reference to the 'English Works of Wyclif' would have led Dr. Gasquet to a whole chapter in the tract 'De Officio Pastorali,' directed against the friars and their supporters, who say it is heresy to write God's law in English. 'For this cause,' says Wyclif, 'St. Jerome . . . translated the Bible from divers tongues into Latin, that it might be afterwards translated into other tongues;' [4] and again, 'The commons of Englishmen know it best in their mother tongue, and thus it were all one to let such knowing of the gospel and to let Englishmen from following Christ and coming to heaven.' [5] So too in a sermon: [6] 'This moveth some men to tell in English Paul's epistles, for some men may better know hereby what God meaneth by Paul.' No one who has read even a little in Wyclif's works can fail to recognise in the first 'some men' a reference to himself and his party. Once more, 'Thus it helpeth here to Christian men to study the Gospel in that tongue in which they know best Christ's sentence.' [7]

[3] *Select English Works of Wyclif*, i. 209. The English of these quotations is here modernised.

[4] *English Works of Wyclif*, p. 429.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 430.

[6] *Select English Works*, ii. 221.

[7] *Ibid.* iii. 184.

The tracts from which these quotations are taken are of admitted authenticity. We will add an example from the Latin treatise 'De Triplici Vinculo Amoris.'

Et ex eodem patet eorum stulticia, qui volunt dampnare scripta tanquam heretica propter hoc quod scribuntur in Anglico et acute tangunt peccata que conturbant illam provinciam. Nam possibile est quod nobilis regina Anglie, soror Cesaris, habeat ewangelium in lingwa triplici exaratum, scilicet in lingwa boemica, in lingwa teutonica et latina, et hereticare ipsam propterea implicite foret luciferina superbia. Et sicut Teutonici volunt in isto racionabiliter defendere lingwam propriam, sic et Anglici debent de racione in isto defendere lingwam suam.[8]

It would be easy to quote many more passages, but these are enough to show that Wyclif did advocate the use of the Scriptures in the vernacular, and that strongly. With this proof before us we cannot attach much weight to the further negative argument that Wyclif's adversaries say nothing about the English Bible in their controversies with him. 'Neither Woodford nor Walden nor Whethamstede so much as refers to Wyclif's translations, or to any special desire upon his part to circulate God's word in English among the people.' We accept Dr. Gasquet's statement without surprise, since any such reference would have been irrelevant to scholastic arguments directed against special doctrines. One may peruse all the published works of Wyclif and get very little light on the character and general opinions of his opponents.

Here, with the proof that Wyclif did insist strongly on the need of an English Bible, and that in the belief of his contemporaries he supplied that need, we might leave the matter, but we should be passing by the argument on which Dr. Gasquet lays most stress, and which seems to have led him to his rash thesis. He is unwilling—or rather unable—to believe that there was not an orthodox and authorised English translation for the use of dutiful churchmen who were untainted by Wycliffite heresy. That such did use an English version there is no doubt. Dr. Gasquet calls attention to the existence of copies of the translation attributed to the Wycliffites which belonged to persons of unquestioned orthodoxy, and even to the religious. One, combining both guarantees, was given by Henry VI to the monks of the Charterhouse; another was owned by the convent of Barking.

There are, moreover [says Dr. Gasquet], instances of the English Bible —the production—the secret production—of the Lollard scribes—that perilous piece of property to possess, as we are asked to believe—there are instances of this being bequeathed by wills publicly proved in the public courts of the bishops. . . . It is, of course, obvious that this could never have been done had the volume so left been the work of Wyclif or his

[8] *Polemical Works of Wyclif* (ed. Buddensieg), p. 168. Cf. in the same book pp. 126, 711.

followers, for it would then, indeed, have been, as a modern writer describes the Wycliffite books, a perilous piece of property. Thus before the close of the fourteenth century—namely, in 1394—a copy of the gospels in English was bequeathed to the chantry of St. Nicholas in the church of Holy Trinity, York, by John Hopton, chaplain there. Fancy what this means on the theory that the English Scriptures were the work of Wycliffite hands! It means nothing less than that a catholic priest publicly bequeaths, in a will proved in his bishop's court, to a catholic church, for the use of catholic people, the proscribed work of some member of an heretical sect.

We should say that Dr. Gasquet's argument is vitiated by an entire misunderstanding of Wyclif's position. First of all he takes it for granted that a Wycliffite translation could not have been faithful.

So far as I have been able to discover [he says], from an examination of the two texts, there is nothing inconsistent with their having been the work of perfectly orthodox sons of holy church. In no place where (had the version been the work of Lollard pens) we might have looked for texts strained or glossed to suit their well-known conclusions do any such appear.

We are not told what texts we might expect to be tampered with, so we cannot follow Dr. Gasquet in an examination of these test passages, but it seems rash to alter the attribution of a translation simply because it is faithful and is unaccompanied by a gloss in certain places. And since, on Dr. Gasquet's showing, the text is not corrupted, what should prevent its use by good Catholics, even though it were Wyclif's? The answer that it would have been discredited as the work of an heretical sect shows an imperfect appreciation of the circumstances of the time and of the repute in which Wyclif was held. It must be borne in mind that to the end of his life he never met with any formal personal condemnation. Articles drawn from his works were condemned in the Blackfriars council, and some of his followers were compelled to recant; but he seems to have remained personally untouched, except that he was forbidden to teach his doctrine on the Eucharist at Oxford. No formal condemnation of his English Bible was ever issued, or, as far as we know, attempted. Far from being the disgraced head of an outcast sect, he was a prominent and distinguished churchman, in intimate relations with the court and government, and generally allowed to be one of the most illustrious members of the university. No doubt he was regarded with suspicion and dislike by the conservative and orthodox party, but there was no brand of heresy upon him personally that could discredit his work if in itself unobjectionable. On the whole the governing body and leading men of the university were on his side. This comes out clearly after the Blackfriars council in the behaviour of the chancellor, who

excused himself for not publishing the council's condemnations on the ground that in the state of feeling at Oxford it might have cost him his life, and the narrative [9] shows that Wyclif's support did not come from a rabble of young scholars, but from men of weight and influence.

Thirty years later matters had changed. The 'Oxford movement' had been repressed, the leaders of the party had recanted, and the Lollards had become a sect, composed mostly of poor and ill-instructed men. Meanwhile the remembrance of Wyclif as an ornament of the Oxford schools and an adviser of statesmen had died away, and his memory was connected only with the foundation of the Lollard heresy, so that his name on pamphlet or translation would be dangerous to its possessor. But by this time the English Bible had its own life, independent of its author's reputation. This consideration goes far to resolve another of Dr. Gasquet's difficulties—that some of the remaining copies are too costly to have belonged to Wycliffites.

> I cannot but think [he says] that an unbiassed mind that will reflect upon the matter must see how impossible it was for a poor persecuted sect like the Lollards, for the writings of which frequent and rigid searches were made, to produce the Bibles now ascribed to them. Many of these copies, as we may see for ourselves, are written with great care and exactness, and illuminated with coloured borders executed by skilful artists. These must surely have been the production of freer hands than the followers of Wyclif were ever allowed to have in England.

The same question might be raised as to Wyclif's acknowledged writings. It was no poor persecuted Lollard that commissioned the great volume of sermons and treatises now in Trinity College, Cambridge,[10] in which good penmanship and intolerable blunders alike point to the professional scribe. It is adorned with illumination, and must have cost a large sum. Other volumes, though not so large, are equally well executed. With regard to the translation of the Bible Wyclif congratulates himself on the support of the gentry. 'One comfort,' he says, 'is of knights, that they savour much the gospel and have will to read in English the gospel of Christ's life.' [11] That this was no empty boast is shown by the list of Wycliffites of rank given in the 'Chronicon Angliae,[12] in which figure some of the most influential men of the day. This is dated after Wyclif's death, and there is evidence as to some that they retained their Lollard tendencies to the end of their life. Among these Cliffords, Neviles, and Montagus some might well have a mind to read the gospel and to have it handsomely set forth. Later on, as we have already remarked, the copies would be multiplied without any thought of their authorship.

[9] *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, p. 298 *et seqq.*

[10] 'Sermons,' *S. E. W.* i. 209.

[11] MS. B. 16, 2.

[12] *Sub an.* 1387, p. 377.

One other point on which Dr. Gasquet lays much stress is that some of these Bibles—indeed, most of them—are marked for the lessons, gospels, and epistles.

There is not a shadow of probability [he says] in the suggestion that Wycliffite Scriptures would be marked for the church services for the use of his 'poor priests.' The truth is that these same 'poor priests' had, in fact, little claim to any sacerdotal character. They are described by Professor Shirley as mere lay preachers, both coarse and ignorant.

Dr. Gasquet is mistaken in saying that Dr. Shirley describes them as lay preachers. He says (what is a very different thing) that in their preaching aspect they bore a resemblance to the lay preachers of John Wesley, and goes on, 'Such as they were they were employed under episcopal sanction through what was then the immense diocese of Lincoln, and probably in others also.' [13] No such sanction would have been given to laymen, and there is no ground for the suggestion that the 'poor priests' were other than their name described. For their use the Bibles might well be marked as to the passages used in service, which they would probably read in the vernacular. That the Wycliffites did attend to the order of the services is shown by the fact that Wyclif's sermons, collected as aids and models to the poor priests, are all on gospels or epistles, while a copy of the version at Dublin containing the table of lessons is believed by the editors to be in the handwriting of Purvey.

We cannot see that Dr. Gasquet has had any success in impugning the Wycliffite authorship of the existing version. But, as he says, 'this involves the tacit assumption that there was no catholic version at all.' Well, what reason is there to shrink from this conclusion as inadmissible? Would not the wonder rather be if such a version existed? No doubt protestant writers have often exaggerated the hostility of the clergy to the vernacular Bible. There was no objection on their part to the devotional use of the Bible in English any more than in Latin. It was a fitting ornament to the library of the man of rank, a useful help to the pious priest; and in such hands the inquisitor had nothing to say to it. But it was quite another matter when it was spread abroad as 'God's law,' [14] among the people, and they were led in reliance on it to question the teaching of their appointed pastors. Knighton represented the feeling of the higher clergy when he wrote:

Sic evangelica margarita spargitur et a porcis conculcatur, et sic quod solet esse carum clericis et laicis iam redditur quasi iocositas communis utriusque et gemma clericorum vertitur in ludum laicorum.[15]

When this was the prevalent tone there was little chance of an authorised version.

[13] *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, xl.

[14] '*Semper praetendendo legem Dei*, Goddis lawe:' Knighton, 2664.

[15] *Ibid.*

To the later of the Wycliffite versions is prefixed a prologue in which the translator describes his method.

For this reason and other [he says], with common charity to save all men in our realm which God will have saved, a simple creature has translated the Bible out of Latin into English. First the simple creature had much travail with divers fellows and helpers to gather many old Bibles, and other doctors and common glosses, and to make our Latin Bible some deal true; and then to study it off the new text with the gloss and other doctors as he might get, and especially Lyra on the Old Testament, that helped him full much in this work; the third time to counsel with old grammarians and old divines of hard words and hard senses how they might best be understood and translated; the fourth time to translate as clearly as he could to the sense, and to have many good fellows and cunning at the correcting of the translation.

On this Dr. Gasquet remarks that these words show that 'the writer had no knowledge of any previous translation, and this is quite inconsistent with the idea that it was the work of one so intimately connected with Wyclif as Purvey was—that is, always supposing that Wyclif had any part in the first version.' Here seemed to be a suggestion for a compromise by which the Wycliffites might be left the honour of one translation while the other was allowed to be the medieval authorised version of which Dr. Gasquet is in search. But how were they to be assigned? Dr. Gasquet's leaning seems to be to the later version; but the prologue is clearly Wycliffite. The term 'simple creature' is quite in accordance with lollard phraseology, but would not so well become a writer to whom had been assigned the honourable task of an authorised translation, while lollardy comes out even more clearly in the clause 'with common charity to save all men in our realm which God will have saved.' Here we have that doctrine of predestination which is so prominent in Wyclif's writings, and which, in its extreme form, was condemned at the council of Constance. Evidently, then, this second version bears the brand of its Wycliffite parentage, while as to the first it is hard to get over the ascription to Hereford in the Bodleian MS. But, in fact, whatever the prologue may seem to suggest, it is impossible to regard the translations as independent. Read for instance these few verses:—

Be ȝe my foloweris, as and I of Crist. Forsoth, britheren, I preise ȝou, that bi alle thingis ȝe be myndeful of me, as and I bitook to ȝou my comaundements, ȝe kepen. Forsothe I wole ȝou for to wite that Crist is the heed of ech man; forsoth the heed of the woman is the man; forsoth the heed of Crist, God.[16]

Be ȝe my foloweris as Y am of Crist. And, britheren, I preise ȝou, that bi alle thingis ȝe ben myndeful of me; and as Y bitook to ȝou my comaundementis, ȝe holden. But I wole that ȝe wite that Crist is heed of ech man; but the heed of thi womman is the man, and the heed of Crist is God.

[16] 1 Cor. xi. 1-

This is a passage taken at random, without any selection, and the similarity in the versions is equally great throughout the New Testament. In the Old Testament there is a little more variation, but even there the connexion cannot be doubted for a moment by any one who compares the two. There is no ground for supposing that the writer of the prologue was making false claims to originality, and his language would be natural enough if he were one of a band of workers who carried through the first version. No one could be found more likely to answer this description than John Purvey, to whom the revision has generally been assigned. Here, then, as throughout our survey, the evidence is in favour of the received ascription, and we are under no temptation to exchange the old lights for Dr. Gasquet's new ones. F. D. MATTHEW.

SOME LITERARY CORRESPONDENCE OF HUMPHREY, DUKE OF GLOUCESTER.

IT is rather remarkable that more attention has not been paid to the progress of Humanism in England, and especially to the literary fame of the duke of Gloucester, whom Oxford honours as the founder of the Bodleian library. That much might be discovered about Duke Humphrey's relation to foreign scholars is proved by the words of Aeneas Sylvius, who in a letter to Sigismund of Austria, written in December 1443, says, *Egredior Italiam et penitus toto divisos orbe Britannos petam, ubi dux est Gleocestriae qui regnum, quod modo Anglicum dicimus, pluribus annis gubernavit;—huic tanta literarum est cura ut ex Italia magistros asciverit poetarum et oratorum interpretes* ('Epistolae,' ed. Basil. 105). That Aeneas was not romancing may be proved by the first of the following letters, which shows that Humphrey was in constant correspondence with the writer, who was commissioned to send him books from Italy. Peter de Monte was a Venetian by birth, a pupil in his early days of the famous scholar Guarino. He afterwards studied in Paris, and then at Brescia, where he lectured on canon law. In 1433 he was appointed apostolic protonotary by Eugenius IV, played some part in the council of Basel, was imprisoned for a time by the *condottiere* Niccolò Fortebracchio, and in 1434 was sent to England as papal collector. He remained there for five years, and made himself acceptable to such Englishmen as cared about literature. On his return to Italy he took part, as his letter tells us, in negotiations for an Italian peace, which was concluded at Cremona in November 1441 and left Francesco Sforza in possession of Milan. He afterwards was sent on a legation to France, and in 1442 was nominated bishop of Brescia, though he did not enter upon his duties till 1445. On the death of Eugenius IV Peter's

political activity came to an end; he confined himself to the work of his see and died at Rome in 1457. Information concerning him and his writings is to be found in Agostini, 'Scrittori Veneziani,' i. 346; Gradenigo, 'Brixia Sacra,' 357; Tiraboschi, 'Storia della Letteratura Italiana,' vi. 625; Rosmini, 'Vita di Guarino Veronese e suoi Discepoli,' iii. 35.

A copy of one of the books written by Peter de Monte for the duke of Gloucester exists in manuscript in the Bodleian library. Mr. R. L. Poole has kindly transcribed the dedication, which forms a valuable appendix to the letter. It is further noticeable that the volume contains another work of interest in the same connexion, 'Ad illustrissimum Principem Humfridum Ducem Glowcestrie et Comitem Pembrochie Lapicastelliunculi Comparatio Studiorum et Rei militaris.' Jacopo de Castiglionchio was a pupil of Filelfo, and translated Plutarch and Dionysius of Halicarnassus. He was a student of military history, and wrote for Pope Nicholas V a treatise, entitled 'Strategicon,' dealing with the manner of fighting against the Turks.[1]

The third document is a letter of Humphrey to Alfonso V of Aragon, of whom Aeneas Sylvius writes, *qui totiens victus tandem vicit, et adversam fortunam in favorem sui convertit; nunquam in castris est sine libris; quocunque it illuc et bibliotheca sequitur.* It is in accordance with this reputation of a warrior scholar that the duke of Gloucester should send him as a present a French translation of Livy, with a letter which is written according to the best rules of the Latin style of the fifteenth century. M. Petriburg.

Letter of Petrus de Monte to Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, 13 Nov. 1441.

(Bibl. Vat. MS. 5221, fol. 133. Printed from Stevenson's 'Vatican Transcripts,' vol. v., in the Public Record Office.)

Illustrissimo duci Glocestriae.

Si tardius quam deberem, serenissime princeps, literis excellentiae tuae respondeo, non est quod mihi subirasci debeat celsitudo tua: nulla enim culpa mea id evenit, sed Pontificis maximi mandato qui me superiori tempore extra curiam misit. Nam cum futurae pacis Italicae magna Pontifici spes data esset, apparerentque signa multa quibus id facile coniici poterat; primum dominum meum Cardinalem Aquilegiensem legatum de latere ad pacem componendam designavit, iussitque una cum illo me proficisci. Ivimus itaque Venetias ubi comes Franciscus legatique principum quorundam ac rerumpublicarum convenerunt. Egimus de pace magno quodam studio ac diligentia, et ita egimus ut, nisi

[1] For other dedications to Duke Humphrey, by Decembri, Aretino, and 'Antonius Pacinus,' see Mr. Macray's paper on 'Dedications to Englishmen by Foreign Authors,' in *Bibliographica*, part iii. (September 1894), which does not include those mentioned in the text.

quid maioris infortunii praeter hominum spem contingat, eam secuturam non dubitemus. Ea duorum mensium absentia effecit, ut tardius literae tuae serenitatis mihi redderentur, ego quoque illis tardius responderem. Gavisus autem sum non parum, clarissime princeps, munusculum meum hoc et libellum de nobilitate celsitudini tuae gratum fuisse; quod ego antea facile mihi persuadebam. Quid enim nobilissimo principi, qualem te esse cognoscimus, gratius dari potuisset quam docta et praeclara de nobilitate disputatio, qua instruimur non in sanguine tantum aut maiorum imaginibus, sed in virtute, probitate, ac praestantia vim nobilitatis consistere. Nam ut a satyro pulcre decantatum est: Longa licet veteres exornent undique cerae Atria, nobilitas sola [est] atque unica virtus; id ipsum celsitudinem tuam opinari atque sentire non dubito. Licet enim ex illa nobilissima ac splendidissima Britaniae regum familia natus sis, quae tot clarissimos principes mundo edidit, quot fere nulla alia, atque ob id plurimum tibi felicitatis et gloriae obveniret: longe tamen maiorem virtuti quam sanguini aut generi nobilitatem inesse censes, utpote qui totus innumerabilibus virtutibus illustrare [? illustratus] quas nolo enumerare aut singulas recensere, ne modum grandioris excedam epistolae. Interea libellos alios scribi facio ad tuam celsitudinem destinandos cum primum absoluti fuerint. Ita fiet ut ab his videar, et ad immortalia beneficia abs te mihi collata aliquid etsi non aeque dignum, at saltem gratum respondeam. De libris hactenus. Scripsit mihi serenitas tua se mirari, quod de his quae mihi abeunti mandaverat nihil unquam responderim. Ego, illustris princeps, deos deasque omnes testor me inter cartulas meas quas saepe numero diligenter perquisivi, nullum celsitudinis tuae mandatum comperisse: id enim illico studuissem pro viribus exequi; nisi fortasse oblivione mea factum est, ut quod mihi mandasti haud memoria teneam. Itaque celsitudinem tuam oro ac deprecor ut si quid me facturum velit suis literis me certiorem faciat: tuum enim debet esse quod optas explorare laborem, mihi iussa capessere fas est. Vale diu felix, splendor et gloria principum, meque habe commendatum, tuae namque dignitati deditissimus sum.

Ex Florentia XIII Novembris 1441.

CAPPELLANUS PETRUS DE MONTE,
Apostolicae Sedis prothonotarius.

(Bodleian Library. Auct. F. 5, 26, p. 1.)

Petrus de Monte ad illustrissimum principem Ducem Gloucestrie de virtutum et viciorum inter se differencia.[2]

Tuas eximias laudes virtutesque permaximas Illustrissime princeps cogitanti mihi ac persepe ut debeo memoria repetenti . Illa longe videtur esse prestancior ceterisque excellencior que sicut superioris etatis principibus te equalem . sic nostre iure ac merito excellenciorem constituit. Sane est optimarum arcium liberaliumque scienciarum pericia cui omni conatu omni ingenio atque studio incumbis. Adeo ut nichil tibi sine librorum leccione iocundum gratum aut certe delectabile videatur. Que res cum in privato in magnis efferri laudibus soleat . in principe tamen nunquam satis digne extolli aut predicari potest. Is enim quem de bello

[2] The punctuation of the manuscript is preserved.

de pace de sociis de subditis de annona de armis de ductando exercitu deque omni reipublice statu ingens cura solicitat:' perraro ad videndos nedum legendos libros ocium sibi videtur vendicare. Quod qui fecerit neque minus publice utilitati animum accomodaverit . Is vere princeps maximis in celum preconiis est efferendus Is omnium linguis omnium litteris perpetue posterorum memorie commendandus. Hinc apud clarissimos antiquitatis scriptores Cesaris virtus ac diligencia plurimum commendatur quod cum exercitu proficiscens eos libros diserte atque eleganter inscripserit: quos vulgo commentarios appellamus Augustus quoque in mutinensi bello[3] quotidie legere scribere aut declamare consuevisse. Theodosius vero mirum in modum extollitur quod die quidem exercebatur in armis vel subditorum causis ius dicebat . nocte autem libris ad lucernam incumbebat . felices medius fidius hi fuere et quavis humana laude ac gloria dignissimi . felix quoque et tu qui et in negocio et in ocio negocium facile reperire consuevisti . de quo P. Cornelium[4] Scipionem eum qui primus affricam devicit admodum gloriari solitum legimus. Quicquid enim tibi superest temporis quicquid quietis a[5] publicis occupacionibus id omne non iocis non venacionibus aut deliciis ut plerique set huic litterario exercicio libenter accomodas [p. 2] Quod si forte legendi facultas defuerit ad disputandi disserendique studium te convertis illud sane pugnandi genus periocunde aggrediens quod erudiendum instruendumque animum plurimum potest. Delectaris autem non una tantum arte aut sciencia quamquam et id quidem esset satis . verum fere omnibus earumque codicibus magna quadam aviditate legisti. Que res grandem profecto ingenii vim excellenciamque declarat. Quemadmodum enim lete segetes et uberes agri culmis interdum aristisque luxuriant sic vegeta et preclara ingenia variarum arcium oblectantur elegancia. Qua vero tenacitate ac firmitate que videris legeris atque audiveris memorie commendes . quis dignis posset laudare preconiis. Vidi ipse persepe dum pro innata tibi incredibili humanitate me dignum censuisti . Quicum in hoc litterato certamine interdum manum consereres te nullius auctoris dictum verbum aut sentenciam in medium adduxisse . Cuius nomen quoque ac libri in unum non produceres. Quocirca illud themistoclis[6] responsum tibi meritissime convenit. Is enim cum memoria polleret eximia quidam vero memorandi artem se illi daturum polliceretur:' mallem inquit obliviscendi artem discere. siquidem illi difficilius multo erat tradere quam memoria retinere. Hec mecum sepenumero excellentissime princeps animo et cogitacione revolvens simulque tuam in me incredibilem benignitatem clemenciamque animadvertens cuius causa siquid in me est ingenii siquid virium id omne tibi me debere cognosco aliquando in publicum prodire et laborum meorum periculum facere institui si forte studiola mea aliquid possent celsitudini tue leticie ac iocunditatis afferre. Quod si consequi potero magno me ac singulari splendore illustratum esse intelligam. Id autem quo pacto facilius exequar non video quam si eam disceptacionem que[7] intra gravissimos ac doctissimos viros de virtutum et[8] viciorum inter[9] se comparacione habita est. In hoc opusculo velut in tabella quadam

[3] MS. *libello*; but the sentence is a quotation from Suetonius, *August.* cap. 84.

[4] MS. *Cornelius*.

[5] MS. *ac*.

[6] MS. *themistodis*.

[7] MS. *qua* ($\overset{u}{q}$ instead of $\tilde{q}$).

[8] *Virtutum et* omitted in MS.

[9] MS. *intra*.

depicta [10] tuo nomini dedicavero quod nulla unquam delebit vetustas aut oblivio. Et quamquam non sim nescius me fortassis apud nonnullos [11] libellum hunc rude atque inculto sermone contextum dono mittere non formidem. Humanissima tamen humanitas et benignitas tua mihi trepidanti adversus detrahencium stimulos audacie plurimum prebuit. Neque in [p. 3] opere hoc ut arbitror quam eleganter quamque [12] ornate de re ipsa disseri set quod ingeniolum meum scribendo consequi potuerit considerabis. Spero quoque quod preclarum illud Artaxerxis persarum regis factum memoria dignum libens gaudensque servabis. Ipso enim deambulandi gracia equitante cum homo quidam pauperimus ei obvius fieret mosque esset persarum regem cum munere salutare :/ aquam ambabus manibus ex fluvio acceptam regi porrexit. Rex iocunde munus recepit :/ promptitudinem dantis magis quam muneris qualitatem animadvertens. Set iam institutum nostrum aggrediamur et disertissimos viros simul colloquentes ac disputantes audiamus.

Letter of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, to Alfonso of Aragon,
12 *July* 1445.

(Bibl. Vat. MS. 5221, fol. 131 b. Printed from Stevenson's 'Vatican Transcripts,' vol. v., in the Public Record Office.)

Illustrissimo principi Alphonso Aragoniae, etc.
Glocestriae dux salutem.

Fama est, illustrissime princeps, etiam usque ab ineunte adolescentia tua per universam prope Christianitatem diffusa, tanta te virtute animique magnitudine praestare, tum etiam rerum gestarum amplitudine et gloria excellere, ut nulla sit pars nostri huius orbis, quam in tuam laudem admirationemque non converteris. Cum solus hac aetate nostra videaris esse qui hanc regiam laudem dignitatisque excellentiam fueris consecutus, tibique soli traditum extitisse ab immortali Deo verum illud decus et splendorem regiae maiestatis indicetur; quo prae ceteris mortalibus fulgeres ac emineres in terris, et reliqui omnes a te uno tanquam a iubare quodam prope divino tuarum virtutum imitatione, si imitari vellent, illustrarentur. Cum quicquid egeris aut feceris non nisi ex altitudine quadam animi cordisque praestantia profecisse censetur. Nam quis est qui te non vellet et amare et admirari, cum sentiunt adolescentiam tuam tanta in primis integritate omniumque bonarum artium doctrina et educatam et institutam extitisse, ut nulla unquam voluptas aut libido te potuerit ab aequitate modestiaque divertere. Tum etiam hanc provectiorem aetatem tuam tanta continuae rei militaris scientia et disciplina adauctam, ut nullus sit hoc tempore qui tibi mea sententia in aliquo laudis genere sit conferendus. Nec etiam ex superioribus quispiam cum quo non possis magnitudine animi conferri. Ex quo facere non potui quin huiusmodi tam praestantissimae virtutes tuae me quoque in tui amorem benevolentiamque concitarent. Cum maxime viderem te unum esse in quo verum illud regium lumen eluceret, quale potissimum principes deceret, in quibus contemplari ceteri possint totius magnificentiae et amplitudinis specimen:

[10] MS. *depictam.* [11] Some words, as *nimis audacem videri,* are omitted.
[12] MS. *quamquam.*

tum etiam cum me iam in eam aetatem devectum conspicere, in qua mihi magis conveniret huiusmodi principes et amare et admirari quam imitari posse, cum sit eiusmodi ut iam delapsa ad senectutem alia potius a me quietudinis studia deposcat. Quapropter cum dominus Philippus Boyl legatus tuus proximis his diebus ad me visitandum venisset, et forte Titi Livii libros ex latino in gallicum sermonem conversos legerem, quos ipse de Romanorum gestis ab Urbe condita scripsit, atque in tuae virtutis sermonem incidissemus quam audire atque extolli mirifice delector; tu occurristi mihi dignus eo libri munere, quo scribam neminem alium hac nostra aetate nec rerum gestarum excellentia, nec animi virtute ac praestantia ad eum legendum operaque imitanda aptiorem, ut esset mei in te animi et benevolentiaė indicium et pignus, et mei etiam causa. Et si certo sciam te id antea per te fecisse, maiori tamen aliquo studio contemplari posses, quale nunc regnum tuapte virtute ac industria esses adeptus. Pro quo conservando tot Romanorum copiae ab Hannibale illo Carthaginensium duce fuerunt deletae. Tuusque magis incenderetur ad virtutem animus, cum videres te tantum ducem imitatum esse, quantum nec superior aetas viderat, et sua pertimesceret, et posterior maxime admiraretur. Accipies igitur comi fronte hoc munusculum meum, quod certe ex animo et corde ad te proficiscitur. Vale felicissime. Ex Granuicio diversorio meo. IV° Idus Julii 1445.

THE AGE OF ANNE BOLEYN.

In discussing some time ago the question of the comparative ages of Anne and Mary Boleyn (English Historical Review, vol. viii. pp. 53-60) I pointed out that the only positive date given by any early writer as that of Anne Boleyn's birth was the year 1507, to which it was assigned by Camden; and I further argued that there was no good reason for supposing Camden to have been mistaken, as this date was in perfect harmony with all other early evidences. I was not aware, however, at the time I wrote, that there was any positive confirmation of this date to be found elsewhere; and I now wish to supply an important additional evidence from a writer contemporary with Camden, which seems to show that he is right. In Henry Clifford's 'Life of Jane Dormer, Duchess of Feria,' edited a few years ago by Father Stevenson, after an account of Anne Boleyn's fall and execution, we read (p. 80), 'She was not twenty-nine years of age.' This implies that she was not born earlier than 19 May 1507. Clifford's life of Jane Dormer, it appears, was written, or at all events was begun, in 1616 (see p. 8). And it is clear that he did not derive his information from Camden's printed statement, for his own statement is a little more precise, implying, in effect, that she was born in the year 1507, but not before 19 May in that year.

James Gairdner.

AN ALLEGED NOTEBOOK OF JOHN PYM.

In the 'Tenth Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission,' Appendix, part vi. p. 82, Mr. Maxwell Lyte, in giving an account of the manuscripts in the possession of Mr. Pleydell Bouverie at Brymore, the house in which Pym formerly lived, prints extracts from a notebook containing, as he says, brief biographical and historical notes by John Pym. On examining these I was at once struck with the statement that the mother of the author of the notes died in 1596, whereas the funeral sermon of Pym's mother was published in 1620, and it is there stated by the preacher, Pym's friend Fitzgeffrey, that she had lived with her second husband, Sir Anthony Rous, more than thirty years. On applying for a solution of my difficulty to Mr. Lyte, he gave me an introduction to Mr. Pleydell Bouverie, who kindly brought the manuscript to London for my inspection. A glance at it was sufficient to show that its handwriting was very different from that of Pym. As the notebook has already been used to eke out the scanty facts of Pym's early life hitherto known, and as it is certain that, unless warning is given, more of its piquant details will find their way sooner or later into his biography, it is worth while to record even this negative result. Further investigation, however, has revealed the very strong probability that the author of the notebook was William Ayshcombe, of Alvescott, in Oxfordshire. The author of the notes had an uncle William Ayshcombe, and another uncle Oliver Aysham (a name which may have been written for Ayshcombe). He had also three sisters, or what in those days counted as sisters, a Temple, a Peniston, and a Rous, his sister Temple being the wife of Sir John Temple, and dying on 28 Jan. 162$\frac{5}{6}$. He was also admitted into the Middle Temple in 1607.

Let us now see how William Ayshcombe stands. He had an uncle Oliver, and as his father had eight sons, whose names are unknown,[1] he may very well have had an uncle William. Moreover in the pedigree of the Temples of Stowe, in Lipscombe's 'History of Buckinghamshire,' iii. 86, we find that a William Ayscough of . . . married Catharine Temple. If we suppose that Ayscough is here a mistake for Ayshcombe, we have William Ayshcombe's wife's sister Hester, married to Sir John Rous, and Martha, another of his wife's sisters, married to Sir Thomas Peniston, whilst his wife's brother Sir John Temple, of Stanton Barry, is married to Dorothy Lee, who, according to the inscription on her monument, given by Lipscombe, iv. 350, died in 1625—possibly 162$\frac{5}{6}$. After this the identification of Ayscough with the Ayshcombe of the Berkshire 'Visitation,' and of the latter with the author of the notebook, can hardly be questioned. As for the admission to the Middle

[1] Sir T. Phillipps's *Berkshire Visitations*, under Ayshcombe of Lyford

Temple in 1607, I have been unsuccessful in an attempt to obtain from the benchers permission to inspect their records of that period; but Mr. Joseph Foster, who has been more fortunate than myself, tells me that William Ayshcombe's admission took place on 26 Jan. 160$\frac{6}{7}$, and that he is described as the second son of Thomas A. of St. Giles's, Oxford. There is here, therefore, a slight error, according to the mode of calculating the date prevailing at the time.

It may be added that the notebook is full of indications that the writer was an Oxfordshire man. His father died at Oxford, his mother at 'Morton in Marsh.' Events taking place at Oxford are frequently referred to, and the one entry about Somerset is as follows: 'I went into Somersetshire, where, having a dangerous illness, I lived about half a year.' These are the words of a visitor, not of a resident.

SAMUEL R. GARDINER.

A LETTER FROM LORD SAYE AND SELE TO LORD WHARTON, 29 DEC. 1657.

LORD SAYE and Lord Wharton both received a summons to sit in the house of lords, or 'other house' established by Cromwell, in accordance with the provisions of the Petition and Advice. Wharton was inclined to accept the seat in that chamber which the Protector offered him, and Lord Saye wrote the following letter to dissuade him. The original of the letter is contained in a volume of Wharton's papers amongst the Carte MSS. in the Bodleian library, vol. 80, f. 749. An extract from the letter is printed in an article on 'Cromwell and the House of Lords' in *Macmillan's Magazine* for January 1895.

C. H. FIRTH.

My Lord,—I have receaved your letter, and am obliged unto you for the many expressions of your love and respects to me, which I shall be glad to answeere uppon any occasion whearin I may serve you; and for this which I take to be the cause of your writinge att this tyme I shall clearly and sincerely declare unto you my judgement thearin, and what my practise will be accordinge thearunto. For the Goverment of this Kingdome accordinge to the right constitution thearof and execution agreable thearunto, I think it to be the best in the worlde; beinge a mixture of the 3 lawfull goverments in that manner that it hath the qintessence of them all, and thearby alsoe the one is a boundery unto the other, whearby they are keapt from fallinge into the extreames which eather apart are apt to slippe into, Monarchy into Tyranny, and Aristocracy into Oligarchy, Democracy into Anarchy; now the cheefest remedie and prope to opholde this frame and building and keape it standinge and steady is, and experience hath shewed it to be, the Peeres of England, and theyr power and priviledges in the House of Lords, they have bin as the beame keepinge both scales, Kinge and people, in an even posture, without incroachments one uppon another to the hurt and dammage of both. Longe experience hath made it manyfest that they

have preserved the just rights and libertyes of the people agaynst the tirrannical usurpation of Kings, and have alsoe as steppes and stares upheld the Crowne from fallinge and beinge cast downe uppon the flower by the insolency of the multitude from the throne of goverment. This beinge soe, will it not be as most unjust, soe most dishonourable and most unworthy, for any antient Peere of England to make himselfe a felo de see both to the Nobilyty of Englande and to just and rightly constituted Goverment of the Kingdome by beinge made a partye and indeed a stalkinge horse and vizard to carry on the designe of overthrowinge the House of Peeres, and in place thearof to bringe in and sett up a House chosen att the pleasure of him that hath taken power into his hands to doe what he will, and by this House that must be carryed on as picked out for that pourpose, and altered and newe chosen as tyme and occasion shall require, some 5 or six Lords called to sitt with them whoe may give some countenance to the designe, which for my part I am resolved neaver to doe, nor be guilty of seemminge to allow thearof, but rather to professe and bare witnes agaynst it: a barbones Parliament, as they call it, without choyce of the people att all is not worse then this, which is layinge asyde the Peeres of England whoe by byrth are to sitt, and pickinge out a company to make another House of in theyr places at the pleasure of him that will rule and with all call a few Lords thearby causinge them to disowne theyr owne rights and the rights of all the Nobylyty of England, dawbinge over the busines in this manner to theyr perpetual shame whoe shall yealde thearunto. For my part this is my resolution, if a writt be sent me I will lay it by me and sitt still, if I be sent for by force I canot withstand it, but when I come up I will speake that I hope by God's assistance which shall be just in his sight and just to this goverment beinge now about unjustly to be subverted. My Lord for your lawers I looke uppon them as wethercockes which will turne about with the winde for theyr owne advantages, which I wish they did not love more then truly, with them thearfore whear thear is might thear is right, it is dominion if it succeed, but rebellion if it miscarry, a good argument for pyrates uppon the sea, and for theaves uppon the highway, fitter for hobbs[1] & athiests then good men and christians. I hope I shall a great deale more willingly suffer for well doinge then have fellowship with unrightuousnes and give the least countenance to that I knowe to be unjust. Your man is in hast thearfore I must end. My service remembred to your good Lady.

Your assured friend and servant

W. Say and Seale.

December 29 1657.

[1] That is, Thomas Hobbes the philosopher, whose writings were said to have reconciled 1,000 gentlemen to the Protectorate.

Reviews of Books

Historical Philosophy in France and French Belgium and Switzerland. By ROBERT FLINT. (Edinburgh and London: Blackwood. 1893.)

WHEN Dr. Flint's former work appeared, a critic, who, it is true, was also a rival, objected that it was diffusely written. What then occupied three hundred and thirty pages has now expanded to seven hundred, and suggests a doubt as to the use of criticism. It must at once be said that the increase is nearly all material gain. The author does not cling to his main topic, and, as he insists that the science he is adumbrating flourishes on the study of facts only, and not on speculative ideas, he bestows some needless attention on historians who professed no philosophy, or who, like Daniel and Velly, were not the best of their kind. Here and there, as in the account of Condorcet, there may be an unprofitable or superfluous sentence. But on the whole the enlarged treatment of the philosophy of history in France is accomplished not by expansion, but by solid and essential addition. Many writers are included whom the earlier volume passed over, and Cousin occupies fewer pages now than in 1874, by the aid of smaller type and the omission of a passage injurious to Schelling. Many necessary corrections and improvements have been made, such as the transfer of Ballanche from theocracy to the liberal catholicism of which he is supposed to be the founder.

Dr. Flint's unchallenged superiority consists alike in his familiarity with obscure, but not irrelevant authors, whom he has brought into line, and in his scrupulous fairness towards all whose attempted systems he has analysed. He is hearty in appreciating talent of every kind, but he is discriminating in his judgment of ideas, and rarely sympathetic. Where the best thoughts of the ablest men are to be displayed it would be tempting to present an array of luminous points or a chaplet of polished gems. In the hands of such artists as Stahl or Cousin they would start into high relief with a convincing lucidity that would rouse the exhibited writers to confess that they had never known they were so clever. Without transfiguration the effect might be attained by sometimes stringing the most significant words of the original. Excepting one unduly favoured competitor, who fills two pages with untranslated French, there is little direct quotation. Cournot is one of those who, having been overlooked at first, are here raised to prominence. He is urgently, and justly, recommended to the attention of students. 'They will find that every page bears the impress of patient, independent, and sagacious thought. I believe I have not met with a

more genuine thinker in the course of my investigations. He was a man of the finest intellectual qualities, of a powerful and absolutely truthful mind.' But then we are warned that Cournot never wrote a line for the general reader, and accordingly he is not permitted to speak for himself. Yet it was this thoughtful Frenchman who said: *Aucune idée parmi celles qui se réfèrent à l'ordre des faits naturels ne tient de plus près à la famille des idées religieuses que l'idée du progrès, et n'est plus propre à devenir le principe d'une sorte de foi religieuse pour ceux qui n'en ont pas d'autres. Elle a, comme la foi religieuse, la vertu de relever les âmes et les caractères.*

The successive theories gain neither in clearness nor in contrast by the order in which they stand. As other countries are reserved for other volumes, Cousin precedes Hegel, who was his master, whilst Quetelet is barely mentioned in his own place, and has to wait for Buckle, if not for Oettingen and Rümelin, before he comes on for discussion. The finer threads, the underground currents, are not carefully traced. The connexion between the *juste milieu* in politics and eclecticism in philosophy was already stated by the chief eclectic; but the subtler link between the catholic legitimists and democracy seems to have escaped the author's notice. He says that the republic proclaimed universal suffrage in 1848, and he considers it a triumph for the party of Lafayette. In fact, it was the triumph of an opposite school—of those legitimists who appealed from the narrow franchise which sustained the Orleans dynasty to the nation behind it. The chairman of the constitutional committee was a legitimist, and he, inspired by the abbé de Genoude, of the *Gazette de France*, and opposed by Odilon Barrot, insisted on the pure logic of absolute democracy.

It is an old story now that the true history of philosophy is the true evolution of philosophy, and that when we have eliminated whatever has been damaged by contemporary criticism or by subsequent advance, and have assimilated all that has survived through the ages, we shall find in our possession not only a record of growth, but the full-grown fruit itself. This is not the way in which Dr. Flint understands the building up of his department of knowledge. Instead of showing how far France has made a way towards the untrodden crest, he describes the many flowery paths, discovered by the French, which lead elsewhere, and I expect that in coming volumes it will appear that Hegel and Buckle, Vico and Ferrari, are scarcely better guides than Laurent or Littré. Fatalism and retribution, race and nationality, the test of success and of duration, heredity and the reign of the invincible dead, the widening circle, the emancipation of the individual, the gradual triumph of the soul over the body, of mind over matter, reason over will, knowledge over ignorance, truth over error, right over might, liberty over authority, the law of progress and perfectibility, the constant intervention of providence, the sovereignty of the developed conscience—neither these nor other alluring theories are accepted as more than illusions or half-truths. Dr. Flint scarcely avails himself of them even for his foundations or his skeleton framework. His critical faculty, stronger than his gift of adaptation, levels obstructions and marks the earth with ruin. He is more anxious to expose the strange unreason of former writers, the inadequacy of their knowledge,

their want of aptitude in induction, than their services in storing material for the use of successors. The result is not to be the sifted and verified wisdom of two centuries, but a future system, to be produced when the rest have failed by an exhaustive series of vain experiments. We may regret to abandon many brilliant laws and attractive generalisations that have given light and clearness and simplicity and symmetry to our thought; but it is certain that Dr. Flint is a close and powerful reasoner, equipped with satisfying information, and he establishes his contention that France has not produced a classic philosophy of history, and is still waiting for its Adam Smith or Jacob Grimm.

The kindred topic of development recurs repeatedly, as an important factor in modern science. It is still a confused and unsettled chapter, and in one place Dr. Flint seems to attribute the idea to Bossuet; in another he says that it was scarcely entertained in those days by protestants, and not at all by catholics; in a third he implies that its celebrity in the nineteenth century is owing in the first place to Lamennais. The passage, taken from Vinet, in which Bossuet speaks of the development of religion is inaccurately rendered. His words are the same which, on another page, are rightly translated 'the course of religion'—*la suite de la religion.* Indeed, Bossuet was the most powerful adversary the theory ever encountered. It was not so alien to catholic theology as is here stated, and before the time of Jurieu is more often found among catholic than protestant writers. When it was put forward, in guarded, dubious, and evasive terms, by Petavius, the indignation in England was as great as in 1846. The work which contained it, the most learned that Christian theology had then produced, could not be reprinted over here, lest it should supply the Socinians with inconvenient texts. Nelson hints that the great Jesuit may have been a secret Arian, and Bull stamped upon his theory amid the grateful applause of Bossuet and his friends. Petavius was not an innovator, for the idea had long found a home among the Franciscan masters: *Proficit fides secundum statum communem, quia secundum profectum temporum efficiebantur homines magis idonei ad percipienda et intelligenda sacramenta fidei.*——*Sunt multae conclusiones necessario inclusae in articulis creditis, sed antequam sunt per Ecclesiam declaratae et explicatae non oportet quemcumque eas credere. Oportet tamen circa eas sobrie opinari, ut scilicet homo sit paratus eas tenere pro tempore, pro quo veritas fuerit declarata.* Cardinal Duperron said nearly the same thing as Petavius a generation before him: *L'Arien trouvera dans sainct Irénée, Tertullien et autres qui nous sont restez en petit nombre de ces siècles-là, que le Fils est l'instrument du Père, que le Père a commandé au Fils lors qu'il a esté question de la création des choses, que le Père et le Fils sont* aliud et aliud; *choses que qui tiendroit aujourd'huy, que le langage de l'Eglise est plus examiné, seroit estimé pour Arien luy-mesme.* All this does not serve to supply the pedigree which Newman found it so difficult to trace. Development, in those days, was an expedient, an hypothesis, and not even the thing so dear to the Oxford probabilitarians, a working hypothesis. It was not more substantial than the gleam in Robinson's farewell to the pilgrims: 'I am very confident that the Lord has more truth yet to break forth out of his holy word.' The reason why it

possessed no scientific basis is explained by Duchesne: *Ce n'est guère avant la seconde moitié du xviie siècle qu'il devint impossible de soutenir l'authenticité des fausses décrétales, des constitutions apostoliques, des 'Récognitions Clémentines,' du faux Ignace, du pseudo-Dionys et de l'immense fatras d'œuvres anonymes ou pseudonymes qui grossissait souvent du tiers ou de la moitié l'héritage littéraire des auteurs les plus considérables. Qui aurait pu même songer à un développement dogmatique?* That it was little understood, and lightly and loosely employed, is proved by Bossuet himself, who alludes to it in one passage as if he did not know that it was the subversion of his theology: *Quamvis ecclesia omnem veritatem funditus norit, ex haeresibus tamen discit, ut aiebat magni nominis Vincentius Lirinensis, aptius, distinctius, clariusque eandem exponere.*

The account of Lamennais suffers from the defect of mixing him up too much with his early friends. No doubt he owed to them the theory that carried him through his career, for it may be found in Bonald, and also in De Maistre, though not, perhaps, in the volumes he had already published. It was less original than he at first imagined, for the English divines commonly held it from the seventeenth century, and its dirge was sung only the other day by the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. A Scottish professor would even be justified in claiming it for Reid. But of course it was Lamennais who gave it most importance, in his programme and in his life. And his theory of the common sense, the theory that we can be certain of truth only by the agreement of mankind, though vigorously applied to sustain authority in state and church, gravitated towards multitudinism, and marked him off from his associates. When he said *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, he was not thinking of the Christian church, but of Christianity as old as the creation; and the development he meant led up to the Bible, and ended at the New Testament instead of beginning there. That is the theory which he made so famous, which founded his fame and governed his fate, and to which Dr. Flint's words apply when he speaks of celebrity. In that sense it is a mistake to connect Lamennais with Moehler and Newman; and I do not believe that he anticipated their teaching, in spite of one or two passages which do not, on the face of them, bear date B.C., and may, no doubt, be quoted for the opposite opinion.

In the same group Dr. Flint represents De Maistre as the teacher of Savigny, and asserts that there could never be a doubt as to the liberalism of Chateaubriand. There was none after his expulsion from office; but there was much reason for doubting in 1815, when he entreated the king to set bounds to his mercy; in 1819, when he was contributing to the *Conservateur*; and in 1823, when he executed the mandate of the absolute monarchs against the Spanish constitution. His zeal for legitimacy was at all times qualified with liberal elements, but they never became consistent or acquired the mastery until 1824. De Maistre and Savigny covered the same ground at one point; they both subjected the future to the past. This could serve as an argument for absolutism and theocracy, and on that account was lovely in the eyes of De Maistre. If it had been an argument the other way he would have cast it off. Savigny had no such ulterior purpose. His doctrine that the living are not their own

masters could serve either cause. He rejected a mechanical fixity, and held that whatever has been made by process of growth shall continue to grow and suffer modification. His theory of continuity has this significance in political science, that it supplied a basis for conservatism apart from absolutism and compatible with freedom. And, as he believed that law depends on national tradition and character, he became indirectly and through friends a founder of the theory of nationality.

The one writer whom Dr. Flint refuses to criticise, because he too nearly agrees with him, is Renouvier. Taking this avowal in conjunction with two or three indiscretions on other pages, we can make a guess, not at the systém itself, which is to console us for so much deviation, but at its tendency and spirit. The fundamental article is belief in divine government. As Kant beheld God in the firmament of heaven, so too we can see him in history on earth. Unless a man is determined to be an atheist, he must acknowledge that the experience of mankind is a decisive proof in favour of religion. As providence is not absolute, but reigns over men destined to freedom, its method is manifested in the law of progress. Here, however, Dr. Flint, in his agreement with Renouvier, is not eager to fight for his cause, and speaks with a less jubilant certitude. He is able to conceive that providence may attain its end without the condition of progress, that the divine scheme would not be frustrated if the world, governed by omnipotent wisdom, became steadily worse. Assuming progress as a fact, if not a law, there comes the question wherein it consists, how it is measured, where is its goal. Not religion, for the middle ages are an epoch of decline. Catholicism has since lost so much ground as to nullify the theories of Bossuet; whilst protestantism never succeeded in France, either after the Reformation, when it ought to have prevailed, nor after the Revolution, when it ought not. The failure to establish the protestant church on the ruins of the old *régime*, to which Quinet attributes the breakdown of the Revolution, and which Napoleon regretted almost in the era of his concordat, is explained by Mr. Flint on the ground that protestants were in a minority. But so they were in and after the wars of religion; and it is not apparent why a philosopher who does not prefer orthodoxy to liberty should complain that they achieved nothing better than toleration. He disproves Bossuet's view by that process of deliverance from the church which is the note of recent centuries, and from which there is no going back. On the future I will not enlarge, because I am writing at present in the HISTORICAL, not the PROPHETICAL, REVIEW. But some things were not so clear in France in 1679 as they are now at Edinburgh. The predominance of protestant power was not foreseen, except by those who disputed whether Rome would perish in 1710 or about 1720. The destined power of science to act upon religion had not been proved by Newton or Simon. No man was able to forecast the future experience of America, or to be sure that observations made under the reign of authority would be confirmed by the reign of freedom.

If the end be not religion, is it morality, humanity, civilisation, knowledge? In the German chapters of 1874 Dr. Flint was severe upon Hegel, and refused his notion that the development of liberty is the soul of history, as crude, one-sided, and misunderstood. He is more lenient

now, and affirms that liberty occupies the final summit, that it profits by all the good that is in the world, and suffers by all the evil, that it pervades strife and inspires endeavour, that it is almost, if not altogether, the sign, and the prize, and the motive in the onward and upward advance of the race for which Christ was crucified. As that refined essence which draws sustenance from all good things it is clearly understood as the product of civilisation, with its complex problems and scientific appliances, not as the elementary possession of the noble savage, which has been traced so often to the primeval forest. On the other hand, if sin not only tends to impair, but does inevitably impair and hinder it, providence is excluded from its own mysterious sphere, which, as it is not the suppression of all evil and present punishment of wrong, should be the conversion of evil into an instrument to serve the higher purpose. But although Dr. Flint has come very near to Hegel and Michelet, and seemed about to elevate their teaching to a higher level and a wider view, he ends by treating it coldly, as a partial truth requiring supplement, and bids us wait until many more explorers have recorded their soundings. That, with the trained capacity for misunderstanding and the smouldering dissent proper to critics, I might not mislead any reader, or do less than justice to a profound though indecisive work, I should have wished to piece together the passages in which the author indicates, somewhat faintly, the promised but withheld philosophy which will crown his third or fourth volume. Any one who compares pages 125, 135, 225, 226, 671, will understand better than I can explain it the view which is the master key to the book. ACTON.

Über das Problem einer allgemeinen Entwickelungsgeschichte des Rechts und der Sitte. Inaugurations-Rede gehalten am 15. Nov. 1893. Von RICHARD HILDEBRAND. (Graz: Leuschner und Lubensky. 1894.)

THE new rector of the university of Graz has used his occasion well. In a small compass he has taken a rational and profitable view of the comparative method as applied to the problems of early law and custom, of its risks, its limitations, and its true functions. History, as we now all know, has become as much natural history as the sciences of direct observation. The *Historiker* must be a *Naturforscher.* But the mere collection and comparison of facts from various tribes, countries, and ages will not do. We have still to beware of bringing with us preconceived ideas, derived, perhaps, from the analysis of quite modern institutions, and taking them without further criticism as a guide to the actual order of historic development. Thus in modern law we regard the right or power of taking the profits of a thing as the natural outcome of ownership. We put the notion of ownership first. Hence, when we find a state of society where private ownership, say, of plough land is not recognised, we are tempted to ascribe ownership to the community. If the tiller or some individual lord is not owner, the township or the tribe must be. But this is a fallacy. The concrete enjoyment comes, in the historical order, before the abstract conception of ownership. One might say that *usus* is a natural, *dominium* a civil institution. Communal or corporate ownership, properly so called, is an artificial extension from the idea of several

ownership in natural persons, and not at all an easy one. Dr. Hildebrand's general statement on this point is absolutely confirmed by my friend Professor Maitland's researches on the history of legal ideas in medieval England.

Again, we are tempted to talk of stages of culture in society as if culture were one and indivisible. But it is nothing of the kind. A step forward in one direction may involve some falling back in others. We must fix on some particular kind of progress to give us a scale. Economic progress, being measurable and not disputable, will afford the required common measure. Apply this to the history of marriage as a test case. Marriage by capture, polyandry, promiscuity, are now commonly represented as marks of primitive society. But when we turn to the facts among people who have a primitive agriculture or none at all, what do we find? Nothing of the sort is known. The truth appears to be that wife capture and polyandry arise out of conditions that do not exist in the most archaic forms of society. Here Dr. Hildebrand, by an independent line of reasoning, fully confirms Maine's scepticism as to the large generalisation of the McLennan school.

The merit and importance of this little monograph are, in my opinion, quite out of proportion to its unassuming bulk. I have freely condensed Dr. Hildebrand's argument in my own words, but in the main, I hope, faithfully. F. POLLOCK.

Les Origines du Droit International. Par ERNEST NYS, Professeur à l'Université de Bruxelles, Juge au Tribunal de Première Instance. (Bruxelles: Alfred Castaigne. Paris: Thorin et fils. 1894.)

THIS work is an encyclopædia of all that was done and thought during the middle ages and the period of the Renaissance in relation to those subjects which we should now describe as international law, or the theory of the mutual relations of states. M. Nys has long been known as having made that subject his own, and has given to the world many of the results of his research in short essays, such as 'Le Droit de la Guerre et les Précurseurs de Grotius,' 'Les Commencements de la Diplomatie,' &c. He has also translated into French the 'Principles of International Law' and the 'Principles of Law' of the late Professor Lorimer, while by doing so he has testified to the value he attaches to ideas as well as to history. One bond of connexion between him and the eminent Scotch philosophical jurist is certainly the appreciation which the latter showed of medieval thought, especially that of St. Thomas Aquinas. No doubt it is on this account that M. Nys has dedicated the present volume to *l'impérissable mémoire de James Lorimer*, though it does not bear on the special views with which that memory will chiefly be connected.

M. Nys is deeply imbued with the spirit of the historical or inductive method which we have learned to pursue, at least by the side of deduction, in every subject which admits of it. 'In every human work,' he says, 'there are two parts, the part of contemporaries and that of those who preceded them in the perpetual struggle which is the lot of humanity' (intr.,

p. ii). Thus in international law there is the part that has been contributed by the doers and thinkers of the last two centuries and a half, during which time there has been an ordered society of states, based on the legal equality of its members; and there is the part that was contributed during the long preceding period, when that society was slowly emerging from a confusion which imperial and papal claims and systems of feudal hierarchy, all since perished, were vainly trying to reduce to order. With regard to the last-mentioned part, it is very remarkable that the ideas, related to our subject, which were put forward during the middle ages were not merely such as arose out of or corresponded to the circumstances then existing. There was more activity of thought than has often been supposed, and the remains of ancient learning were sufficient to direct that activity not only to actual surroundings, but also to materials which told of a different condition of things, in some respects more like that which has since arisen; and hence modern international ideas are anticipated by medieval ones, to a greater extent than the modern frame of international society was anticipated by anything which existed in the middle ages. 'The middle ages,' says M. Nys, 'were more a period of discussions than is commonly thought. . . . In what more especially concerns matters appertaining to the law of nations the medieval writers often displayed an admirable audacity of mind' (intr., p. iii). 'The exact notion of international law is not met with among the authors of the middle ages properly so called. They resume the study of Roman law with a new ardour; they create the science of common law; they build up customary law; they examine problems of political right, especially under the influence of Aristotle. Yet international law, as a whole, escapes their view; imbedded in natural law, it remains confounded, like it, in canon and Roman law. Little by little natural law is disengaged from the matrix; it is studied timidly on the occasion of certain titles in the compilations of Justinian, or of certain rules decreed by councils or inscribed in papal constitutions. Little by little the law of war becomes the subject of discussion on the occasion of the same titles and the same rules. Little by little also the law of embassage is explained and developed. Certain questions suggested by the study of the law of war or the law of embassage even assume importance; the opinion of Christendom is divided on them—as, for example, the question of the rights of unbelievers. No doubt in all these speculations there is not yet any perception of a whole; but one thing is certain, it is here that we must seek the origin, the birth, of two new branches of jural science, natural law and international law' (ch. i.).

M. Nys begins with a chapter on the general notions current in the middle ages with any relation to his subject, and passes to the position and claims of the papacy and the empire, and to the attitude of the church and of theologians towards war. Then follows a series of chapters in which facts and opinions are marshalled according to the departments of the subject which they concern, as they might be in a treatise on modern international law; and in these private war and the dealings of vassals and cities furnish their contingent of information, as indeed, before the notion of a sovereign state had been distinctly established, they furnished their aid to the development of the subject. And

lastly the eternal aspiration of humanity towards peace, and the utopias to which it has given rise, come under review.

We have put down the book with the impression that, valuable as it is for the scientific study of international law, it ought to be still more valuable to the historian. The latter, so far as he has to deal with incidents and changes bearing on international or quasi-international relations, will find in it the means of viewing those incidents and changes in connexion with the general drift of analogous events, and of bringing the conduct of his characters to the test of the opinions and practice of their time. It is a commonplace that such should be the aim of the historian, but it is not easy for him to carry out that aim with reference to a branch of his subject which has been developed into a separate science, unless he receives and will accept the assistance of those who have specially cultivated that science. We have often regretted that international lawyers do not know more of history and historians more of international law. We should have better international law if it were more inductively treated, and then probably it would be more attractive to the historian, and he would know more of it. But the historian of the middle ages or of the sixteenth century has now, in M. Nys's 'Origines du Droit International,' a book in which what can be done for him from that point of view is well done, and he will be ill advised if he neglects to make himself familiar with it. J. WESTLAKE.

Selections from Strabo; with an Introduction on Strabo's Life and Works. By the Rev. H. F. TOZER, M.A., F.R.G.S., Honorary Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1893.)

IT is long since any serious work has been done in England upon Strabo, and in providing English readers with this attractive introduction to a writer not, perhaps, attractive in the mass, but abounding in instruction, Mr. Tozer has added another solid service to the many which he has already rendered to all serious students of ancient geography. His work has, no doubt, been facilitated by the recent excellent treatise of Dubois ('Examen de la Géographie de Strabon,' Paris, 1891,—the fourth section of Hugo Berger's 'Erdkunde der Griechen' was not, apparently, published in time to be of use); but the *griffe* of the independent student and eye-witness is clearly marked upon the book, and it is not every editor of Strabo who can correct from personal inspection an eccentric statement of the latter about the view from the top of Mount Argaeus. Without being an enthusiast about his author—it would, perhaps, be difficult to be enthusiastic about Strabo—Mr. Tozer is a good deal juster to him than is, for instance, Müllenhoff, whose hostility to Strabo, by the way, he understates (p. 43). He is, perhaps, even too lenient to Strabo's blunder-headed depreciation of Pytheas, and to his controversial views on mathematical and physical geography. But he is only just to the geographical eye of Strabo—his power of vividly and accurately conceiving (as in the description of the Armenian plateaux or the Gaulish river system) a large mass of country as a whole—and to the force and perspicuity with which Strabo often expounds the relation of man to his environment. 'No-

where is Strabo's originality more clearly seen than here. He is, in fact, the only writer in antiquity who has systematically treated in this respect of nature or man' (p. 33). Mr. Tozer follows Strabo around the world which he describes, and in so doing takes sides with those who maintain that Strabo had hardly visited Greece at all, and in particular had never seen Athens. The excellence of his work on Asia Minor, so highly praised by Professor Ramsay, is fully recognised by Mr. Tozer, and important minor points like Strabo's belief in a connexion between the ocean and the Caspian are brought clearly out. That Strabo describes less his own day than a day some way back is urged by Mr. Tozer not less strongly than by Professor Mahaffy [1] and Emil Kuhn,[2] and there are some interesting remarks on the question whether Strabo addressed himself primarily to a Greek or to a Roman reader. All this introduction, of over fifty pages, is, in fine, a piece of competent scholarly exposition, which will give the English reader who has never yet embarked on Strabo all the necessary preliminary information, and will put him at the most enlightened point of view.

Of course every student of the later periods of Greek or Roman history knows that Strabo is a perfect mine of information, and the publication of M. Tardieu's wonderful index [3]—one of the most useful pieces of work that have been done in our time for the student of antiquity—has only deepened that impression. But few would have suspected that Strabo would lend himself so readily to selection, and that so exceptionally interesting a book as this could be made out of him. Mr. Tozer's plan has been to take the books in their order, and to give extracts out of each. His volume is thus divided into seventeen sections, corresponding to the seventeen books of Strabo, beginning with 'Prolegomena' and ending with 'Egypt.' It is full of curious, interesting, and important matter. Such, for instance, are the accounts of the geographical and racial *morcellement* of Spain, of the river system of Gaul, of the Alpine passes, of the magnificence of Rome and the physical causes of its greatness, of the Black Sea and the Caucasus, of the priestly governments in Asia Minor, of the Brahmins in India, and the nilometer at Elephantine—all these pictures embroidered, as it were, on the luminous background of the 'Roman peace.' Strabo as a whole may be dull, but Strabo read in this way, and with such a guide as Mr. Tozer, is hardly less interesting than Herodotus.

To each of his selections Mr. Tozer prefixes a brief introduction, with elucidatory notes—generally historical and antiquarian in character—at the foot of the Greek text. In general this apparatus is all that could be wished by the most exigent of readers, and if I confine my remarks to a few points on which disagreement is possible, or on which further light appears desirable, it is due to considerations of space only. On p. 110, in the statement that Balbus's triumph was 'the first occasion on which this honour was conferred on one who was not a Roman citizen,' we should read, 'who was not born a Roman citizen.' Of course he was a Roman citizen at the time of his triumph. On p. 201 there appears to be a confusion between the hypæthral sanctuary of Apollo (for which Dio is the sole and perhaps untrustworthy authority) on the northern

[1] *Greek World under Roman Sway*, p. 192. [2] *Entstehung*, p. 421.

[3] Vol. iv. of his new translation of Strabo (Paris, 1890).

horn of the bay and the famous temple of the Actian Apollo on the southern one. Kuhn, 'Entstehung,' p. 416, note, is worth looking at in this connexion. On p. 270 the explanation of a strategia in Cappadocia as 'the (Roman) prefecture' will mislead most readers. The term 'prefecture' is a little technical for use in this connexion, and the strategies in Cappadocia were a pre-Roman institution, just as they were in Thrace and Egypt. Strabo expressly dates them back to Archelaus's predecessors, and Professor Ramsay[4] appears to be right in speaking of them as 'an antiquated institution.' Elsewhere I miss the further light which Mr. Tozer is so competent to give. Thus on p. 148 a note on Strabo's statement that Rome was the only city on the Tiber would have been interesting. It is practically true to this day, and Nissen's reasons for it[5] were worth a mention. On p. 236 more seems to be wanted about the two Larymnæ in the light of Pausanias, iv. 23, 7, and Hertzberg's discussion of the point. On p. 278 there should, perhaps, be a note to warn the beginner against confusing the Paphlagonian Sebaste with the much more important Sebasteia (Siwas). On p. 308 something more about the great school of Tarsus would have been welcome. Plutarch, 'On the Cessation of Oracles,' chap. i., as particularly interesting to Englishmen, might at all events have been worked in. On p. 105 the note on the 'couvade' ignores the 'New English Dictionary' and the controversy of 1893. On p. 96 the statement as to the absence of tin in modern Spain appears to be a mistake. At least the first living authority on modern Spain[6] asserts the contrary. The passage of Strabo on the use of mountaineers in the Roman army (p. 89) is immensely suggestive. It might have been shown by cases like those of the Astures, Cantabri, Vocontii, &c., that there was good ground for Strabo's remark, and the very interesting parallel of Anglo-Indian experience[7] might also have been adduced. On p. 233 Mahaffy's 'Greek World,' &c., pp. 81–82, might have suggested an interesting note. On p. 214, note 3, a reference to Middleton's 'Ancient Rome,' i. 24, would have been in place, and on p. 285 G. Radet's admirable article on the Pisidian cities in the *Revue Archéologique*, xxii. 204, certainly deserved a mention. But even if, in some of these points at all events, the book will admit of being strengthened in a second edition, they amount to very little. Mr. Tozer has produced a most helpful, workmanlike, and admirable volume, for which those who use it most assiduously will learn to be most grateful.

William T. Arnold.

Studi di Storia Antica e di Topografia Storica. Dal Dott. Gabriele Grasso. Fasc. I. (Ariano: Stabil. Tipogr. Appulo-Irpino. 1893.)

This pamphlet deals with topographical questions relating to the western part of ancient Apulia. Their importance is of a decidedly limited character, and the results cannot be said to carry us much beyond those reached in the ninth volume of the 'Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.' It may, however, be worth while to summarise briefly those points which

[4] *Historical Geography*, p. 284. [5] *Landeskunde*, i. 320, 323.
[6] Theobald Fischer in Kirchhoff's *Länderkunde von Europa*, ii. pt. ii. 710.
[7] *Asiatic Quarterly Review* for January 1889, p. 46 foll.

are new. First comes a discussion of the name Aquilonia. Mommsen distinguished three places ('C. I. L.' ix. p. 88)—Aquilonia in the Hirpini (Lacedogna), the Aquilonia of Livy, x. 38, &c., and the *mutatio Aquilonis* of the Jerusalem itinerary. The second of these Grasso identifies with Macchia Godena, not far from Bovianum (see 'C. I. L.' ix. t. iii.), and he suggests that the latter part of the modern name may be a survival of Akudunniad, which we know was the Oscan form of the first Aquilonia. The *mutatio Aquilonis* is not the name of a place near Bovino ('C. I. L.' ix. p. 87), but indicates a station at the river Aquilo (now Celeno, *l.c.* t. ii.) Some of the minor roads of the district are next dealt with. It is not necessary to assume that the Via Herculia of 'C. I. L.' ix. 6059, &c., was made under Diocletian and Maximian. It is more likely that the name is local. But until some definite place can be pointed out we prefer to keep to Mommsen's conclusion. The road which connected Aeclanum and Herdoniae was called the Via Herdonitana ('C. I. L.' ix. 670), and the Via Aurelia Aeclanensis was the name of that between Aeclanum and Aequum Tuticum. To the latter belong the inscriptions at Grottaminarda ('C.I.L.' ix. 1126, 6071). Eighteen pages are next devoted to arriving at the conclusion stated by Mommsen in half a dozen lines, that the name of the *oppidulum* which Horace could not get into an hexameter ('Sat.' i. 5, 87) is Ausculum ('C. I. L.' ix. p. 62). But in his 'Addenda' Grasso suggests that it may be Herdoniae, which presents greater metrical difficulties, while the difference of distance is unimportant. The third part deals with Aequum Tuticum, the etymology of which is discussed without any satisfactory result. The modern name of the site is S. Eleuterio, and Grasso gives an interesting proof that this comes from the connexion with the place of a Bishop Eleutherius (or Liberator), who was martyred in the Diocletian persecution. The name Messana, or Missenum, which some martyrologies associate with him, is the stream Miscano, which flows near the site. Finally, the comparatively modern origin of Ariano is demonstrated, as against the assertion of the eighteenth-century local historian Vitale that it represented an ancient town. All the inscriptions there are imported. But the existence of a *fundus Arianus* at Velleia suggests that the name may be ancient.

G. McN. Rushforth.

Infamia: its Place in Roman Public and Private Law. By A. H. J. Greenidge, M.A. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1894.)

This is a thorough and scholarly treatment of a subject which owes much of its difficulty and at the same time of its interest to the fact that it lies upon the by no means scientific frontier between law and morality. The question as to the period at which informal transactions became actionable at Rome may, perhaps, always remain a debatable one, but whether we incline to an early or a relatively late date—and at the moment the current of opinion seems in favour of the latter—the subject of *infamia* will always be of interest in the history of Roman private law; for, as regulated by the censor, it seems to have been in many cases a substitute for and a precursor of a definite legal sanction. Its interest for the student of public law is even greater.

Mr. Greenidge devotes his first forty pages to a definition of the sub-

ject and an outline of his treatise. He justly remarks that a definition of an institution whose history extended over many centuries must be a very general one, though it is not, perhaps, as valueless as he appears to think. If it does nothing more, his definition (p. 37) illustrates the clearness and sobriety which are marked characteristics of his book. He agrees in the main with Mommsen as against Savigny that *infamia* during the republic was not a clearly marked juristic conception. He traces its origin to the censorian control over manners and morals, a control which, being legally irresponsible, produced, fortunately for Roman morality, no definite code of rules, though the censorian edict was in all probability, like the prætorian, largely tralatitious. He argues against the distinction which Savigny and others have supposed to exist between *censoria notatio* and *infamia*, or, substituting facts for names, between disqualifications imposed arbitrarily by the censor and a system of permanent disabilities existing independently of the discretion of the censor, although enforced through his agency. The conclusion arrived at is that in republican times condemnation neither on the ground of delict nor of fiduciary obligations produced *ipso iure* disqualification for office or loss of suffrage. The magistrate could treat the condemnation as a ground of exclusion, but, as is shown by the case of Antonius, the colleague of Cicero in the consulship, he could disregard it. With reference to crimes it was only gradually, by legal interpretation, that the principle was established that *infamia* followed conviction. In the 'Lex Iulia Municipalis,' 'a codification of the most permanent portion of the censorian *infamia*' touching the disqualifications for the position of senator in a municipal town, we have most valuable evidence as to the nature and limitation of the conception at the close of the republican period. After tracing in some detail the working of *infamia* in connexion with the senate and the equestrian order, Mr. Greenidge passes on to the prætorian *infamia*. He shows that the prætors in whose edicts *infamia* appears as a bar to indiscriminate postulation borrowed the conception from the censors: in their hands, however, it became of necessity definite and codified. In chapter v. we see how in the empire the idea, inherent in the censorian procedure, of exclusion from public honours became again the dominant one. By the time of Constantine *infamia* is a definite legal conception, with fixed consequences, and is used by the emperors as a powerful means of punishing crimes and administrative abuses.

Mr. Greenidge's book is an excellent example of the application of the methods and results of modern criticism to a special subject, and he has chosen for his subject a typical Roman institution. *Infamia* traces its origin to the *ius publicum*, and its vitality to that care for public reputation which was the strongest moral force in republican Rome: it was developed by censorian edicts issued in strict connexion with administrative functions; it owed its formulation to the prætor, while, finally, the emperors sharpened and wielded for their own purposes the weapon forged by their republican predecessors. Mr. Greenidge is scrupulously fair in his use of the texts and in his treatment of modern authorities, and he refrains altogether from the too usual practice of extracting by torture strange and discordant utterances from the long-suffering *corpus iuris*.

HENRY BOND.

A History of the Roman Empire from its Foundation to the Death of Marcus Aurelius. By J. B. Bury, M.A. (London: John Murray. 1893.)

This new volume of the 'Student's Manuals' bridges over a gap which has long been felt to exist. As Professor Bury says in his preface, we have hitherto had no English handbook giving a detailed account of the first two centuries of the Roman empire, and he has set himself the task of placing this most important period on the same footing as that of the republic. It can no longer now be said that a systematic knowledge of events after the battle of Actium is difficult to acquire, and the researches of the great German historians into the constitution of the principate are brought within the reach of the English schoolboy. The two able and lucid chapters which Mr. Bury devotes to this side of imperial history are one of the best features of his book. The first of them deals not only with the final form which Augustus gave his constitution, but with all the interesting experiments which preceded it. The vexed question as to the importance of the consulship between 27 and 23 B.C. is discussed in detail, and while the views of Mommsen are followed in the main the very different ones of Professor Pelham are quoted at length in a note. Mr. Bury is indeed very careful in this chapter to avoid giving only one side of a question. Though the now generally accepted interpretation of the title *princeps* as a shortened form of *princeps civitatis* is adopted in the text, Herzog's modified revival of the old theory that it stood for *princeps senatus* is noticed and explained. The 'Lex de Imperio' is discussed and quoted in full, and the conflicting views of Mommsen and Herzog are both given as to whether the senate alone, or the senate and the army alike, had a right to the bestowal of the proconsular *imperium*. The second chapter gives an equally clear account of the joint rule of *princeps* and senate, and answers most of the questions which would occur to a student as to the way in which the theory of the dyarchy worked out in practice. The *cursus honorum*, the position of the *equites*, the functions of the magistrates are all well described. The minute detail with which all this rather abstruse constitutional theory is presented may seem to some out of place in a handbook. But such a criticism would be unfair. Original work in Roman history during the last few decades has been largely centred on its constitutional side; and in no department has better work been done and greater progress made than in that of the early principate. Whether or not, therefore, we consider that too much stress is laid at the present moment on the constitutional aspect of history, we cannot blame Mr. Bury for his profusion of detail. Where he is really open to criticism is in the disproportionately small space he has alloted to his general review of the constitution of Augustus as considered in the light of the second century. Only four pages, and these terribly unimpressive and inadequate, are deemed sufficient for the whole political development of the principate. The modifications which the dyarchy underwent in the direction of autocracy, the influence on it of the military element, the question of east and west, the extension of Roman citizenship, the front the empire presented to the barbarians, the growing power of Christianity, are all hurried over. And this is the more to be regretted be-

cause there are few men that have a right to speak with such authority on these points as the author of the 'History of the Later Roman Empire.'

Scarcely less valuable than the chapters on the constitution of the principate are those on the provincial administration of Augustus. Not only is an excellent general summary given of the various ways in which Rome governed her subjects, but the position and history of each province are described in detail. If a fault is to be found with the matter of this part of the book, it is in the very scanty treatment of the *concilia* and their connexion with the state worship of the emperors. With the style it is impossible not to feel dissatisfied when one remembers Mommsen's 'History of the Provinces of the Roman Empire,' with all its lift and stimulus. Lucidity and terseness are not everything. Directly we get beyond the exposition of constitutional details we have a right to complain if a handbook which is to introduce young students to a great epoch is lacking in interest. But the responsibility of its writer is doubled when his subject is one that can be made as fascinating as can the history of imperial Rome.

Mr. Bury's estimate of the position and characteristics of the first ten emperors is a sober and sensible one. The section on Domitian in particular is very thoughtful and sympathetic, and clears away many prejudices. His account of the events of their principates enters into great detail, and cannot entirely reduce to dulness what comes down to us in the language of Tacitus and Juvenal. Mr. Bury's observations on financial administration are always valuable, and he is very careful on military questions. The winning and losing of Germany, the campaigns in Armenia under Claudius and Nero are all well told, and never does Mr. Bury rise nearer to enthusiasm than over the battle between the generals of Otho and Vitellius at Locus Castrorum. We can say, indeed, that wherever Mr. Bury treats of the first ten emperors he has made good use of his authorities, and is quite accurate. Though too the reader is conscious of the loss of the personal element, when no dignity or impressiveness of style is left to take its place, the reigns of Nerva and Trajan are adequately described, and the latter is brightened considerably by copious and excellent quotations from Pliny's letters.

Mr. Bury does not seem to have realised how much original work has yet to be done for Hadrian and the Antonines. Almost the only advance he has made on Merivale's account of Hadrian is to give a clearer account of the constitutional and legal changes of his principate, and to utilise Dürr's monograph on his journeys. All credit is due to Dürr for his idea of basing the dates of the journeys on a systematic collection of inscriptions; and he has carried it out with laborious industry. But he lays down for himself no canons of evidence, and never even discusses the question as to what constitutes a proof of Hadrian's presence in a place at a given time or any time at all. More than once a fuller study of inscriptions shows that Dürr's methods of argument would antedate the 'Orient Express,' if not actually make Hadrian to be in two places at one and the same time. And not only have Dürr's conclusions from the evidence before him to be carefully sifted, but since 1881, when his book was published, a number of inscriptions have been discovered which

materially add to that evidence. Dürr, indeed, never heard of Wood's 'Discoveries at Ephesus,' published though it was in 1877, till the main body of his work was completed, and could only touch on it hastily in his 'Nachtrag.' But it is unfortunate that Mr. Bury, who accepts all Dürr's general conclusions in the body of his work, except in one case where Herzog has declared against him, and merely makes a reservation in a note that 'there are still many points which must be regarded as highly uncertain,' has not even studied Dürr very carefully. On p. 497 he says, following the views Dürr expresses in his text, 'His second journey began by a second visit to Athens, where he spent another winter (129–130 A.D.). Then he sailed to the south coast of Asia Minor, and landing in Caria or Lycia,' &c. A glance at Dürr's 'Nachtrag' would, however, have shown Mr. Bury that Hadrian's own words to the ἄρχοντες and βουλή of Ephesus, preserved in Wood's 'Inscriptions from the Odeum,' No. 1, prove conclusively that he left Athens before 10 Dec. 129, and that it was at Ephesus, not in Caria or Lycia, that he landed. His subsequent route, through Caria to Laodicea on the Lycus, is proved by another letter, also written before 10 Dec. 129. It is sent to the people of Astypalaea, and is published in the *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* for 1883, pp. 405–407. The letter from Ephesus is interesting in itself, though I believe no one has yet mentioned it except in its bearing upon the dates of the journeys. It is one of many proofs of the intense personal interest Hadrian took in his subjects, in spite of the vast scale and varied character of his undertakings. He is anxious that the commander of the vessel which had just brought him from Eleusis to Ephesus should be made a member of the βουλή. He is the best sailor of his time, and it is always his ship that is chosen by the proconsuls of the province when they have to cross the sea. Hadrian himself will pay his entrance fee.

It is not only on the reconstruction of the journeys that Mr. Bury might have spent more time. Plew's pamphlet on Hadrian, for instance, ought not to have escaped his notice, with its suggestion that the Πολιορκητικά of Apollodorus was written expressly for the use of Hadrian and his generals in the Jewish revolt. Nor can we believe that if Mr. Bury had read Theodore Reinach's delightful article on the temple of Cyzicus in the *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, May–December 1890, he would have failed to make use of that quaint account which Cyriacus of Ancona gives of his visit to it in the fifteenth century, telling us, as it does, how the marble statue of the bearded Hadrian, so supreme in its magnificence that Cyriacus thought it was that of Jupiter, still watched, after the passage of thirteen centuries, over the twelve gods of Olympus. There are other significant and picturesque details, of which Mr. Bury must have known, and which he must consciously have rejected. The story of how Hadrian carried to Trajan the news of his succession to the empire was certainly worth a notice. It rests on excellent authority, throws a strong light on the character of the man, and, as Merivale unfortunately blundered over it, has never yet been told accurately in English. Trajan was at Colonia Agrippensis when Nerva died, but the news from Rome came first to the army of Upper Germany at Moguntiacum. Whose privilege should it be to take the message on

and greet Trajan as emperor? Hadrian was determined it should be his; but Servianus, his brother-in-law and superior in command, irritated because the younger man's debts and extravagance seemed to find more favour with their common kinsman than the stern precision of his own life, was as determined to prevent him. Not content with sending on an equerry himself, he detained Hadrian in camp, and, when there was no longer any excuse for this, took care that his carriage should be tampered with. Directly Hadrian had started the carriage broke down. But the man who would afterwards walk twenty miles a day bareheaded in heat or cold merely to encourage his soldiers was not to be baulked. He walked the whole way on foot, outstripped the equerry, and won the respect as well as the favour of the first soldier of the age. Spartian's words acquire an added interest when we remember that it was on 27 Jan. that Nerva died. The heavy roads put a strong man on foot scarcely at a disadvantage with a vehicle or horseman, and we need no longer suspect the story of exaggeration.

When, again, Mr. Bury says, 'On coins Hadrian is often represented as addressing his legions,' whereas the facts are that we have extant coins struck in honour of his great field days by twelve different armies, from the legions of Cappadocia to the legions of Spain, from Mauretania to Britain, there is surely not only a sacrifice of the picturesque, but a loss of impressiveness which may vitally affect his readers' and, indeed, his own grasp of the period. We cease, therefore, to be surprised that Mr. Bury altogether ignores the relation between the new Hellenism and the empire when he tells the story of Polemon and Antoninus merely to illustrate the clemency of Antoninus and not the power of Polemon, and indeed only tells half the story; and when—worst omission of all—he fails to notice that perhaps most striking of all letters, which, with its one and only word, ἐμάνης, was enough to show Avidius Cassius that his cause was bound to fail. For Herodes Atticus had thrown on the side of Marcus τὰ τῆς γνώμης ὅπλα, and the public opinion of the eastern half of the Roman world was against the rebel. A misstatement which will be more widely recognised is the account which Mr. Bury gives on p. 549 of the 'Colonate.' There is no excuse for discussing the question at all, and omitting all mention of the inscription of the Saltus Burunitanus and Professor Pelham's researches into the history of the imperial domain land. Nor has Mr. Bury now and again avoided more obvious blunders. On p. 514 we read the astounding statement that Hadrian 'forbade the sale of male or female slaves for immoral purposes or for employment in the arena.' Did Mr. Bury realise what would have been the significance of such a law, if it could possibly have entered Hadrian's head to enact it? Mr. Bury has, unfortunately, omitted the concluding words of the sentence, *causâ non praestitâ*; and this *causa* of Spartian's was probably, as Mommsen points out in the 'Ephemeris Epigraphica,' vol. vii. p. 410, either the consent or the proved criminality of the slave. Finally, is

> I would rather not be Florus,
> Have to haunt the Roman taverns,
> Lurk about among the cook shops,
> *Feel the bossy bowl assail* me,

the translation of

> Ego nolo Florus esse,
> Ambulare per tabernas,
> Latitare per popinas,
> *Culices pati rotundos,*

which is what Mr. Bury prints as its original? Mr. Hodgkin, who supplied the translation, must of course have adopted the reading of the second hand of the 'Codex Palatinus,' *calices*, though what induced him to do so we cannot conceive. *Culices* refers to something which it would be very much more unpleasant to be assailed by.

RONALD M. BURROWS.

The Apology and Acts of Apollonius, and other Monuments of Early Christianity. Edited, with Introductions, Notes, &c., by F. C. CONYBEARE, M.A. (London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1894.)

MR. CONYBEARE has placed students of church history under great obligations by devoting himself to the study of the Armenian language and by using his knowledge to make accessible remains of church history preserved in it. Even a published work containing valuable material is often passed by for want of a translator. The Armenian version of the 'Diatessaron' of Tatian had been published long before it was used to settle the many disputes that had arisen; and now we find that, since 1874, a volume containing the 'Acts' of Apollonius, issued at Venice, has escaped the notice of the learned world. The volume before us contains a translation of the Armenian version of a number of acts of martyrdom of very various values. Most important is that of Apollonius; this was first published by Mr. Conybeare in the *Guardian* for 18 June 1893. A fresh translation by Herr Buchardi, with full notes and introduction, was contributed by Professor Harnack to the Royal Prussian Academy (*Sitzungsberichte*, 27 July 1893, xxxvii. 721). There is an article by Professor Seeberg in the *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift* (October 1893, iv. 836); a notice by Mr. E. G. Hardy ('Christianity and the Roman Government,' p. 200); and a discussion of the legal aspects of the trial by Professor Mommsen (*Sitzungsberichte*, 7 June 1894, xxxviii. 497).

The martyrdom of Apollonius, as a newly discovered historical document concerning an important and difficult period, demands a full notice. From Eusebius ('Hist. Eccl.' v. 21) we learn that in the reign of Commodus the Christians enjoyed peace. In spite of this Apollonius, a Christian distinguished for his culture and learning, was accused before the courts. His accuser was put to death by having his legs broken, but Apollonius did not escape. The judge (ὁ δικαστής) entreated him to sacrifice, and requested him to give an account of himself before the senate (πολλὰ λιπαρῶς ἱκετεύσαντος τοῦ δικαστοῦ καὶ λόγον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῆς συγκλήτου βουλῆς αἰτήσαντος). He delivered a defence before that body, but refused to sacrifice, and was beheaded. The sentence is stated to have been indirectly due to a decree of the senate (ὡς ἀπὸ δόγματος συγκλήτου), owing to an ancient law that those who had appeared before the court and refused to recant should not be acquitted (μὴ δ' ἄλλως ἀφεῖσθαι τοὺς ἅπαξ εἰς

δικαστήριον παριόντας καὶ μηδαμῶς τῆς προθέσεως μεταβαλλομένους, ἀρχαίου παρ' αὐτοῖς νόμου κεκρατηκότος). Eusebius adds that a full account of Apollonius's trial and defence will be found in his collection of ancient martyrdoms. No other writer gives us any information of any value. Jerome's account is an inaccurate and misleading reproduction of that of Eusebius. He states that Apollonius was a 'senator,' an inference almost certainly incorrect from the circumstances of the trial.

It is the 'Acta' contained in Eusebius's collection, or rather a fragment of them, that Mr. Conybeare has now put before us. After a short and late introduction the document begins suddenly, 'Terentius' (this is a mistake for Perennis, which Eusebius gives), 'the prefect, commanded that he should be brought before the senate.' Then follow reports of two trials, both of them conducted by the prefect. The first is short and concludes thus: 'The prefect said, "Surely thou wast not summoned hither to talk philosophy. I will give thee one day's respite, that thou mayest consider thine interest and advise thyself concerning thy life." And he ordered him to be taken to prison.' After three days Apollonius is brought up again; the dialogue is a much longer one, and Apollonius gives an account of his faith in the language of the apology of the day. At the end the magistrate says, '"I would fain let thee go, but I cannot, because of the decree of the senate; yet with benevolence I pronounce sentence on thee," and he ordered him to be beheaded with a sword.' The 'Acta' may be accepted as perfectly genuine. They are clearly the documents which Eusebius had before him, and his judgment has almost invariably been proved absolutely correct. Moreover the tone is exactly that of the second-century apology. The genuine early Christian *acta* are, it must be remembered, documents of very considerable importance, for they were often derived directly from the shorthand reports taken in court. They are, in fact, among the earliest 'law reports' that we possess. The legal aspect of the question is the first that demands our attention, and we may be excused if, on this side, we reproduce, for the most part, the views of Professor Mommsen.

In the first place why did the case come before the senate? The old answer, based on a conjecture of Jerome's, was that it was because Apollonius was a senator; but this does not explain the circumstances, for the case is not tried before the senate, nor does the senate (or the consul as their mouthpiece) pass judgment. It is tried before the prefect Perennis, not, as was the ordinary custom, before the *praefectus urbi*, but before the *praefectus praetorio*. The answer, as given by Mommsen, is that the emperor, or the pretorian prefect acting for him, had referred the matter to the senate for their decision as to the course to be pursued. But why was it tried before the pretorian prefect? The case seems to have been one which came under the direct criminal jurisdiction of the emperor. Either because of private pressure or because of the commanding position then occupied by Perennis (the exact reason may become clear later), it was delegated to that officer. He refers the matter to the senate. The senate reply, as Tiberius had replied once to them, *Exercendas esse leges*, and Perennis is obliged to execute the law. This is an instance, then, of the power constantly exercised under the republic by the senate of advising and influencing the executive officers. It is almost the only instance

of such a power being exercised under the empire, and the circumstances which led to it seem to have been peculiar.

Now we know that, owing to the influence of Marcia, the imperial concubine, the Christians enjoyed peace under Commodus. The imperial favour towards them would work not by any change of law, but by discouraging accusations against them. No one would accuse those whom the emperor favoured. For some reason or other—perhaps from motives of private revenge, perhaps owing to the intrigues of the extreme pagan party—an accusation is brought against Apollonius. He is a man of position; the case cannot be passed over; the laws are quite clear; the emperor probably refuses to interfere personally. It is obvious that Perennis wishes to save Apollonius if possible. He therefore refers the matter to the senate, hoping that either they will support him in not carrying out the law or will succeed in persuading Apollonius to sacrifice. In neither way does he succeed; the Roman aristocracy, or what passed as such, then, as at a later date, seems to have been reactionary, and opposed to the innovations of degenerate emperors. They are able to assert their authority, and Perennis cannot, in the face of public opinion, refuse to carry out the law. The 'Acta' are imperfect, and it will be found that we have no record of the proceedings before the senate. The first trial is usually (by Harnack, for example) considered to have been before that body, but, as Mommsen points out, it, like the second, is conducted by the prefect, and the prefect would be quite unable to conduct a case before that body; moreover we do not obtain the information from it which Eusebius gives—namely, the decision of the senate. We may notice that his language is singularly accurate. The sentence is carried out indirectly owing to a decree of the senate (ὡς ἀπὸ δόγματος συγκλήτου), which exactly corresponds to the circumstances suggested above.

One more point may be noticed. Eusebius (and we have seen that his language is otherwise correct) speaks of 'an ancient law' which stated that Christians should not be released without abjuring their faith. This cannot, of course, imply an actual *lex* against the Christians, but means that the procedure against them had, through a long course of legal interpretation, become definite and fixed. Christians were not treated in the half-hearted, irregular manner it has been sometimes the custom to imagine. There are many more points we should like to discuss, but we must pass on to other documents.

The 'Acts' of Paul and Thekla have been brought into prominence by Professor Ramsay's very ingenious attempt at restoring them to their original form. The Armenian version of the 'Acts' corroborates his judgment in some points, but is hardly as valuable as Mr. Conybeare thinks. In the first place relatively to the Syriac there is not much that it supplies. Mr. Conybeare mentions nine points in which difficulties Professor Ramsay had found in the present text are absent in the Armenian; in at least six of these cases the same omissions occur in the Syriac text which Dr. Wright edited and Professor Ramsay made use of; in only one case probably does the Armenian give a decisively superior reading. On the other hand, in some cases the reading of the Syriac is distinctly preferable. In § 23 the Syriac represents St. Paul, as do the Greek manuscripts, as living in an open tomb by the roadside. The incident is probably not

authentic, but the residence in an empty tomb is characteristic of Asia Minor, and the Armenian has watered this down to 'in a house of a young man.' Nor, again, speaking generally, is the Armenian text of the value Mr. Conybeare ascribes to it: 'Except for the interpolation of the burning of Thekla the Armenian may very nearly represent the original form of the text as it stood in the first century.' This is far too high a judgment to form of it; in many cases it gives a confused and meaningless version, as, for example, § 28, where the Greek is preferable to the Armenian or Syriac and the Latin to both. We have noticed other instances where the Armenian reading is certainly wrong. The fact is that the scientific study of the text of apocryphal works and of the Acts of Martyrs is only just beginning. It often presents very complicated problems, and is of very real importance if we are ever to be able to use the 'Acta' as historical documents. Being used for 'edification' they suffered as many and as violent alterations as a popular hymn does in the hands of an editorial committee. Fortunately we can often correct these alterations by the large number of manuscripts and versions accessible; only we must use them rightly. Each of them in some cases preserves the original text, in others it is interpolated and altered; it is only by comparing them all together and exercising considerable critical acumen that we can arrive at the original text. We cannot do it, as Mr. Conybeare wishes, by adopting one text and considering its reading the correct one. We are grateful to Mr. Conybeare for the new material he has provided; we cannot adopt his method of using it.

The other documents in this volume are of very inferior value. They are none of them in their present form genuine, and all are late. Their value, like that of other 'Acts,' lies in the evidence that they give of local customs. For instance, in the 'Acts' of St. Polyeuctes (p. 129) we read, 'Let us dance our customary dances, if it be our pleasure so to do.' We have clear evidence of a Christian festival, or *πανήγυρις*, keeping up the local customs of pre-Christian times as a religious or semi-religious ceremony. So, again, the account of the Magian worship in the 'Acts' of St. Hiztibouzit (pp. 259, 262) is full of interest. For the rest these documents are no better and no worse than hundreds of others which adorn the 'Acta Sanctorum.'

We have spoken so far of the documents and not of Mr. Conybeare's work. Of the merits of his translations we are not, for the most part, able to form an opinion. We notice, however, differences between the English and German translations of the 'Acts' of Apollonius in a number of small points. In one case Mr. Conybeare must surely be wrong. He writes, 'The Egyptians, again, have given the name of God to the onion and to a wooden mortar,' where the German substitutes 'leek,' which must be right. His Greek, again, is not free from errors; he translates *πλείους ἐπὶ τὴν σφῶν ὁμόσε χωρεῖν πανοικί τε καὶ παγγενῇ σωτηρίαν* 'numbers came and received for their own the salvation which was prepared for every house and race,' instead of 'turned with all their households and families to their salvation.' The mistake should teach Mr. Conybeare not to be too hard on others; he shortly afterwards states that 'no fourth form boy could have made more errors in translating these twenty lines of Eusebius than does Hieronymus.'

There are two main faults to find with Mr. Conybeare. In the first place he is very uncritical. He introduces his book thus: 'The object of the following translations is to give the reader, in a succession of vivid pictures and glimpses, an insight into the practical working of Christianity during the first three centuries of its history.' The 'Acts' are claimed as genuine. Now, with the exception of the 'Acts' of Apollonius, they are all (even the legend of Thekla) in their present form unauthentic, belonging to the fourth and following centuries, and giving little or no insight at all into the earlier period. To take one instance, the 'Acts' of Callistratus bristle with incongruities and contain many long speeches full of late technical terminology, and a great many interesting but late theological speculations. On these speeches he writes, 'They impress me personally as the genuine discourse delivered by him, merely arranged and touched up by a second hand.' We will quote a few lines of these, and ask our readers to judge: 'All substance of the Father is of the Son, except that he is not begetter, but begotten; and all substance of the Son is of the Holy Spirit, except that this is not begotten, but emanative.' We cannot date this at once, but it could not be earlier than the end of the fourth century, and is probably much later. On p. 307 there is a distinct refutation of Apollinarianism. The whole theology is late and developed, and quite inconsistent with a genuine work or an early forgery. We may state that the 'Acts' are full of interest, but for a very different period of doctrinal development.

But side by side with these uncritical theories Mr. Conybeare expresses very extraordinary views on church history. For instance, on p. 174 he writes, 'This implies that the synoptic gospels were not known in Africa before the third century.' The incident on which he bases this conclusion is incorrectly stated, and the inference wrongly drawn, while the conclusion itself is not an error of judgment, but a confession of ignorance. The writings of Tertullian prove the existence in Africa of the four gospels in a Latin version in the second century. Let us take another statement. Referring to the 'Acts' of Apollonius, he states that 'we may almost infer that the martyr had not heard of the legend of the birth of Christ from a virgin.' The argument is of course simply the argument from silence; but how valueless this is may be seen from two cases. We know that Justin believed and taught the doctrine, but there is no reference to it in his genuine 'Acts;' the same is true of Cyprian. But even the documents in this volume ought to have made Mr. Conybeare pause. They are mostly late, but even he puts several of them into the fourth century; one he puts decidedly later, and only one mentions he miraculous birth. Would Mr. Conybeare argue that it was not known in the third or fourth century? Apollonius is of course a philosopher and apologist who puts the Christian creed in the form in which it might seem most attractive to an educated pagan. There are many more passages which we had marked for comment, but we do not care to go through them. Enough has been said to show that Mr. Conybeare's statements must always be taken with some degree of caution.

We do not wish to conceal our gratitude to Mr. Conybeare for the valuable material which he has provided. He has already made two discoveries which have conferred immense obligations on church his-

torians, and we hope he may continue his researches. It has been necessary to point out mistakes, because this work undertakes to give a vivid picture of early Christianity, and from that point of view it is singularly misleading. A. C. HEADLAM.

Philopatris: ein heidnisches Konventikel des siebenten Jahrhunderts zu Constantinopel. Von R. CRAMPE. (Halle: Niemeyer. 1894.)

AT the beginning of the last century Gesner laid a new foundation for determining the date of the mysterious dialogue entitled *Philopatris*, which found a place among Lucian's works, because it is written in Lucianic style. Before Gesner it was supposed to have appeared under one of the last princes of the Julio-Claudian dynasty; but that scholar made it clear that the scene was laid at Constantinople, and it followed that the reign of Constantine was the prior limit. Gibbon's guess that the work was written in the third century—a theory strangely approved of by Milman—was, therefore, retrograde. Gesner himself assigned it to the time of Julian the Apostate; but this view did not satisfy certain internal notes of time, and was, moreover, based on the theory that the author was a pagan scoffing at Christianity. Niebuhr approached the problem with greater learning and skill. His chief contribution to the question lies in his recognition of the fact that the author is not a pagan, but a Christian. He supposed it to have been written in the reign of Nicephorus Phocas, and this epoch seemed to correspond happily to the incidental chronological data supplied by the treatise. Gfrörer, and recently (with certain modifications) Aninger, adopted Niebuhr's date; but they rejected the really important result of his investigation, and maintained the old view that the *Philopatris* is directed against the church. Any one who reads the dialogue with an open mind will, I feel sure, agree that there is not the least suggestion that derision of Christianity is to be read between the lines. Certainly if the author intended to attack the Christian church with the weapon of Lucianic ridicule, no satire ever composed is more irredeemably frigid, more signally pointless. But Niebuhr's date cannot be right. He did not lay sufficient stress on the fact that the polemic against paganism is a leading feature in the dialogue, that the author is in earnest with it. Such a polemic would be an inexplicable anachronism in the tenth century. The true solution was discovered by Gutschmid, and has now been adopted, defended, and established in the thoroughgoing investigation of Crampe. The dialogue belongs to the reign of Heraclius; and the notes of time which could be interpreted in relation to the reign of Nicephorus can be more easily interpreted of the earlier period. Crampe narrows the date of composition to the winter or spring of 622–3. The allusion to a massacre in Crete (p. 595) is explained by George of Pisidia (Herac. 2, 75), who mentions a disastrous Slavonic invasion *by sea* and land in 621–2, which is clearly to be combined with the Slavonic invasion of Crete noticed by the presbyter Thomas (Land's 'Anecd. Syr.' i. 115), but placed by him in 623. The Persian war and the invasions of the Scythians—that is, the Avars—suit this date, and Crampe shows that the reference to Arabia (p. 617) need cause no difficulty. The fact that there were total eclipses of the sun, visible at

Constantinople, in 606 and 617, is an interesting commentary on the words (p. 613) *μῶν ἐκλείψει ὁ ἥλιος;* There is not, of course, the slightest doubt that there were, in the reign of Heraclius, pagans hostile to the government, and perhaps disposed to intrigue with Persia. This fact can be established on other evidence. As to the prophecy about the month Mesori (p. 610), Crampe has a clever conjecture (p. 46).

J. B. Bury.

The Mohammadan Dynasties: Chronological and Genealogical Tables, with Historical Introductions. By Stanley Lane-Poole. (Westminster: Constable. 1894.)

There are some books of which it is the fashion to say that they are indispensable; the student cannot get on without them if he wishes to be abreast of the latest information and to have his hands properly equipped for his work. Such a book assuredly is the one before us. In it Mr. Lane-Poole has collected from many sources and with unwearied diligence the chronology of all the Mohammadan princes of any importance of whom we have any notice. He has arranged them in dynasties and presented the results in a large number of tables and in some graphic plans in which the growth and decay of the great empires are traced in a way most easy to the memory. He has done me the honour of quoting me largely and with generous acknowledgment in that part of the story which I have myself worked—namely, the Mongols and the various dynasties into which their empire broke up. I can speak with unstinted praise of this part of the work, and from my own knowledge am bound to confess that such a book could not have been written unless Mr. Lane-Poole had had ready access not only to the eastern historians but also to the multitudinous coins in which the chronology of these intricate dynasties is preserved. What a picture these dry tables present, when we can use them as an index of the great panorama of eastern history, the history of those who with the sword in one hand and the Koran in the other have shaped so much of the world's history! We begin with the magnificent khalifs who in two successive dynasties, at Damascus and Baghdad, controlled the civilised world from the Pillars of Hercules to the borders of China. They collected together from all the four winds of heaven what the wealth and culture of mankind had created. The Moors in Spain and Sicily, the Seljuks in Asia Minor, the Samanis at Bokhara, and the Afghans at Delhi were so many brilliant satellites of the khalif. Suddenly, like a hurricane in the desert, the swarms from Mongolia came down upon this garden, where everything was scattered or destroyed and the last of the black-coated successors of the Prophet was made to swallow molten gold in his own palace. Mongols and Turks in succession founded vast and far-reaching empires, which were broken into innumerable fragments, each with its own history, until we come down to our own day, when the sultan, the shah, and the empress of India virtually divide among them the children of Islam. The story is indeed a romantic one and desperately involved. To its mazes it will be impossible to find a better guide than that contained in the work before us. Henry H. Howorth.

An Oriental Biographical Dictionary, founded on materials collected by the late T. W. Beale. A new edition, revised and enlarged by H. G. Keene, C.I.E., M.A. (London: Allen. 1894.)

Mr. Keene appeals to 'scholars of larger leisure and opportunities for an indulgent treatment of a work originated by a man who had never been in Europe nor enjoyed the use of a complete library;' but the excuse may hardly avail for a new edition revised by Mr. Keene himself in London. The ground-idea of the dictionary is admirable, and the late Mr. Beale must have expended enormous labour in its preparation. The pity is that a book of reference which might have been made authoritative is spoilt for want of accurate collation and revision. As it is, the dictionary is full of misprints, misspellings, errors of fact, and wrong dates, all of which might have been avoided by a little scholarly care. Instead of forming an invaluable source of accurate information, it is only too likely to minister to that loose and careless manner of treating oriental history which is too generally characteristic of those Anglo-Indian writers who are linguists rather than scholars. The arrangement is peculiar. As in the British Museum Catalogue of Printed Books, the subjects occur under the most unlikely names: for example, Bīrūnī appears under Abū-Raihān, Tabarī under Abū-Ja'far, Wākidī under Abū-'Abdullah, Shahr*i*stānī (*sic*) and Mutarrizī under Abul-Fath. Sometimes there are cross-references, often there are not. Thus Al-'Azīz, the son of Saladin, appears only under Abul-Fath, where no one would look for him; and Al-Hākim, the celebrated caliph of Egypt, is only to be traced under Abū-Mansūr. Sometimes double articles are given under two different names, and the information is scattered (and contradicted) between them. Sometimes cross-references are given to articles which do not exist (*e.g.* 'Baba Soudai. *Vide* Soudai'). Many names appear under the prefixed article; for example, most of the caliphs: but others drop their article and appear, more conveniently, under the first letter of their principal name. So we find Ghazzālī and Harīrī, without a word to show that they are always called Al-Ghazzālī and Al-Harīrī in Arabic; but if we seek for Mamūn or Hārūn ar-Rashīd we must search under Al-Mamūn and Al-Rashīd. Some Atābegs appear under the title Atabak; others do not. The headings are frequently wrongly spelt both in Arabic and Roman letters; as Bāsūs for Al-Basūs, or still worse, Bāzirī for Al-Būsīrī, two names which in Arabic have scarcely anything in common; whilst Būsīrī's famous 'Mantle Poem' is called the 'Brilliant Star,' on the authority of Lemprière's 'Universal Dictionary'! The book is full of such misspellings as, one would think, must be impossible to any trained orientalist. We find Ibn-Khālikān and Ibn-Khalīkān (carefully so spelt in Arabic type) for Ibn-Khallikān; Zamaghsharī; Murawij for Mardāwīj; Dashmagir for Washmagīr: Mōiz, and Maizz: Mouyyad for Muayyad; Zuhīr for Zuhayr; Hārath for Al-Hārith; Halākū for Hūlākū; Azurbejān and 'Azarbāījān, both wrong; Al-Ghāzī for Il-Ghāzī; Aljaitū for Uljāitū; Ashhad for Ikhshīd; Amarath for Amurath; Mubārik Shāh, for Mubārak; Al-Sālah for Al-Sālih; Yūsaf *passim* for Yūsuf. Some of them may seem trifles to English readers, but they involve an astonishing ignorance of Arabic grammar and orthography.

Even if these details were excused, the matter of the biographies is absolutely uncritical and incomplete. A list of an author's works is sometimes given, but no translations of the Arabic titles or explanation of their contents, and very seldom any notice of European editions or translations. In the article on 'Abdul-Latīf' for example (where the date of birth is a century out, being given as A.D. 1261, A.H. 660, instead of 1161, 557), not a word is said of De Sacy's admirable translation; the great Leyden text of Tabarī is not mentioned, nor Sachau's 'Bīrūnī,' nor De Goeje's editions of the early geographers. Under 'Ahmad,' where we have to look for Makkarī, we are informed that there is a translation by Gayangos, 1810, vol. i.; whereas Don Pascual's *two* volumes were published thirty years later. Under Antār (*scil.* 'Antarah) we read of an 'English translation of the first volume:' but the only translation is in four volumes by Hamilton. Obviously an article on an oriental writer which does not state accurately the best editions and translations of his works is defective. Such articles as 'Abul-Mahasin, Author of the Work called "Manhal-i-Sāfī,"' or so-and-so 'a celebrated caligrapher,' without dates or comments, are simply useless. Nor are the articles on men of action any better. Take the following complete biography: '*Batu Khan*, the son of Jūjī Khān and grandson of Changez [elsewhere spelt Chingiz] Khān. He ruled at Kipchak, and was contemporary with Pope Innocent IV.' That is all we are told about the great Mongol chief, who not only ruled over all Kipchak (which is not a town), but burnt Cracow, invaded Hungary, laid siege to Pesth, and fought the Teutonic knights at Liegnitz. Such an article is worse than useless; it is mischievous. Take again Barbar*a*ssa (*sic*), for whom there is an amusing Arabic transliteration which assuredly was never used by any Eastern writer: we are told that he took Tunis in 1533, 'after having driven out the Venetians, but Andrea Doria retook it again A.D. 1536.' Now Khayr-ad-dīn Barbarossa took Tunis in 1534, not 1533, from the Hafsid kings, and not from the Venetians, and it was 'retaken again' in 1535, not 1536, by Charles V, whose admiral was Doria. It is added that Barbarossa 'afterwards reduced Yemin in Arabia Felix:' but Arabia Felix is the Yemen, and Barbarossa never was there in his life. Once more, take the biography of Abd-al-Kadir (which is out of its alphabetical order): '*Abdul-Qadir* (Sultan) was the descendant of a Marabaut family of the race of Hāshim, who trace their pedigree to the Khalīfas of the lineage of Fatima. His father died in 1834. His public career began at the time of the conquest of Algiers by the French. In 1847 he was defeated and surrendered himself, but was afterwards permitted to reside in Constantinople. He died in 1873.' It would be difficult to compose a more absurdly inadequate account of the great Algerian patriot. All his long struggle with the French from 1831 to 1847 is ignored. He is called Sultan when his title was Emīr. He resided not only at Constantinople, but at Brusa and Damascus (and here his great services during the Syrian massacres, which won him the Legion of Honour, ought to have been recorded), and he died in 1883, not 1873, at Mecca.

Apart from the meagreness of the articles, the dates are frequently, perhaps usually, incorrect. There were four sultans of Turkey of the name of Ahmad, and their dates are all wrong; Ahmad I died in A.H. 1026,

not 1025; Ahmad II succeeded in 1102, not 1103; Ahmad III was deposed in 1143, not 1142; and Ahmad IV ('Abd-al-Hamīd I) succeeded in 1187, not 1188; 'Abd-al-Majīd succeeded in 1255, not 1277. There is no article on the reigning sultan of Turkey. The Almohade 'Abd-al-Mumin is stated to have 'meditated the invasion of Spain when death stopped his career in A.D. 1156;' but before this a large part of Spain had been subdued by his armies, and he died in 1163. Al-Hākim, the Fātimid, is stated to have come to the throne in A.H. 381, A.D. 990, instead of 386, 996, and to have been succeeded by his son 'Tāhir,' for Az-Zāhir. Dynastic lists are sometimes given in the article on the first king of a dynasty, but these lists are generally without any dates, and often (*e.g.* Mamlūks, p. 239) teem with errors. Abū-l-Fidā, the historian, a member of the Ayyūbid family, appears in the Mamlūk dynasty. No Seljūks of Rūm are given, no dynastic lists of the Idrīsids, Ikhshīdids, Hamdānids, Ziyārids, Jalairs, and many others, no article on the Guptas, and only twelve lines on the Achaemenidae. It is impossible to begin even to suggest the innumerable important names omitted, or to point out the numerous unimportant names included. The preface says that Anglo-Indian lives are omitted, yet we find George Thomas (under George) and others, besides Franco-Indians like Boigne and Dupleix. Possibly the crowd of insignificant Indian authors and grandees who fill a large part of the work may have some interest for Indian students, but they occupy a totally disproportionate place in a work which omits whole series of names of the first rank. But the worst feature is not its inadequacy but its inaccuracy. In almost all the articles tested serious errors have been found, and whilst there is a vast amount of useful information scattered over the ill-ordered contents, it is not safe to depend upon any single statement without verification elsewhere. The book is a disastrous example of the careless, slipshod manner in which oriental history is too often treated, and it is difficult to believe that Mr. Keene, who is no mean judge of scholarly work, can have personally devoted his extensive knowledge to its revision.

S. LANE-POOLE.

Etude sur la Vie et la Mort de Guillaume Longue-Epée, Duc de Normandie. Par J. LAIR. (Paris: Picard. 1893.)

M. LAIR, the author of this sumptuous monograph, is well known to French students by his contributions to the 'Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes' and other historical work. He was led to undertake the present dissertation by the discovery, at Clermont-Ferrand, of the curious poetical lament for the death of the duke, which he edited at the time. M. Léopold Delisle found subsequently at Florence another and more perfect manuscript of the poem, which he assigns to the beginning of the eleventh century, about the date of the French copy. The fine facsimiles of both manuscripts given in this treatise should prove of interest to palæographers. Unfortunately the text is corrupt, and even if perfect would be of little historical value. So obscure is the period, and so few the sources available, that M. Lair could not hope to increase or correct our knowledge to any appreciable extent. He gives his reasons for

placing the Norman revolt against the duke in 934, not, as Mr. Freeman did, in 932, and differs from this writer in believing the Avranchin and Cotentin to have become Norman earlier than he thought, and in denying the Saxon character of Bayeux, on which Mr. Freeman insisted. Practically no further light is thrown on the duke's assassination, but the stories to which it gave rise are an interesting subject of study. Mr. Freeman's wide reading enabled him to supply some happy parallels, and M. Lair must have misunderstood him when he urged that the murders of Eadwulf and Uhtred (whom he oddly terms 'Godwulf' and 'Ulstred') could not, from their dates, have influenced the *trouvères* or accounted for subsequent confusion. Mr. Freeman's object was to explain not the historical, but the legendary elements in the tale by Greek parallels; and he was singularly successful in thus demonstrating their folklore character. His only slip—which M. Lair seems to have overlooked—was his applying to Anscytel the words of William of Malmesbury—*vir exigui corporis sed immanis fortitudinis*, which refer to Balzo. On this Balzo, the hero, it would seem, of a lost *chanson de geste*, M. Lair has much that is interesting to say. One may hope that he will give us further studies on the early history of Normandy.

J. H. Round.

History of the English Landed Interest: its Customs, Laws, and Agriculture. By Russell Garnier, B.A. Two volumes. (London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1892, 1893.)

It is with a feeling of disappointment that we close Mr. Garnier's 'History of the English Landed Interest.' Questions of all kinds affecting land are everywhere in the air, and a trustworthy summary, embodying the results of recent investigations, would be welcomed by students and by others interested in such matters. Such a book remains to be written, and will require, as a condition of success, a wider and a deeper knowledge than can be detected in this work. The first part opens with a brief sketch of agriculture in British times, and then deals, at somewhat greater length, with the period of the Roman occupation and the various theories on the mark system. Then follows some account of land tenures, agriculture, and seignorial powers among the Anglo-Saxons, while the sketch of Norman times deals with feudalism and 'Domesday Book.' Under the heading of 'The Middle Ages' are grouped chapters descriptive of life and work on the barony, of estate management, and of the transformation of the landlord into the landowner. The sketch of the Tudor period includes a picture of a sixteenth-century farm, and of the general aspect of the country, the horses, orchards, and gardens, while the concluding portion traces the progress of agricultural theory under the Stuarts and deals with the business transacted in the court leet and court baron. Throughout the volume there are defects which detract seriously from its value for students, while it is scarcely calculated to interest the general reader. Closer acquaintance with easily accessible authorities would, in many cases, have led to a modification of the views placed before us. Without any qualification we are told that at the close of the Anglo-Saxon

period[1] 'the whole of England numbered 300,785' (i. 78 *n.*). Later on, in speaking of the same time, 'a total population of a million and a half' is given.

Whether it is ever expedient for an historian to pause and 'give rein to fancy' (p. 5) may be questioned. It has, in this case, led to more than one unfortunate contradiction. In vol. i. 300 Sir A. Fitzherbert is said to have written his 'Book of Husbandry' about 1534, and his 'Book of Surveying' a year or two later. A note informs us that 'there is no need to confuse his identity with that of his brother, though some have done so.' There might be no need, if these dates were correct, but those who argue in favour of authorship by Sir Anthony have to face the fact that both books date back to 1523 at latest; and this does introduce some difficulty into the matter. But this by the way. In vol. i. 308 the statement is made that, 'remembering the rebellion of King Edward VI's reign, Sir A. ends up with the suggestion,' &c. On Mr. Garnier's own showing the books were written years before the accession of Edward VI; and, as the worthy knight died in 1538, it is inconceivable that his recollections could have been inserted into later editions. It is also curious to come across a mention of 'W. S. Gentleman's treatise, written . . . in 1581.' This turns out to be that 'Brief Examination of Certain Ordinary Complaints' which is getting to be known to students under the newer title of 'A Discourse of this Common Weal of England.' It would be interesting to examine evidence, if it were offered, in favour of authorship by any one of the name of Gentleman. Closer acquaintance with the treatise might have prevented one mistake, and a cursory glance at Miss Lamond's article in an earlier number of this REVIEW (April 1891) might have brought the facts up to date. Mr. Garnier's theory that 'the original Saxon overlord was first a judge, afterwards a landlord' is supported by little proof, but affords an illustration of his method of treating obscure questions. In support of his argument great stress is laid on the antiquity of the court leet, while Dr. Maitland's theory that the leet jury was no primitive institution[2] is rejected with scanty reference, and without any valid objection. Mr. Garnier then proceeds, 'It is the fashion for modern theorists to ignore entirely the statements of sixteenth and seventeenth century writers. They, however, had access to works which have long ceased to exist. Many of them were lawyers, accustomed by profession to sift evidence. . . . When, therefore, such writers inform us that the court leet was the oldest in the kingdom, we should pause before we reject the statement' (i. 69). The charge against modern theorists may, perhaps, be sufficiently met by the suggestion that they—and the band is not without distinguished lawyers—find it unnecessary to construct their theories upon the somewhat uncertain foundation of later second-hand information, but prefer to build upon the surer basis of contemporary evidence which they can sift for themselves.

From many of Mr. Garnier's assertions on points but indirectly connected with his subject we are bound to dissent. Thus it is a mistake to say that the collectors, overseers, and governors who administered poor relief were finally replaced by churchwardens. These latter

[1] Sharon Turner's figures are taken, without any of his limitations.

[2] *Select Pleas in Manorial Courts*, I. p. xxxvii.

functionaries are mentioned in early Tudor legislation in connexion with the collection and administration of relief, and by the act of 1601 they are reinforced by regular overseers. It is certainly untrue that at the Restoration 'to a nation intoxicated with loyalty the wish of the crown became the law of the land,' and it is, perhaps, unnecessary to disprove in detail the statement that 'the sheriffs were originally chosen as knights of the shire by the suffrages of the people, but since the statute of Edward II out of the list submitted by the privy council' (ii. 72). In dealing with the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries contemporary authorities are more freely used, and the narrative gains in interest and value as a compilation. Though Mr. Garnier follows Thorold Rogers on many points he is by no means disposed to consider that a landlord must necessarily be a villain. Indeed, he does full justice to the enterprise and public-spiritedness of the great eighteenth-century improvers, and to the aid given by capitalists and others to the progress of scientific agriculture in more recent times. While we differ from Mr. Garnier on various questions, such as the eagerness of the mercantilists to secure economic freedom (ii. 111) and the tardiness with which Adam Smith's views were adopted by statesmen (ii. 115), we feel that many chapters in the second volume may be recommended to those who require a summary such as is here provided, and who do not object to have the moral of the narrative drawn for them. ELLEN A. M'ARTHUR.

Die Cluniacenser in ihrer kirchlichen und allgemeingeschichtlichen Wirksamkeit bis zur Mitte des elften Jahrhunderts. Von ERNST SACKUR. Two vols. (Halle: Max Niemeyer. 1892, 1894.)

THESE volumes contain a vast mass of material, valuable in any form to students of the tenth and eleventh centuries, and peculiarly valuable as here presented in the form of a learned and readable commentary on the still vaster collections of material made by others. Dr. Sackur has written a history of the monastic reformation of 910–1048 —that is, from the foundation of Cluni to the death of Abbot Odilo. The history of that reformation is in no sense the history of Cluni; it is the sum of the histories of all the monastic houses which underwent reform in the spirit of the Benedictine rule, and Cluni was but one of these. Dr. Sackur accordingly includes in his work all the monasteries in Burgundy, Upper and Lower Lotharingia, France, Italy, and Spain which were touched directly or indirectly by the reform movement, no matter whether that movement took its rise in Cluni or in some other centre wholly independent of Cluni, such as Ghent under Gerard of Brogne or Metz under John of Gorze. The bare fact that a monastery received an abbot or a group of monks trained in a house where Odo of Cluni, Gerard of Brogne, or John of Gorze is known to have taught, either in person or through his pupils, is often all that can be recorded. Without that record the three principal schools of reform could not be distinguished. They were perfectly harmonious; they aimed by the same means at the same objects; they were not mutually exclusive, and no substantive variation makes it possible to distinguish a monastery with an abbot from Cluni from a monastery with an abbot from Ghent or Metz.

The tenth-century reformers sought to revive the reforms of Benedict of Aniane, as the best means to correct certain prevailing abuses. The abuses arose chiefly from the neglect of the rule which forbade monks to hold private property, and of the rule which forbade them to eat flesh. During the decay of the monastic system it appears that monasteries had ceased to provide sustenance for their inmates, for it was a special privilege of Cluni and Fleury to be allowed to receive monks of other houses whose abbots denied them the means of life and compelled them to depend for support on private property. The reformers also laid special stress on the necessity of absolute obedience, and defined the rule of silence more closely than had yet been done. With regard to the daily and nightly offices, certain special arrangements were in force at Cluni and Fleury, known to us from the form of discipline drawn up for the Italian house of Farfa, which describes Cluniac customs as they existed in Odilo's time, and from the Fleury customs printed from a manuscript of the same period by John a Bosco. In matters of food and dress the second reform movement followed closely on the lines of Benedict of Aniane's reform. Instead of the tunic, cowl, and scapulary of the original rule, the rule of 817 ordered each monk to have two tunics, two *cucullae,* and two *camisiae.* The original *scapulare* had become the *cuculla* of 817, a sleeveless garment reaching to the ankles; the old *cuculla* was the *camisia* of 817. The new *cuculla* furnished with a hood was worn over the tunic, a full garment with long sleeves. These were the 'two coats' for which the Cluniacs were later to be severely criticised.

Dr. Sackur suggests that the descent of Cluniac reform from the reform of 817 may be traced directly, for at St. Savinus's, Poitiers, the traditions of Benedict of Aniane were still followed. St. Martin's, Autun, received eighteen monks from St. Savinus's, and according to one authority Berno, first abbot of Cluni, 910, was a monk sent from Autun to Baume. Already in Berno's time pious founders handed over monasteries to his guidance, a practice in which there was nothing novel. Sometimes the founder stipulated that Berno's successor in the abbacy should be freely elected by the convent. In 929 Romainmoutier, near Lausanne, several days' journey distant from Cluni, was put under Cluni's abbot. At Aurillac and Tulle, Odo, Berno's successor, put in subordinates, and each of these monasteries provided abbots for monasteries in their neighbourhood. The relation of Fleury to Cluni was of this nature. After a brief resistance the monks of Fleury were compelled to accept Odo, abbot of Cluni, as their own abbot, and on his death Archembald, prior of Cluni, was chosen by the Fleury monks as his successor. From that time close association ceased, and Fleury led a movement of its own, scarcely less far-reaching than that of Cluni. Like Cluni, Fleury had a number of filial cloisters more or less subject to the control of the maternal house, such as Pressy, in the diocese of Autun, Sacerge, in the département de l'Indre, Lonlai, in the diocese of Le Mans, and La Réole. Fleury monks were sent as abbots to St. Evre, St. Vincent de Laon, St. Pierre le Vif lez Sens, St. Florent lez Saumur, and St. Pierre de Chartres received twelve monks from Fleury. In 1008 the monasteries of St. Gildas and Lochmenech, in Brittany, were both reformed from Fleury, and all the English monasteries

created or revived at the end of the tenth century by Oswald and Ethelwold were directly due to the influence of Fleury. Furthermore Dunstan's relations to Ghent make England representative of another school of reform, wholly independent of either Cluni or Fleury—namely, the school of Gerard of Brogne, in Lower Lotharingia, which Dr. Sackur treats as a spontaneous growth. Gerard had been educated at St. Denis, near Paris, and to his influence are traced the reform of St. Bavo's and of St. Peter's, Ghent, of St. Amand, perhaps St. Omer, and others. At St. Vaast, St. Wandrille, and Mont St. Michel he began movements which were subsequently strengthened from Fécamp.

Equally spontaneous and independent of Cluniac influence was the school of Upper Lotharingia, led by John of Gorze and Adalbero of Metz. From Gorze were reformed St. Arnulf's and two nunneries at Metz, and Moyenmoutier, in the diocese of Toul, from whence sprang others. The influence of Gorze spread into the diocese of Liège to Stavelot, united to Malmédy, St. Hubert en Ardennes, Gembloux, and Lobbes, in the last instance with only scanty success. In the person of Gauzlin, bishop of Toul, Fleury influence may have come in contact with Gorze influence, for he had been at Fleury. He reformed St. Evre, whence an abbot was sent to St. Vannes en Verdun. The movements of British monks in Lotharingia are peculiarly interesting, because they offer a point of union between the reform at Fleury and in Upper Lotharingia. They also show that an intimate relation existed between the schools of learning in Brittany and Lotharingia, which may help to elucidate the history of the transference of manuscripts from one country to the other. Cadroe, a British Scot, had been taught at Fleury, the Irishmen Macallin and Forannan at Gorze. Macallin had for a while ruled over twelve Fleury monks at St. Vincent's, Laon, and at a small house in the Vermandois the three British monks had been together before they founded Waulsort or Vassor, in the diocese of Liège. Cadroe was summoned to rule St. Clement's, Metz, at Adalbero's request, and his successor at Metz, an Irishman named Fingen, went afterwards to St. Vannes's, Verdun.

The monasteries of St. Rémy at Rheims and of St. Cyprian at Poitiers were responsible for two groups of reformed houses, and the connexion of Rheims with Fleury and of Poitiers with Cluni was so remote that these two may be classed as independent centres.

With all these concurrent and independent reforms Dr. Sackur's book is concerned, and each receives detailed treatment. England alone is excepted, and to English readers this will be a source of much regret. Worcester, Winchester, Peterborough, Ely, Crowland, Ramsey, Tewkesbury, Westbury, Winchcombe, and others ought all to appear here, and their history stands sorely in need of such a commentary as Herr Sackur could give. That he considers English evidence relevant is clear from his reference to Ethelwold's 'Concordia Regularis' which he wrongly calls Dunstan's. If Gerard of Brogne and John of Gorze and Abbo of Fleury were 'Cluniacenser,' certainly Ethelwold and Oswald were.

It will be seen that the title of this work is somewhat misleading. It should at least hint at the paradox that the book is a history of the Cluniac order during the time when there was no such order, but only a monastery of Cluni. The struggles of Odilo as abbot of Cluni, 983-1048,

after supremacy over monasteries which were reformed by him, do not imply that he aimed at founding a Cluniac 'order.' In Odilo's first year of abbacy the cells of Cluni numbered twenty-seven, and two abbeys at Mâcon and others at Charlieu and Sauxillanges were permanently under the influence of Cluni. Odilo tried to increase the power of Cluni by centralisation, and on a few occasions met with an opposition which was successful, but at Paray-le-Monial, Lérins, and Peterlingen he gained his end. Long before and long after Odilo's time it was felt to be dangerous for monasteries to choose an outsider as abbot, and if such a man had to be chosen careful stipulations were made, saving him from all obligations to the house from which he came. Nevertheless monks of monasteries of high repute like Cluni were eagerly desired as abbots by smaller monasteries, and it was by their means that Odilo kept control of a Cluniac 'congregation' which extended beyond the walls of Cluni. When the Cluniac abbot died it might be a matter of difficulty for the monks of the lesser house to secure free election. The conception of a Cluniac 'order' in the sense in which the word was to be used when rival orders sprang up was alien to the ideas of the time. Direct dependence on Cluni, as the essential feature of the Cluniac order, was an idea not conceived in Odilo's time, and he had no intention of organising a congregation with characteristics that would make it exclusive. That he had a strong desire to be himself a leader or general of an army of monks is very probable, for in a satire written against him by Adalbero, bishop of Laon, this military conception of monasticism is attacked. To point his moral Adalbero tells a tale how, a doubt having arisen in a monastery as to the interpretation of contradictory precepts, the bishop considered the matter and sent one of the monks to Odilo for advice. He returned in the evening mounted on a foaming steed. The bishop could scarcely recognise him. He wore a bearskin on his head, his gown was cut short and divided behind and before to make riding easier. In his embroidered military belt he carried bow and quiver, hammer and tongs, a sword, a flint and steel, and an oaken club. He wore wide breeches, and as his spurs were very long he had to walk on tiptoe. The bishop asked, 'Are you my monk whom I sent out?' He answered, 'Some time monk, but now a knight. I here offer military service at the command of my sovereign, who is King Odilo of Cluni.' Even Odilo's own supporters admitted that he always travelled with such a number of monks that he seemed more like an archangel than a leader and prince (*dux et princeps*) of monks.

The spread of Cluniac reform east and west of the Rhine in the first half of the eleventh century was due rather to the influence of William of Dijon and Richard of St. Vannes's than to Odilo. Odilo centralised and concentrated the movement; they spread it. William Volpiano became a Cluniac under Odo's influence, and entered St. Bénigne de Dijon, with twelve Cluniac monks, in 990. From this centre he came into possession of a multitude of cells and dependent monasteries, and becoming abbot of Fécamp, to which house was secured the same freedom in the choice of its abbot as Cluni possessed, he followed in the footsteps of the Ghent reformers, and helped to resuscitate Mont St. Michel, St. Wandrille, St. Ouen, Jumièges, and Bernay. His influence extended even

to the Irish cloisters at Metz, to Gorze, to St. Evre, and to Moyenmoutier. Richard of St. Vannes's had a still more extended sphere of influence through his pupils Leduin and Poppo. Richard, educated at first under the Irishman Fingen at St. Vannes's, Verdun, went to Cluni, and was sent back to St. Vannes's by Odilo, 1004, that he might reform it. He then began to work upon St. Vaast d'Arras, St. Amand, St. Peter's, Ghent, on a number of Liège monasteries, and on houses in the diocese of Chalons, Noyon, Beauvais, and Amiens. His pupil Leduin, whom he had placed at St. Vaast, added the reformation of St. Bavo's, Ghent, and of the once famous double monasteries Marchiennes and Hamage, and from St. Vaast St. Bertin's fell under the new influences.

Poppo of Stablo or Stavelot first became acquainted with Richard when the former was at St. Thierry, Rheims, one of the houses reformed from Fleury, and what Richard did in Lower he did in Upper Lotharingia. His chief work was done either by his pupils or by himself at Metz and Trier. From St. Maximin's, Trier, he spread the Cluniac reform eastwards into parts of Germany hitherto untouched. Limberg and Hersfeld were his chief acquisitions, and in 1034 even St. Gall was influenced by a monk of Stablo, but both there and at Reichenau opposition to the Lotharingian movement prevailed. In 972 a monk of Einsiedeln, Wolfgang, bishop of Ratisbon, reformed St. Emmeran's, and from Einsiedeln and St. Emmeran's Swiss and Swabian monasteries were affected by a movement independent of Burgundy and Lotharingia, in a spirit more in harmony with the strength of the episcopate among the East Franks.

Besides this history of the various branches of the reform movement, east and west of the Rhine, Dr. Sackur's book contains a full account of all those monasteries in Spain and Italy which came directly or indirectly under Cluniac influence. John of Gorze's monastic reformation at Cordova deserves a fuller mention. The last four chapters of the second volume are those which are likely to be most read in England. They sum up the influences on literature, art, and economics which may be traced to one or other of these centres of reform. In his preface Dr. Sackur says that no one has yet written 'a comprehensive work, based upon all the accessible materials, which prosecutes a searching inquiry into all the divers directions of the reform movement.' Such a work he has himself written.

MARY BATESON.

The First Nine Books of the Danish History of Saxo Grammaticus. Translated by OLIVER ELTON, B.A.; with some Considerations on Saxo's Sources, Historical Methods, and Folk Lore, by FREDERICK YORK POWELL, M.A., F.S.A. (London: David Nutt. 1894.)

IN the Introduction (p. xvi, note 1) Mr. Elton quotes a passage from the work of Erasmus 'De optimo dicendi Genere,' expressing his wonder that a Dane of the age of Saxo (about 1200) could have written with so much force and eloquence. But Mr. Elton adds, 'Doubtless its very merits, its "marvellous vocabulary, thickly studded maxims, and excellent variety of images," which Erasmus admired, sealed it to the vulgar.' In point

of fact it may be doubted whether most students of Scandinavian legends have not been repelled by the mannered style of Saxo's prose, and still more by the stilted phrases and the obscurities of his numerous poems. Thus many of us, no doubt, have been content with reading the stories in some such work as N. M. Petersen's 'Danmarks Historie i Hedenold' (2nd edition, 1854), and only using Saxo's as a book of reference. But Petersen mainly depended upon Eddic lays, or (where these failed him) upon Icelandic sagas, that were later and often more corrupt than the narratives of Saxo. Moreover Petersen followed an arrangement of his own, very different from that of Saxo, in his history of the so-called successive Danish kings. Mr. Elton, then, has done us good service in presenting us with a plain translation, both of the prose and the verse, in the first nine books of Saxo. He has also enriched his introduction with a 'folk-lore index,' by Professor York Powell, showing the light thrown by Saxo upon the Danish laws and manners, and giving lists of the proverbs and folk tales that occur in these books.

Saxo probably used several lists (more or less like those still existing, a few of which are printed here at pp. cviii–cxi), which differed in the order and parentage of the kings. This may account for the repetition of names. Thus there are Dan I, son of Humble (p. 15); Dan II, son of Uffe (p. 143); and Dan III, son of Frode II (p. 145), although that name must have been originally invented for only one being, the eponym of Denmark. Again, no less than six kings are here called Frode (in Saxo's Latin, Frotho). This word (answering to the Icelandic Fróði, 'wise' or 'learned') was perhaps an appellation, originally confined to the mythical lawgiver and peacemaker (of the time of Christ) whom Saxo makes out to have been Frode III, and who occupies the whole of book v. (pp. 148-211). It may, of course, have been afterwards given to another. But evidently, as Mr. Powell remarks (p. xlv), 'Saxo has carved a number of Frodes out of one or two kings of gigantic personality.'

Let us now take a very brief glance at some of the kings. In book i. Dan is the grandfather of Skiold (from whom the Danish royal family took the name of Skioldungs), and Skiold's son and grandson, Gram and Hadding, fill the rest of the book. They mix freely with gods and giants. Hadding's foster mother, the giantess Hardgrep, forces a corpse to prophesy (p. 27).[1] Hadding, when in danger of capture, meets an old one-eyed man (Odin), who takes him up on his horse (Sleipnir), throwing his cloak over his fellow-horseman's head. Hadding peers through an armhole, and he sees the sea under the horse's hoofs (p. 29). Saxo here gives his first accounts of the wizards, Odin and his peers, who prolonged their lives for centuries, and whose juggleries seduced men to worship them (pp. 24–5 and 30–2). Hadding has other wild adventures. One of them we will glance at further on. In another he is led by an elf woman into the under-world; he sees two hosts of the dead, who have fallen by the sword, fighting for ever; and he approaches the wall of the undying land (p. 38). This adventure is compared by Mr. Powell with that of Thomas of Ercildoune, &c. (pp. lxv, lxxii, lxxv, &c.) In the quasi-historical portions Hadding avenges the death of his father

[1] A scene bearing a general resemblance to that of Erichtho and the corpse in Lucan's *Pharsalia*, end of bk. vi.

(Gram) upon Swipdag and his son Asmund (pp. 30, 32); but he forms such a close attachment to Asmund's son Hunding that, when he hears of the death of Hunding, he hangs himself (p. 44). This act devoted Hadding to Odin, as Hanga-týr, the *lord of the hanged* (at least according to the later myths).[2]

In book ii. Hadding is succeeded by his son, Frode I. He is chiefly remarkable for the war tricks that he plays in his campaigns in the east, together with some in the west, including Great Britain (pp. 45–61). After Frode I Saxo names his son Halfdan, who becomes father of Ro and of Helge Hundingsbane (the latter name famous in a beautiful Eddic lay); and thus he introduces Helge's son, Rolf Krake, the founder (he says) of Leire in Zealand, and the father of the heroic kings of Leire. The great combat that overthrew Rolf and his champions was most celebrated in northern literature. Saxo expands in Latin verse 'a certain ancient Danish song' (p. 80), that has now perished, but is partly represented by the fragments of the 'Biarka-mál.'[3] A passage, preserved in Saxo's Latin, relates how Biarki (one of Rolf's champions) is told by his wife, the Valkyria Rute, that, by looking under her arm set akimbo, he may see Odin himself, on his tall steed, rejoicing in the battle (p. 80). The end of 'Hrolfs Saga Kraka' (a late saga) is likewise paraphrased from the 'Biarka-mál.'

In book iii. Saxo returns to the myths of the old gods (vulgarised into wizards), which culminate in the death of Balder and in Odin's vengeance for his son (pp. 83–100). Saxo here inserts the first part of Hamlet (pp. 106–17). Book iv. opens with the second part of Hamlet (pp. 118–30). Next comes the legend of Uffe (the elder Offa of Matthew Paris), known in his childhood as Uffe the Dull. His father, Wermund, grows blind and buries his favourite sword, Skrep (named from its swishing sound), deeming his son unfit to wield it. But suddenly Uffe challenges the two chief champions of the Saxon army. Wermund then gropes about till he finds Skrep. He sits on a bridge leading to the isle of combat, prepared to drown himself if his son is killed, and he listens eagerly. At length he cries, 'I hear Skrep,' and again, 'I hear Skrep,' and each time (he is told) his son has cleft one of the Saxon champions in two (pp. 138–42). This is one of the most genuine heroic tales in the volume.

Book v. is occupied (as mentioned above) by the reign of Frode III. It contains many adventures, but Frode himself is chiefly praised for his laws (pp. 187–9 and 192–3), and for his peace of thirty years, hallowed (without his knowledge) by the birth of Christ (pp. 209–10). At the end the king is gored to death by a witch in the shape of a sea cow (p. 211).

Books vi. and vii. have for their chief hero and poet the gigantic Starkad, whose name is given to one of the epic metres ('Starkaðarlag'). He is decreed by Odin to live three generations, but to do one foul deed in each generation (p. 226).

In book viii. a poem by Starkad furnishes Saxo with a list of heroes under Harald Hildetand and his rebellious nephew, Sigurd Ring, at the

[2] See Vigfusson's *Dictionary*, under the verb *hanga*.

[3] See *Corp. Poet. Boreale*, i. 118–9.

battle of Bravalla (dated by the elder critics about 730, by the moderns about 775). Upon this 'veritable battle of the nations' Mr. Powell remarks that no doubt 'the results had much to do with the wonderful outward stir' of the viking period. After Bravalla Saxo suddenly goes back to very old-world legends, and he relates that of Jarmerik and Swanhild, as it had been told by Jornandes of Eormanric, the great Gothic monarch of the fourth century. Another insertion here is the myth of King Snio (*Snow*). Another is the legend of Gorm the Old, the worshipper of the monster 'Vgarthilocus' (namely, the Útgarða-Loki, visited by Thor in the prose 'Edda'); how he sends Thorkill to learn tidings of his god; how Thorkill brings him a horrible tale from the under-world, together with a foul bristle plucked from the beard of 'Vgarthilocus,' and how the monster's worshipper dies for shame. Saxo presently returns to the eighth and ninth centuries, and he tells of Gotrik (or Godefridus), the report of whose murder (in 810) is said to have been welcome to Charlemagne (pp. 358–60).

Book ix. contains the exploits of Ragnar Lodbrog, both in east and west. He is thrown by Ælla of Northumberland into a den of vipers, and sings his death song there (p. 380). His sons avenge his death upon Ælla.[4] He is succeeded in Denmark by his son Sigurd Snake-Eye, and then by his grandson Erik the Christian (converted by St. Ansgarius). The book ends with Gorm III, and the devices by which his queen, Thyra, broke the news of the death of their favourite son, Kanute (p. 390).

On looking back at the contents of these nine books it will be seen that they form a tangled web of myths and legends, with one or two broken threads of historical traditions. It naturally happens, during the formation of the early epic cycles, that the attributes and actions of the old gods are often transferred by the singers to some mortal hero. A notable instance occurs in book i. Hadding begins his career as a special favourite of Odin, the chief of the Asa-gods, and he ends it with being closely connected with Niord and Frey, the chiefs of the Vana-gods. He is cursed (p. 36) for having killed 'a benignant god' in the shape of a sea monster. He appeases the deities by offering victims to Frey, and by establishing the yearly sacrifice in his honour, known as the 'Fröblod' (which was celebrated at Upsala). Presently (p. 37) he receives a wound in the leg, when defending the princess Ragnhild against a giant. She nurses him, and she shuts up a ring in his wound as a token. Eventually she recognises him by the ring, and marries him. But she loves the woody mountains, and he the sea; and they each sing a stanza (p. 40), his being a complaint of the howling of wolves and hers a complaint of the screeching of gulls. This story is evidently that of Niord, the sea god, and Skathe, the giantess. She has chosen Niord by his feet; but each of them is soon tired of the other's dwelling-place, and they sing alternately against the wolves and against the gulls (see the Icelandic verses from the prose 'Edda' quoted by Mr. Powell in his p. cvi). Peter Andreas Munch has noticed this in his 'Gude- og Helte-Sagn' (1854), pp. 143–4; he mentions also that the 'Frøblot' is ascribed by Snorri Sturluson to Frey himself, and he comes to the conclusion that Hadding was regarded (at least in Denmark) as a personification of Frey

[4] See *A.S. Chronicle*, an. 876.

or Niord. Dr. Rydberg takes a very different view of the mythological situation (see his 'Teutonic Mythology,' translated in 1889). He regards Swipdag, the slayer of Gram and the deadly foe of Gram's son Hadding, as the earthly representative of Frey and the other Vana-gods, whilst Hadding fights on the side of the Asa-gods. At last Hadding finds that the Asas have deserted him, and that he has offended the Vans by killing the sea monster (which is nothing less than Swipdag himself), and so he forces himself to sacrifice to Frey.[5] Dr. Rydberg mentions elsewhere the stanzas of Niord and Skathe, and makes a slight allusion to their appearing in Saxo,[6] but he draws no deduction from their being attributed to Hadding and his wife. Mr. Powell, in like manner, only says, 'That Saxo's attribution is, when it differs from Icelandic attribution, wrong, is pretty clear in such a case as that of Hadding's verses, for the authority of the prose "Edda" is unquestioned.'[7] Perhaps, then, the whole episode may have been a mere piece of embroidery used by a narrator to adorn the Hadding legend, and perhaps the same might be said with regard to other passages that have engaged the more serious attention of modern mythologists.

In a part of Mr. Powell's section on 'Mythology' (§ 9, pp. cxv–cxxvii) he makes good use of Dr. Rydberg's really wonderful volume. He gives a summary of the long discourse on the Swipdag myth (so far as it relates to Saxo), and he accepts the most important conclusions. At the same time he objects to one or two of the minor points. For instance, he says, 'The identification of Swipdag with Hamlet, "Teutonic Mythology," 572, is not at all convincing.'[8] I will here mention one more point (only a small detail) upon which Dr. Rydberg and Mr. Powell are agreed, whereas I am compelled to differ from them. Dr. Rydberg thinks he has reason for identifying Alf Sigarsson, of book vii. (see p. 274), with the white god, Heimdal; and he adds that Saxo's description of him confirms this conjecture, for 'rays of light seemed to issue from his silvery locks.'[9] But surely the words of Saxo need not be taken to imply anything supernatural. They are, *Cuius eciam insignem candore cesariem tantus come decor asperserat, ut argenteo crine nitere putaretur.*[10] And nothing more is said about it, except that Alfhild is captivated by the beauty of the youth. Mr. Powell, in his section 11, called 'Folk Tales,' not only speaks of Alf's '*illuminating hair*, which gives light in the darkness,' but he adds the curious remark, 'as it obtains in Cuaran's thirteenth-century English legend' (p. xcvi). This is quite a slip, for in the English poem of 'Havelok' (who is never there called Cuaran), and also in both the much earlier French versions (in which Cuaran is his by-name), the mystic flame issues from the mouth of the sleeping hero, and illumines all around him. I cannot help wondering whether Mr. Powell was misled by the remembrance of an article of my own, in which I compared the flame breath of Gaimar's Havelok, and the consequent exhortations of Argentille, with the flame hair of the sleeping Servius Tullius and the exhortations of Tanaquil.[11]

[5] *Teut. Mythol.* p. 557. [6] *Ibid.* p. 161. [7] Powell, p. cvi.
[8] *Ibid.* p. cxxiii, note. [9] *Teut. Mythol.* p. 113. [10] Bk. vii., Holder's ed. p. 228.
[11] See my *Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum*, vol. i. (1883), pp. 428–9.

Mr. Elton has a separate treatise (appendix ii.) upon Saxo's 'Hamlet' (pp. 398–413). No definite conclusion, probably, can ever be reached as to its remote origin, except that it is a branch of the Brutus legend, as 'Havelok' (in a less intimate degree) is a branch of the Servius Tullius legend. Mr. Elton does not mention the name of Havelok; yet surely the two stories are connected, and surely something may be said as to their development. I myself regard it as almost certain that Havelok Cuaran derived more than his name from Anlaf Cuaran. The nickname Cuaran is Irish for 'sock' or 'buskin.' Anlaf is in Irish Amhlaeibh, and in Welsh Abloec; and the name of Havelok in the thirteenth-century Grimsby seal is still spelled 'Habloc.' This Anlaf was stepson of a sister of our Athelstan; but in 927, when he was a child, he was expelled from Northumbria; and thus Athelstan played the part of the 'usurping uncle.' He married a daughter of the king of Scotland; but, in 937, he and his cousin Anlaf of Dublin were defeated by Athelstan at Brunanburg. The two Anlafs returned, and were actual kings of Danish Britain from 940 to 944. Anlaf Cuaran (whose cousin was now dead) was driven back to Ireland in 944, and he began a new career there, which lasted till 980. One of the camp stories, told of Anlaf, has been preserved by Malmesbury (in his 'Gesta Regum,' with a sequel in his 'Gesta Pontificum'). It seems not improbable that it was some extravagant camp story told of him that was the original of the war trick (about setting up the dead men) related both of Havelok and Hamlet. It is related again by Saxo (see p. 147) of Fridleif I. But here again it is a Danish king who invades England after conquering Dublin, and who gains a second day by setting up his slain. Here again, therefore, the legend points towards the camp of Anlaf Cuaran.

Havelok and Hamlet were called 'mythical half-brothers' by the elder Grundtvig.[12] The expression is, perhaps, too strong. But they may fairly be called foster brothers. They both grow up at the court of a 'usurping uncle,' and are both famous for their quaint sayings. But there the first resemblance ends. In the case of Havelok the usurper is not the uncle of Havelok himself, but of Argentille. Havelok's simplicity is real. He is quite content with playing pranks before the court at Lincoln, where the king treats him as a sort of jester.[13] He is aware of the marvellous flame breath, but it never makes him dream of being the heir of kings or of having any wrongs to avenge; indeed, he is ashamed of it until Argentille becomes his Valkyria (even the crowning war trick is her device, for it is done *par conseil de la reine*, l. 773); and she informs his splendid body with the spirit of a hero. Hamlet, on the other hand, schemes for revenge; and his sayings are in character with his assumed madness. But the course of the two stories often brings the same incidents to the front. Thus each of the heroes is a disinherited Danish prince; each marries an English princess, and regains his power in Denmark; each returns to Britain and marches against an English king; each is accompanied by his own Valkyria (the English Argentille and the Scottish Hermuthruda); each of them half loses the first day's battle, and each wins the second day by staking up the dead men in

[12] *Nordens Mythologi*, 1832, p. 365.

[13] *De lui son jugleur fescit* (Gaimar, in Wright's edition, l. 166).

squadrons.[14] These are marks of the same workshop at the very least. I am myself inclined to believe that various Anglo-Danish minstrels identified both heroes with Anlaf Cuaran, and modified the tales, and appended the last wild camp story; and that then they carried the 'Hamlet' (perhaps carried it *back*) to Denmark, ages before it was known to Saxo Grammaticus. H. L. D. WARD.

Die päpstlichen Kreuzzugs-Steuern des dreizehnten Jahrhunderts: ihre rechtliche Grundlage, politische Geschichte und technische Verwaltung. Von Dr. ADOLF GOTTLOB. (Heiligenstadt: F. W. Cordier. 1892.)

THIS is a full and clear treatise on a technical subject which has points of contact with several important issues. Papal taxation is usually treated from the side of the people taxed. Dr. Gottlob approaches it as a student of papal finance and organisation, and this makes his work more interesting. The system he describes touches the whole subject of medieval commerce and exchange; it throws great light on the financial ideas and methods of the age, and as a study of a special department of the organisation of the curia it has a fascination of its own. The growth of papal collections is here described in a dry, clear light, without antagonism, and with much research and clear grouping of facts. Part i. treats of the papal right to tax the church and its beginnings, part ii. of its political history in the thirteenth century, part iii. of the organisation generally. England is specially treated of on pp. 105 and 139; on p. 251 is an account of the office of *campsor* or *cambiator*, spoken of by Matthew of Paris as *scambiator*. The comparative independence of England as regards the papacy is illustrated in this department of ecclesiastical relations, and her exceptional position is noted on p. 147. One of the most interesting parts of the book is that which discusses the bull 'Clericis Laicos,' concerning which very loose statements are often made elsewhere, and the constitutional importance of which as a new departure is often overrated. Dr. Gottlob traces the development of its principle, and clearly shows (1) that the bull only applied to extraordinary taxation, and (2) that the subsequent limitation as to its not applying to fiefs in clerical hands was not at first expressed. The upshot of the English and French crises caused by the bull was that the curia was driven to depend more and more upon eastern lands for contributions, a result which led to an increase of financial pressure upon Germany, and to the greater prevalence of abuses there. In the last chapter (on pp. 234–5) is an interesting account of appeals to Rome. J. P. WHITNEY.

The Life and Times of James I, 'the Conqueror,' King of Aragon, &c. By F. DARWIN SWIFT, B.A. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1894.)

MOST of us have depended for our knowledge of the national hero of the Aragonese—Jaime el Conquistador—upon his own naïve chronicle of the events of his turbulent life, and Zurita's well-known 'Annals of the Crown of Aragon.' The 'Chronicle,' of which an excellent English edition was published a few years ago, under the able editorship of Don

[14] See my *Catalogue of Romances*, i. 435–6.

Pascual de Gayangos, was written many years after most of the events related in it happened, and is naturally faulty in many respects, both in the omission of much matter necessary to a proper understanding of the times, and in the obscurity of its details. Still, such as it was, it gave us a distinct impression of the man who wrote it—that he was selfish, utterly unscrupulous, and violent, but at the same time so simple in his self-deception as to be almost childlike. It is evident that he looked upon himself as not only a specially chosen instrument of Providence, but a righteous man, who should be held as a pattern for all posterity. Mr. Darwin Swift has taken the 'Chronicle' and followed it line by line, checking, amplifying, correcting, by the aid of every scrap of information, published and unpublished, which would serve to throw greater light on the facts of the life of his hero. He has, moreover, opened an almost unworked field of research in the archives of the crown of Aragon in Barcelona, which were known to contain much valuable information with regard to the early history of the Romance nations, but have hitherto been almost entirely neglected by English scholars. The result is a sound, thorough, painstaking, and trustworthy, if somewhat dry and pedantic, history of one of the critical epochs which have decided the fate of subsequent civilisation. The story has never been told before in its entirety, and its full significance may even yet have to be weighed, but so far as the facts themselves go, the history of James the Conqueror never need be written again; and Mr. Darwin Swift may be welcomed in the small number of patient, industrious investigators who have distinctly added to our sum of historical knowledge.

In Aragon itself King Jaime is, and always was, famous, mainly because he conquered the kingdoms of Valencia and Majorca from the Moors, and was, of his time, the first Christian champion against the infidel. His interest to us does not depend so much upon this phase of his troubled life as upon his efforts, unsuccessful in one case and only partially successful in the other, to attain ends of which the success or failure was to leave a mark upon human progress for all time to come. From his mother, who was a daughter of the lord of Montpellier, he inherited important territories of the south of France. The counts of Provence and Toulouse were his kinsmen and feudatories; the count of Béarn paid him homage; and his dream was, by federation at first, perhaps by consolidation afterwards, to weld these petty chieftains and his own dominions into a strong Romance empire, which should shut out the advancing Frenchmen of the north from the shores of the Mediterranean; and, with the great seaboard from Valencia to Genoa, become the mistress of the sea. It was a grand idea, and Jaime laboured for it through many years of stress and storm, cutting asunder marriage bonds over and over again in the families of the southern princelets, in order to form fresh matrimonial combinations, which should tend to the unification of territory under his own sway. But fates were against him, and the diplomacy of St. Louis fully equal to his own; so one by one the Provençal chieftains, all but Béarn, fell to be feudatories of the pushing northern Franks, and Don Jaime, years before his death, accepted the inevitable, and the dream of a southern Romance empire faded for ever. His other task was one he held in common with other European rulers of his time, notably with the English

Plantagenets, with whom he was so closely connected—namely, the humbling of the feudal barons by making common cause against them with the growing power of the towns and the industrial classes. In this he was hampered more than most of his contemporaries by the peculiar character of the peoples over whom he was called to reign. To this day both the Aragonese and Catalans are noted amongst Spaniards for their obstinacy, their impatience of authority, and their turbulence; and from the earliest birth of the kingdom of Aragon and the county of Barcelona, the representative assemblies, or Cortes, had held the power of the purse. The king of Aragon was subject to the constitution of Aragon in judicial and financial matters, until the *fueros* were trampled under foot by Philip II, more than three centuries after the time of the Conquistador, in revenge for the protection given in Aragon to Antonio Perez, although the shadow of the old institutions existed even long after that. Jaime el Conquistador, therefore, was regarded by his nobles as their feudal chief and not their absolute sovereign; and from the time the great king emerged from his nonage until, worn out with strife of well-nigh three score years and ten, he sank to his grave in the garb of a Cistercian monk, hardly a month passed that he was not at issue with one or more of his turbulent nobles. It ended in a drawn battle after all; for though Jaime failed to make himself the absolute monarch he aimed to be, and found the *fueros* of Aragon and the *customs* of Catalonia stronger than he was, yet he struck a deadly blow at the encroachments of his feudal nobles, and so aided in the downfall of a system which was already declining in the rest of Europe.

The bewildering and intricate marriage combinations made or projected by the Conquistador between the members of his numerous family and those of neighbouring princes, the ceaseless battles and sieges against the Moors and his own subjects, and the feuds with his sons, are all detailed by Mr. Darwin Swift with a painstaking striving for absolute correctness, and a wealth of notes which is rather distracting and often unnecessary. It would be, however, ungracious to complain of this, as Mr. Swift writes history in this way on principle, and there is very much to be said for the method. He remarks, 'It has been said somewhere that the best book which could be written would be a book consisting of premises only, from which the readers should draw their own conclusions; and on this principle the facts of Jaime's life have been allowed here to speak for themselves, without being rendered inaudible by a buzz of needless comment.' Correct as this may be, it is nevertheless allowable to sigh a little over the avoidance of picturesque local colour in many places where it might have been introduced without going beyond Mr. Swift's darling authorities. For instance, Mr. Swift merely mentions, without comment, Jaime's visit to Burgos in 1270, when he was 62 years of age, to attend the marriage of his grandson Ferdinand of Castile with Blanche of France. The annals of Castile tell much of this splendid gathering, and the imagination is captured by the meeting there of the two royal giants, Edward Longshanks, the young English prince, and Jaime, the Aragonese, both of them near upon seven feet high, both of them great kings, great warriors, and great statesmen. How they must have towered above all their royal kinsmen, both in stature and genius—

even over Alfonso the Wise, Jaime's son-in-law and Edward's brother-in-law. How the old king must have impressed the young one; for he was already full of wise aphorisms, and had crystallised his life principles into words. At this very meeting he gave (as he himself records) 'six counsels of perfection' to Alfonso—(1) always to keep his word when once given; (2) always to consider well before signing a grant; (3) to keep the people in his love; (4) in any case to conciliate the church and the towns, with whose aid he could, if necessary, crush the nobles; (5) not to infringe the grants made to the settlers in Murcia, and to people it with a hundred men of importance, giving them large allotments and letting out the rest of the land to artisans; (6) not to punish any one in secret. But though there may be some passing regret for a want of colour and brightness in the book, these qualities must be acknowledged to be of secondary importance to a strict adherence to ascertainable fact; and in this primary and all-important quality, Mr. Swift's history of James the Conqueror is beyond reproach. I have taken pains to verify many of his numerous references, and in no one instance have I found the slightest divergence from his authorities. Of few historians can as much be said.

MARTIN A. S. HUME.

Calendar of the Patent Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office. Edward III, 1330–1334. Published by authority of the Home Secretary. (London: H.M. Stationery Office. 1893.)

THIS is the second volume of the 'Calendar of Patent Rolls of the Reign of Edward III.' The first volume, covering the years 1327–1330, was published in 1891. There is no occasion to repeat upon the publication of this new instalment the general remarks made in the HISTORICAL REVIEW, viii. 135–140, with reference to its predecessor. The work is continued on exactly the same lines, and, though on some small points some of us would like the method of cataloguing to be slightly altered, it is more to the purpose to testify to the continued zeal and energy shown by Mr. Maxwell Lyte and his staff in carrying out a further stage of this great national work in so short a space of time. The labour involved in the production of each of these volumes must be enormous, and the work of sorting and arranging the index alone must be exceedingly great. Every year that passes gives scholars more opportunities of testing this work, and, though this process must inevitably reveal a few flaws here and there, further examination seems, for the most part, but to add fresh testimony to the carefulness and solidity with which these catalogues are being made. It is worthy of special commendation that some important documents, as for example, the Treaty of Paris of 1331, are given in full instead of being merely calendared.

The former Calendar of this series of Edward III's 'Patent Rolls' was carried out by several hands. For the present volume Mr. R. F. Isaacson is, we are told, responsible under Mr. Maxwell Lyte's immediate supervision, while Mr. Isaacson has also compiled the index. With regard to the former volume it was necessary to point out that in some small points the index was not quite so satisfactory as that of the companion series of 'Close Rolls.' It is to be regretted that the effect of the vast amount of

patient labour expended on the index of the present volume is, in some small respects, marred by the appearance of similar errors. There are fewer mistakes in indexing the Welsh names than in its predecessor. But 'Cautermaure' still appears in the index for Cantrevmawr, and 'Thlancadok' is put for Llangadock. Many other mistakes of the same sort also occur, though one is glad to notice that the two Llanthonys are properly distinguished, and that 'Lampadervaur' is correctly indexed as Llanbadarn Vawr. There should, however, be an index heading 'Whitland,' the English equivalent for the 'Alba Landa' of the documents, which form, however, alone figures in the index. There is still much confusion owing to Welsh places being described as belonging to counties like Monmouthshire which did not then exist, or being assigned, like Abergwili, to counties which then existed, but of which the places in question did not in the fourteenth century form a part. But the worst cases of carelessness in identifying place names with their modern equivalents seem to occur with respect to those situated in the English king's dominions in France. Some of the errors of the index with regard to such names are truly portentous. It is not creditable to English official scholarship that this volume should go to the world with such entries as 'Abbeville in Aquitaine' or 'Amiens in Aquitaine.' It suggests that the compiler had only just enough knowledge to know that the English kings possessed Aquitaine and thereupon inferred that, as Ponthieu belonged to the English king, Ponthieu—and its neighbourhood too apparently—must necessarily be in Aquitaine also. The honour of Laigle might well be indexed under some more vernacular name than 'Aquila.' 'Sheriff' is not a felicitous translation of the 'vicecomes' of the English king's lands in France. If it were necessary to describe Bayonne and Bordeaux as 'in Aquitaine,' the more obscure Bazas was worth the same description. No attempt is made to find out the modern equivalents of the badly spelt names of the more out-of-the-way Aquitanian towns mentioned in the rolls. The inquirer who seeks to know what entries in the volume concern Blaye, La Bastide, or Peyrehorade will have to turn to those towns in the index under the forms 'Blaine,' 'La Batude,' 'Petreforade.' La Réole is indexed as 'La Riole in France,' a somewhat vague description; Térouenne as 'Tirvan,' though called in the text 'Tirwan.' Saint Valery is indexed as 'St. Waleric,' and Tonnay-Charente as 'Tanney.' In calling attention to these blunders I do not wish to magnify their importance, or to depreciate the vast mass of solid work efficiently done. But they are the more irritating since they could have been easily removed, had the common precaution been taken of submitting the proofs of the index to some person competently acquainted with the local geography of Wales and Gascony, who was also accustomed to the ancient terms of the place names of these regions. T. F. Tout.

Epistolario di Coluccio Salutati. A cura di Francesco Novati. Vols. I. and II. 'Fonti per la Storia d' Italia.' (Roma: Sede dell' Istituto Storico Italiano. 1891–1893.)

The humanist whose bent scholar's figure forms the frontispiece of the first volume of his letters well deserves the care which his editor has

bestowed. Not only was Coluccio Salutati the honoured friend of Petrarch and Boccaccio, but his correspondence may be said to form a characteristic autobiography of a man of letters in the fourteenth century. The letters so far printed lie between 1360 and 1393, and of these only a small number have hitherto been published. It is strange that the Bibliothèque Nationale should have so long concealed this treasure from the lovers of the early renaissance.

Salutati writes first from his native township of Settignano, where he exercised the profession of notary. Hence he found promotion in the municipal chancery of Todi. The factions of this wild Umbrian town were disturbing to scholarship and dangerous to life, and the secretary begged his influential friend Francesco Bruni to find a position, however humble, in the curia. Thus he had the fortune to witness the arrival of Urban V at Rome, and the entrance of Charles IV and his empress. He writes with enthusiasm of the vigour with which the restored papacy undertook the architectural revival of the capital, and with consequent despondency of the pope's withdrawal. Rome was for Salutati, as for others, the mirage of disillusion. His denunciation of the morals of the clergy is clearly more than a literary commonplace; his zeal for antiquity touched no sympathetic chord among a people which alone, as he writes, in Italy took no interest in its past. Gladly, therefore, Salutati accepted the post of under-secretary at Lucca. Here he found little more content. It is, perhaps, as he himself remarks, peculiarly a student's weakness to think that every post would suit his studies save that which he has chanced to win. The secretarial duties, from which he derived his livelihood, were an irksome interruption to the scholarship which made his life. His correspondence, he confesses, is constantly in arrear; he has found no time to write, nor even, alas, to read. Like many a stylist Salutati was perhaps no economist of time. The Lucchesi may have had good reason for not reappointing their under-secretary, who is found in temporary rustication in his house at Settignano. His retirement was *reculer pour mieux sauter*; he received a call to Florence, where before long he won the coveted post of chancellor to the signoria, the blue ribbon of many a generation of humanists. Here he might well be satisfied. *Ornatus prosperis et iactatus adversis in Florentinam urbem, portum michi, ut spes est, salutiferum, naviculam vite mee fessus impegi.* But even at Florence his lot fell upon troubled times. One of the chancellor's most important letters is an outspoken defence of Florence against Gregory XI. The pope's invitation to enter a general Italian league was rejected on the same grounds which were afterwards to be utilised by early protestant publicists: *Adde quod summus pontifex potest et, quod verecunde commemoro, solet de plenitudine potestatis rumpere federa, contractus rescindere, iuramenta absolvere, et omnes ab huiusmodi promissionis nexibus liberare, et unius rescripti edicto consuevit infringere que multis oportuit consensibus roborare, ut iam, si recte respicias, nichil firmum, nichil durabile possis cum Ecclesia sancta componere, cum omnia possit apostolatus auctoritas irritare.* The sentiment of nationality is strongly marked. The cause of Florence was that of Italy. *Certamus . . . cum exteris gentibus, cum Italici nominis hostibus, cum illis qui, cum patria non sufficiat sua, in miseram Ausoniam mittuntur in predam.* In

conclusion the pope is warned not to rely upon Florentine faction, due only to exaggerated love of liberty: *Non putes quod cum libertatem singuli querant, illam universi perditum eant.* Of these Florentine factions the chancellor had full experience, for in 1378 he witnessed the rising of the Ciompi. The permanent civil service usually furnished the first victims of a Florentine revolution. It is creditable to Salutati's tact that he was left his office to give literary shape to the aspirations of democracy and the reprisals of reaction.

The greater events of Italian history naturally receive comment in these letters, and it is not always easy to decide whether Salutati is writing as the secretary or as the man. A long letter of congratulation and advice is addressed to Charles of Naples, in which the writer gives expression to the general contemporary opinion of Giovanna's high ability as a ruler; it is, he says, the best title of Charles to fame that he has conquered so incomparable a queen. To the secretary of Gian Galeazzo Visconti his Florentine *confrère* dwells on his delight that Bernabò has been arrested by the most virtuous prince of all Lombardy. Bernabò was, indeed, not yet murdered, but Salutati, as a true humanist, has no condemnation for tyrannicide. From the change of government he augured peace to all the Visconti's neighbours. It is not the function of a permanent secretary to be a prophet. Five years later a letter to Francesco Novello de Carrara celebrates the recovery of Padua from the treacherous grasp of the Comes Virtutum. Here Salutati's congratulations have a truer ring, *Sum denique gente Italicus, patria Florentinus: natura et affectione Guelphus; ut inter tot nexus tantaque vincula prorsus non possim te non diligere nec tui status columen non amare.* It must have needed all the secretary's professional impersonality to applaud Jacopo d' Appiano's assumption of the despotism of Pisa, and to assure him of his belief that he was innocent of the murder of Gambacorti and his sons. Jacopo was known at Florence to be a Viscontean agent, and Gambacorti had been warned of his machinations; yet the deed once done it was needful to defer the inevitable rupture. That the new tyrant was an inferior member of Salutati's own profession made the task no pleasanter. Illustrious foreigners are also among the correspondents. Juan Fernandez de Heredia, soldier, diplomatist, and man of letters, is assured in many pages that history is the fount-head of all knowledge. Salutati would fain translate into Latin the lives of Plutarch which the knight of St. John had caused to be done into modern Greek and thence into Aragonese; in return for a copy he would despatch a Latin translation of the 'Odyssey.' A similar exchange is the object of an amusing letter to Jost of Moravia, who to this alone owes, perhaps, his corner in the world of letters. Salutati hopes that in return for a copy of Plutarch the margrave will inflict summary justice on the dean of Olmütz for breach of contract in not forwarding the coveted 'Chronica Regum Boemiae.' A higher importance, however, attaches to the light which is thrown upon the great literary movement of the age. Salutati's compositions are too often frigid Ciceronian essays on moral topics, on the merits of friendship, the consolations of death. He is saved, however, by the sincerity of his feelings, and his letters upon the deaths of the two high priests of culture, Petrarch and Boccaccio, are noble epitaphs to his great friends. The

former he regarded as the finest writer of his own or any age, surpassing Dante in rhymed Italian verse, Cicero and Virgil in Latin prose and poetry. The threatened fate of the unfinished 'Africa' filled him with alarm; rescued from the flames, he would with his own hands correct and annotate the poem and send a copy to each great seat of learning—to Bologna, to Paris, and to Oxford. Boccaccio also has the destiny of immortality, but from the list of works which is to win this guerdon the 'Decameron' is absent. It was this enthusiasm for the classics, combined with the belief that the ascending series was not yet closed, that made the real force of the early humanists. Students of Dante will find interest in Salutati's frank criticism on the first part of Benvenuto's commentary as being too prosaic, and in his discussion of two passages of the 'Inferno' (v. 60). Readers of Sacchetti will appreciate the tale of the secretary's evening stroll on the piazza, when he heard 'Pippo's' marvellous music, which was neither song nor whistle, but resembled the subdued note of the cage bird on feeling an unwonted ray of sunshine.

Nothing would more clearly illustrate the expansion of the new learning than an analysis of the classes to which Salutati's correspondents belong—the professional humanists of the first rank, the gentry, the lawyers, the schoolmasters, the members of good burgher families. In almost every letter there are quotations from the classics, criticisms upon Latin authors, promises to lend codices, or requests to borrow. Yet it was a transition age between the great periods of learning, and after the death of Petrarch and Boccaccio humanism seemed likely to be choked by material interests. Hence the diatribes against the lawyers and the doctors, professions which made gold their idol and diverted youth from sound learning, the latter twisting the law to provide them with jewels and fine clothing, the former swarming upon the land and depriving their patients alike of life and livelihood. In writing to his noble correspondents Salutati always distinguishes them from among their fellows, who are devoted to hunting, hawking, and the pursuit of wealth. The exceptions are such men of gentle blood as Guido di Polenta, Roberto Guidi, count of Battifolle, Tommaso d' Alviano, and above all Napoleone Orsini. The lamp of learning was still alight in the salt swamps of Ravenna, the rolling wastes of the Campagna, and the wild uplands of the Mugello.

Nor are mere personal incidents in the lives of Salutati and his friends without interest in the social history of the age. The writer was twice married. It is characteristic that his chief friends were unable to attend the first wedding feast, on the plea of exile; they are begged at least to send their wives, and to provide the bridegroom with three thousand oranges. Marriage, however, was incompatible with study; had not Cicero observed that it was impossible to be the servant of a wife and of philosophy? Yet the young wife's sudden death was as destructive to learning as her marriage. The widower's letter to Boccaccio perhaps deserves quotation. *Tanto merore confectus sum ut, memet oblitus, et tuarum literarum memoriam perdiderim et honestorum studiorum lucubrationem omnino dimiserim, adeo quod institutum opusculum De vita associabili et operativa de medio michi currentis stili fervore subtraxerit; nec mirum, quod enim pene inauditum est, michi cum illa omnium rerum summa concordia fuit, nec toto coniugii tempore unum in quo vel solo*

verbo michi restiterit valeo recordari. Three years later the disconsolate scholar was forced to the confession *In bigamiam incidi.*

The amusements and misfortunes of his friends supplied the humanist with texts for sermons. Petrarch was justly punished by ague for attending the marriage of the duke of Clarence with Violante Visconti at Pavia, where the luxury of the foul tyrant emphasised the sufferings of the poor. Francesco Bruni was yet more severely handled for his wanton *villeggiatura.* The papal secretary was studying the fathers; yet he wrote of verdant meads and nightingales, of eels and sucking pigs and winged fowl; he dwelt upon the peasants' gifts of cherries, chestnuts, pears, and apples; he prided himself upon his skill with the rod, an art in which he had rapidly instructed his servants and his tenants; and what wonder? for *magister artis ingeniique largitor, Venter.* Then follows a discourse on the snares of the senses, for it is hinted that Bruni had other failings, inappropriate to his age and learning, which are attributed to the society of the clergy among whom he had his being.

Once permanently settled at Florence, Salutati believed himself, as do all secretaries, to be overworked. His public duties, he complains, extended thoughout Italy, and wherever the Latin tongue was read. He had, moreover, a private practice among citizens too ignorant to explain their own affairs, much less to commit them to writing, and while he attempted to give shape to their ideas he would be interrupted by a summons to the signoria. His fame as an elegant letter-writer brought strange requests; one friend pressed for an invective against an enemy, another for a conclusive reply to Petrarch's diatribe on marriage, and more especially second marriage. Love is severely handled in a versified letter to Alberto degli Albizzi, who had just exchanged exile for an existence yet more restless.

In Salutati there is little trace of the jealousy, the self-conceit, the rancorous abuse of dilettante decadence. He held to the old traditions of religion, morality, and manners. He emphasises his belief in the immortality of the soul, which already among his compeers was regarded as old-fashioned. A 'pirate' professor is warned not to clash with an established lecture on Seneca's tragedies; let the struggle for supremacy be in research and not the lecture room, *non ex infimo docendi gradu, sed ex aliqua altioris culminis specula.* A humanist often abused but rarely apologised, yet a letter of Salutati to one whom he had failed to greet becomingly, because he was absorbed in play, may read a lesson in courtesy to many a modern whist-player: *Veruntamen, amice carissime, novisti quantum soleant illiusce ludi contaminatione mentes mortalium occupari, ita ut ludentes omnes, civilitatis immemores, sibi ipsi omniumque circumstantium corone, et denique sepe ipsi omnium rerum opifici Deo turpiter irascantur.* He had, moreover, courage and common sense. He disbelieved in the current tale that antichrist had been born. He reproached his friends whom the plague had frightened from Florence when the city most needed them, and when the Ciompi were left to burn and plunder at will. His family, it is true, had been sent to the hills, but his wife was terror-stricken at her father's and sister's death; the aromatic pill which he carried was rather a sensuous gratification than a sanitary amulet. He scoffed at the prevailing astrological or medical superstitions,

criticising the fashionable theory of the corruption of the atmosphere which has left a too permanent survival in the term 'influenza.' Yet he was, perhaps, corrupted by the intellectual atmosphere of his age; he was a pedant, possibly a prig. Many of his letters are wearisome discourses. Nevertheless the vast expanse of platitude is brightened by the many-twinkling smile of humour. Those who borrow books and keep them for six months will enjoy the retort to an importunate lender: *Importune, querule, infeste, moleste et denique contumeliose, nescio si dicam amice carissime. Ecce quod tibi libellum tuum, quem utinam nunquam vidissem, ne in ipso agnovissem quam vitrea, quam plumbea, quam vilis et quam fragilis foret amicitia tua, que pro quodam vilissimo scartabello mecum fuit et totiens et tam inurbane debacchata, remitto. Habes epistolas tuas* [Cicero's letters], *habes quod tam garrule deposcebas. Nichil plus debeo.* E. Armstrong.

Thomas III, Marquis de Saluces: Etude historique et littéraire. Par N. Jorga. (St. Denis: H. Bouillant. 1893.)

To English readers the name of Saluzzo is probably best known through a passing allusion in Chaucer, who associates it with 'Mons Vesulus.' It is a little town in the Piedmontese plain, just at the point at which the Po, rushing down from Monte Viso, ceases to be an impetuous mountain torrent as it enters that plain. It was not till 1142 that it became the capital of a marquisate, which ultimately, after many vicissitudes, became merged, as was but natural, in the dominions of the dukes of Savoy. Monsieur Jorga has devoted to the life of one of the independent marquises of Saluzzo, Thomas III (born 1356, died 1416), a painstaking monograph, which, though a thesis presented to the university of Leipzig, is yet printed at St. Denis, and is thus (especially when taking into account the probable nationality of the author as indicated by his name) quite a cosmopolitan production. M. Jorga's work is thorough and conscientious, though he laments that he has been limited to the use of printed authorities only. Yet, as he half confesses, his hero is not a very interesting or important personage.

Politically Thomas III's life and reign form an episode in the early history of French influence in North Italy. The marquis of Saluzzo, frequently attacked by his more powerful neighbours the princes of Achaia (a cadet branch of the house of Savoy) and the marquises of Montferrat, naturally seeks aid from the Dauphin on the other side of the Alps, becomes his vassal, and gladly welcomes the arrival of Charles of Orleans to take possession of his wife's dower of Asti. But in 1413 Thomas had to yield to the force of events and do homage for Saluzzo to the prince of Achaia. His reign thus affords an interesting study in the history of the advance of the house of Savoy, but is of local interest and importance only, so that M. Jorga's careful researches will only attract the few students who for one reason or another are drawn towards the history of Saluzzo. M. Jorga points out in his preface, and it may be well to note the fact here, that, in consequence of the long French occupation of the marquisate in the sixteenth century, most of the medieval Saluzzo archives are now among the archives of Grenoble, the number

of documents there preserved being, according to a competent authority, no less than 1,719.

From a literary point of view Thomas III is of rather greater importance. During his captivity in Turin (at the hands of the prince of Achaia) he wrote in 1395 an allegorical poem of great length, entitled 'Le Chevalier Errant.' M. Jorga has carefully investigated this production, and prints numerous extracts from it. It is mainly interesting as embodying many personal experiences, bad and good, of the author during his restless and troubled career, and as illustrating the amount of literary culture (*e.g.* the books with which he was acquainted) possessed by a fourteenth-century Piedmontese princelet. But, as even M. Jorga has to admit, this poem is generally tedious in the extreme, and is a production of the pseudo-chivalry of the fourteenth century. Tournaments and forlorn damsels in distress, many digressions, and much allegorising leave little room for anything else.

M. Jorga gives a very full index, while he hints that his four pages of 'Corrigenda' (certainly a disproportionate amount) are due to his inability to correct the proofs in all respects. As he seems puzzled (p. 53) by certain local names in Provence, it may be well to point out that all the places named are (like those mentioned with them) in the valley of the Ubaye, and its side glens, north of Barcelonnette. Hence 'Serena' is the present 'Sérenne,' near St. Paul, and 'Meliceto' probably 'Maljasset,' at the head of the valley, while 'Archia' is 'Larche' or 'L'Arche,' on the way from Barcelonnette to the Col de l'Argentière or de Larche, one of the 'great passes of the Alps' which was crossed by Francis I's army in 1515.

W. A. B. Coolidge.

Town Life in the Fifteenth Century. By Mrs. J. R. Green. (London: Macmillan & Co. 1894.)

The history of fifteenth-century England, and that of English municipal life in the middle ages, have shared an undeserved neglect in the past, but of recent years much has been done to wipe out the reproach in both cases. Mrs. Green has the honour, however, of being the first to bring the two lines of study to a focus and make a serious attempt to estimate the importance of the part played by the English towns in the last critical century of the expiring middle ages. Persuaded that the seeds of the great outburst of the Tudor time were stirring beneath the frozen surface of the preceding age, she endeavours to picture for us what may be called the domestic reaction of that great growth of English commerce which Schanz has described in his elaborate monograph. The book opens with a vigorous protest against the habit of looking upon the fifteenth century as 'the profoundly tragic close of a great epoch,' a pitiful period of low and material views in politics and society; the nation 'soured and demoralised by thirty-five years of a war that was as unjust as it was unfortunate,' the ruling class destroying itself in a selfish war of factions, the townsmen sunk in a sordid apathy to all the higher aspects of life. That in many of the things which make a nation great the age was barren by the side of its successor, or even its predecessor, is not denied, but the

saving leaven which redeems it from the charge of unfruitfulness is discovered in the quiet revolution of industry and commerce, and the silent growth of the sturdy middle class, which was in the next century to rise upon the ashes of the feudal nobility. The expansion of English commerce, the briskness and vitality of town life, the slow but effective training of a whole class of men in the methods and discipline of government, the visible embodiment of their strong sense of local unity in the multitude of new town halls, the learning and resources of their town clerks, all these and many other features of their humble annals are insisted upon with a fervour which sometimes borders on the dithyrambic. It was an age of democratic transition, 'in many ways extraordinarily like our own.' True, the magnates of the towns, whose advent to wealth and power constituted this democratic revolution, were oligarchs of the most uncompromising type in their own local spheres; but even here, we are told, the growth of prosperity and decreasing isolation was not unaccompanied by an agitation for more popular government, which was sometimes successful, if only for a season.

While admitting that historians have been apt to exaggerate the gloom of the fifteenth century, and that Mrs. Green has done good service in emphasising the presence of elements of promise for the future, we are inclined to think that the picture she has drawn is a little overcharged. To us the dawn seems greyer than it is painted in these picturesque pages. The facts which are here brought together to illustrate the growth of English trade in the earlier part of the period are interesting, but they ought not to obscure the broad line of demarcation which the firm establishment of the Yorkist dynasty constituted in this as in other respects. Nor can it be admitted without more evidence than seems forthcoming that 'it was doubtless through its vigorous burghers that the house of commons in the early part of the fifteenth century laid hold of powers which it had never had before nor was to have again for two hundred years.' Their experience in local government certainly did not shine very conspicuously in the commons' exercise of its new powers. It may very well be that it was they who were always querulously complaining of 'lack of governance,' while they crippled the government by keeping the purse-strings tightly closed. Men who grasped such powers in the state might have been expected to play a less helpless and inglorious part than they did in the unfortunate reign of Henry VI. Some advance was made in material things even before the close of the civil struggle; but here too Mrs. Green scarcely makes sufficient allowance for the check administered to the expanding trade of the country by the disastrous war with France. Bristol and the Cinque Ports suffered most severely, and the discontent of the latter contributed one of its most unquiet elements to the war of factions. That there was a decided retrogression from the preceding century in public spirit and municipal liberty would appear more clearly in these volumes if Mrs. Green had not embodied many episodes of town life in the fourteenth century in her description of the fifteenth-century town. There is one rather curious instance of this eclectic method. In speaking of the social rise of city men at the close of this period seen in the creation of citizens as knights of the Bath by Edward IV, Mrs. Green adds, with a simple reference to the Paston Letters, that 'the Poles of Hull

were rising into importance.' The reader who did not know would be surprised to learn that the family in question had been ennobled almost a century before.

Another current view traversed in these volumes is that which finds in the fifteenth century the culmination of the process which finally handed over the government of the towns to close oligarchies. The evidence adduced does not compel, however, more than a slight qualification of this view. It is quite probable, as Mrs. Green urges, that popular government in the towns had never been much of a reality, and that the ruling class had been gradually reducing it to a form; but this does not alter the fact that the fifteenth century stereotyped the narrow oligarchies of the vast majority of English towns. An 'effort to enlarge the sphere of political activity' can apparently only be asserted of Norwich, Lynn, and Sandwich; at all events no other instances are cited. These were all in a way exceptional towns under the direct influence of the constitution of London, and in the two former the movement which gave them representative common councils belongs to the first decade or so of the century. It is admitted too that no permanent popular colour was imparted to their constitution.

We have ventured to criticise some of Mrs. Green's main contentions, but we are not the less alive to the great value of her work. It makes no claim to work up inedited material, but it brings together from a wide range of printed sources an immense mass of facts and extracts from them, a narrative of admirable perspicuousness and literary power. Such a vivid picture of the life of the medieval English town will be indispensable to every student of the time. It does not, of course, fall within the scope of the book to enter into the many vexed questions that besiege the inquirer into the origin and early history of municipal life; but on one or two of these points Mrs. Green holds decided views of her own, which at least deserve serious consideration. Dr. Gross's views on the nature and ultimate fate of the merchant guild are subjected to severe criticism on the basis of materials relating to the Trinity guild at Coventry, supplied by Miss Dormer Harris. But the fact that Coventry had possessed a merchant guild before the grant of 1340 is overlooked, and the relation of the later to the earlier may have some bearing on the question at issue. The explanation offered of the rather puzzling use of *cives* (or *burgenses*) and *communitas* is interesting, if not convincing: 'I venture to suggest that *cives* was the term used for the corporate body of citizens possessing chartered rights, while *communitas* stood for the citizens in another aspect, as the community which held property and enjoyed privileges by immemorial custom, before a charter of free borough had been obtained. The uses of *communitas* are, as is too well known, many, but it was employed so constantly to express the corporate character of chartered boroughs that the attempt to identify it with the community of the old *burh* seems to rest on a very doubtful basis. When Ipswich received its charter from King John it was the *tota villata burgi* which assembled to elect the ruling magistrates, and it was the *communitas ville* which met and gave its assent to the ordinances of the new governing body. Among the few mistakes of a trifling kind which we have noted is the ascription on two occasions of the first capture of Bordeaux by the French to 1445

instead of 1451. We do not know on what authority the 'Libel of English Policy' is attributed to the hand of Bishop Moleyns. Pauli in his preface to Hertzberg's edition, which Mrs. Green does not seem to have used, declared himself unable to solve the problem of its authorship.

JAMES TAIT.

Zur Verhaftung des Landgrafen Philipp von Hessen. Von Dr. GUSTAV TURBA. (Reprinted from the *XXIII. Jahresbericht der k.k. Oberrealschule im II. Bezirke Wien.*) (Vienna. 1894.)

THIS essay well deserved reprinting, although to my mind the gist of the matter treated in it is outside the new and corrected documentary evidence produced in its appendix. There can be no doubt that Landgrave Philip of Hesse, who was slippery enough himself not to err by over-trusting others, was taken grievously by surprise when, after surrendering to Charles V on 19 June 1547, instead of being raised from his knees by the emperor, he was handed over to Alva and detained in custody for a period of five years. It is equally certain that the emperor's acceptance of the interpretation placed by the appointed mediators (the electors Joachim of Brandenburg and Maurice of Saxony) upon the terms—as Bishop Granvelle writes them in his letter to the queen of Hungary—*à gnad et ungenad* extended merely to the promised exclusion of capital punishment, *perpetual* imprisonment, and loss of lands. The question remains why the mediators had, on their own account, personally guaranteed Philip, in case of his surrender, against further inconvenience (*Beschwerung*), and how he had come to trust this undertaking. Dr. Turba shows, more decisively than protestant historians have usually been disposed to admit, that the responsibility for this miscarriage cannot be brought home to the emperor and his ministers; and this view is confirmed by the authentic copy here first given of the mediators' articles, as communicated by Granvelle to Queen Maria. Yet it is not easy to explain why the landgrave should have confided in the delusive security offered him by the new elector Maurice and his colleague, more especially as Philip's position was not exactly desperate, and had been improved by the reverse experienced towards the end of May by the imperialist duke Eric of Brunswick. Thus the real difficulty remains unsolved. It is noticeable that Dr. Turba acquits the emperor of the charge that at an earlier period of the negotiations he imposed upon Philip offensive aid against his old ally John Frederick, and mentions the rumour at the imperial court that this dishonourable condition was suggested by Philip himself. The chequered reputation of the 'magnanimous' landgrave need, however, hardly be burdened by this painful insinuation. A. W. WARD.

Maria Stuart und der Tod Darnleys. Von Dr. H. FORST. (Bonn: Emil Tschiersky. 1894.)

IN his present *brochure* on Mary Stuart's responsibility for the death of Darnley Dr. Forst confines himself to an examination of the extant documentary evidence, exclusive of the casket letters. In a paper

('Beiträge zur Geschichte der Maria Stuart') contributed to Sybel's *Historische Zeitschrift* (vol. lxvi. pp. 241–70) he had attempted to demonstrate the inconclusiveness of the arguments against the authenticity of the letters; and his present aim is to meet the main objections that have been raised by Bekker, Sepp, and Philippson to the other evidence collected by the Scottish government. In the discharge of this task he admittedly suffers under the disadvantage that he has been unable to consult many of the original authorities, and has been compelled to content himself with accepting the version of the facts supplied by his opponents. Even if in many instances he may have succeeded in refuting them, his processes are sometimes more laborious than they might otherwise have been, and the general result is more or less fragmentary and futile. To discuss intricate and controverted historical questions on second-hand evidence is scarcely in any circumstances legitimate, and the more intricate and controverted they are this method becomes the more unjustifiable. The Marian controversy is at least not one of those in which the avowed use of this method can be permitted, for perhaps more than any other historical controversy it has been confused and complicated by discussions based on an imperfect mastery of the original evidence. The impartiality and acuteness with which Dr. Forst deals with historical evidence renders it the more to be regretted that he should have afforded any excuse for classing him with the impulsive enthusiasts who supply their lack of knowledge by the unrestrained exercise of sentiment and prejudice. His vindication, however, of the documentary evidence—even when he is not engaged in simply slaying the slain—is in several respects superficial, and he over-estimates the importance of this evidence for present historical purposes. Apart from the casket letters the main evidence against Mary is circumstantial. To refute the testimony of the various witnesses cannot touch this evidence; and even if Dr. Forst had succeeded in reconciling this testimony with itself and with established facts all suspicion would not be removed from it. He forgets that it is vitiated by the fact that some of those who took part in collecting it were themselves engaged in the plot against Darnley, and that others not directly engaged in it were privy to it or its abettors. The theory of Philippson that the plot was contrived and carried out, not by Bothwell, but by Moray and the protestants, may be unsupported by evidence, and even essentially incredible; but it is undeniable that most of the leading protestant nobles, and probably even Moray, knew beforehand that the death of Darnley was determined on, and practically, if not formally, consented to his death. Dr. Forst explains the failure of Moray to proceed against Huntly and other well-known conspirators by the fact of their power; but to suppose that Moray was actuated by consuming anxiety to revenge the death of Darnley is to beg the question. The procedure in the first instance against Bothwell, and finally against the queen, for the murder was dictated solely by political motives. It was on this account alone in some degree hypocritical; but, in addition to this, the prosecutors had to control the evidence of the witnesses so as to exclude its reference to other conspirators.

T. F. Henderson.

Calendar of Letters and State Papers relating to English Affairs, preserved principally in the Archives of Simancas. Vol. II. Elizabeth, 1568–1579. Edited by Martin A. S. Hume, F.R.Hist.S. Published under the direction of the Master of the Rolls. (London: H.M. Stationery Office. 1894.)

Probably before the publication of the Venetian and Spanish calendars no one would ever have guessed at the immense importance of foreign archives in enabling English people to read in its true light the history of their own nation. The earlier volumes of the Spanish archives, edited by M. Bergenroth, have upset many a cherished theory which had held its ground without challenge for two or three centuries, and have scattered to the winds many a prejudice derived from the perusal of protestant historians. But what is most surprising in the whole matter is the light thrown upon the gossip of the English court by the despatches of the Venetian and still more by those of the Spanish ambassadors of the reign of Henry VIII. The despatches of Eustace Chapuys are more valuable in this respect than all the accumulated treasures of the Record Office and the Cottonian library in the British Museum. It cannot, indeed, be said that the records preserved at Simancas relating to the first twenty years of Elizabeth's reign are so rich, either as regards general history or courtly gossip, as those which have appeared under the editorial care of M. Bergenroth or Don Pascual de Gayangos. Still they are in both these respects of considerable value. Two volumes of the reign have already appeared. Of the first, which was reviewed in our January number of 1894, we shall have nothing to say except so far as may be necessary in illustration of the contents of the second.

At the opening of this volume Don Guzman de Silva is still ambassador from Philip of Spain, but is superseded by Don Guerau de Spes in the summer of the year 1568, very soon after the dismissal of Dr. Mann, the English ambassador to Spain, who had disgusted Philip by his outspoken revilings of the pope and the Roman church. Mann must have been most injudicious, for, not content with scoffing at religious processions, he had been heard to say that the pope was a canting little monk. After the recall of Don Guerau, who had suggested his own removal and was sent as ambassador to Venice, there is no ambassador; but Antonio de Guaras, a merchant of London, carried on the diplomatic intercourse between the two courts for four or five years, till the appointment of Bernardino de Mendoza in January 1578. The name of Antonio de Guaras was, we believe, almost unknown to English historians till Mr. Froude's history of the reign of Elizabeth appeared, and even there the notices of him are few and far between. It will be better known in the future, not only because of the prominent part played by him, as detailed in the numerous letters addressed by him to Philip and others calendared in this volume, but also by the interesting monograph published in 1892 by Mr. Richard Garnett. After the dismissal of Don Guerau de Spes in December 1571, upon the discovery of his complicity in Ridolfi's plot, he plays a most important part, for though not accredited as ambassador he behaves himself and is treated by the queen and Cecil almost exactly as if he were. He must have been an old man, for he had been living in

this country for nearly forty years, and seems to have been highly trusted by the king of Spain, for in his instructions to Guzman de Silva, who had preceded Guerau de Spes as ambassador, Philip had recommended him to avail himself of the services of Guaras, as being thoroughly conversant with English affairs. The same advice was not given to the new ambassador, against whose wishes Guaras was appointed to look after Spanish interests in England after his departure. No one would guess from the tone of the letters addressed by him to Philip and the duke of Alva, as well as those addressed to himself by the king, that he held no official position. In fact he was caressed by the queen and her minister, just as if there had been no foundation for the suspicions which had long been entertained at the English court as regards his actions and intentions. He had been kept a prisoner in his own or some other house since 8 May 1569, till the time when he was seized and turned out, every room having been locked and sealed up in the queen's name. He managed, however, to write many letters to Philip and the duke of Alva, some of which amply vindicate the suspicions entertained about him. Thus in June 1570 he gives his opinion unreservedly that 'if his majesty would now attack England he could conquer it without drawing the sword if the force sent were of sufficient extent, because in such case all the catholics would at once join him, whereas if the force were not equal to that of the English it is feared they (the catholics) would join their fellow countrymen on the defensive' (p. 252). Afterwards he says that the council clearly understand that if Spain were to declare itself openly the majority of the English would come over to their side. Between 3 Sept. 1570 and 26 March 1572 no letter of his appears in the Simancas archives, but it is evident that at the latter date he is quite at liberty, and apparently on the best of terms with Burghley, who, he says, rules the whole of the country. For some reason or other both the queen and her prime minister found it worth their while to pet and caress him, both of them wishing to diminish the strained relations existing between the two countries since the dismissal of the ambassador. His sympathies as far as religion is concerned may be judged by the account he gives in a letter to the duke of Alva, 30 Aug. 1572. After detailing what he has heard of St. Bartholomew's massacre—viz. that 'eight thousand huguenots have been put to death, the whole faction, together with the man they call the king of Navarre, the prince of Condé, and the admiral of France, as well as all the principal persons met together for the marriage feast of Navarre'—he adds, 'God grant that it may be true and that these rebel heretics have met with this bad end' (p. 409). Again, in a letter addressed to the duke of Alva he says that when the news of the massacre reached England the bishops went to the queen, urging upon her that the imprisoned bishops and clergy should all be executed, but that the queen would not consent to it.

From 6 to 12 October he was at court every day, apparently endeavouring with Burghley to smooth over all the difficulties of the situation, and was of opinion that Burghley was willing to make some sacrifices, if only a good understanding could be arrived at between Philip and Elizabeth. But at the beginning of the next month Guaras was suspected of being of the cabal conspiring against the queen. Though

after December 1572 the Simancas records give us no information for nearly two years, the gap is filled by extracts from his correspondence preserved in the Cottonian library and elsewhere in the British Museum. From December 1574 till the time of his arrest and imprisonment they are continuous. He was certainly in correspondence with Mary queen of Scots, at that time a prisoner in England, as he had been also with the prince's 'good grandmother,' who had years ago written to him on the subject of James's marriage with the infanta, and with others who were plotting rebellion, and it was not without very reasonable cause that he anticipated his arrest on 19 Oct. 1577 by destroying his letters and papers. He was not released till May 1579, after Bernardino de Mendoza had been appointed ambassador to England. The renewal of diplomatic relations with Spain probably saved his life, the queen having told the new ambassador that he would have been hanged if he had not been one of Philip's subjects. Soon afterwards he was ordered to leave England within ten days of 3 June, but fresh suspicions arose and he did not escape from the country till the end of May in the following year; and the last we hear of him is his stay in Paris till July, on his return to his native country. We have dwelt the longer on Guaras's history partly because he has been so little noticed till lately and partly because of the singular position which he held for five years, acting almost as if he were an ambassador, though possessing no credentials as such. In fact he makes a claim for a grant of 20,000 crowns on the score of his having served the king since the time when the duchess of Parma first employed him, and especially for the service rendered for more than seven years since the beginning of the troubles of 1570–1578, and for his having settled matters in which others who had been sent to negotiate had failed, and that to the surprise of everybody.

As regards the general contents of the volume, they are extremely interesting; and for those who do not care to read the documents they have been well epitomised in the editor's preface. But Major Hume, though well acquainted with the history of the period, writes English in an awkward style and is not always very perspicuous. In other respects the volume is not perfectly edited, and, what is quite inexcusable in so large a type as that in which these works are issued, there are many mistakes of press, of which the modest sample of eleven given in the meagre list of *errata* represents not so much as a tithe of the proper number. There ought also to have been more notes, to explain the names of persons with whom ordinary readers are not familiar. Some, perhaps, it would have been impossible to find out, such havoc do Spanish writers make with English names, and in the present case this difficulty is increased by the fact that nearly all these despatches were written in cipher. As a specimen we select *Katermilme* as the Spanish for *Walter Mildmay.*

The chief feature to be noticed is the contrast between the respective attitudes of Spain and England. In the first volume Spain is dominant, but before the conclusion of the second England has entirely gained the ascendency. All the time the two sovereigns were addressing each other as the dearest friends, yet Elizabeth was doing all she could to foster and encourage the revolt of the Netherlands, and Philip was only hindered by

his own indecision from following the advice of his ambassadors and invading England. And yet there was a moment when he was almost persuaded to undertake what he thought would result in the re-establishment of the catholic faith in England. Guerau de Spes on 8 Jan. 1569 had conveyed to him the message of the queen of Scots, 'Tell the ambassador that if his master will help me I shall be queen of England in three months, and mass shall be said all over the country.' The message reached the king of Spain a few days before he wrote his letter to the duke of Alva in which he says, 'Don Guerau points out . . . the good opportunity . . . to remedy religious affairs in that country by deposing the present queen and giving the crown to the queen of Scotland, who would immediately be joined by all the catholics. It will be well . . . to inquire . . . what success would probably attend such a design. . . . If you think the chance will be lost by again waiting to consult me, you may at once take the steps you may consider advisable in conformity with this my desire and intention.' The invasion of England was deferred for nearly twenty years, the duke of Alva's present view being that an open rupture with England at the present time would scarcely be 'advantageous, considering the state of the treasury,' and the Netherlands being 'so exhausted with the war and late disturbances and so bereft of ships and many other things necessary for a fresh war.'

In one point Philip was wiser than all the queen's advisers. He saw, what few other councillors did, that the queen never intended to marry, but was only fooling her suitors, partly for political reasons, partly out of mere coquetry. The idea of a marriage with the archduke of Austria was nearly extinct at the beginning of this volume, and that with either of the brothers of the French king was coming to its termination before the end of it. It seems most probable that Elizabeth had made up her mind not to marry after all idea of Leicester's success was over. What reason she had was best known to herself, but if common reports were true no one can wonder that such was her determination. In December 1574 Guaras speaks of a plan which was concerted for marrying one of the sons of the earl of Hertford and Lady Catharine Grey 'to a daughter of Leicester and the queen of England, who, it is said, is kept hidden, although there are bishops to witness that she is legitimate' (p. 491).

We gather both from the accounts of this and of the preceding volume that Elizabeth, though she could upon occasion hold her own against all her council, has been credited with more diplomatic address than she deserves. She is almost uniformly spoken of as being wholly given up to pleasure, whilst in the numerous divergences of opinion amongst her councillors Cecil appears to manage everything his own way. Both the queen and her astute minister were quite alive to the importance of the proverb *Divide et impera* and to the desirableness of preserving the balance of power in Europe; but the application of the maxim was difficult in the case of assisting the rebellion in the Low Countries, when there was a chance of their being annexed to France. To cripple Spain was very desirable, but to aggrandise France was a policy distinctly to be avoided; and both in assisting the huguenots in the one country and the Calvinists in the other her ministers did not feel the same difficulty which could not but present itself to the mind of the queen, that to encourage the re-

bellion of subjects against their sovereign might form a precedent for the same game being played against herself by the catholics of England. Nevertheless the truth of the Venetian ambassador's saying, that the 'queen of England feeds herself and lives in safety upon the losses and misfortunes of others,' was recognised in other courts than that of the most Christian king and his mother.[1] But the queen of England in both cases boldly protested that she was acting only as mediator, and that if her advice had been listened to the affairs both of France and of Flanders would not now be in their present condition.[2] This was in answer to the queen mother's haughty words to Elizabeth's ambassador that it was useless to deny the assistance rendered to the insurgents at La Rochelle, and that his queen would live to repent her mode of proceeding.

As for the ecclesiastical matters of the second decade of the reign, there is less that is new in this second volume than in the first. But it entirely confirms what might have been gathered from the first, that the number of adherents to the old faith was much greater both among clergy and laity than has been commonly supposed. It may be gathered from notices scattered up and down in both volumes that Elizabeth vainly strove to convince herself that the church had been reformed after the Lutheran model; but that Lutheranism existed in England only in her own idea, the mass of her protestant and puritan subjects being wholly Calvinist. One of the items in the faulty and insufficient index is entered thus, with six places of reference: 'Augustinian Creed.' Probably most people would interpret this as meaning the creed of Calvin, which Calvinists have always tried to represent as identical with that of St. Augustine. Reference to the places where the word occurs will show that it is not the Augustinian creed, but the Augustan creed or the confession of Augsburg, that is alluded to. In three of them it is definitely spoken of as such, and one of the passages alludes to the town of Augsburg and has nothing whatever to do with the celebrated confession of faith which derives its name from that town. As regards the character and conduct of the bishops and clergy of the new learning, a Spanish ambassador was not likely to have a very favourable opinion; but we learn from him that Jewel of Salisbury, whom he styles a great heretic, had been the chief instigator when the queen seized the money sent by Philip for the pay of his troops in the Netherlands, the bishop saying that God had sent it to defend his gospel (p. 91). In another letter, written by a Portuguese named Fogada, we are again told that, as a revenge for the massacre of St. Bartholomew's day, the English 'bishops went to the queen and represented to her that, to prevent disturbances, the bishops and other clergy now imprisoned should be executed' (p. 412).[3]

We have been obliged to omit all reference to Elizabeth's treatment of the unfortunate queen of Scots, but may, perhaps, have an opportunity of recurring to that subject after the appearance of the next volume of this valuable series.

[1] *Venetian Calendar*, 1558–1580, p. 568. [2] *Ibid.* p. 561.

[3] Compare above, p. 163.

Martiri di Libero Pensiero e Vittime della Santa Inquisizione nei Secoli XVI, XVII, e XVIII. Per A. Bertolotti. (Roma: Tipografia delle Mantellate. 1892.)

This is a very useful and, for certain purposes, valuable collection of documents relating to executions and other punishments carried out by the civil governor of Rome, during the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, at the instance of the Roman inquisition. The documents have been made accessible by the fact that the archives of this official came into the hands of the government of Italy on the occupation of Rome. They are published with the view of illustrating the activity of the Roman inquisition during these centuries; but Signor Bertolotti is careful to point out that they cannot be taken as at all representing the entire activity of that body, inasmuch as these pages only refer to those who were handed over to the civil power for certain punishments. The archives of the inquisition itself are not accessible, being kept by that still existing Congregation, and are not open to the inspection of the historian. Signor Bertolotti has, however, supplemented his information on these matters by the help of the archives of Mantua and other Italian states, in which a considerable correspondence with the inquisition is preserved.

The object of the compiler is, he tells us in his introduction, purely historical, and no attack is intended specially on the Roman church. 'All churches,' he says, with some truth, 'I believe to be intolerant.' It is perhaps a pity that he should somewhat depreciate the value of what seems as a whole to be a carefully collected series of historical records by an introduction which is, to say the least, somewhat unnecessarily excited. This undue excitement has perhaps a little tended to weaken the author's sense of what should properly be called religious persecution. In his introduction he speaks of Pius V as having been the cause of severe persecutions of 'heretics, Jews, Turks, prostitutes, and journalists' (if we may so translate *gazzettieri*); and the list sufficiently shows that Signor Bertolotti has hardly considered what classes of persons the state should tolerate, and what class the state may be compelled to repress. But this mere slip in the introduction would be of little moment if it were not that it is perhaps this confusion which has led Signor Bertolotti to include under his 'martyrs' many whose offences appear to be almost purely political. Examples of this may be seen in Signor Bertolotti's fifth section, where he gives us documents concerning the execution of Gian Paolo Baglioni in 1520, and in his nineteenth section, in which he gives extracts from the archives of the governor of Rome of the year 1565 with respect to the execution of some person or persons accused of conspiring to murder Pius IV. Signor Bertolotti himself points out that these are political executions; but why did he include the notices of them in his work? Other examples of the same confusion can be found in sections xxvii. and xxix., while in sections xxxix., xl., and lxxii. the causes of punishment are not stated. These records are all interesting, but they do not seem to belong to the work as it is described in its title. Indeed, this title obviously needs alteration. There are in the book no records of the eighteenth century at all, and only seventeen sections respecting the seventeenth century.

The collection is still, however, interesting and useful. There has

always been some doubt as to the extent and character of the action of the Roman inquisition, and this collection gives us some interesting and trustworthy material. It shows that the inquisition was at least at times sufficiently active, but also it seems to bring out the fact that its activity was not very great as compared with that of similar organisations elsewhere. It is quite true, as Signor Bertolotti says, that the documents only represent a part of the activity of the inquisition, but probably they do represent to some extent the more serious and severe punishments inflicted by it. Signor Bertolotti's reference to the *miriadi di roghi inalzati nella città dei Papi* is an absurd and not very creditable exaggeration. It is to be regretted, at least from the point of view of the historian, that the Congregation of the Inquisition does not publish its records, but according to Signor Bertolotti there still remain large quantities of registers belonging to the office of the governor of Rome, accessible to the historical student and not yet examined. It is impossible that any final judgment should be passed upon the subjects connected with persecution in Rome until this has been done. A. J. CARLYLE.

Periods of European History. V. *Europe,* 1598–1715. By HENRY OFFLEY WAKEMAN. (London: Rivington, Percival, & Co. 1894.)

MR. WAKEMAN has been well advised in imparting, if not unity, at least something of cohesion to his narrative by directing the special attention of his readers to the growth of the monarchical power of France, and thus, as it were, repeatedly recalling them to their bearings. Not that several of his other chapters or passages are inferior in execution to those which deal with French affairs; while of his personal sketches, with which he has evidently taken pains, that of Lewis XIV, whose essentially royal qualities he underrates, does not strike me as the most successful. His account of the thirty years' war, one of the few historical subjects of the kind in which English learners have been lucidly instructed, is careful and competent throughout, and his references to Swedish history by no means owe the whole of their effectiveness to Geijer's patriotic pages. It is at times difficult to suppress a wish that teachers would trust a little more to one another's powers of presentment, and that such historical knowledge and literary ability as Mr. Wakeman's could be spent upon more enduring work. I had noted various details in his book which to my mind might be modified with advantage; but the effect of the whole is good, and the workmanship scholarly, and I see no reason for quarrelling with the mere mannerisms of an excellent course of lectures. It would be even less excusable to take up the gauntlet which Mr. Wakeman throws down in his preface, when he says that in his spelling of names he has followed custom as 'the only reasonable and consistent rule.' In theory he is perfectly right; but does custom at Oxford or elsewhere tolerate such hybrids as 'Cleves-Jülich' and 'Lothaire of Trier'? And for what reason does a 'duke' in France become a *duc*, unless it be to mark the distinction that 'in England the nobles were a class singled out from their fellow-countrymen by greater responsibilities, in France they became a caste distinguished from the inferior people by special privileges'? In this, as in most of Mr. Wakeman's antitheses, with which, indeed, he overflows,

there is truth as well as point; but students should so far as possible be spared sayings which not only require but challenge criticism. I venture on this hint because, notwitstanding his manifest tendency to epigram, Mr. Wakeman's judgments, both in pragmatic and in personal history, strike me as on the whole singularly well-balanced and fair.

A. W. Ward.

The Diary of Samuel Pepys, M.A., F.R.S. With Lord Braybrooke's Notes. Edited, with Additions, by Henry B. Wheatley. Vols. II.–IV. (London: George Bell & Sons. 1893–4.)

At the present time of writing the new edition of Pepys's 'Diary' has reached its fourth volume, over which the expurgator's sponge, if it has passed at all, has passed with the very gentlest touch. Since in a former number of this Review fault was found with Mr. Wheatley's treatment of certain passages of the manuscript with which he had to deal in editing his first volume, I may as well say that these passages concerned Mrs. Pepys. Although the partner of her lot only set her down as 'a very good companion as long as she was well,' she ought, well or ill, to have been protected against indignities of publicity from which honest women have hitherto been allowed to remain exempt. On the other hand, I am glad to record my conviction that the self-exposure of her husband can, in the interest of good morals and manners, hardly be carried too far, though in what sense it could be carried further than it is in the present edition of his 'Diary' one shrinks from imagining. I am not referring to the items of his personal bill of health, and to matters elucidatory thereof, which are preserved in the amber of these pages; for I have no opinion either way as to their utility or futility. But to psychology and ethics he becomes the more precious the more they can see of him. His frailties and his frankness in committing them to cipher have as a matter of course all along been understood to constitute essential elements both in his character and in the infinite entertainment which the study of it has furnished to posterity. But a perusal of the volumes now before me establishes the conclusion that these frailties and this frankness alike sprang from a brutality of nature, restrained by nothing in heaven or earth but a fear of immediate consequences. The flutterings of a feeble conscience, the uneasy remembrance of days when self-indulgence was not in fashion, and the promptings of a shrewd common sense, which did excellent duty for a better philosophy of life, suggested those expressions of self-dissatisfaction which wear the pleading aspect of remorse. While a veil rested on part of these ingenuous confessions it seemed as easy to forgive Pepys when he was weak as to applaud him when he was resolute. Thus he practically, and with only an occasional pardonable relapse, overcame the habit of drinking; and when he airily confesses himself a slave to beauty it seems almost sufficient to condemn him to the laughter which is probably the last sentence he would have chosen to incur. But facts are stubborn things; and not even the Joseph Surface of any age could tolerate the man who calmly holds over a wanton assignation to next 'Lord's day,' and goes forth to commit adultery a few hours after giving

his wife a black eye. Whether it was that the diarist desired to deepen the obscurity of his cipher by the occasional use of French words in dangerous places, or whether as he drew nearer to the *beau monde* he thought himself entitled to interlard his speech with scraps of its favourite tongue, nothing else could have more appropriately completed the contemptibility of the exhibition than these conveyances. Here is, so far as it can be extracted, a specimen of a style which I much fear gave secret pleasure to the writer, but which, ludicrous as it is, cannot be quoted without an effort of patience. (Pepys has been recounting an adventure with the wife of a dockyard *employé*, whom he had basely taken advantage of his official position to seduce.) 'But strange to see how a woman, notwithstanding her greatest pretence of love *a son mari* and religion, may be *vaincue*.' And in the same paragraph, after a sentence concerning official business, 'So to my office a little and to Jervas's again, thinking *avoir rencontrais* [sic] Jane, *mais elle n'était pas dedans*. So I back again to my office, where I did with great content *ferais* a vow to mind my business, and *laisser aller les femmes* for a month, and am with all my heart glad to find myself able to come to so good a resolution, that thereby I may follow my business which and my honour thereby lies a-bleeding.'

His 'honour' has, of course, no relation to his conscience; he means his official reputation. For the rest, although in the secrecy of his own chamber this vanquisher of workmen's half-terrified wives and of willing ale-house wenches could write in the above cynical strain, he disliked coarseness of speech in high places, whether from honest Lord Craven when in committee or from King Charles II himself, of whose ribald wit, deliberately designed to raise in others the blush of which his majesty was himself incapable, the 'Diary,' early in vol. iv., contains an example worth the notice of all who think leniently of the royal saunterer. The reason for this apparent self-contradiction may have been twofold. In the first place there is, apart from the awkward reminiscences of his friend Christmas, sufficient internal evidence to show that Pepys was bred a puritan; and again, nature had indisputably endowed him with no ordinary share of good sense. It is true that the details of his puritan breeding are missing, since, with the exception of an incidental passage or two in the 'Diary,' we have no information concerning his early life before the period on which Mr. Firth's recent discovery has thrown light. (It may be observed in passing that, notwithstanding his Montagu connexion, or perhaps one should rather say in consequence of its character, he had not been accustomed in his younger days to move in good company on terms of ease. See the curious passage, ii. 229, where he ingenuously confesses that on a visit to a house full of fine ladies he 'was much out of countenance, and could hardly carry himself like a man among them.') Of his precise early training the influence remained with him, and finds expression in his matter-of-course resort to pious phrases, and in the formalism of mind without which his system of private oaths and his solemn satisfaction in observing the letter of these engagements would be simply inconceivable. But the same influence also manifests itself under certain more attractive aspects of his character. He records (iii. 336–8) with every token of concurrence a very remarkable conversation with an outspoken but perfectly reasonable admirer of the republican system; he notes (iv. 210) with

characteristically cautious sympathy the arrest by constables of several 'poor creatures' for attending a conventicle. 'They go like lambs, without any resistance. I would to God they would either conform or be more wise, and not be catched!' And, with all his subserviency to the times, he has an unmistakable aversion against the court and courtiers, and as manifest a respect for the memory of Oliver Cromwell, whom in the later days of his protectorate Pepys seems to have had special opportunities of meeting. There can be little doubt but that the puritan element in Pepys contributed to lend steadiness and accuracy to his judgment of men and things; to keep his eyes open to the incredibly low standard of public as well as private morals under the new *régime* to which he had as a matter of course 'adhered;' to make him regard 'the great turn' of the Restoration as a *de facto* settlement which might quite possibly be succeeded by another; and ready as his back was to bend to authority, whether in the person of Lord Chancellor Clarendon or that of the duke of Albemarle (how admirably he portrays the nervous reserve of the one and the astute stolidity of the other!), to prevent his opportunism from running away with his judgment.

Pepys thought (iii. 23) that chance rather than policy had determined the rise of most men of his acquaintance. This view of things, which there was certainly much to favour, was specially brought home to him by his experiences in the particular branch of the public service in which, through his early connexion with Sandwich, the 'my lord' of the 'Diary,' the best part of his life came to be spent. The devotion with which he requited his patron's kindness is all the more to his credit, inasmuch as it was the reverse of servile, and he was not afraid of administering a wholesome warning to a chief whose goodwill was the best security of his own future, and who actually had a great part of his dependent's money in his hands. But the history of the navy office, like that of the navy itself during the early years of the Restoration age, is too wide a subject to be discussed here. It is at the same time difficult to read—or re-read—any portion of the story of our naval administration (let us say before the Reform Bill) without increased wonder at the forces which insured the survival of both navy and nation. Probably the corruption was not worse under Charles II than it had been under Charles I, or than it proved in some later periods; and though Pepys complains of the extremely small number of naval men in parliament competent to look after the business, I am not aware that the remedy has ever been very seriously looked for in this direction. His own struggles are in so far edifying that he honestly endeavoured to serve the king's interests in the first instance, and his own pocket and plate chest only by the way. Survey, flags, timber—matters of secondary and matters of primary importance—his eye at least was on them all; and want of power rather than want of will—certainly not want of insight—precluded him from sweeping clean all the crannies of the department. At the close of vol. iv. of this edition we leave him with a more than doubtful prospect of cultivating with enduring success 'Tangier, one of the best flowers in his garden,' and enjoying in the naval successes which had followed upon the first failures or rumours of failures in the first Dutch war of the reign a very delusive contradiction of his gloomy but sagacious earlier forebodings. For when or just

before the war broke out he had perceived very clearly that there was nothing we wanted so much as men, unless it was money. In comparison with this just censure of our weakness his criticisms of particular commanders (such as Prince Rupert), shrewd as they are, sink into insignificance.

As is well known, the later portions of the 'Diary' exhibit more fully than those now before us the efforts of Pepys under the *aegis* of the duke of York towards a reorganisation of the navy office; and it is in connexion with these that his claims to remembrance as a public servant may yet receive ampler recognition than has hitherto been accorded to them. There is no other side of his life that will bear the close scrutiny which his record of part of its course so pressingly invites, unless it be his musical pursuits, of which the guiding taste and judgment receive corroboration in this edition of the 'Diary' from some interesting notes based on the criticisms of the late Dr. Francis Hueffer. Unhappily, since even in his private life Pepys knew the value of discretion, the chances are small of the recovery of much further evidence, by which it might prove possible to illustrate him from himself in his less guarded moments. Yet it is tantalising to read of his wholesale destruction, at Christmastide 1664, of everything in his papers or books that he judged to be 'either boyish or not to be worth keeping or fit to be seen, if it should please God to take him away suddenly'—not to mention the romance which, under the title of 'Love a Cheate,' he began when in residence at Cambridge, and which, on reading it over ten years afterwards, he liked very well, or (though this never was more than a project) the 'History of the Dutch Wars,' a theme which he recognised as 'sorting mightily with his genius,' or the 'Book of Stories,' which, early in 1664, he was actually keeping up to date, and in which he entered some of his 'excellent good table talke' with the Coventrys and some of his office colleagues.

Mr. Wheatley's edition of the 'Diary,' as already observed, leaves nothing to be desired as to the completeness of its text, and publishers and printers have done their best to make it a standard edition in form as well as in matter. As to the annotations, while Lord Braybrooke's on the whole excellent notes have been reprinted, the new editor has preferred brevity in his own additions, and has not, on the whole, been prodigal of the stores of his well-known antiquarian learning. This is as it should be, for superfluity is as much the abhorrence as it is the temptation of the scholar. Yet a good literary note, not too narrowly measured, has its charm; see, for instance, Mr. Wheatley's (iv. 322) confirming Lord Braybrooke's identification of the 'ballet' mentioned by Pepys with the famous 'To all you ladies now on land,' and consequent establishment of the date of that poem. As Mr. Wheatley's edition will presumably not include the 'Correspondence,' his note on iii. 168 might have stated explicitly that two letters from Dryden to Pepys, whom in the former he addresses as *padron mio* on the occasion of sending him Chaucer's 'Good Parson,' are actually extant. And this reminds me that if it was necessary to reprint Lord Braybrooke's illustrations of Pepys's account of the glorious third of June, taken from that far from attractive volume 'Poems on State Affairs,' the 'Annus Mirabilis' might have deserved at least a refer-

ence, more especially as a fancy in Dryden's lines on the death of Sir John Lawson was afterwards unceremoniously adopted and improved by Campbell. There could have been no harm, again (to pass from laureate to laureate), in enlarging the note on Epsom Wells, of the waters of which Pepys partook with so startling a freedom, by a reference to Shadwell; by the way, in the text to which this note is attached (iii. 222, line 18) the omission of the indefinite article makes Pepys say the opposite of what he obviously intended; conversely (ii. 309) the editor suggests the insertion of a verb strange in this collocation to seventeenth-century usage. Instead of being at the pains of enlightening his readers as to the derivation of 'scotoscope' (iv. 215), and the meaning of 'fellmonger' (ii. 75), the editor might have cleared up the allusion to the mysterious innovation favoured by Mrs. Pepys when she apparently donned a white wig (iv. 373), and have given us the real name of the 'red Rhenish wine called Bleahard, a pretty wine, and not mixed, as they say' (iii. 173). Was it, perchance, Bleichart (Ahrbleichart), a red hock still approved by those who affect the variety in question? In conclusion, the *cognoscenti* might have welcomed a note on the system of shorthand practised by Mr. (afterwards Sir William) Coventry, to which Pepys rather condescendingly refers (ii. 12). Mr. Wheatley is doubtless acquainted with the interesting paper by the late Mr. J. E. Bailey (Manchester, 1876), where it is shown that the system of stenography employed by Pepys was an earlier one than that which Lord Braybrooke seems to have assumed to be more or less followed by the diarist. A. W. WARD.

Madame: a Life of Henrietta, Daughter of Charles I and Duchess of Orleans. By JULIA CARTWRIGHT (Mrs. Henry Ady). (London: Seeley & Co. 1894.)

THIS is an interesting and well-written life of an attractive figure in the history of the seventeenth century. Mrs. Ady has added much to the earlier biography of the duchess given in Mrs. Everett Green's 'Lives of English Princesses.' Besides availing himself of Daniel de Conac's 'Memoirs' and the excellent edition of La Fayette's 'Histoire d'Henriette, published by M. Anatole France in 1882, she has used the English State Papers to good purpose. The value of the book to historians is greatly enhanced by the fact that it contains not merely a number of letters by Madame herself, but 98 letters from Charles II to his sister, now first published in their original form from the MSS. in the French foreign office. Readers of Sir John Dalrymple's 'Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland' will remember that he gives extracts from these letters, and a French translation of most of them was published in M. de Baillon's work on 'Henriette-Anne d'Angleterre' some ten years ago. But the raciness of the originals was entirely lost in the process. The chief defect of Mrs. Ady's work is that she does not give proper references for the facts stated and passages quoted in her text. In her bibliography in the introduction she should also have mentioned the article on 'Philippe d'Orléans et Madame Henriette d'Angleterre' contributed by Pierre Clément to the *Revue des Questions Historiques*. Finally, it is worth noting

that the papers of Earl De La Warr contain several letters from the duchess to Lord Fitzharding which have escaped Mrs. Ady's notice ('Fourth Report of the Historical MSS. Commission,' pp. 279, 280).

C. H. Firth.

The Life of John Churchill, Duke of Marlborough, to the Accession of Queen Anne. By Field-Marshal Viscount Wolseley, K.P. 2 vols. Third edition. (London: Bentley & Son. 1894.)

Lord Wolseley's life of Marlborough has already reached a third edition, nor is its success surprising. The subject is full of interest, and the life of a great general by one who writes with authority on military matters naturally commands attention. The two handsome volumes are printed in excellent type and illustrated by admirable reproductions of miniatures and contemporary maps. Lord Wolseley himself has taken great pains to produce a work of permanent value. His researches have been very extensive. He has made use of all the references to Marlborough which can be gathered from the 'Reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission.' The 'Domestic State Papers,' the papers of the war office, the archives of the French foreign office, the Clarke MSS. in Trinity College, Dublin, the Carte MSS. in the Bodleian library, and the collections at Blenheim Palace and Spencer House have all been laid under contribution. From these different sources a large amount of hitherto unpublished information has been brought together and employed to elucidate Marlborough's life. The new materials do not throw very much fresh light on Marlborough's political career, but his early life and personal history, and the history of the two families of Churchill and Jennings, are all retold with greater completeness and correctness by the aid of this evidence.

Marlborough's early military career occupies about a fourth or a fifth of these volumes, and the chapters devoted to the Sedgmoor campaign and the capture of Cork and Kinsale are additions of real value to English history. Lord Wolseley explains the movements of Monmouth and his opponents with greater clearness than previous writers, and sets in their true light Marlborough's eminent services during the campaign and in the final battle. 'Churchill,' he concludes, 'was the only officer on either side who displayed activity, vigilance, or any knowledge of war.' Throughout the campaign his commander, Feversham, 'never seems to have known what his enemy was doing, or where he was going, a fact which of itself proves he did not know his business. Before he assumed command Churchill, with only a small body of cavalry at his disposal, had hung upon the rebel army so closely that it could go nowhere, and neither do nor plan anything of which he was not fully aware. He harassed it night and day, cutting off stragglers, and preventing many from joining Monmouth who would otherwise have done so. But Feversham, with a stronger and much better army than the rebels could muster, always suffered Monmouth to take the initiative, and to do and go where he pleased, whilst the royal army merely blundered after them.' Another proof of Churchill's superiority was the correctness with which he conjectured Monmouth's design to get away north to his friends in Cheshire. 'It was characteristic of Marlborough that from apparently small indica-

tions he possessed the power of divining his enemies' plans, and was thus enabled to forestall them.' Turning to the battle which closed the campaign, Lord Wolseley's conclusion is that 'Feversham's fault was not so much an unskilful disposition of his piquets and outposts as the fact that he went to bed in ignorance of his enemy's doings and intentions.' The battle was lost to Monmouth 'chiefly through the bad handling and the misconduct of Grey's untrained horse and the cowardice of its leader.' Churchill's business in the battle was to neutralise by his own vigilance and energy his commander's incapacity and want of forethought. He put himself at the head of Dumbarton's regiment, checked by their fire the advancing rebel infantry, and gave the rest of the royal army time to form. He placed the artillery in the position where the support of the guns was most needed, brought fresh regiments into action, and led the dragoons to the capture of Monmouth's fieldpieces. In short, he made his presence felt throughout the whole of the king's army, and contributed more than any other man present to the success of the day. Macaulay's account of the campaign does not do full justice to Churchill's services but this is due rather to want of military knowledge than to his prejudice against Churchill. In his brief account of Marlborough's Munster campaign he gives him, in Lord Wolseley's view, more praise in one respect than he really deserves. After describing the capture of Cork Macaulay continues, 'No commander has ever understood better than Marlborough how to improve a victory. A few hours after Cork had fallen his cavalry were on the road to Kinsale.' Lord Wolseley, on the other hand, expressly blames Marlborough for not despatching his cavalry to Cork sooner. 'His horse and dragoons took no active part in the siege; they were available for other work, and might and ought to have been held in readiness throughout Sunday to start for Kinsale at a moment's notice. As soon as Colonel Macgillicuddy surrendered they should have marched without delay to summon Kinsale, before the news of the fall of Cork had reached that place. The distance was only seventeen and a half miles, and before daybreak on Monday the town ought to have been in Marlborough's possession and the two forts invested by his cavalry' (ii. 204). On such a question as this a non-military critic can scarcely pronounce any opinion. It is worth observing, however, that Sir William Napier, in some cursory criticisms on Marlborough's later campaigns, concludes that neither after Ramillies nor Oudenarde did Marlborough sufficiently improve his victory, and it will be curious to see if Lord Wolseley agrees with this verdict.[1] The effect of Marlborough's expedition is in one respect overrated by Lord Wolseley. He describes the departure of Lauzun and his French troops to France as caused by the fear of Marlborough's projected expedition, and thinks that the mere rumour of his intended attack on Cork sufficed to clear Ireland of the French contingent (ii. 162). On the other hand, as he himself states, Marlborough did not propose his scheme to William's council till $\frac{7}{17}$ Aug., and preparations for carrying it out did not begin much before the end of that month (ii. 151, 155). Now Lauzun's letters show conclusively that he had made up his mind to quit Ireland by the beginning of August, and was entreating his government to send orders

[1] *Life of William Napier*, ii. 242.

for the embarkation of his troops, and ships to carry them, some weeks before he could have heard of Marlborough's expedition.[2]

The history of Marlborough's campaigns is treated with great minuteness and great care, but at the same time with great vigour and spirit. The chapters which relate to his political career are by no means of equal merit, and those dealing with the general history of the time might with advantage have been omitted altogether. Lord Wolseley is not at home in the politics of the seventeenth century, either domestic or foreign, and has no grasp of the political conditions of the period and no exact knowledge of the facts. Equally unsuccessful are his laboured attempts to vindicate Marlborough. His conception of his hero's character is neither clear nor consistent, and his judgments are confused and contradictory. On one page he says of Marlborough, 'His moral character was as far above the age in which he lived as he was in ability above the men who governed it' (ii. 425). Twelve pages later we are told, 'His character does not inspire so much respect as his genius, but until he became captain-general at William's death his career had been little more than one long series of intrigues, sometimes with, sometimes against his colleagues.' The author then apologises for Marlborough's intrigues. 'His enemies declare that he did not play the game fairly; but who amongst his contemporaries did so? Not surely James II or William III, or Sunderland; not Shrewsbury, Nottingham, Godolphin, or Admiral Russell' (ii. 437). All this defence amounts to is that Marlborough was no worse than his contemporaries. What, then, becomes of the contention that 'his moral character was far above the age in which he lived'? Moreover even this defence is sometimes abandoned. 'There is much to find fault with in Marlborough's conduct during the reign of William and Mary, for he not only erred in judgment, but sinned against the common code of public morality' (ii. 112).

Lord Wolseley starts by laying down the principle that 'the more closely we study Marlborough's character the more clearly we see that with him a love for protestantism was a guiding principle, to which even his craving desire for power and renown was always subordinated' (i. 52, cf. pp. 28, 365). The first point in Marlborough's career which requires explanation is his desertion of James II in 1688. The motive which he alleged himself was solely his attachment to the protestant religion. His conduct, he said in his letter to James, 'could proceed from nothing but the inviolable dictates of my conscience and a necessary concern for my religion.' Lord Wolseley fully accepts this explanation: 'Beyond all doubt he firmly believed that in seeking to create William king he was serving God by furthering the interests of protestantism' (ii. 85). Accepting this plea, the question remains whether the treachery which marked his desertion, and the time he selected for it, can be similarly excused. Lord Wolseley answers that desertion in the face of the enemy is the greatest of military crimes, and that from a military point of view it is impossible to acquit Marlborough of desertion. Moreover his conduct towards James personally was 'in the highest degree treacherous and deceitful,' and his behaviour and that of the officers who deserted with him 'implies a depth of baseness and treachery which is all

[2] See Rousset, *Louvois*, ed. 1879, iv. 427-30.

but diabolical.' But 'the deceitfulness into which he was led through his determination to rid the country of James II did not strike him as sinful or dishonourable, for in following the course which he deliberately chose he acted as he believed was best for England.' Had he resigned his commission, as an honourable man would have done, he might have been sent to the Tower; had he joined William in Flanders, as honester men did do, he would not have been able to induce part of the English army to desert with him, and then the revolution might not have been successfully effected (ii. 81–7). In short, while Marlborough's duty to his God obliged him to desert James, his duty to his country justified him in deserting in a peculiarly treacherous and dishonourable manner. According to Lord Wolseley motives of personal ambition had no influence in determining Marlborough's conduct at this crisis. On the contrary, he acted in direct opposition to his personal interests (i. 376, ii. 39, 83). The weak point of this theory is that the result proved that Marlborough had not acted in opposition to his personal interests, and he was quite astute enough to foresee that result. William made him a privy councillor and a gentleman of the bedchamber, and raised him to the dignity of an earl. Marlborough had expected to be rewarded for his desertion of James, for he almost immediately proceeded to grumble because he thought his rewards insufficient. 'He was thoroughly discontented,' says the author, 'with the inadequate rewards he had received for his great service to William at the revolution' (ii. 115, 227). This is clearly incompatible with the view that duty to God and duty to his country had been his sole motives.

His treason to William is still less defensible than his treason to James. Discontented with the government he had helped to set up, he entered into communication with James, protested penitence and devotion, and supplied him with information about William's military and naval plans. Duty to his God, duty to his country, and an ardent love for the protestant religion do not help to explain his conduct here. His biographer's defence is that he did not mean to fulfil his promises to James. 'It was all lip work.' 'In his heart he loathed the principles upon which James had governed; his conduct, therefore, throughout this correspondence with St. Germains must have been dictated by purely selfish motives. . . . There were a variety of chances in favour of James's restoration, and the far-seeing Marlborough desired to make himself safe in the event of any one of them coming off. . . . He was as careful as a modern bookmaker to hedge against every possible turn of fortune's wheel' (ii. 228, 231, 317, 442). On the author's own showing Marlborough's second treason was entirely dictated by a desire for his personal security, and we are justified in concluding that his first treason was partly dictated by a desire for his personal aggrandisement.

Throughout both volumes the author constantly attacks Swift and Macaulay, and, it must be owned, not without provocation. But his language concerning them is extravagant and unmeasured. Macaulay is described as 'our great historical novelist.' An historian would have contented himself with saying that Macaulay was a great historian with great faults, but writers who are not qualified by training or knowledge to appreciate Macaulay's merits are naturally more sweeping. Swift is

denounced as the author and inspirer of all the historical charges against Marlborough. 'Each succeeding historian has been content to follow Marlborough's story as it was originally told for party purposes by the unscrupulous Swift' (ii. 422). This is not correct, for the most serious charges against Marlborough are based on documents of which Swift knew nothing. Lord Wolseley himself is constrained to admit that Marlborough's own conduct supplied a substantial foundation for the charges made against him. 'It must be freely admitted that during the years 1688–1698 Marlborough's career was sullied with acts which in the present day would place him beyond the pale of society, and which furnished Swift and Macaulay with ample materials for condemning him' (ii. 82).

The question of Swift's charges against Marlborough has been discussed at length in a letter from Mr. Henry Craik printed in the *Times* 14 May 1894, and in an article on 'Marlborough, Macaulay, and for Swift' which appeared in the *United Service Magazine* for the following June. For political purposes Swift adopted and popularised the theory that Marlborough's ruling motive was avarice, and Macaulay subsequently adopted the theory as a key to Marlborough's character, and reasserted it with greater emphasis and more lasting effect. Marlborough's love of money was undeniable. 'Want of money had engendered in Churchill that strict attention to economy from which parsimony is often bred. Long-practised frugality degenerates easily into penuriousness, and that again into miserly habits and avarice. It did so in his case, and afforded grounds for the biting invective of the Swifts and Manleys of his own day and of the Macaulays, Thackerays, and other romance-writers of the present century' (i. 132). Underlying the charges which Swift and Macaulay bring against Marlborough there is a basis of truth, and when the exaggerations with which those charges were accompanied have been refuted the main charges themselves remain to be dealt with. For instance, the charge that Marlborough betrayed the Brest expedition to James in order to get rid of his rival Tollemache is entirely groundless. The subject is fully discussed in Paget's 'Paradoxes and Puzzles,' and some new evidence on the subject of the expedition has been recently printed in this Review (January 1894). But that Marlborough did betray the expedition remains certain, and when exaggeration and fiction are separated from the truth the charges which remain proved against Marlborough are sufficient to refute the conception of his character set forth by Lord Wolseley. He fails to see the bearing of the facts he records and the consequences of the admissions he makes. If it is erroneous to represent avarice as Marlborough's guiding motive in life, it is at least equally erroneous to say that his guiding motive was his love for protestantism.

In conclusion a few miscellaneous minor points may be noticed. Klopp's 'Der Fall des Hauses Stuart' contains some letters written by different Austrian agents relating to Marlborough's dismissal in 1692 (vi. 375), and to his part in the negotiations which led to the formation of the grand alliance (vol. ix. *passim*). The statement that 'the great Locke' contributed 400*l.* towards Monmouth's expedition has been proved erroneous (see Fox Bourne, 'Life of Locke,' ii. 20, and the article on

Locke in the 'Dictionary of National Biography'). Misprints of proper names are far too numerous.[3]

C. H. FIRTH.

Un Paladin au XVIIIme Siècle: le Prince Charles de Nassau-Siegen, d'après sa Correspondance originale et inédite de 1784 à 1789. Par le MARQUIS D'ARAGON. (Paris : Librairie Plon. 1893.)

'PRINCE CHARLES OF NASSAU-SIEGEN,' who seems quite towards the close of his life to have established his claims to a title which had been denied to him so long as a holy Roman empire and a principality of Nassau-Siegen were in existence, is fortunate in his biographer. This volume, though it will hardly resuscitate a reputation which has all but vanished from the pages of history, furnishes a good example of a kind of monograph in which French literature continues to excel ; nor is there anything pretentious about the way in which the marquis d'Aragon has executed his task, unless it be the introductory flourish on his title-page. Why should an adventurer of doubtful descent, and a courageous soldier (or sailor) of fortune, gifted with a light heart, a ready pen, and a steady eye towards the main chance, be described as a paladin out of date ? At the other end of his book the marquis d'Aragon makes bold to assert that had his hero 'been a paladin of the middle ages, or a *condottiere* of the sixteenth century, or a companion of Pizarro or Fernando Cortez, or one of those volunteers of the Revolution who earned their *bâtons* as marshals of France on battle-fields of undying fame, he would have lacked neither energy nor heroism, nor even natural gifts (*talents*) for achieving a lasting reputation like the rest.' So much may, perhaps, safely be granted ; but there seems nothing specially pathetic in the fact that, without a country or a cause, without apparently even a belief in his own star, this 'prince' should have survived such reputation as he had succeeded in acquiring. He began as a young lion of the Lauzun type, and was, in fact, an associate of that third-rate Alcibiades. He fought his duels, including one with the count de Ségur, which, as the combatants afterwards swore eternal friendship, proved of importance to him in his subsequent career ; for it was Ségur who, when ambassador in Russia, secured for him the goodwill of the mighty empress Catharine, and who seems to have utilised him for his own diplomatic endeavours. He sailed round the world, and was at a later date destined for the command of an expedition against Dahomey, which Beaumarchais was prepared to 'finance,' and which was to seat the victorious 'paladin' on the throne of Juida (Whiddah). The legion which he had been permitted to levy for this purpose he subsequently proposed to devote to an invasion of Jersey ; but this undertaking was likewise postponed. Before, in 1782, during the siege of Gibraltar, he gallantly conducted a futile attack upon that fortress by means of floating batteries, he had married a Polish lady of

[3] *E.g.* i. 38, *for* Danch *read* Dunch ;
i. 135 „ Lockard „ Lockhart ;
i. 387 „ Maggot „ Meggot ;
ii 15 „ Trimball „ Trumbull ;
ii. 27 „ Barry „ Berry.

rank—the princess Sangusko, *née* Gordzka—his letters to whom during the years 1784–9 form the substance of the present volume. They cover the most interesting part of the period during which he served the empress Catharine as a naval commander against Turks and Swedes. After his Baltic campaigns he exerted himself as agent of the empress to bring about an effective co-operation with the French emigrant princes. (The marquis d'Aragon should, by the way, have resisted the temptation to speak of the duke of Brunswick's retreat as *contrainte ou achetée*, when, as his own note shows, he is perfectly aware how baseless is the charge of corruption, notwithstanding the prince of Nassau-Siegen's 'additional evidence.') Finally he withdrew to his estates in Podolia, and died there in 1808—most respectably, according to his present biographer.

One perceives indications that discretion was not the *forte* of the prince's charming wife; and this may help to account for the fact that his letters to her touch comparatively little upon politics. Moreover, he was aware that in the empire which he served the sanctity of private correspondence was not regarded as inviolable; indeed, Catharine II may have been quite pleased to read some of the pretty things he said about her. Some of his earlier letters are dated from Vienna, where his suit was in progress before the *Hofkammergericht*, and from Leopol in Podolia, where as a landed proprietor he had a seat in the provincial diet. Polish affairs were at that time (after the first partition) in a more than usually complicated condition; but the main issue upon which these letters throw some light is concerned with the shameful intrigues to undermine the position of King Stanislas Augustus, to whose offers of devotion Catharine paid little attention after she had become desirous of co-operating with Austria in Polish as well as in Turkish affairs. Hence the king's journey to the borders of his monarchy at the time of the empress's famous progress, and the interview of three hours at Kanieff, which, according to the prince de Ligne, cost Stanislas Augustus three millions. Conditionally on the assent of the diet the alliance of Russia was here secured by him, and another step was thus taken towards the ruin of Poland.

Of the progress of Catharine II, just referred to, and of Potemkin's supremely audacious Taurian exhibition in honour of his mistress, we have here a very amusing authentic account, which, we observe, has been specially extracted by the author of this volume for the benefit of the readers of the *Revue des Deux Mondes*. The French government stood in a peculiar relation towards the policy of a Russo-Austrian war against Turkey, of which the imperial journey and the meeting of Catharine with Joseph II were generally understood to constitute the announcement; for, although France as (in Catharine's phrase) 'the protectress of the Mussulmans' could not like this policy, yet she could not prevent it. Ségur was, therefore, probably on the right track in attempting to overtrump Austria, while completely defying Great Britain and Prussia, by bringing about a quadruple alliance between Russia, Austria, France, and Spain, which would have put an end to the isolation of France and at the same time have safeguarded the future of Turkey. Towards this end the personal influence of a gallant officer and popular cavalier like the prince of Nassau-Siegen seemed not unlikely to prove an effective aid, more espe-

cially as he was a grandee of Spain, where he had formerly been offered the command of the Walloon guards. His Gibraltar exploit had created for him a kind of naval reputation, and with remarkable tact he contrived very speedily to establish intimate personal relations with the omnipotent Potemkin—the author and manager of the solemn farce of the Crimean progress—whose jealousy he had as yet done nothing substantial enough to arouse. Thus, when the empress had returned home from the fictitious glories of Sebastopol and Pultawa, and when Turkey had thought herself driven to declare war, the prince of Nassau-Siegen found himself placed in command of the fleet, consisting chiefly of light vessels, which was opposed to the armada sent to the mouths of the Danube under the capudan pasha. With, rather than under, Nassau served the notorious Paul Jones, whom he found a most undesirable colleague, more especially since, as the prince de Ligne put it, he displayed none of the candour which distinguished his namesake Tom. Their joint victory, of which the prince may be correct in claiming the whole of the credit, destroyed one entire division of the Turkish fleet, with the exception of its vanguard, with which the capudan pasha gained the open of the Black Sea.

The prince of Nassau-Siegen was not fortunate enough to witness the capture of Oczakoff, the solitary success achieved by the vainglorious Potemkin in this protracted campaign. The prince had been called to St. Petersburg in the interests of the proposed quadruple alliance, which the aggressive Polish policy of Prussia seemed likely to render more acceptable to the empress Catharine; but the negotiations, which the prince travelled to Madrid to expedite, fell through, and soon afterwards his friend Ségur's mission came to an end. He was thereupon employed as a naval commander in the war against Sweden, caused, though not altogether without provocations on the Russian side, by the restless ambition of Gustavus III. An autograph letter written by that sovereign to the prince before the opening campaign is, so far as I know, new, and characteristic enough to deserve quotation in full.

Je m'adresse à un chevalier français qui va chercher la gloire partout où se trouvent la guerre et les dangers, pour le prier d'engager mes ennemis de respecter les lois de la guerre. Tâchons, autant qu'il est en nous, d'en adoucir les calamités.

Lorsque j'eus le plaisir de vous voir à Spa, et que vous me promîtes de venir me voir un jour, je ne croyais pas que vous viendriez si bien accompagné. Mais j'espère que nous nous efforcerons de vous recevoir convenablement, et je vous prie d'être persuadé que je vous conserverai les sentiments que vous me connaissez. GUSTAVE.

The prince of Nassau-Siegen made no direct reply; but his biographer reprints (from the memoirs of the count de Ségur) an equally amusing letter addressed by him to the king, politely requesting the latter to disavow his published official relation of an action between the Swedish and Russian fleets—I presume the Swedish defeat of 13 Aug. 1789—which contradicted the Russian official relation published by the prince himself. At Swenskesund in the following year Gustavus III (though he had already composed for himself an oration in the manner of Plutarch for the event of his having to give up his sword to the prince of Nassau) gained an unexpected but, as it proved, a futile, victory over the

gallant adventurer opposed to him. It is to the credit of Catharine II, among whose faults want of magnanimity was not included, that she wrote to him most kindly after this reverse. But, as fate would have it, his wars were over; and the Franco-Russian campaign against British possessions in India, which he is said to have proposed to Buonaparte about the year 1799, remained unexecuted, like the minor designs of its author's youth.

A. W. Ward.

La Belgique sous l'Empire et la Défaite de Waterloo, 1804–1815. Par Sylvain Balau. Two volumes. (Paris: Plon. Louvain: C. Fonteyn aîné. 1894.)

One is inclined to question, in examining these two volumes, whether there was any call to produce a work on so large a scale to describe a period during which Belgium had lost her identity and formed an organic part of the French empire. But if there is much here that is neither new nor even unfamiliar, the book may be pronounced fairly complete, thanks to much patient labour on the part of the author. He has worked through special monographs and local histories; he has gathered up all the accounts of contemporary Belgian witnesses, and with no less perseverance has rifled the abundant store of memoirs of the imperial epoch, recent as well as old, such as those of Marbot, Broglie, and Pasquier. From these numerous sources M. Balau has drawn many curious facts about Belgium, and has woven into an interesting monograph a mass of information previously to be sought for in many and various places. Thus, for example, he adds to an account of the religious history of the years 1804 to 1814, drawn mainly from Haussonville, a number of fresh details, from purely Belgian authorities, on the particular condition of the dioceses, the vacancies in the sees, and the confusion which followed upon Napoleon's appointment of bishops without investiture by the pope. The subject is handled from the point of view of a priest, and naturally assumes importance; but it is treated with considerable moderation, and the author has the good taste to dismiss the ridiculous story of the emperor dragging Pius VII by the hair in the palace of Fontainebleau.

M. Balau lays much stress also upon military history. Following Thiers, Jomini, and Brialmont, he narrates the wars of the empire, at some unnecessary length, it must be owned, even describing those, as in the case of the Russian campaign, which do not immediately concern Belgium. In this section of the work, however, we find its most attractive passage. M. Balau, like General Renard, emphatically denies the accusation of cowardice brought against the Belgian troops serving in the campaign of 1815 by some English writers, such as Alison and MacFarlane—an accusation which was repeated in parliament on 15 Dec. 1854. In dealing with this matter the writer has had the advantage of the collaboration of a distinguished officer in the Belgian service, the chevalier de Selliers de Moranville, who has reconstructed with great sagacity the plan of Wellington's tactics. The calumny may be said to be finally disposed of. The following passage is worth quoting:—

'La partie principale de son dispositif de combat consistait en une forte ligne d'infanterie qu'il plaçait habituellement sur des hauteurs à portée efficace de mousqueterie en arrière de la crête du terrain. Ainsi placée

cette ligne échappait aux vues de l'adversaire qui demeurait dans l'ignorance absolue de son existence ; par conséquent, l'artillerie ennemie ne pouvant la prendre pour but de son tir, les troupes qui la composaient demeuraient parfaitement intactes et bien souples dans la main des chefs jusqu'au moment où elles entraient en action.

'En avant de cette ligne d'infanterie, ainsi dissimulée, Wellington plaçait une forte ligne d'artillerie à la crête même du terrain ; dans les intervalles entre les batteries ou en avant de celles-ci, occupant des points favorables du terrain, étaient jetés quelques bataillons d'infanterie dont le nombre total ne dépassait pas le sixième de toute l'infanterie présente sur le champ de bataille. Cette avant-ligne avait pour mission de protéger l'artillerie contre une attaque brusque de l'assaillant, de contrarier son approche et enfin d'attirer sur elle le feu de ses batteries. Ce triple résultat ayant été obtenu, les troupes de l'avant-ligne avaient terminé leur mission, et il était dans l'ordre naturel des choses qu'énervées et fatiguées, inférieures en nombre, elles dussent plier sous le choc des masses assaillantes se lançant à l'attaque de la position.

'Mais quelle était d'autre part la situation de ces masses assaillantes ? Avant d'atteindre la crête de la position, où devaient commencer seulement les difficultés les plus sérieuses, elles étaient soumises à un feu violent d'artillerie et à une guerre de chicanes que leur suscitaient les troupes de l'avant-ligne ennemie. Ces dernières, après avoir combattu pendant quelque temps, se repliaient ou étaient enfoncées. Les masses assaillantes atteignaient alors la crête, mais fatiguées et déjà énervées par la lutte, quelque peu en désordre et échappant à la direction de leurs chefs. C'est à ce moment qu'elles voyaient se dresser tout à coup devant elles une ligne imposante d'infanterie, et avant de trouver le temps de se reconnaître elles recevaient à courte portée une salve tirée par des troupes fraîches et dont l'effet était terrible. Surprises, étonnées par les pertes affreuses qu'elles subissaient, les colonnes d'attaque s'arrêtaient hésitantes et cherchaient instinctivement à se déployer pour répondre à ce feu meurtrier. Mais Wellington ne leur laissait pas le temps de se remettre et lançait ses troupes à la bayonnette sur elles ; en même temps sa cavalerie les chargeait avec vigueur. L'ennemi était ainsi rejeté hors de la position avec des pertes énormes.

'Hormis quelques cas exceptionnels, Wellington plaçait systématiquement sur l'avant-ligne les troupes étrangères qui combattaient sous ses ordres. Ainsi fit-il avec les Espagnols et les Portugais durant les guerres de la Péninsule, comme avec la plupart des Hollando-Belges à Waterloo. Aux troupes anglaises étaient réservés les emplacements bien abrités derrière la crête. Aux yeux des personnes non initiées à cette tactique les troupes anglaises récoltaient tous les lauriers de la victoire, puisqu'elles seules paraissaient avoir tenu solidement. Les autres n'avaient-elles pas, en effet, été culbutées au premier choc ?

'Il faut le proclamer bien haut : ce sont les apparences trompeuses qui forment la source des calomnies anglaises sur la conduite des Belges à Waterloo. Nous ajouterons qu'en laissant se propager sans protester la version qui nous représente comme des fuyards, les chefs anglais ont manqué de générosité et de justice envers des alliés qui les avaient fidèlement et valeureusement servis.'

If he had only the credit of having explained this important point, M. Balau's work would deserve consideration; but it is as the first consecutive and complete account of the events in which the Belgians were concerned during the empire that the book claims our special attention. We have noticed a few slips in details. M. Balau sees a republican plot in Malet's fiasco, disregarding A. Duruy's refutation of Hamel and Pascal Grousset. On another topic one is somewhat surprised to see the author plead extenuating circumstances in dealing with the irregularities of Marie Louise, and speak euphemistically of her *liaison* with Neipperg, which scandalised Europe for years before the emperor's death, as a 'morganatic marriage.'

EUGÈNE HUBERT.

The Diary of a Cavalry Officer in the Peninsular and Waterloo Campaigns, 1809–1815. By the late Lieut.-Col. WILLIAM TOMKINSON. (London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1894.)

THE writer of this diary went out to Lisbon in 1809 as a cornet in the 16th light dragoons. He was so severely wounded in a skirmish just before Sir Arthur Wellesley's passage of the Douro that he had to take a long leave of absence. In April 1810 he went to the front again, was present at the battle of Busaco (which he spells Bosoac), took part in the retreat to the lines of Torres Vedras and in the subsequent advance to the Spanish frontier, and was employed in the operations in Spain down to the fall of St. Sebastian. He also went through the Waterloo campaign. His son, the editor of this diary, is justified in the hope which he expresses that its contents may prove of some interest to the general public, and of some value to the student of military history. It lays no claim, indeed, either to romantic colour or to scientific thoroughness. Where it deals with operations at which the writer was not present it is not always accurate. Thus it assigns the merit of advising Marshal Beresford to make the final effort which saved the battle of Albuera not to Hardinge, but to D'Urban. When most trustworthy it is only a rough journal, kept by a plain, brave, sensible man whose heart was in his work. But just for this reason it supplies many details and incidents which add substance to our fading memories of the Peninsular war. The miseries endured by the people of the country and by the contending armies, the mutual cruelty of the French and the Portuguese, the activity of the guerillas and the mischief which they did to the invaders, the unpopularity of the British with the very Spaniards in whose cause they came to fight, and the inability of the Spaniards to take a large or serious view of the war are all illustrated anew in this diary. The account of the Waterloo campaign is tolerably full, but adds very little new material to what has been published already.

F. C. MONTAGUE.

Briefe von Wilhelm von Humboldt an Georg Heinrich Ludwig Nicolovius. Herausgegeben von R. HAYM. (Berlin: Emil Felber. 1894.)

THIS little book is the first volume of a new series, which should be of considerable interest to students of German life and thought. It is pro-

posed to publish a number of letters, diaries, and private papers illustrative of the intellectual development of Germany since the Reformation, with more particular reference to the classical and romantic periods of German literature in the last and the present centuries. But the series will not be confined to *belles-lettres* alone; it will endeavour to show the growth of music, painting, sculpture, and political ideas. The present volume will be chiefly interesting to those who are investigating the history of higher education in Germany; for Nicolovius, to whom these letters are addressed, was Humboldt's assistant, and afterwards his successor, at the Prussian ministry of education, and the correspondence of the two friends accordingly teems with university news. The letters begin in the eventful year 1809, and the last of them is dated 1835; but there is an unfortunate gap between 1819 and 1830, during which time Humboldt and Nicolovius were both living together at Berlin. The fourteenth letter, written from Paris in June 1814, is of some historical value, and it is interesting to find Humboldt relating, in another passage, how he consulted Goethe as to the qualifications of a professor. The two appendices contain seven juvenile letters of Humboldt to his friend the medical student Beer, and eight more of his letters, dating from the years 1809–10, to Arnim and Wolf. The editor has done his work well, as was to be expected from a professor of German literary history and the author of a careful 'Life of Max Duncker,' which was reviewed in these pages three years ago (vol. vii. 386). W. MILLER.

König Ludwig II von Bayern: ein Beitrag zu seiner Lebensgeschichte. Von C. VON HEIGEL. (Stuttgart: A. Bonz & Co. 1893.)

THE author of this book, who bears a name honoured in Bavarian historiography, appears to have very naturally seized a strange chance of acquiring a reputation of his own by composing a series of plays designed to respond to the interest without bounds taken by the late unfortunate king Lewis II of Bavaria in everything connected with his namesake the Grand Monarch. This association has inspired Herr C. von Heigel with the notion of writing the life of his patron, and of exposing the misrepresentations by which theory and scandal have, according to their wont, inevitably coloured its dubious records. A kindly intention (even if intermixed with a desire of speaking of oneself) deserves recognition; but the malevolence and the trash put to shame in these pages could not have illustrated more glaringly than the author's own 'contribution' to the unfortunate king's biography the golden value of silence in the face of reminiscences over which every patriot—and it is ill to sneer at even Bavarian patriotism—should wish to cast a veil. History will lift a sufficient corner of that veil in her own good time, in so far as the details of personal biography are necessary to her purpose. It may be in keeping with the manner of this compilation if I mention that I was present at Munich on the occasion which is here appropriately described as the climax in the career of the unfortunate king. Certainly it was a memorable day when, in July 1870, the heir of the house of Wittelsbach side by side with the crown prince of Prussia reviewed the Bavarian troops, which were to take so glorious a part in the French campaign.

The secret treaties concluded between Prussia and the southern states at the time of the peace of Nicolsburg were then still unknown to the public; and the attitude of the king of Bavaria was ascribed to his personal resolution. Yet had the outcries of a resolute faction or any prejudice or waywardness of his own induced Lewis II to play fast and loose with his engagements, grave difficulties must infallibly have arisen. Thus a debt of gratitude is indisputably due to his memory, which cannot be better paid than by saving it not only from the censors of his fate-stricken career, but also from his friends. A. W. WARD.

The History of Trade Unionism. By SIDNEY and BEATRICE WEBB. (London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1894.)

IT is certainly time that a history of trade unions was written. For, like many other institutions, they have passed through many and various stages. For a long time they were obscure, little known; they were then for a season viewed with suspicion and active dislike; now they are commonly praised to the skies, as representing order and progress combined. Naturally enough, the facts of their history, their growth and development, have been disregarded, and it is this that Mr. and Mrs. Webb have set themselves to elucidate. The greatness of their undertaking is shown by the elaborate bibliography which they have appended to their work, and we may readily believe their statement that the labour of investigating the history of the earlier unions, bodies which came and went, has been very considerable. The result has been to give us a book which is thoroughly readable, and which must form the basis of any future work on the same lines; which is written with commendable impartiality, if at times with something of a *parti pris* as regards the future. We owe, first of all, to this book the explosion of the old theory which traced the origin of trade unions to the medieval gilds. The writers have shown that the connexion was assumed far too readily, and rests on no sound historical evidence, and until fresh evidence is forthcoming it must be regarded as 'not proven.' The actual history falls under two general heads, external and internal. Externally, the relation of trade unions to the state, their place in the social organism, has been constantly the subject of legislation. The first period extends down to 1825, when the principle of combination, the right of collective bargaining, was definitely established. The second reaches to 1875, when, by an act passed by the ministry of the day, 'the legislation of trade unions was completed by the legal recognition of their methods.' So far the aim of the leaders was to secure an application of the principle of *laissez faire.* Internally, we may notice the various changes which have come over trade unionists on the subject of apprenticeships, and a restriction of the number of those engaged in a trade, the rise and decay of centralisation, of the trades council or trades union as opposed to the trade unions, the growth of the New Unionism with its contempt for the friendly society element, and its impatience at the conservatism of the older bodies. A point on which the writers speak with authority, but on which, perhaps, they will not command equal assent, is the relation in which trade unions stand to socialism. The reader cannot forget how closely Mr. Webb is identified with the socialistic propaganda, and is

hardly surprised to find that he describes in some detail the conversion of trade unionists from *laissez faire* to his own cherished opinions. It would, perhaps, have been better had less prominence been given to this particular subject. Lastly, a feature which must not be overlooked is the justice which the writers do to some almost forgotten or unknown heroes in the struggle. The notices of Francis Place, of Applegarth, Newton, and Allan will probably suggest much that is new to the average reader, whilst, to take two better-known names, the work of Odger and Howell is fairly and properly appreciated. L. R. PHELPS.

A History of Westmorland. By RICHARD S. FERGUSON. *A History of Lancashire.* By Lieutenant-Colonel HENRY FISHWICK. (Popular County Histories. London: Eliot Stock. 1894.)

CHANCELLOR FERGUSON'S 'History of Westmorland' is a worthy companion to his 'History of Cumberland,' and a model of what a short county history ought to be. It is well arranged, contains just the information the general reader who takes an interest in local history requires, and supplies the references to more exhaustive works on particular localities and subjects necessary to guide more serious students.

Colonel Fishwick's book is not of the same excellence as the 'History of Westmorland,' but it is a useful and a meritorious piece of work. Its value would have been greatly increased by the addition of a brief classified bibliography like that given in the appendix to its companion volume.

C. H. FIRTH.

Peel: its Meaning and Derivation. By GEORGE NEILSON, F.S.A. Scot. (Glasgow: Strathern & Freeman. 1893.)

THE real difficulty of the etymology of *peel* resides, as Mr. Neilson here shows with much clearness and success, in the great change of meaning which the word has undergone. It is not unlikely that this was in some measure due to a confusion with the word *pile*, from the Latin *pila*, as seems to be shown by the use of *pile* in Piers Plowman, C. xxii. 366, where the sense of 'peel' will suit the passage. But, considered phonetically, the words are quite distinct; and the Middle English *peel* or *pēl* can only be equated to the Old French *pēl*, with long close *e*, which signified originally 'a stake.' The O.F. long close *e* arises from Lat. *ā*, so that the O.F. *pēl* is precisely Lat. *pālum*, accusative of *pālus*, a stake. No other etymology is, phonetically, possible. This is the origin for which Mr. Neilson argues; and he traces the history of the development of the 'peel' from its beginning, as 'essentially a wooden structure,' to its development into a small structure of solid stone in later times. The whole of the argument is historically instructive, and the illustrative allusions are well selected and carefully explained. There can be no doubt, as Mr. Neilson suggests, that the Welsh *pill* was merely borrowed from English, as, indeed, is expressly stated in the supplement to the present writer's 'Etymological Dictionary,' p. 821, ed. 1884. In other respects the etymology there given is wrong, because it only accounts for the Middle English *pile* (from Latin *pila*), and fails to explain how the Middle English *pēl* came to have a long close *e*, as already shown by

Chaucer's 'House of Fame,' 1310, where it rhymes with *wēl*; and again, *wēl* or *weel* rhymes with *steel* in the 'Knightes Tale,' group A, 2124. We may congratulate Mr. Neilson on having fairly proved his point by tracing the history of the structure of the *peel* during successive periods. After all, the development of the word *moat* is quite as extraordinary. Originally, it signified the embankment on which a small fort was placed, whereas it is now only (or chiefly) used to signify the trench out of which the earth for embankment was dug; and we generally expect a moat to be full of water. It is interesting to observe how the Old French *pel* was treated when it had to be turned back into a Latin form. Sometimes it became *pelum* and sometimes *pela*. The latter form shows that its Latin original was quite forgotten.

WALTER W. SKEAT.

Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada. IX. (Montreal: Dawson Brothers. 1891.) X. (Ottawa: John Durie & Son. Montreal: W. Foster Brown & Co. London: Bernard Quaritch. 1892.)

'THE Royal Society of Canada for the Promotion of Literature and Science within the Dominion' came into being at the end of 1881, the marquis of Lorne being then governor-general. Montreal was the place of its birth, but the meetings have usually been held at Ottawa, the political centre of Canada, and the national importance of the society has been recognised by an annual grant by the Dominion parliament. Its 'Transactions' are necessarily partly in English and partly in French. Of the four sections of which the society consists the first two, which deal respectively with French and English literature, with history, archæology, and allied subjects, are those which are likely to interest readers of the ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW. In vol. ix. the most exhaustive paper is one by Dr. Bourinot on 'Cape Breton and its Memorials of the French *Régime*,' which has since been given to the world in a separate form.[1] It is so comprehensive that future writers will find difficulty in discovering any further information about this interesting island. Akin to the subject of Dr. Bourinot's paper is a short paper, with useful plates, by W. J. Ganong upon the site of the old Acadian fort La Tour. The North American aborigines are a constant subject of interest. The abbé Cuoq deals at length with the 'Grammaire de la Langue Algonquine,' and the Shuswap people of British Columbia and the now extinct Beothiks of Newfoundland form the subjects of papers by Dr. Dawson and Dr. Patterson respectively. In the French section among other papers may be mentioned one on General Richard Montgomery, and one on 'Jacques Cartier, Questions de Droit Public, de Législation, et d'Usages Maritimes.' Vol. x. is not so voluminous as its predecessor. It contains a continuation of the paper on the Algonquin language, and an appendix by Dr. Patterson to his paper on the Beothiks. Dr. Patterson also writes on Sir William Alexander, whose schemes of Scotch colonisation the name of Nova Scotia still recalls. Nova Scotian currency is the subject of another paper by

[1] See ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW, viii. 596.

Dr. McLachlan. M. Tassé writes on Voltaire and Madame de Pompadour, *deux noms sinistres attachés à notre* (Canadian) *histoire*; and M. de Cazes on 'L'Episode de l'Ile de Sable,' the abortive expedition of the marquis de la Roche to Sable Island towards the end of the sixteenth century. Canada is rich beyond most countries—certainly beyond most European colonies—in subjects of historical interest; and it is no small matter for congratulation that the Dominion has a Royal Society able and anxious to collect materials and to bring evidence to light. The fact that two languages are placed at the disposal of the society promises well for the future of literature and science in Canada, and French and English Canadians are working hard side by side in the interests of knowledge. It may be added that for many years past the Dominion government has spent money on the collection and arrangement of the historical records of Canada, and under the competent charge of Mr. Brymner the archives of the Dominion are gradually being ordered and enriched. No expense has evidently been spared in preparing these volumes for the public. The printing is excellent, the arrangement is clear, and the maps and woodcuts are very attractive.

C. P. LUCAS.

The Protected Princes of India. By WILLIAM LEE-WARNER, C.S.I. (London: Macmillan & Co. 1894.)

MR. LEE-WARNER, like so many able Indian administrators, has turned for recreation to the task of enlightening his countrymen upon a subject about which his experience enables him to write with authority. He has taken up a task which much needed to be begun. Save for Mr. Tupper's extremely able and valuable book, 'Our Indian Protectorate,' it cannot be said that we have anything of the nature of a scientific study of the relations of our Indian empire with the native states around or within its borders. The work is one of great importance and interest to students of international relations, of diplomacy, and of law. Mr. Lee-Warner is unusually well qualified for the task he has undertaken, and he has accomplished it with indubitable success. He may be said to have first seriously introduced to English readers a scientific examination of Indian treaties. He has traced through the periods of non-intervention, of isolation, of annexation, and of subordinate union, the growth of the complicated relations in which we find ourselves to-day to the different princes with whom we are connected at innumerable points of internal as well as external administration. The book falls rather within the sphere of political science or of international law than the province of the HISTORICAL REVIEW. We must, therefore, be content to say that the book is one which no student of Indian politics can afford to neglect and which will be welcomed by the historian as well as by those whom it more directly concerns. An excellent map, with a tabular statement showing the year in which the leading states were finally entered on a footing of permanent treaty relations, adds to the value of the book. The account of Lord Cornwallis's policy during his second administration will strike historical students as especially clear and suggestive. Some, however, of Mr. Lee-Warner's historical comparisons are not altogether convincing.

Both the principal of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford, and the press of his university are to be congratulated upon the skill with which they have succeeded in comprising the entire works of Dante, both prose and verse, Latin as well as Italian, in one compact and handy volume (*Tutte le Opere di Dante Alighieri*, nuovamente rivedute nel testo da Dr. E. Moore. Oxford: nella Stamperia dell' Università. 1894). The type, though small, is beautifully clear; and the volume, which is hardly too large for the pocket, will be a godsend to those whose good fortune it is to spend some of the winter months in Italy. But these are by no means the only people who will profit by Dr. Moore's edition. All students of Dante are aware of his many years' labours on the text of the author, and the importance of his 'Contributions to the Textual Criticism of the "Divina Commedia"' was duly noticed by us five years ago (vol. v. p. 193). The scholar will rejoice to find Dr. Moore's results incorporated in his new edition, and to have the less accessible of Dante's works, and even those doubtfully assigned to him, united with the famous ones in a single volume, and furnished with an extremely serviceable index by the competent hands of Mr. Paget Toynbee.

Two or three years ago we took some account of the valuable materials recently made accessible for the medieval history of the church of Utrecht (see vol. vii. 347–52). Since that date Dr. Brom's *Bullarium Traiectense*, of which we then welcomed the beginning, has steadily advanced and is now nearly complete (as far as tom. ii. fasc. ii. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1893). Another work of capital importance for the history of the see is the scholarly edition of its ancient chartulary published by Mr. S. Muller Fz. (*Het oudste Cartularium van het Sticht Utrecht*. Werken uitgegeven door het Historisch Genootschap gevestigd te Utrecht, 3rd series, No. 3. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1892). The editor warns us frankly at the outset not to look for any positive novelties in his book. It had, in fact, been published in its entirety once, and a good many of its contents have found their way into sundry printed collections. But the edition was not only an unsatisfactory piece of work; it had the additional disadvantage of being taken from a single manuscript, the Egmond codex of *c.* 1100, now in the British Museum. Mr. Muller, on the other hand, has used besides this the 'Liber Donationum,' recently discovered among the cathedral muniments at Utrecht—a manuscript written partly about 1200, partly a generation or so later—as well as several other copies derived either directly or indirectly from these two. Among them we notice Bondam's manuscript of the first half of the thirteenth century, lately restored to Utrecht from the spoils of Sir Thomas Phillipps. The editor furnishes in his introduction some valuable criticisms on the dates of the various collections which make up the chartulary, and on the extent to which the interpolator has had his hand in them; and his book is provided with a full calendar of the documents, but unfortunately no index.

In connexion with these Utrecht books we may notice Professor Paul Fredericq's *Geschiedenis der Inquisitie in de Nederlanden tot aan hare Herinrichting onder Keizer Karel V* (1025–1520), part i. (Ghent: Vuylsteke, 1892), which supplies an historical introduction to and commentary upon the earlier portion of his 'Corpus Documentorum' on the subject.

Following in the lines laid down by Mr. H. C. Lea in his great work on 'The Inquisition of the Middle Ages,' Dr. Fredericq traces the manner in which the bishop's cognisance of cases of heretical pravity was largely supplanted by that of the pope, a change which was completed soon after the establishment of the Dominican order; and he examines the working of the new system down to the end of the thirteenth century. At the same time we are shown how the episcopal inquisition held its ground side by side with the papal, and how the church was able to avail itself of the assistance of the secular power. The whole treatise is full of interest, and with the 'Corpus Documentorum'—the work of Dr. Fredericq and his pupils at the university of Ghent—it supplies a profitable example of the way in which university studies under a professor, pursued as they are not pursued in England, may lead to positive additions to our store of historical materials as well as to a valuable digest of results.

Binterim and Mooren's book on the archdiocese of Cologne has for more than sixty years been a well-known storehouse of facts. In republishing it under the title *Die Erzdiöcese Köln bis zur französischen Staatsumwälzung* (2 volumes. Düsseldorf: Voss, 1892–1893), Dr. Albert Mooren has left the substance of the earlier portions much as they stood, though he has corrected a good deal in matters of detail. The second volume has the advantage of several new and extensive documents. The kernel of the work in its present form consists of three great texts, the *Liber Valoris* of the benefices in the archdiocese made in the fourteenth century (vol. i. 55–525), a *Descriptionsbuch* drawn up on the same lines but with more particulars in 1599 (vol. ii. 34–153), and a still more minute *Designatio* of the benefices in the duchy of Jülich and Berg, 1676, followed by a *Matricula* or custumary of dues and services (vol. ii. 154–406). The fourteenth-century calendar printed in vol. i. 526–539 presents features of interest. The notes, which add largely to the bulk of the work, are not in all respects satisfactory. Old mistakes are repeated and sufficient attention has not been paid to the local literature of the last half-century or to recent editions of the texts cited. The sections dealing with the statistics of the diocese in the last century can hardly be estimated by a foreigner; but it is evident that they contain an abundance of material which will be welcome to the special student.

In *Oliver Cromwell*, by Samuel Harden Church (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1894), we have not the work of a professional historian, but of a writer who takes a deep interest in one of the great characters of English history. Judged from this point of view it shows wide reading, and is written with spirit and enthusiasm. Its defects are that the earlier part of Cromwell's life is dealt with at disproportionate length and the history of the protectorate too briefly treated, that the author is not sufficiently discriminating in the use of his authorities, and that it contains many errors. For instance, the account of Cromwell's conduct in 1647 and the narrative of the battle of Marston Moor both contain serious mistakes. There is a fine portrait of Cromwell after Lely's picture. As a popular biography of the Protector the book will not supersede the lives by Mr. Harrison and Mr. Picton.

Under the title of *St. Paul's Cathedral and Old City Life: Illustrations of Civil and Cathedral Life from the Thirteenth to the Sixteenth Centuries* (London: Elliot Stock, 1894), Dr. W. Sparrow Simpson has put together a pleasant volume of miscellanies in supplement to his more systematic works on the history of Old St. Paul's. He gives us a commentary on the medieval and later inventories of the cathedral treasury, which he was the first to publish, and collects a variety of notices relative to Paul's Cross, of which he supplies four illustrations. In his account of the sermons preached there he prints long extracts from two by Dean Feckenham and Dr. Glasier (1555), which are of considerable interest. The miscellaneous facts and curiosities gathered together in this beautifully printed book are made available to students of church antiquities in general by means of a full index.

A Classified List of Printed Original Materials for English Manorial and Agrarian History during the Middle Ages, by Frances Gardiner Davenport, A.B. (Radcliffe College Monographs, No. 6) (Boston, 1894), seems to be an excellently well arranged hand-list of those printed materials that any one who is studying the economy of English medieval manors will find useful in his work. It evidently represents a great deal of well-applied labour, and can be confidently recommended to such as desire a guide to the extents, court rolls, account rolls, and the like.

CORRESPONDENCE

Shakespeare and the Jews

There seems to have been some misunderstanding by Professor Hales (English Historical Review, October 1894, p. 652) as to my meaning when I said that the supreme genius of Shakespeare has been used to incite hatred and suspicion against the Jews. It is a fact that the character of Shylock has been by many people interpreted to mean a villain without excuse or qualification. Professor Hales himself surely admits as much when he says, 'At a superficial glance one may perceive only a fiend in human shape; and perhaps Elizabethan audiences, furious with prejudice and bigotry, saw only what was devilish in the wretched being they derided and loathed' (p. 657). It is also a fact that Jews have been the victims of unjust hatred and suspicion. I merely drew the inference that the former has contributed something to the latter. It is a matter of common observation, and I have noticed instances of it myself. We may regret it, but it is so. I did not enter into the larger question of the moral intention of Shakespeare, and what he meant the character of Shylock to teach. He has not put his meaning on record, and there have been different opinions expressed about it. In consequence it is a literary rather than an historical matter, and would almost require a volume for adequate treatment. Arthur Dimock.

Periodical Notices

[Contributions to these Notices, whether regular or occasional, are invited. They should be drawn up on the pattern of those printed below, and addressed to Mr. R. L. Poole, at Oxford, by the first week in March, June, September, and December.]

Two Sabæan inscriptions now at Göttingen: printed by J. FLEMMING.—Nachr. Gesellsch. Wiss. Göttingen 1894. 2.

Roman and Iberian inscriptions: by F. FITA [an article on the remarkable discoveries of Don José Salurrullana at Fraga, between Saragossa and Lerida; of great importance for the phonetic value of the so-called Iberian alphabet in this district].—Boletin R. Acad. Hist. xxv. 4. *Oct.*

Epigraphical excursions: by A. C. MENA, jun. [an exhaustive description of antiquities and inscriptions on several of the roads of the Itinerary of Antoninus].—Boletin R. Acad. Hist. xxv. 1–3. *July–Sept.*

The 'Gospel of Peter:' by A. C. MCGIFFERT [who considers the work not to be Docetic].—Papers Amer. Soc. of Church Hist. vi.

The earliest Roman mass-book: by F. BISHOP [urging that the Gelasian sacramentary was introduced into Gaul as early as the sixth century, and that the Vatican text is to be preferred to those of Rheinau or St. Gall; and claiming Alcuin for the author of the supplement to the Gregorian sacramentary which afterwards became included in the body of the work].—Dublin Rev. N.S. 12. *Oct.*

The Martyrology of O'Gorman: by H. D'ARBOIS DE JUBAINVILLE.—Anal. Bolland. 1894. 2.

A catalogue of the manuscripts and early printed books of the cathedral of Vich in 1806 [among the legal and theological MSS. are codices of Virgil and Horace of the eleventh century. Many of the older MSS. have unfortunately disappeared].—Boletin R. Acad. Hist. xxv. 4. *Oct.*

The history of Moses of Chorene: by G. KHALATIANTS [an examination of the theory of Carrière that the history of Armenia by this writer ought to be referred to the seventh or even the eighth century].—Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnago Prosviestchenia. *Oct.*

The Acts of the bishops of Le Mans: by the late JULIEN HAVET. Appendix of documents.—Bibl. École Chartes, lv. 2, 3.

The imperial charters of the monastery of Peterlingen: by H. BRESSLAU.—Anz. Schweiz. Gesch. 1894. 4.

Vita et miracula S. Stanislai Kostkoe: by UBALDINI.—Anal. Bolland. 1894. 2.

The statutes and service-books of the church of Albi: by R. TWIGGE.—Dublin Rev. N.S. 12. *Oct.*

Contributions to the historiography of the crusading states, especially in the time of Frederick II: by P. RICHTER. II: The 'Estoire d'Eracles.' III: The 'Annales de terre sainte;' with a note on the memoirs of Philip de Nevaire [of Novara].—Mitth. Inst. Oesterreich. Gesch.-forsch. xv. 4 (continued from xiii. 2).

The two chronicles of Richard of San Germano and their relation: by A. WINKELMANN. Mitth. Inst. Oesterreich. Gesch.-forsch. xv. 4.

Parvum et simplex exercitium ex consuetudine humilis patris domini Florencii [Florens Radewijnsz.] *et aliorum devotorum* [a work proceeding from the circle of the brethren of common life]: printed from a Berlin manuscript by D. J. M. WÜSTENHOFF.—Arch. Nederl. Kerkgesch. v. 1.

Pier Candido Decembri's Italian translation of Caesar's 'Commentaries:' by A.

MOREL-FATIO [who describes a manuscript of it among the Chigi collection in the Bibliothèque Nationale].—Bibl. Ecole Chartes, lv. 2, 3.

The growth of sagas: by F. YORK POWELL [analysing the elements by which they have been enlarged to their final dimensions, with special reference to Egil's Saga, to which the writer denies any original historical value].—Folk-Lore, v. 2. *June.*

The trustworthiness of the data supplied by the Hrafnkelssaga for the history of law: by O. OPET [examined with a negative result].—Mitth. Inst. Oesterreich. Gesch.-forsch., Ergänzb. iii. 3.

Autobiography and its development in the middle ages: by F. VON BEZOLD.—Zft. Kulturgesch. i. 2, 3.

R. Flint's 'History of the Philosophy of History.'—Edinb. Rev. 370. *Oct.*;—by R. M. WENLEY, Scott. Rev. 48. *Oct.*

Modern historians and their methods: by H. A. L. FISHER.—Fortnightly Rev. N.S. 336. *Dec.*

The origin of western civilisation: by F. LEGGE.—Scott. Rev. 48. *Oct.*

The law of progress in religions: by comte GOBLET D'ALVIELLA.—Rev. Belg. 1894. 3.

The earliest history of Babylonia.—Quart. Rev. 358. *Oct.*

The fall of the Assyrian empire: by F. DEMOOR [on the character and duration of Nabupalassur's power in Babylonia; the two sieges of Nineveh, and the date of its final overthrow].—Muséon 1894. 3.

The office of the king in ancient Egypt: by A. WIEDEMANN [partly the mediator between the gods and his subjects, partly the commander of the army, partly the absolute sovereign of the land].—Muséon 1894. 4.

The ritual legislation of the Hebrews in its religious aspect: by A. VAN HOONACKER.—Muséon 1894. 3.

Jerusalem: by major C. R. CONDER. Scott. Rev. 48. *Oct.*

The journeys of king Herod to Rome: by L. KORACH.—Monatschr. Gesch. Judenth. xxxviii. 12.

The beliefs, rites, and customs of the Jews connected with death, burial, and mourning: by A. P. BENDER.—Jew. Qu. Rev. 25. *Oct.* (continued from 22).

Contributions to the knowledge of Vedic chronology: by H. JACOBI.—Nachr. Gesellsch. Wiss. Göttingen 1894. 2.

The historical treatment of Homer: by R. PÖHLMANN.—Hist. Zft. lxxiii. 3.

The Caesars.—Quart. Rev. 358. *Oct.*

Industrial associations under the Roman empire: by W. LIEBENAM.—Zft. Kulturgesch. i. 1–3.

The primitive church and the papacy [with reference to the work of L. Rivington].—Church Qu. Rev. 77, *Oct.*; Dublin Rev. N.S. 12, *Oct.*

St. Clement of Rome's epistle and the early Roman church.—Church Qu. Rev. 77. *Oct.*

Paganism in the middle of the fourth century: by P. ALLARD.—Rev. Quest. hist. lvi. 2. *Oct.*

St. Nicholas and Artemis: by E. ANICHKOF [attempting to show a connexion between the attributes and cultus of the Ephesian goddess and the medieval associations of St. Nicolas].—Folk-Lore, v. 2. *June.*

Agricola the Briton and the Pelagian writings attributed to him by Caspari.—Church Qu. Rev. 77. *Oct.*

The letter of bishop Maximus to Theophilus of Alexandria: by G. MORIN [illustrating the ecclesiastical history of Gaul at the beginning of the fifth century].—Rev. Bénéd. Maredsous, x. 6.

The text of the spurious letters addressed to Peter Fullo of Antioch in the collection distinguished by Maassen as the 'Sammlung in Sachen des Monophysitismus:' by O. GÜNTHER [describing the manuscripts and examining their relation].—Nachr. Gesellsch. Wiss. Göttingen 1894. 2.

On the early medieval guilds: by L. M. HARTMANN [dealing with Τὸ ἐπαρχικὸν βιβλίον, documents from Ravenna from the tenth century onwards, and the disputed evidence from Rome].—Zft. Social-Wirthsch.-Gesch. iii. 1.

The organisation of the county in the Frankish realm: by W. SICKEL.—Mitth. Inst. Oesterreich. Gesch.-forsch., Ergänzb. iii. 3.

Corsica and Sardinia in the donations to the papacy: by R. DOVE [reviewing P. Kehr and A. Schaube's interpretations of the passage in the 'Vita Hadriani;' examining the history of Corsica from the re-establishment of the imperial authority in 534, showing that it was won by the Lombards under king Liutprand, but that the donation of it was never carried into effect by Charles the Great; tracing the history of Corsica and Sardinia down to the time of Gregory VII, and accounting for the forged redaction of the 'Pactum Ludovici' concocted in 1083–1086 by means of his policy in regard to these islands].—SB. Bayer. Akad., phil.-hist. Cl., 1894. 2.

Abelard and Arnold of Brescia: by M. DE PALO [a contrast between the literary and the political reformer. The writer rejects the statement of Otto of Freising that Arnold was a pupil of Abelard, believing that their first meeting was at Sens in 1140, and that Arnold's radicalism was wholly of native growth].—Arch. stor. Ital. 5th ser. xiv. 3.

The life and work of St. Thomas Aquinas: by T. O'GORMAN.—Papers Amer. Soc. of Church Hist. vi.

The college of St. Martial at Avignon: by U. BERLIÈRE.—Rev. Bénéd. Maredsous, x. 8.

The itinerary of Martin V from Constance to Rome [16 May 1418—28 Sept. 1420]: by P. MILTENBERGER.—Mitth. Inst. Oesterreich. Gesch.-forsch. xv. 4.

War in Morocco at the close of the fifteenth century: by M. JIMÉNEZ DE LA ESPADA [a very interesting document on the methods of filibustering on the African coast, with an account of the expeditions in which the anonymous author was engaged, undated but previous to 1505, and perhaps to the capture of Melilla in 1497; excellent explanatory and illustrative notes; and an introduction]. Boletin R. Acad. Hist. xxv. 1–3. *July–Sept.*

St. Theresa.—Church Qu. Rev. 17. *Oct.*

Superstitious beliefs and practices in vulgar Greek Νομοκάνονες: by W. R. PATON.—Folk-Lore, v. 3. *Sept.*

Queen Elizabeth and France [to 1572]: by Miss J. M. STONE.—Dublin Rev. N.S. 12. *Oct.*

Philip II of Spain and the last years of Mary Stuart: by M. PHILIPPSON.—Hist. Zft. lxxiii. 3.

The invasion of France by the imperial troops in 1635–1636: by O. VIGIER.—Rev. Quest. hist. lvi. 2. *Oct.*

Papers concerning peace negotiations in 1638, from the Schleswig Archives: printed by J. A. WORP.—Bijdr. vaderl. Geschied. 3rd S. viii. 4.

The war of the Spanish succession in the Chronicles of Lodi: by G. AGNELLI [chiefly derived from the MS. of Fagnani, a Dominican, who gives an excellent description of the general character of the operations on the Adda, and the siege of the castle of Milan from 1701 to 1706; and illustrates the bad discipline and want of spirit in the French troops as compared with prince Eugene's. Popular sympathies seem to have been with the archduke. There are also interesting details of the old-fashioned Spanish Lombard garrison, of the French military hospitals, the German commissariat, and the reckless expenditure of the French].—Arch. stor. Lomb 3rd S. iii. *Sept.*

The secret negotiations of the state-pensionary L. P. van de Spiegel and the English minister lord Auckland with the French general Dumouriez through the mediation of the French minister M. E. de Maulde Hosdan [Nov. 1792 to Feb. 1793]: by L. WICHERS.—Bijdr. vaderl. Geschied. 3rd S. viii. 3.

Wilhelm von Humboldt's observations on the Spanish cortes [1811]: by B. GEBHARDT.—Hist. Zft. lxxiii. 3.

An unsigned paper found among the remains of the duke of Reichstadt [apparently written in the winter of 1831 or the spring of 1832]: printed by H. SCHLITTER.—Mitth. Inst. Oesterreich. Gesch.-forsch. xv. 4.

Memoir by Theodor von Bernhardi on the Polish revolt of 1863.—Hist. Zft. lxxiii. 1.

On the servile classes in Champagne from the eleventh to the fourteenth century: by H. SÉE. I.—Rev. hist. lvi. 2. *Nov.*

The war of partisans in Upper Normandy: [1424–1429]: by G. LEFÈVRE-PONTALIS.—Bibl. École Chartes, lv. 3, 4 (continued from liv. 5).

The 'Economies Royales' of Sully and Henry IV's great design: by C. Pfister. V, concluded.—Rev. hist. lvi. 2. *Nov.*

The diocese of Bordeaux in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: by E. Allain.—Rev. Quest. hist. lvi. 2. *Oct.*

Early professions of faith of French protestants, Robert Estienne, Lefèvre, and Calvin: by O. Douen and N. Weiss.—Bull. Soc. Hist. Protest. Franç. xliii. 9. *Sept.*

Letters close of Francis I on the protestants of Savoy [1538]: by H. Hauser.—Bull. Soc. Hist. Protest. Franç. xliii. 11. *Nov.*

Catherine de Médicis and the politiques [1560–1576]: by comte H. de la Ferrière.—Rev. Quest. hist. lvi. 2. *Oct.*

Recent literature on the massacre of St. Bartholomew: by N. Weiss.—Bull. Soc. Hist. Protest. Franç. xliii. 8. *Aug.*

John of Luxembourg [1537–1576] *and the reformation in the county of Ligny-en-Barrois*: by H. Dannreuther.—Bull. Soc. Hist. Protest. Franç. xliii. 10. *Oct.*

The protestants of Sedan [1572–1710] by N. Weiss & A. Bernus.—Bull. Soc. Hist. Protest. Franç. xliii. 10. *Oct.*

The reformation in Vermandois and the county of Cambray [1592–1599]: by J. Pannier.—Bull. Soc. Hist. Protest. Franç. xliii. 8. *Aug.*

The man in the black velvet mask, commonly called the iron mask: by F. Funck-Brentano [who decides for his identity with Mattioli].—Rev. hist. lvi. 2. *Nov.*

The relations of the marquis de Langallerie with the Jews: by D. Kauffmann.—Rev. Études Juives 56. *April.*

The masonic lodge at Montreuil-sur-Mer [1761–1809]: by E. Charpentier.—Révol. Franç. xiv. 6. *Dec.*

Pierre Soulier, protestant minister [1743–1794], put to death during the reign of terror: by D. Benoît.—Bull. Soc. Hist. Protest. Franç. xliii. 11. *Nov.*

The twentieth-tax in the country of Toulouse in the years preceding the revolution: by M. Marion.—Révol. Franç. xiv. 5. *Nov.*

The county of Eu at the time of the calling of the estates general of 1789: by F. Clérembray.—Révol. Franç. xiv. 1. *July.*

Abbé Soulavie's account of the elections of the clergy of Caen in 1789: printed by A. Brette.—Révol. Franç. xiv. 2. *Aug.*

The ranks of officers in the army of the revolution: by E. Charavay.—Révol. Franç. xiv. 4. *Oct.*

Bournon's history of the Bastille and the 14th July 1789: by J. Flammermont.—Révol. Franç. xiv. 5. *Nov.* (cf. 6. *Dec.*)

Chasles, a regicide priest [1753–1826]: by E. Welvert.—Rev. Quest. hist. lvi. 2. *Oct.*

Gay-Vernon [1748–1822], *constitutional bishop of Limoges*: by A. Artaud.—Révol. Franç. xiv. 4–6. *Oct.–Dec.*

The 20th June and the 10th August 1792, as described by Michel Azéma, deputy of the Aude in the legislative assembly: letters printed by C. Bloch.—Révol. Franç. xiv. 2. *Aug.*

The municipality of Tourcoing under foreign occupation [1792–1793]: by H. Prentout. Révol. Franç. xiv. 1, 2. *July, Aug.*

The town of Condé [1792–1794]: by P. Foucart.—Révol. Franç. xiv. 5, 6. *Nov., Dec.*

The notebook of the abbé Jehin [one of the leaders of the revolutionary movement in the principality of Liège] *at Paris* [6 May 1793–6 Nov. 1794]: by A. Body.—Bull. Inst. archéol. Liégeois, xxiii. 3.

Letter of Godefroy [14 Nov. 1793] illustrating the reaction against the worship of Reason: printed by F. A. Aulard.—Révol. Franç. xiv. 6. *Dec.*

Documents of the revolutionary government: the decree of 14 Frimaire an II [4 Dec. 1793] and other documents of the time, reprinted by F. A. Aulard.—Révol. Franç. xiv. 3. *Sept.*

The political effects of the partial renewal of representative assemblies: by G. Pouzet, art 3 illustrated from the history of the relations between the Directory and the egislative councils 1797–1800].—Ann. Sciences Polit. ix. 5. *Sept.*

The causes of the 18th Brumaire: by F. A. Aulard [the growth of military feeling; disgust with politics; the existence of a party, possibly not a minority, hostile to

republican institutions; the failure of leading men owing to the executions of 1793 and 1794; the suppression of Paris; and the division of parties].—Révol. Franç. xiv. 1. *July*.

Bonaparte and the supposed attempt at his assassination by the Five Hundred [10 Nov. 1799]: by F. A. Aulard [who decides it to be a fable].—Révol. Franç. xiv. 2. *Aug*.

The conventionnels who held office after the 18th Brumaire: by A. Kuscinski.—Révol. Franç. xiv. 3. *Sept*. (cf. 4. *Oct*.)

Letter of general Menou to Jean-Baptiste Fourier [21 May 1801]: printed by E. Charavay.—Révol. Franç. xiv. 1. *July*.

The Hundred Days at Dijon: by P. Gaffarel.—Révol. Franç. xiv. 2–4. *Aug.-Oct*.

The German currency in the middle ages: by K. T. von Inama-Sternegg.—Zft. Social-Wirthsch.-Gesch. iii. 1.

The county of Hegau: by G. Tumbült [the counts, 724-926, with brief later notices; the landgravial rights; boundary disputes; exempt districts].—Mitth. Inst. Oesterreich. Gesch.-forsch., Ergänzb. iii. 3.

Udalhardis, wife of count Frederick II of Leiningen: by E. Krüger.—Anz. Schweiz. Gesch. 1894. 4.

Recent literature on the history of the origin of German towns: by K. Uhlirz.—Mitth. Inst. Oesterreich. Gesch.-forsch. xv. 4.

The position of Lusatia in the golden bull of Charles IV: by W. Lippert.—Mitth. Inst. Oesterreich. Gesch.-forsch. xv. 4.

Religious, artistic, and social forces in Germany in the later middle ages: by K. Lamprecht.—Zft. Kulturgesch. i. 1.

Familiar letters of German ladies [1461–1509]: printed by G. Steinhausen [as specimens of the epistolary style of the period].—Zft. Kulturgesch. i. 1.

The communism of the followers of Huter in Moravia in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries [1526–1626]: by J. Loserth.—Zft. Social-Wirthsch.-Gesch. iii. 1.

Duke Otto of Brunswick-Lüneburg's renunciation of his right to the government of the principality of Lüneburg and his marriage with Meta von Campe: by A. Wrede [giving an account, chiefly in the words of the Duke's own narrative of the year 1526, of a *mésalliance* to which he adhered with honourable fidelity after taking the opinion of Wittemberg].—Zft. hist. Ver. Niedersachsen, 1894.

Melanchthon's lecture on Cicero's 'De Officiis' [1555]: by W. Meyer.—Nachr. Gesellsch. Wiss. Göttingen. 1894. 2.

The carnival at Münster in the sixteenth century: by P. Bahlmann.—Zft. Kulturgesch. i. 2, 3.

The siege of Vienna by count Thurn [2–14 June 1619]: by A. Huber & J. Hirn.—Mitth. Inst. Oesterreich. Gesch.-forsch. xv. 4.

Wallenstein's catastrophe: by K. Wittich. II: Jan.-Feb. 1634 [treated in connexion with the Swedish negotiations published by G. Irmer].—Hist. Zft. lxxiii. 2.

Letters of Pufendorf to Falaiseau, Friese, and Weigel, with remarks by K. Varrentrapp.—Hist. Zft. lxxiii. 1.

Benjamin Schmolck the hymn-writer [1672–1737]: by J. E. Rankin.—Papers Amer. Soc. of Church Hist. vi.

The foundation of the Austrian navy, with documents [1720]: by K. Lechner.—Mitth. Inst. Oesterreich. Gesch.-forsch. xv. 4.

The responsibility of Frederick the Great for the outbreak of the Seven Years' War: by R. Koser [an embittered reply to M. Lehmann's recent attempt to show that the position of Frederick II in the summer of 1756 was not sufficiently perilous to explain his taking arms; demonstrating, in accordance with the conclusions of Ranke, that the arming of Prussia was caused by the preparations of Russia, and that these were the immediate consequence of Kaunitz's instructions to Esterhazy of 13 March 1756].—Hist. Zft. lxxiv. 1.

The town of Hanover in the Seven Years' War: by O. Ulrich [a detailed account of the fortunes of the Hanoverian capital in the Seven Years' War, more especially during the two occupations by the duke de Richelieu in 1757 and 1758: interesting

as showing the corruption existing in the French army, which otherwise was guilty of no gross misconduct; and, incidentally, as illustrating the disadvantages of the British connexion to the electorate].—Zft. hist. Ver. Niedersachsen, 1894.

Frederick the Great in 1761: by H. von Sybel.—Hist. Zft. lxxiii. 1.

Charles Augustus of Saxe-Weimar, Goethe, and the Fürstenbund: by P. Bailleu [in criticism of O. Lorenz].—Hist. Zft. lxxiii. 1.

The military policy of Prussia after Jena from the treaty of Tilsit to the treaty of Kalisch [1807–1813]: by Nathan-Forest.—Ann. Sciences polit. ix. 5. *Sept.*

The Prussian reform legislation in its relation to the French revolution: by F. Koser [criticising G. Cavaignac's work on Stein's ministry].—Hist. Zft. lxxiii. 2.

Duke Friedrich Wilhelm of Brunswick's march through North Germany in 1809, with maps and plans.—Milit.-Wochenbl. 1894, Beiheft 9, 10.

The acceptance of industrial freedom in Prussia [1810–1811]: by K. von Rohrscheidt. I.—Zft. Social-Wirthsch.-Gesch. iii. 1.

Letters of the war-minister von Roon [1864], showing that it was through his efforts that Bismarck was made minister in 1862.—Hist. Zft. lxxiii. 2.

Documents on the Jews of Wiener-Neustadt: by Schweinburg-Eibenschütz.—Rev. Études Juives 56. *April.*

Some features of papal jurisdiction in medieval England: by J. Moyes [illustrated from W. H. Bliss's 'Calendar of papal letters, 1198–1304'].—Dublin Rev. N.S. 12. *Oct.*

The taxation of papal bulls addressed to England: by E. Bacha [it was on a higher scale doubtless on account of the greater cost of transmission].—Bull. Comm. hist. Belg., 5th S., iv. 2.

The expulsion of the Jews from England: by B. L. Abrahams.—Jew. Qu. Rev. 25. *Oct.*

Mrs. J. R. Green's 'English Towns in the fifteenth century.'—Edinb. Rev. 370. *Oct.*

The master masons of Scotland.—Scott. Rev. 48. *Oct.*

Tudor intrigues in Scotland in connexion with queen Margaret [1513–1541].—Scott. Rev. 48. *Oct.*

The history of the doctrine of apostolical succession in the church of England since the reformation: by H. C. Vedder.—Papers Amer. Soc. of Church Hist. vi.

The earl of Lonsdale's papers.—Edinb. Rev. 370. *Oct.*

Lord Wolseley's Life of Marlborough.—Edinb. Rev. 370. *Oct.*;—Quart. Rev. 358. *Oct.*;—by W. O'C. Morris, Scott. Rev. 48. *Oct.*

The earl of Mar's 'Considerations and proposalls for Irland on a restoration' [July 1722]: printed by the hon. S. Erskine.—Dublin Rev. N.S. 12. *Oct.*

Buchan [an historical and descriptive account].—Quart. Rev. 358. *Oct.*

The ancient history and topography of Naples illustrated from inscriptions: by A. Sogliano.—Arch. stor. Napol. xix. 3 (continued from 1).

The duchy of Naples: by M. Schipa. XI: The contest with the Norman monarchy [1131–1137], concluded.—Arch. stor. Napol. xix. 3.

History and art [containing among other notices a description of the discoveries and reconstructions in the castle of Milan since its transference from the military to the municipal authorities in 1893. The more important relate to the age of Galeazzo Maria Sforza, Bona of Savoy, and Ludovico Moro].—Arch. stor. Lomb. 3rd S. iii. *Sept.*

The battle of Porto Longo or Sapienza [1354]: by V. Lazzarini [including the operations which preceded and followed the disaster of the Venetian fleet, and the inquiry into the conduct of the officers, with illustrative documents from the Archivio di Stato at Venice].—N. Arch. Ven. viii. 1.

Giangaleazzo Visconti a prisoner: by G. Romano [denying the alleged attempt of the Visconti to poison the emperor Rupert at Sulzbach, and attributing the slander, on Uzzano's confession, to the hatred of the Florentine government for Giangaleazzo.]—Arch. stor. Lomb. 3rd S. ii. *June.*

The alliance of king René with Francesco Sforza against the Venetians: by E. Colombo, concluded.—Arch. stor. Lomb. 3rd S. ii. *June.*

Guiniforte Barzizza, master of Galeazzo Maria Sforza: by A. Cappelli [contains interesting letters describing the visit of the young prince to Borso d'Este in 1457, and to the diet of Mantua in 1459].—Arch. stor. Lomb. 3rd S. ii. *June.*

The first years of Ferdinand of Aragon and the invasion of John of Anjou: by E. Nunziante. X. [1459–1460].—Arch. stor. Napol. xix. 3.

Notices concerning Neapolitan writers and artists of the Aragonese period: by E. Pèrcopo. IV: Gabriele Altilio, Giuliano da Majano, Rutilio Zenone, Aurelio Bienato.—Arch. stor. Napol. xix. 3.

A satire of Ercole del Mayno [a Milanese] *against Venice*: by E. Motta [written in 1483 during the Ferrarese war; a summary of the sins of Venice in the fifteenth century, down to the seizure of Cyprus, the bringing of the Turks to Otranto, and the invitation to French, Germans, and Swiss. An account is added of the writer's magistracy at Bormio and his assassination].—Arch. stor. Lomb. 3rd S. iii. *Sept.*

Alonso Hernandez' 'Historia Parthenopea,' a Spanish poem on the feats of the Gran Capitano [Gonçalo de Cordova] in the kingdom of Naples [printed in 1516]: by B Croce.—Arch. stor. Napol. xix. 3.

Filippo Strozzi: by A. Bardi biographical study supported by unpublished letters of Strozzi to his brother Lorenzo and to Francesco Vettori, 1512-1535. The author believes Strozzi to have been selfish, unprincipled, and easily led, having no real love for popular liberties. He discredits the theory of suicide as being alien to Strozzi's character].—Arch. stor. Ital. 5th S. xiv. 3.

Tommaso Campanella [† 1639], *a philosophical poet of the Italian renaissance*: by E. Gothein.—Zft. Kulturgesch. i. 1.

The cavaliere Antonio Micheroux in the Neapolitan reaction of 1799: by B. Maresca. V.—Arch. stor. Napol. xix. 3.

Bibliographical notices of recent works relating to Italian history: by C. Cipolla.—N Arch. Ven. viii. 1.

Vitae B. Odiliae viduae Leodiensis libri duo priores.—Anal. Bolland. 1894. 2.

Supplementary documents to the 'Oorkondenboek van Holland en Zeeland' [1230–1299]: printed by J. de Fremery.—Bijdr. vaderl. Geschied. 3rd S. viii. 4.

A thirteenth-century account-book [of the seigneurs of Mortagne]: by A. d'Herbomez. Messager Sciences hist. Belg. 1894. 2.

Historical songs in the vernacular of the Netherlands before the religious troubles of the sixteenth century: by P. Fredericq.—Bull. Acad. Belg., 3rd S., xxvii. 5.

The chronicler Guillaume de Vottem, prior of St. Jacques at Liège: by U. Berlière Bull. Comm. hist. Belg., 5th S., iv. 2.

The fortifications of Antwerp in the sixteenth century: by Wauvermans.—Ann. Acad. archéol. Belg. xlviii. 1.

Dom Mathieu Moulart, abbat of St. Ghislain and bishop of Arras: by U. Berlière.—Rev. Bénéd. Maredsous, x. 6.

On the history of the separation of North and South Netherland. V: *The election of Anjou*: by P. L. Muller.—Bijdr. vaderl. Geschied. 3rd S. viii. 4.

The preparation in exile of the reformed church of Holland [in the years preceding 1572]: by R. Fruin.—Arch. Nederl. Kerkgesch. v. 1.

Dom Jacques de Marquais [1541–1604, the reformer of the abbey of St. Martin at Tournai]: by U. Berlière.—Rev. Bénéd. Maredsous, x. 4.

Madier-Montjou in Belgium: by M. Sulzberger [on the history of the *proscrits* of the 2nd Dec.]—Rev. Belg. 1894. 4.

The independence of Belgium and the schemes of general Brialmont [on the neutrality of Belgium].—Rev. gén. Belg. 1894. 6.

The restoration of the château of Gerard le Diable at Ghent: by A. Verhaegen.—Messager Sciences hist. Belg. 1894. 2.

The correspondence of the papal secretary with the nuncios in Poland [1605–1609] *relative to the tsar Dimitri* [the false Demetrius], preserved in a Vatican manuscript: by P. Pierling [who states that Tourguénev's extracts in the 'Hist. Russ. Monum. are totally insufficient and misleading].—Rev. Quest. hist. lvi. 2. *Oct.*

Klenck the Dutchman in Moscow: by A. M. L. [from his original narrative, which gives a curious picture of Russian life in the time of the emperor Alexis].—Istorich. Viestnik. *Sept.*

Extracts from the memoirs of prince Eugene of Würtemberg [who entered the Russian service in 1796]. I: [containing interesting details of the emperor Paul].—Russk. Starina. *Oct.*

Prince Bagration: by A. Orelski [one of the heroes of Borodino. The writer approves of his plans of the great campaign in opposition to those of Barclay de Tolly]. Istorich. Viestnik. *Sept.*

Kutuzov in the year 1812: by D. Buturlin [interesting details of the battle of Maloyaroslavets and the French retreat].—Russk. Starina. *Oct.–Nov.*

Notes on the circumstances in which Alexander I's constitutional scheme of Oct. 1819 [printed in vol. lxxii. 1] *was produced*: by A. Stern.—Hist. Zft. lxxiii. 2.

The embassy to Khiva in 1842: by I. Zakharyin [by an eye-witness. The embassy was undertaken by the Russians to enter into relations with the khan after the unfortunate expedition of Perovski in 1839].—Istor. Viestnik. *Nov.*

Memoirs of M. Olshevski [dealing with the war in the Caucasus. In this part of the memoirs an account is given of the capture of Shamyl].—Russk. Starina. *Nov.*

The relations of the bishops of Sion to the empire [from the eleventh to the sixteenth century]: by V. van Berchem.—Anz. Schweiz. Gesch. 1894. 3.

Notes on the medieval bishops of Sion: by R. Hoppeler.—Anz. Schweiz. Gesch. 1894. 4.

The pedigree of the house of Kiburg in the thirteenth century: by E. Kruger.—Anz. Schweiz. Gesch. 1894. 4.

Charter granted by count Amedeus VI of Savoy for the town of Couthey in Vallais [1352]: printed by R. Hoppeler.—Anz. Schweiz. Gesch. 1894. 3.

The date of Zwingli's statement on the question of an alliance with imperial cities of the evangelical profession: by J. Strickler [arguing for 1529, not 1527].—Anz. Schweiz. Gesch. 1894. 4.

The chronicler Bartholomeus Anhorn's will [1611]: printed by F. Jecklin.—Anz. Schweiz. Gesch. 1894. 4.

The conquest and colonisation of Mexico: by J. G. Icazbalceta [the character and difficulties of the conquerors; their success due in the slightest degree to cavalry and firearms; the experiments in administration; the alleged cruelties much exaggerated; the work of the Franciscan missions].—Boletin R. Acad. Hist. xxv. 1-3. *July-Sept.*

The second journey of Orellana on the Amazon: by M. Jimenez de la Espada [the only formal and detailed document on this expedition of 1545. It is by P. Sanchez Vezino, one of Orellana's comrades].—Boletin R. Acad. Hist. xxv. 4. *Oct.*

The conquest of Oceania by the European nations: by P. Barré [a summary of the process of annexation up to the present day, accompanied by a map showing spheres of influence, and by tables of the comparative area and population of the possessions of the different powers and the states recognised as independent].—Rev. de Géogr. *Nov.*

The contest for religious liberty in Massachusetts [1646–1833]: by H. S. Burrage.—Papers Amer. Soc. of Church Hist. vi.

The life and work of bishop Francis Asbury [1745–1816]: by A. Lowry.—Papers Amer. Soc. of Church Hist. vi.

Papers on Philip Schaff [† 20 Oct. 1893].—Papers Amer. Soc. of Church Hist. vi.

The American Historical Register, of which the first number appeared in September, is a monthly illustrated publication devoted to the history and antiquities of the United States of America, with special reference to family and local matters. In No. 1 is a facsimile of a letter of Washington to James Madison [5 Nov. 1786].

List of Recent Historical Publications

I. GENERAL HISTORY

(Including works of miscellaneous contents)

Bertrand (A.) & Reinach (S.) Nos origines. II : Les Celtes dans la vallée du Pô et du Danube. Illustr. Paris : Leroux. 7·50 f.

Bocquet (L.) Le célibat dans l'antiquité envisagé au point de vue civil. Paris : Giard & Brière. 5 f.

Chimienti (P.) Il diritto di proprietà nello stato costituzionale. Pp. 197. Turin.

Corazzini (F.) Storia della marina militare antica. II, 1. Pp. 430, 14 plates. Florence.

Döllinger (J. I. von). Addresses on historical and literary subjects. Transl. by Margaret Warre. Pp. 282. London : Murray. 14/.

Geffcken (H.) Zur Geschichte der Ehescheidung vor Gratian. Pp. 82. Leipzig : Veit. 2·50 m.

Gregorovius (F.) Briefe an den Staatssekretär Hermann von Thile. Herausgegeben von H. von Petersdorff. Pp. 264, portr. Berlin : Paetel. 6 m.

Harrison (F.) The meaning of history and other historical pieces. Pp. 507. London : Macmillan. 8/6.

Historische Untersuchungen, Ernst Förstemann gewidmet von der historischen Gesellschaft zu Dresden. Pp. 143. Berlin : Teubner. 4 m.

Lane-Poole (S.) Coins and medals; their place in history and art : ed. by. 3rd ed. revised. Pp. 286, illustr. London : Stock.

Masi (E.) Nuovi studî e ritratti. 2 vol. Pp. 291, 368. Bologna. 16mo.

Pernot (A.) Aperçu historique sur le service des transports militaires. Pp. 492. Limoges : Lavauzelle. 10 f.

Piedelièvre (R.) Précis de droit international public, ou droit des gens. I : Des états et de leurs relations en temps de paix. Pp. 603. Paris : Pichon. 10 f.

Pramberger (E.) Atlas zum Studium der Militär-Geographie von Mittel-Europa. 10 maps. Vienna : Hölzel. Fol. 8 m.

Tomaschek (W.) Die alten Thraker: eine ethnologische Untersuchung. II : Die Sprachreste. 2 : Personen- und Ortsnamen. Pp. 103. Vienna : Tempsky.

Weiss (A.) Traité théorique et pratique de droit international privé. II : le droit de l'étranger. Paris : Larose. 12 f.

Westlake (J.) Chapters on the principles of international law. Pp. 275. Cambridge : University Press. 10/.

Wolff (H. W.) Odd bits of history, being short chapters intended to fill some blanks. Pp. 267. London : Longmans. 8/6.

Wyss (G. von). Geschichte der Historiographie in der Schweiz. I. Pp. 80. Zürich : Fäsi & Beer. 1·60 m.

II. ORIENTAL HISTORY

Aegyptische Urkunden aus den königlichen Museen zu Berlin. Griechische Urkunden. XI. Pp. 321–352. Berlin : Weidmann. 2·40 m.

Barbé (E.) Le nabab René Madec : histoire diplomatique des projets de la France sur le Bengale et le Pendjab [1772–1808]. Pp. 300. Paris : Alcan.

Bose (P. N.) A history of Hindu civilisation during British rule. I, II. London : Paul, Trübner, & Co. 15/.

Danvers (F. C.) The Portuguese in India : a history of the rise and decline of their eastern empire. 2 vol. Maps and illustr. London : Allen. 42/.

Herzfeld (L.) Handelsgeschichte der Juden des Altertums aus den Quellen erforscht und zusammengestellt. Pp. l, 344. Brunswick : Meyer. 3 m.

Koenig (X.) Essai sur la formation du canon de l'ancien testament. Paris : Fischbacher. 2 f.

Martine (P.) Histoire du monde oriental dans l'antiquité. Paris : Dupont. 12mo. 3·50 f.

Maspero (G.) Bibliothèque égyptologique, comprenant les œuvres des égyptologues français dispersées dans divers recueils. I : Etudes de mythologie et d'archéologie egyptiennes. Pp. 417. Paris : Leroux. 12 f.

—— Histoire ancienne des peuple

d'Orient. I: Les origines; Egypte, Chaldée. I–V. Pp. 80, illustr. Paris: Hachette. 3·50 f.

Megavorian (A.) Etude ethnographique et juristique sur la famille et le mariage arméniens, précédée d'une aperçu historique. Pp. 127. Geneva: Stapelmohr. (2·50 m.)

Merx (A.) Documents de paléographie hébraïque et arabe publiés par. 7 plates. Leyden: Brill. 4to. 10·50 fl.

Rouquerol (G.) Expédition de 1830 et prise d'Alger par les Français; organisation et rôle de l'artillerie du corps expéditionnaire. Pp. 112, 4 plates. Nancy: Berger-Levrault. 2.50 f.

Saladin (H.) Description des antiquités de la régence de Tunis: monuments antérieurs à la conquête arabe. II. Pp. 188, illustr. Paris: Leroux.

Starck (E. von). Palästina und Syrien von Anfang der Geschichte bis zum Siege des Islam. Lexikalisches Hilfsbuch. Pp. 168. Berlin: Reuther & Reichard. 4·50 m.

Tiele (C. P.) Western Asia, according to recent discoveries; transl. by Elizabeth J. Taylor. Pp. 36. London: Luzac. 2/6.

III. GREEK AND ROMAN HISTORY

Blanchet (A.) Les monnaies grecques. (Petite bibliothèque d'art et d'archéologie. XVI.) 12 plates. Paris: Leroux. 18mo. 3·50 f.

Blondel (J. E.) Histoire économique de la conjuration de Catilina. Paris: Guillaumin. 6 f.

Cagnat (R.) & Goyau (G.) Lexique des antiquités romaines, rédigé sous la direction de. Plates. Paris: Thorin. 7 f.

Casati de Casatis (C.) Ius antiquum: Vegoia; droit papirien; leges regiae; lex XII tabularum. Paris: Didot. 12 f.

Holm (A.) The history of Greece, from its commencement to the close of the independence of the Greek nation. I. Pp. 438. London: Macmillan. 6/.

Ihering (Rudolf von). Entwicklungsgeschichte des römischen Rechts. Einleitung; Verfassung des römischen Hauses. Aus dem Nachlass herausgegeben. Pp. 124. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. 3 m.

Inscriptionarum Latinarum, Corpus. VIII: supplementum. II. Pp. 1667–1903. Berlin: Reimer. Fol. 22 m.

Leonhard (R.) Institutionen des römischen Rechts. Pp. 572. Leipzig: Veit. 11 m.

Monumenti antichi pubblicati per cura della R. Accademia dei Lincei. IV, 1. Pp. 587. Milan: Hoepli. 4to, with atlas of plates folio.

Pélade (M.) Rome: histoire de ses monuments anciens et modernes. Pp. 239, illustr. Paris: Delhomme & Briguet. 2·50 f.

Sittl (C.) Die Grenzbezeichnung der Römer: ein Beitrag zur Limes-Frage. Pp. 25, 4 plates. Würzburg: Stahel. 1·50 m.

Strachan-Davidson (J. L.) Cicero and the fall of the Roman republic. Pp. 446, illustr. London: Putnam. 5/.

Taciti (Cornelii) Annalium ab excessu divi Augusti libri. By H. Furneaux. Text. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 6/.

—— de Germania. Ed. with introd. and notes by H. Furneaux. Pp. 131, map. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 6/6.

IV. ECCLESIASTICAL AND MEDIEVAL HISTORY

Acta martyris Anastasii Persae Graece primum edidit H. Usener. Pp. 30. Bonn: Cohen. 4to. 2 m.

André (Mgr.) & Condis (abbé). Dictionnaire de droit canonique et des sciences en connexion avec le droit canon. Revu et considérablement augmenté par J. Wagner. I: *A–D*. Pp. lxxxiv, 808. Paris: Walzer. 15 f.

Archer (T. A.) & Kingsford (C. L.) The crusades: the story of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem. Pp. 467, illustr. London: Unwin. 5/.

Böhmer (J. F.) Regesta Imperii. V: Die Regesten des Kaiserreichs [1198–1272]. Neu herausgegeben und ergänzt von J. Ficker und E. Winkelmann. VIII. Pp. 2110–2196. Innsbruck: Wagner. 4to. 3·60 m.

Bragognolo (G.) Storia del medio evo dalla caduta dell' impero romano d' Occidente alla morte di Enrico VIII di Lussemburgo. Pp. 690. Turin.

Cassani (G.) Origine giuridica delle decime ecclesiastiche in generale e delle centesi in particolare, con appendici sull' albergheria. Pp. 165. Bologna: Regia tipografia.

Constance.—Regesta episcoporum Constantiensium: Regesten zur Geschichte der Bischöfe von Constanz [517–1496]. II, 1: [1293–1314]. Bearbeitet von A. Cartellieri. Pp. 1–80. Innsbruck: Wagner. 4to. 4 m.

Colenbrander (B. W.) Beknopte geschiedenis van het Christendom. 2 vol. Pp. 327, 320. Zutphen.

Delaville le Roulx (J.) Cartulaire général des hospitaliers de Saint-Jean de Jérusalem [1100–1310]. I. Paris: Leroux. Fol. 100 f.

Emerton (E.) Mediæval Europe [814–1300]. Pp. 607. Boston: Ginn.

Eucherii (S.) Lugdunensis opera omnia. I: Formulae spiritalis intelligentiae, instructionum libri II, passio Agau-

nensium martyrum, epistula de laude Heremi. Accedunt epistulae ab Salviano et Hilario et Rustico ad Eucherium datae. Recensuit C. Wotke. (Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, XXXI.) Pp. 199. Leipzig: Freytag. 5·60 m.

Ferrai (L. A.) Il processo storico della chiesa romana nel medio evo. Pp. 27. Rome: tip. Forzani.

Fontane (M.) Histoire universelle. Le Christianisme (de 67 av. J.-C. à 117 ap. J.-C.) Paris: Lemerre. 7·50 f.

Froude (J. A.) Life and letters of Erasmus. Pp. 410. London: Longmans. 15/.

Gabotto (F.) Les légendes carolingennes dans le Chronicon ymaginis mundi de frate Jacopo d'Acqui. Pp. 40. Montpellier: imp. Hamelin.

Habsburgische Urbar, Das, herausgeben von R. Maag. I: Das eigentliche Urbar über die Einkünfte und Rechte. (Quellen zur Schweizer Geschichte. XIV.) Pp. 536. Basel: Geering. (10 m.)

Harnack (A.) Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte. II: Die Entwickelung des kirchlichen Dogmas. I. 3rd ed. Pp. 483. Freiburg: Mohr. 10 m.

Heinrich von Derby's Preussenfahrten [1390-91 und 1392], Rechnungen über. Herausgegeben von H. Prutz. (Publication des Vereins für die Geschichte der Provinzen Ost- und Westpreussen.) Pp. civ, 226. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. 6 m.

Kirsch (J. P.) Die päpstlichen Kollektorien in Deutschland während des vierzehnten Jahrhunderts, herausgegeben von. (Quellen und Forschungen aus dem Gebiete der Geschichte. III.) Pp. lxxviii, 562. Paderborn: Schöningh. 20 m.

Icelandic sagas, and other historical documents relating to the settlements and descents of the Northmen on the British isles. III, IV. Transl. by sir G. W. Dasent. Pp. lxii, 470, xxxvii, 491. London: Published under the direction of the master of the rolls. Each 10/.

Legrand (É.) Lettres de l'empereur Manuel Paléologue. I. Pp. 112. Paris: Welter.

Le Monnier (L.) History of St. Francis of Assisi. Engl. transl. Pp. 542. London: Paul, Trubner, & Co. 16/.

Masson (A. L.) Jean Gerson; sa vie, son temps, ses œuvres. Pp. 432, illustr. Lyon: Vitte. 6 f.

Mehlhorn (P.) Aus den Quellen der Kirchengeschichte. I: bis Konstantin. Pp. 116. Berlin: Reimer. 1·60 m.

Professione (A.) Contributo agli studî sulle decime ecclesiastiche e delle crociate. Pp. 19. Turin: Clausen.

Ritter (K.) Karl der Grosse und die Sachsen. I: Die Kriege mit den Sachsen. Pp. 74. Dessau: Kahle 1·50 m.

Rügamer (P.) Leontius von Byzanz: ein Polemiker aus dem Zeitalter Justinians. Pp. 176. Würzburg: Göbel. 2 m.

Santol (J.) De l'industrie et du commerce en Roussillon durant le moyen âge. Pp. 32. Céret: Roque.

Schnürer (G.) Die Entstehung des Kirchenstaates. Pp. 116. Cologne: Bachem. 1·80 m.

Spreitzenhofer (E.) Die Entwicklung des alten Mönchthums in Italien von seinen ersten Anfängen bis zum Auftreten des heiligen Benedict. Pp. 139. Vienna: Kirsch. 2·80 m.

Stieda (W.) Hansisch-venetianische Handelsbeziehungen im fünfzehnten Jahrhundert. Pp. 191. Rostock: Stiller. 5 m.

Sychowski (S. von). Hieronymus als Litterarhistoriker. (Kirchengeschichtliche Studien. II, 2.) Pp. 198. Münster: Schöningh. 4·60 m.

Tyconius, The book of rules of, ed. by F. C. Burkitt. (Texts and Studies. III, 1.) Cambridge: University Press. 5/.

V. HISTORY OF MODERN EUROPE

Bonghi (R.) Storia dell' Europa durante la rivoluzione francese [1789-1795]. II. Turin: Paravia. 16mo. 4 l.

Bonnac (marquis de). Mémoire historique sur l'ambassade de France à Constantinople, publié par C. Schefer. Pp. lxxviii, 287. Paris: Leroux.

Endres (K.) Beispiele aus dem deutsch-französischen Kriege von 1870-71 und dem russisch-türkischen Kriege von 1877-78. (Troschke's Anleitung zum Studium der Kriegsgeschichte. Ergänzungsband.) I. Pp. 1-154, map. Darmstadt: Zernin. 4·80 m.

Eyveau (G.) Storia moderna: la rivoluzione protestante e la preponderanza protestante e la preponderanza spagnuola [1517-1648]. Pp. 360. Turin.

Gaffarel (P.) Bonaparte et les républiques italiennes [1796-1799]. Pp. 303. Paris: Alcan. 5 f.

Kleemann. Die Linien (Linien-Verschanzungen) in Mittel-Europa im siebzehnten und achtzehnten Jahrhundert. Pp. 92. Darmstadt: Zernin. 1·80 m.

Lavalette (count), adjutant and private secretary to Napoleon, Memoirs. Pp. xxxvi, 460, portr. London: Gibbings.

Lumbroso (A.) Saggio di una bibliografia ragionata per servire alla storia dell' epoca napoleonica: *A–Azuni*. Pp. 155. Modena: Namias.

Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland, nebst ergänzenden Actenstücken. III: [1572-1585]. 2: Der Reichstag zu

Regensburg [1576]; der Pacificationstag zu Köln [1576]; der Reichstag zu Augsburg [1582]. Bearbeitet von J. Hansen. Pp. xciii, 679. Berlin: Bath.

Paine (Thomas), The writings of. Ed. by M. C. Conway. II: 1779–1792. Pp. 523. New York: Putnam. $2·50.

Pélissier (L. G.) Documents sur les relations de Louis XII, de Ludovic Sforza, et du marquis de Mantoue [1498–1500], tirés des archives de Mantoue, Modène, Milan, et Venise. Pp. 99. Paris: Leroux.

Pelletan (C.) Les guerres de la révolution. Pp. 204, illustr. Paris: Colin. 18mo. 1·50 f.

Poland.—Analecta Romana, quae historiam Poloniae saeculi XVI illustrant, ex archivis et bibliothecis excerpta edidit J. Korzeniowski. (Scriptores rerum Polonicarum. XV.) Pp. lxiv, 359. Cracow: Buchhandlung der polnischen Verlagsgesellschaft. 14 m.

Rose (J. H.) The revolutionary and Napoleonic era [1789–1815]. Pp. 388, maps. Cambridge: University Press. 4/6.

Sabron (F. H. A.) De oorlog van 1794–1795 op het grondgebied van de republiek der Vereenigde Nederlanden. 2 vol. Pp. 366, 87; 238, 81, maps. Breda: Broese.

Spain.—Recueil des instructions données aux ambassadeurs et ministres de France. XI: Espagne, avec une introd. par A. Morel-Fatio. I: 1649–1700. Pp. 527. Paris: Alcan. 20 f.

Starcke (C. N.) Den nyeste Tids Historie fra den franske Revolutionens Begyndelse. Pp. 174, 5 maps. Copenhagen. (5·25 m.)

Stern (A.) Geschichte Europas seit den Verträgen von 1815 bis zum Frankfurter Frieden von 1871. I. Pp. 655. Berlin: Hertz. 10 m.

Stoerk (F.) Nouveau recueil général de traités et autres actes relatifs aux rapports de droit international. Continuation du grand recueil de G. F. de Martens. 2e série. XIX, 1. Pp. 286. Göttingen: Dieterich. 11·60 m.

Testa (A. & L. de). Recueil des traités de la Porte ottomane avec les puissances étrangères depuis le premier traité conclu en 1536 jusqu'à nos jours. VIII: France. Pp. 633. Paris: Leroux. 12·50 f.

Weil (comte). La campagne de 1814, d'après les documents des archives impériales et royales de la guerre à Vienne; la cavalerie des armées alliées pendant la campagne de 1814. III. Pp. 579. Paris: Baudoin. 8 f.

A. FRANCE

Auton (Jean d'). Chroniques de Louis XII. Publiées par R. de Maulde la Clavière. III. Pp. 410. Paris: Laurens. 9 f.

Ayroles (J. B. J.) La vraie Jeanne d'Arc. II. Paris: Gaume. 15 f.

Bardoux (A.) Guizot. Paris: Hachette. 12mo. 2 f.

Batcave (L.) Les archives municipales d'Orthez. Pp. 19. Pau: Ribaut.

Belleval (marquis de). Un capitaine au régiment du roi: étude sur la société en France et sur une famille de la Flandre française au XVIIIe siècle. (Bibliothèque historique des provinces. I.) Paris: Lechevalier. 12mo. 3·50 f.

Blennerhassett (lady). Talleyrand. Pp. 572. Berlin: Paetel. 12 m.

———Engl. transl. 2 vol. London: Murray. 24/.

Bligny-Bondurand (E.) Inventaire sommaire des archives départementales antérieures à 1790. Gard. Série E. I. Pp. 461. Nîmes: imp. Chastanier. 4to. 10 f.

Bosquet (maréchal). Lettres [1830–1858]. Paris: Berger-Levrault. 5 f.

Bower (H. M.) The fourteen of Meaux: an account of the earliest reformed church within France proper. Pp. 125, illustr. London: Longmans. 6/.

Chalons-sur-Marne, Catalogue de la bibliothèque municipale de. Fonds Garinet: Manuscrits; histoire de Champagne. Pp. 260. Châlons-sur-Marne: imp. de l'Union républicaine.

Chérot (H.) L'éducation du grand Condé, d'après des documents inédits. Pp. 32, 34, 49. Paris: imp. Dumoulin.

Delmas (L.) Histoire de l'Hôtel-Dieu de Poitiers et de son hospitalisation militaire, de 1202 à nos jours. Pp. 94, plates. Paris: Oudin.

Dubois (abbé). Histoire du siège d'Orléans [1428–1429]: mémoire inédit, publié par P. Charpentier. Pp. xxxviii, 458, plates. Orleans: Herluison. 10 f.

Ducrest (madame). Memoirs of the empress Josephine, with anecdotes of the courts of Navarre and Malmaison. 2 vol. Pp. 876. London: Nichols. 21/.

Duquesnoy (Adrien), député du tiers état de Bar-le-Duc sur l'assemblée constituante. Journal [3 mai 1789–3 avril 1790], publié par R. de Crevecœur. I: 3 mai–29 octobre 1789. Paris: A. Picard. 10 f.

Duquet (A.) Guerre de 1870–1871: Paris, Thiers, le plan Trochu et l'Hay [2–29 novembre]. Paris: Charpentier. 12mo. 3·50 f.

Eck (T.) Saint-Quentin dans l'antiquité et au moyen âge: récit relatant les intéressantes découvertes faites dans cette ville en 1892, 1893. Pp. 51. Paris: Leroux. 2 f.

Faye (H.) Doléances du tiers état de Tours aux états généraux de 1789. Pp. 47. Tours: imp. Deslis.

Forestié (E.) Quelques inventaires du XIVe siècle. Pp. 33. Paris: Leroux,

FUNCK-BRENTANO (F.) Catalogue des manuscrits de la bibliothèque de l'Arsenal. IX. 2. Table générale des archives de la Bastille (*A–K*). Pp. 277–633. Paris: Plon. 6 f.

GALLI (H.) Les représentants de la Marne aux assemblées de la révolution. Pp. 55. Châlons-sur-Marne: imp. de l'Union républicaine.

GONTAUT (duchesse de) [1773–1836], gouvernante to the children of France. Memoirs. Transl. by J. W. Davis. 2 vol. Pp. 476. London: Chatto & Windus.

GRIN (François), religieux de Saint-Victor à Paris. Journal [1554–1570] publié par le baron A. de Ruble. Pp. 56. Nogent-le-Rotrou: imp. Daupeley-Gouverneur.

GUILLAUME (J.) Procès-verbaux du comité d'instruction publique de la convention nationale. II: 3 juillet 1793–30 brumaire an II]. Pp. ciii, 949. Paris: Hachette. 12 f.

HARDY DU PERINI (colonel). Batailles françaises. I: [1214–1559]. Pp. 363, illustr. Châteauroux: Majesté. 18mo. 3 f.

LABAT (G.) Documents sur la ville de Royan et la tour de Cordouan [1481–1799]. III. Pp. 150, plate. Bordeaux: impr. Gounouilhou. 4to.

LAS CASES (comte de). Le mémorial de Sainte-Hélène, suivi de Napoléon dans l'exil par O'Meara et du séjour du Dr Antommarchi à Sainte-Hélène. I. Paris: Garnier. 12mo. 3·50 f.

LECESTRE (L.) Mémoires de Gourville. I: 1646–1669. Pp. cxvi, 270. Paris: Laurens. 9 f.

LEMAS (T.) Etudes documentaires sur la révolution: les commissions militaires révolutionnaires dans l'Ille-et-Vilaine [1793–1794]. Paris: Fischbacher. 1·50 f.

LE MENÉ (J. M.) Histoire des paroisses du diocèse de Vannes. I. Pp. 558. Vannes: impr. Galles. 7·50 f.

LESGAZES (J. J. de). Le mémorial historique, contenant la narration des troubles et ce qui est arrivé diversement de plus remarquable dans le païs de Foix et diocèse de Pamiers [1490–1640]. Pp. 280. Foix: impr. Pomiès.

MARCA (P. de). Histoire de Béarn. New ed. with life, bibliography, and documents, by V. Dubarat. I. Pp. cccxxxii, 459. Pau: Ribaut. 4to. 12 f.

MENEVAL (baron C. F. de). Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de Napoléon I [1802–1815]. Edition entièrement refondue. III. Paris: Dentu. 7·50 f.

MOLINIER (A.) Correspondance administrative d'Alfonse de Poitiers. I. Pp. 798. Paris: Hachette. 4to. 12 f.

NICOULLAUD (C.) Casimir Périer, député de l'opposition [1817–1830]. Pp. 500, portr. Paris: Plon. 8 f.

PARISIENSIS, Chartularium universitatis. Collegit notisque illustravit H. Denifle. Pp. xxxvii, 777. Paris: Delalain. 4to.

PASQUIER (chancelier). Mémoires, publiés par le duc d'Audiffret-Pasquier. 2e partie. Restauration, II [1820–1824]. V. Paris: Plon. 8 f.

———Engl. transl. III. Pp. 468. London: Unwin. 16/.

PETIT (E.) Séjours de Charles VI [1380–1400]. Pp. 90. Paris: Leroux. 3·50 f.

PUAUX (N. A. F.) Histoire populaire du protestantisme français. Pp. 392. Paris: Revue chrétienne. 4to.

QUESNEL. Histoire maritime de la France depuis Colbert. Paris: Challamel. 4 f.

REURE (abbé). Les deux procès de Jeanne d'Arc et le manuscrit d'Urfé. Pp. 12. Lyons: Vitte.

SEPET (M.) Napoléon; son caractère, son génie, son rôle historique. Paris: Perrin. 12mo. 2·50 f.

SOUANCÉ (vicomte de). Abbaye royale de Notre-Dame des Clairets; histoire et cartulaire. Paris: Lechevalier. 10 f.

SPIERS (V. J. T.) History and literature of France in synoptic tables, and essays on the chief characters and epochs. Pp. 356. London: Rivington, Percival, & Co. 6/.

THIÉBAULT (général baron). Mémoires publiés d'après le manuscrit original par F. Calmettes. III: 1799–1806. Pp. 563, plates. Paris: Plon. 7·50 f.

TUETEY (A.) Répertoire général des sources manuscrites de l'histoire de Paris pendant la révolution française. III: Assemblée constituante (3e partie). Pp. xliv, 725. Paris: Champion. 10 f

VINGTRINIER (A.) Histoire de l'imprimerie à Lyon de l'origine jusqu'à nos jours. Illustr. Lyons: Storck. 7·50 f.

B. GERMANY AND AUSTRIA-HUNGARY

BADEN und Hachberg, Regesten der Markgrafen von [1050–1515]. Bearbeitet von R. Fester. IV, V. Pp. 201–344, 41–56. Innsbruck: Wagner. 4to. Each 4 m.

BAX (E. B.) German society at the close of the middle ages. Pp. 276. London: Sonnenschein. 5/.

BIOGRAPHIE, Allgemeine deutsche. Parts 182–185. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. Each 2·40 m.

CARL von Oesterreich, Ausgewählte Schriften. Herausgegeben im Auftrage seiner Söhne, der Herren Erzherzoge Albrecht und Wilhelm. V. Maps, &c. Vienna: Braumüller. Pp. 667. 13 m.

DAHN (F.) Erinnerungen. IV: Würzburg, Sedan, Königsberg. I: [1863–1870]. Pp. 612, map. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel. 10 m.

FROMMHOLD (G.) Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte. Pp. 224, 3 maps. Berlin: Heyman. 5 m.

GÜSSFELDT (E.) Die Insel Reichenau und ihre Klostergeschichte. Pp. 85. Constance: Meck. 12mo. 1 m.

AMBERGER (J.) Die französische Invasion in Kärnten im Jahre 1809. C: Die Lage Kärntens während der Anwesenheit der Feinde. II. Pp. 47. Klagenfurt: Kleinmayr. 1 m.
HEUSER (E.) Die Belagerung von Landau [1702, 1703]. Pp. xl, 208, plates, &c. Landau: Kaussler. 4 m.
HOF, Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt: E. Widmanns Chronik der Stadt; J. Schlemmers Geschichte der Belagerung der Stadt [1553]. Herausgegeben von C. Meyer. Pp. 486, plates. Hof: Lion. 11 m.
JOACHIM (E.) Die Politik des letzten Hochmeisters in Preussen Albrecht von Brandenburg. II: [1518–1521]. (Publicationen aus den königlich preussischen Staatsarchiven. LVIII.) Pp. 402. Leipzig: Hirzel. 12 m.
KÜNTZEL (G.) Ueber die Verwaltung des Mass- und Gewichtswesens in Deutschland während des Mittelalters. (Schmoller's Staats- und socialwissenschaftliche Forschungen, XIII. 2) Pp. 102. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. 2·60 m.
LAMPRECHT (K.) Deutsche Geschichte. IV. Pp. 488. Berlin: Gaertner. 6 m.
LOSERTH (J.) Der Communismus der mährischen Wiedertäufer im sechszehnten und siebzehnten Jahrhundert: Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte, Lehre und Verfassung. Pp. 188. Leipzig: Freytag. 3·60 m.
MEHLIS (C.) Studien zur ältesten Geschichte der Rheinlande. XI: Der Drachenfels bei Dürkheim. Pp. 32, map. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. 1·60 m.
MIKLAU (J.) Franz II Rákóczy [1676–1735]: ein Lebens- und Charakterbild. Pp. 48. Brünn: Knauthe. 1 m.
POLEK (J.) Die Bukowina zu Anfang des Jahres 1783, nach einer Denkschrift von J. Budinszky. Pp. 84. Czernowitz: Pardini. 12mo. 1 m.
SCHMOLLER (G.) & KRAUSKE (O.) Die Behördenorganisation und die allgemeine Staatsverwaltung Preussens im achtzehnten Jahrhundert. I: Akten von 1701 bis Ende Juni 1714. (Acta Borussica. IV.) Pp. 143, 843. Berlin: Parey. 21 m.
RAPPOLTSTEINISCHES Urkundenbuch [759–1500]: Quellen zur Geschichte der ehemaligen Herrschaft Rappoltstein im Elsass, herausgegeben von K. Albrecht. III: [1409–1442]. Pp. 675. Colmar: Barth. 4to. 32 m.
STRAKOSCH-GRASSMANN (G.) Geschichte der Deutschen in Oesterreich-Ungarn. I: [bis 955]. Pp. 551. Vienna: Konegen. 12 m.
TREITSCHKE (H. von). Deutsche Geschichte im neunzehnten Jahrhundert. (Staatengeschichte der neuesten Zeit. XXVIII.) V: Bis zur März-Revolution. Pp. 774. Leipzig: Hirzel. 10 m.
ZEISSBERG (H., Ritter von). Erzherzog Carl von Osterreich. I. Pp. 434, 473, maps, &c. Vienna: Braumüller. 20 m.

C. GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

ADAMNANI vita s. Columbae, edited from Dr. Reeves's text, with introd. and notes, by J. T. Fowler. Pp. xcv, 201. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 8/6.
BALDWIN (F. S.) Die englischen Bergwerksgesetze; ihre Geschichte von ihren Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart. (Münchener volkswirtschaftliche Studien. VI.) Pp. 258. Stuttgart: Cotta. 5 m.
BIOGRAPHY, Dictionary of national. Edit. by S. Lee. XLI: *Nichols–O'Dugan*. Pp. 455. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 15/.
CATHCART (W.) The ancient British and Irish churches, including the life and labours of St. Patrick. Pp. 340, illustr. London: Baptist Tract Society. 5/
CHARLES II, Calendar of state papers, domestic series [Oct. 1668–Dec. 1669], edited by Mrs. Everett Green. Pp. 779. London: H.M. Stationery Office. 15/.
CHURCH (S. H.) Oliver Cromwell: a history, with extracts from his letters and speeches. Pp. 534. London: Putnam. 12/6.
CLARKE papers, The: selections from the papers of William Clarke, secretary to the council of the army [1647–1649], and to general Monck and the commanders of the army in Scotland [1651–1660]. Ed. by C. H. Firth. II: April 1648–January 1654-5. Pp. xxxix, 303. Printed for the Camden Society. 4to.
CROMWELL'S Soldier's Bible: being a reprint in facsimile of 'The Souldier's Pocket Bible' compiled by Edmund Calamy, 1643. Pp. 16. London: Stock.
FISHWICK (H.) A history of Lancashire. Pp. 305. London: Stock. 7/6.
GARDINER (S. R.) History of the commonwealth and the protectorate. I. London: Longmans.
GARDINER (S. R.) & MULLINGER (J. B.) Introduction to the study of English history. 3rd ed. London: Paul, Trübner, & Co. 7/6.
GREGORY (sir William), formerly member of parliament and sometime governor of Ceylon. Autobiography. Pp. 380, portrait. London: Murray. 16/.
GUILLAUME le Maréchal, comte de Striguil et de Pembroke: poème français publié par P. Meyer. II. Pp. 390. Paris: Renouard.
KINGSTON (A.) Hertfordshire during the great civil war and the long parliament. Pp. 212. Hertford: Austin. 4to. 8/.
LIEBERMANN (F.) Ueber Pseudo-Cnuts

constitutiones de foresta. Pp. 55. Halle: Niemeyer.

Macray (W. D.) A register of the members of St. Mary Magdalen College, Oxford. New Series. I: Fellows; to the year 1520. Pp. 187. London: Frowde. 7/6.

Masson (D.) The life of John Milton. II: [1638–1643]. New and revised ed. London: Macmillan. 16/.

Ordish (T. F.) Early London theatres Pp. 298, illustr. London: Stock.

Ottley (R. L.) Lancelot Andrewes. Pp. 216, portr. London: Methuen. 3/6.

Pike (L. O.) A constitutional history of the house of lords. Pp. xxxv, 405. London: Macmillan. 12/6.

Portland (duke of), Manuscripts of the. III. (Historical Manuscripts Commission, 14th report. Appendix. II.) London: H.M. Stationery Office. 2/8.

Privy Council, Acts of the. New Series. IX: 1575–1577. Ed. by J. R. Dasent. Pp. xxxiii, 452. London: H.M. Stationery Office. 10/.

Radford (L. B.) Thomas of London before his consecration. Pp. 270. Cambridge: University Press. 4/6.

Roxburghe (duke of), Manuscripts of the, &c. (Historical Manuscripts Commission, 14th report. Appendix. III.) London: H.M. Stationery Office. 1/2.

Scotland.—Registrum magni sigilli regum Scotorum: the register of the great seal of Scotland [1620–1633]. Edited by J. M. Thomson. Pp. 1095. Edinburgh: Published under the direction of the lord clerk register. Fol. 15/.

Sharpe (R. R.) London and the kingdom. II. London: Longmans. 10/6.

Sheppard (E.) Memorials of St. James's palace. 2 vol. Pp. 413, 419, illustr. London: Longmans. 36/.

Simpkinson (C. H.) Life and times of William Laud, archbishop of Canterbury. Pp. 307, portr. London: Murray.

Traill (H. D.) Social England: a record of the progress of the people; ed. by. II: Edward I—Henry VII. Pp. 587. London: Cassell.

Tuckerman (F.) Upon the royal prerogative in England, especially since the accession of the house of Brunswick. Pp. 108. Heidelberg: Hörning. 2·40 m.

Walpole (Horace). Memoirs of the reign of king George III, re-edited by G. F. R. Barker. 4 vol. Pp. 334, 324, 271, 320; 16 portr. London: Lawrence & Bullen. 52/6.

D. ITALY

(including San Marino)

Beltrami (L). Il castello di Milano (Castrum portae Iovis) sotto il dominio dei Visconti e degli Sforza [1368–1535]. Pp. 739. Milan: Hoepli. 22·50 l.

Berliner (A.) Geschichte der Juden in Rom von der ältesten Zeit bis zur Gegenwart. Pp. 119, 127, 236, illustr. Frankfurt: Kauffmann. 10 m.

Cesareo (G. A.) Pasquino e la satira sotto Leone X: l' ultimo re di Cipro; i due archipoeti. Pp. 15, 22. Rome: Unione cooperativa editrice. 16mo.

Cesaresco (countess E. Martinengo). The liberation of Italy [1815–1870]. Pp. 420, portr. London: Seeley. 5/.

Dante Alighieri, Tutte le opere di; nuovamente rivedute nel testo da E. Moore. Pp. 490. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 7/6.

Hauttecœur (H.) La république de San-Marino. Pp. 256, plates. Brussels: Havermans. 5 f.

Marucchi (O.) Le memorie dei ss. apostoli Pietro e Paolo nella città di Roma, con alcune notizie sul cimitero apostolico di Priscilla. Pp. 130, plates. Rome: tip. Romana. 2 l.

Miceli (V.) Carattere giuridico del governo costituzionale, con speciale riguardo al diritto positivo italiano. I: La corona. Pp. 136. Perugia: tip. Umbra. 2·50 l.

Morpurgo (S.) I manoscritti della r. biblioteca Riccardiana di Firenze: manoscritti italiani. I, 3. Pp. 161–240. Rome: tip. Bencini. 1 l.

Pagano (L.) Studî sulla Calabria. I, 1–4. Pp. 1–324. Naples.

Paglicci Brozzi (A.) Il regio-ducal teatro di Milano nel secolo XVIII: notizie aneddotiche [1701–1776]. Milan: Ricardi. 16mo.

Ricasoli (B.) Lettere e documenti pubblicati per cura di M. Tabarrini e A. Gotti. X. Pp. 556. Florence: Le Monnier.

Schulz (H.) Der Sacco di Roma; Karls V Truppen in Rom [1527–1528]. (Hallesche Abhandlungen zur neueren Geschichte. XXXII.) Pp. 188. Halle: Niemeyer.

Sutter (C.) Aus Leben und Schriften des Magisters Boncompagno: ein Beitrag zur italienischen Kulturgeschichte im dreizehnten Jahrhundert. Pp. 128. Freiburg: Mohr. 2 m.

Vernois (general von Verdy du). A tactical study, based on the battle of Custozza [24 June 1866]. Transl. by G. F. R. & R. A. Henderson. Pp. 130. London: Gale & Polden. 6/.

Villari (P.) I primi due secoli della storia di Firenze. II. Pp. 271. Florence: Sansoni. 5 l.

——The two first centuries of Florentine history: the republic and parties at the time of Dante. Transl. by Linda Villari. Pp. 365. London: Unwin.

E. OTHER COUNTRIES

ALEXANDRE III, S. M. I., Souvenirs de Sébastopol, recueillis et rédigés par. Trad. de N. Notovitch. Paris: Ollendorff. 7·50 f.

BELGIUM.—Biographie nationale. XII, 2. *Louis de Bourbon—Lys.* Pp. 481–824. Brussels: Bruylant. 6 f.

BRUINVIS (C. W.) Verdrukking en volharding der Remonstranten te Alkmaar in 1619 en volgende jaren, naar officiëele en andere deels ongedrukte bronnen. Pp. 46. Alkmaar: Coster.

CODERA (F.) & TARRAGO (J. B.) Bibliotheca arabico-hispana. IX. Index librorum de diversis scientiarum ordinibus Arabice. I. Madrid.

COLLECCION, Nueva, de documentos inéditos para la historia de España y de sus Indias. V. Madrid: Murillo. 4to. 12 pes.

DIERCKS (G.) Geschichte Spaniens von den frühesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart. I. Pp. 442. Berlin: Cronbach. 7·50 m.

DIJK (A. G. van) & SCHARP DE VISSER (P. F. C.) Geschiedenis van het koninkrijk der Nederlanden [1814–1894]. Pp. 154. Vlaardingen: Dorsman & Odé.

ESCUDERO Y PEROSSO (F.) Tipografía hispalense: anales bibliográficos de la ciudad de Sevilla. Pp. 657. Madrid: Rivadeneyra. 4to. 15 pes.

HERBOMEZ (A. d'). Comptes de la ville de Tournai [1240–1243]. Pp. 15. Brussels: Hayez.

JOOSTING (G. C.) Ordelen van den etstoel van Drenthe [1518–1604]. Pp. 474. The Hague: Nijhoff.

LEROY-BEAULIEU (A.) The empire of the tsars and the Russians. Transl. by Z. Ragozin. II: The institutions. Pp. 566. New York: Putnam. (12/6.)

LETHABY (W. R.) & SWAINSON (H.) The church of Sancta Sophia, Constantinople: a study of Byzantine building, Pp. 305, illustr. London: Macmillan.

NIERMEYER (J. F.) Zur Geschichte der Kartographie Hollands in den drei vorigen Jahrhunderten. Pp. 32. Rotterdam: Wenk & Birkhoff. 4to.

PHILIPPSON (M.) Ein Ministerium unter Philipp II; Kardinal Granvella am spanischen Hofe [1579–1586]. Pp. 642. Berlin: Cronbach. 12 m.

POLAND.—Codex epistolaris saeculi XV. III. Collectus cura A. Lewicki. (Monumenta medii aevi historica res gestas Poloniae illustrantia. XIV). Pp. lxxx, 665. Cracow: Buchhandlung der polnischen Verlags-Gesellschaft. (10 m.)

STCHERBATOW (feld-maréchal prince Paskévitsch), sa vie politique et militaire d'après des documents inédits. Trad. du russe. IV: [1831]. Paris: Reinwald. 15 f.

SWEDEN.—Sveriges ridderskaps och adels riksdags-protokoll. XI: 1672. Ed. by S. Bergt. Pp. 476. Stockholm. (9 m.)

UNGER (J. H. W.) Album discipulorum Erasmianae scholae quae est Rotterodami [1719–1879]. Pp. 40. Rotterdam: Wenk & Birkhoff. 4to.

WALISZEWSKI (K.) Autour d'un trône: Catherine II de Russie. Pp. 472, portr. Paris: Plon.

WELDEREN RENGERS (W. J. van). Schets eener parlementaire geschiedenis van Nederland sedert 1849. II. Pp. 341. The Hague: Nijhoff.

VI. AMERICAN AND COLONIAL HISTORY

BUCKINGHAM (S. G.) Life of William A. Buckingham, the war governor of Connecticut. Pp. 537. Springfield: Adams.

DRAKE (S. A.) The making of Virginia and the middle colonies [1578–1701]. Pp. 228, maps. London: Gibbings.

MILLARES (A.) Historia general de las Islas Canarias. V. Pp. 300. Las Palmas: Miranda. 4to.

SCHMIDT (E.) Vorgeschichte Nordamerikas im Gebiet der Vereinigten Staaten. Pp. 216, illustr. Brunswick: Vieweg. 5 m.

SCOTT (W. A.) The repudiation of state debts: a study in the financial history of Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Louisiana, Arkansas, Tennessee, Minnesota, Michigan, and Virginia. Pp. 325. New York: Crowell.

SHERMAN (general and senator). Correspondence [1837–1891]. Ed. by R. S. Thorndyke. Pp. 384. London.

THOMPSON (R. W.) Recollections of sixteen presidents, from Washington to Lincoln. 2 vol. Portr. Indianapolis: The Bowen-Merrill Co. (30/.)

Errata

Vol. ix. page 487, note, line 23 from bottom: *dele* 'which neither his predecessors nor successors received.'

Page 639, line 14: *for* 'Duke of Cornwall' *read* 'Earl of Chester.'

Page 645, note 46, line 1: *for* 'market' *read* 'fair.'

THE ENGLISH

HISTORICAL REVIEW

NO. XXXVIII.—APRIL 1895

Edmund, Earl of Lancaster

PART II.

BEFORE digressing to enumerate the various grants which Edmund received, so as to get some idea of his power as an English baron, we left him in 1267 arranging tournaments as a sort of afterpiece to the barons' war. He is next mentioned on 6 March 1268 as one of the witnesses to a charter of privileges which Henry III issued to the citizens of London as a step to a final reconciliation with them.[1] A crusade to the Holy Land was now being preached by the legate Ottobon. It was an obvious way of promoting a speedy oblivion of intestine feuds, and clearing the country of elements of disorder, to unite the late combatants in such a common enterprise. So the two brothers Edward and Edmund both took the cross at Northampton on 24 June 1268, and their example was followed by many others.[2] But after ten troubled years, following on Henry III's earlier extravagances, money was not very plentiful amongst the royal family. Edward I was reduced to borrow from Louis IX of France. Edmund was in a somewhat better position with his confiscated earldoms, and he hastened to add to his resources by making a rich marriage. On 20 Nov. 1268 Henry permitted him to marry Isabella de Fortibus, widow of William de Fortibus, earl of Albemarle. Isabella was a daughter of Baldwin de Redvers, earl of Devon, and heiress to the Isle of Wight and to the earldom of Devon.[3] But Edmund,

[1] *Liber de Antiquis Legibus*, pp. 102–5.

[2] *Ann. Winton.* ii. 107; *Waverley*, ii. 357; Wykes, iv. 217; *Worcester*, iv. 458.

[3] *Appendix to* 31*st Report*, p. 11; Rishanger, p. 163. Proposals had previously been mooted for Edmund's marriage with the queen of Cyprus (April 1256; Rymer, i. 341), and with a daughter of the count of Flanders (*Royal Letters, Henry III*, p. 197).

presumably to make more sure of the fortune, did not marry her, but her daughter Avelina,[4] who cannot have been more than ten years old at the time of the marriage, which took place on 9 April 1269 in the presence of the king and queen and almost all the magnates of England.[5] Edmund thought he had thus secured the succession to the lordship of Holderness, as well as the Isle of Wight and earldom of Devon. The monks of Dunstable about this time complain in their chronicle that they could not get remedy from the king's courts in a quarrel with Isabella of Albemarle, because Edmund, the king's brother, had married her daughter Avelina.[6] During the whole of the year 1269 Edmund was occupied in preparations for his crusade.[7] On 25 July of that year or the following he received power to let out his lands to farm for seven years, the lessee to hold them for the full term, even if Edmund died without heirs before its expiration; and another grant that, in the same event, his executors should hold his lands till the term of seven years for the payment of his debts, when, in the ordinary course of things, his lands would have escheated immediately to the crown.[8]

Henry III's magnificent and costly rebuilding of the abbey of Westminster, which he had begun in 1220, was now approaching completion. The Confessor's chapel, the chapels round the apse, and the transepts were finished about this time. Alexander, king of Scotland, and his wife, Margaret, daughter of Henry III, paid a visit to England, perhaps with the view of attending the approaching translation of the bones of St. Edward to the new shrine which Henry had constructed for them and in which they still remain. In the safe-conduct issued to Alexander on 16 Sept. Edmund was one of the four magnates who were to attend on him,[9] and Edmund met his sister, the queen of Scotland, at St. Albans.[10] The ceremony of translation took place on 13 Oct., Edmund being amongst the great men who helped to carry the bier.[11]

On 19 Oct. 1269 were issued writs of protection to Edmund and six other great men about to proceed to the Holy Land. Amongst

[4] Avelina was a niece of Gilbert, earl of Gloucester, according to *Ann. Osney*, iv. 221. She had been at first a ward of Richard de Clare, earl of Gloucester, and then of Edmund's elder brother Edward (Poulson, *History of Holderness*, p. 34). Edmund paid Amicia, countess of Devon, 1,000*l.* for her share in the marriage of Avelina (31*st Report*, App. p. 11).

[5] *Calendarium Genealogicum*, i. 217; *Ann. Osney*, iv. 221; *Winton*, ii. 107; Wykes, iv. 221; Rishanger, p. 63; *Annales Londonienses* (ed. Stubbs), i. 80 (*Chron. of Ed. I and II*).

[6] *Ann. Dunstable*, iii. 249.

[7] Rishanger, p. 64.

[8] In Nichols's *Leic.* vol. i. pt. i. App. pp. 20–1, the date given is 25 July, 53 Henry III. In *Appendix to* 31*st Report*, pp. 11, 12, the date given is 25 July 1270.

[9] *Catalogue of Documents relating to Scotland*, No. 2542.

[10] *Flores Historiarum*, ed. Luard, ii. 459.

[11] Wykes, iv. 226.

these companions of Edmund was Robert de Bruce, earl of Carrick, son of the claimant and father of the great Robert Bruce.[12] But it was not until 13 Feb. 1271 that Edmund appointed his mother, Eleanor, his lieutenant and representative, with the fullest powers of alienation and putting to farm over his lands,[13] while his actual departure for the Holy Land did not take place until between 25 Feb. and 4 March 1271.[14] Edward had set out in the previous August, but the crusaders had turned aside to besiege Tunis, and Edward joined them only to find Louis IX dead and a treaty concluded with the infidels. Determined to continue the crusade, even if he had to go by himself, he wintered in Sicily, and arrived in the Holy Land in May. In September Edmund, who must have therefore spent six months in his journey to the east, joined his brother with a few companions.[15] He did little or nothing there,[16] being mentioned only as taking part in one action, which was little more than a plundering raid. This was at the time when the sultan Bibars was engaged in northern Syria, repelling a devastating raid of the Mongols.[17] On 22 Nov. 1271 the Christian army set out to destroy the tower of Kakoun; but hearing that the bulk of the inhabitants of Kakoun were encamped with their wives and children, according to their annual custom, about three days' journey from Acre, they advanced by night, hiding in the woods by day. They surprised the Saracens in their beds, killed 1,000, and captured 5,000 cattle, with the loss of only one man, a squire of Alexander Seton. But, eager to place their booty in safety, they then returned, and the real object of the expedition was never attained.[18] Though Edward wished to continue the war, the Christians showed so little sign of making any headway with their small forces, that on 22 April 1272 the king of Cyprus and Jerusalem concluded a truce with Bibars.[19] Edmund left the Holy

[12] Rymer, i. 482–3. In the *Calendar of Patent Rolls* they are given early in 54 Henry III. A safe-conduct to Robert de Bruce, who is going with Edmund, is dated 19 Oct. 1270 (*Catalogue of Documents relating to Scotland*, No. 2575).

[13] Nichols's *Leic.* vol. i. pt. i. App. p. 21.

[14] *Ann. Winton.* ii. 110; *Waverley*, ii. 377.

[15] *L'Estoire d'Eracles, Empereur*, in *Historiens Occidentaux des Croisades*, vol. ii. p. 461 (*Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, par les soins de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*). Sanuto, *Liber Secretorum Fidelium Crucis*, in *Gesta Dei per Francos*, ed. Bongarsius, 1611, vol. ii. p. 224.

[16] *Ann. Winton.* and *Ann. Waverley*, ii. 110, 377.

[17] Röhricht in *Archives de l'Orient Latin*, i. 623; *L'Estoire d'Eracles, Empereur*, *ubi supra*, p. 461.

[18] *L'Estoire d'Eracles, Empereur*, ii. 461: *propter lucrum dimittentes principale intentum.* Sanuto, ii. 224. *Chronica de Mailros* (Bannatyne Club), p. 218; *Archives de l'Orient Latin*, i. 623.

[19] *L'Estoire d'Eracles, Empereur*, ii. 462. A letter of Hugh Revel, grand master of the hospital, to Edward, published in *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes*, vol. lii. (1891), p. 53, speaks of this truce as if Edward I had made it. If we regard this as only a loose statement of the facts, it at any rate goes far to prove that Edward did not oppose, or at least was cognisant of, the treaty. Revel would hardly speak in that

Land in May.[20] He arrived in England about 6 Dec., entered London amid the rejoicings of the citizens of all classes on Sunday, the 11th, and went to visit his recently widowed mother, Eleanor, on the 12th.[21] Fruitless as had been Edmund's crusade, it seems to have cost him a good deal of money. On 1 Aug. 1272 Eleanor, acting on her commission of 13 Feb. 1271, had let out to farm for four years to Edmund of Almayne, son of Richard of Cornwall, king of the Romans, the manors of Hinckley, Shilton, Desford, Thornton, and Bagworth, and the rent of Gunthorpe, along with the courts, views of frankpledge, and other rights pertaining to the honour of Leicester, in the counties of Leicester, Northampton, Warwick, Nottingham, and Rutland, and the firms of Godmanchester and Huntingdon, with the cellars and markets of St. Ives, for a sum of 3,500 marks.[22] In 1272 Pope Gregory X asked the English clergy to pay to Edward and Edmund a tenth of their revenues for two years,[23] which they granted in 1273, and paid almost all of it in the first year.[24] Gregory wrote to Edward I, on 30 Nov. 1273, asking him to deal liberally and kindly with his brother Edmund.[25] In the issue roll of the exchequer, 4 Ed. I (20 Nov. 1275 to 20 Nov. 1276), appears an item of 300*l.* paid to Edmund, part of 1,700 marks which were in arrear to him of 2,600 marks which Henry III had granted to him in aid of his going to the Holy Land, to be received from the issues of the iters of the justices in their last iter for the county of Lincoln. This sum was paid by assignment to Edmund, earl of Cornwall, evidently in discharge of some debt to him.[26]

Edward I had set out homewards before the news of his father's death reached him, but his progress was slow, as he had to negotiate with the French king, Philip III, about some claims to Saintonge, the Agenois, and the three bishoprics of Perigord, Cahors, and Limoges, arising out of the treaty of Abbeville (1258) and the death of Alfonse of Poitiers, brother of St. Louis. He had also the affairs of Gascony to arrange, and particularly a revolt of Gaston de Béarn, viscount of Bigorre, engaged his attention. A rumour got abroad that he was never going to return to England, and a band of rebels gathered in the north. But Edmund went out

way if Edward had openly opposed the treaty, or if it had been concluded without his knowledge.

[20] *L'Estoire d'Eracles, Empereur*, ii. 462. Knighton's statement that he was present at the time of the attempt to assassinate Edward, which took place on 18 June, must therefore be wrong: Twysden's *Scriptores Decem*, col. 2458, l. 34.

[21] *Ann. Winton.* and *Ann. Wav.* ii. 112, 379; Wykes, iv. 253; *Ann. Wigorn.* iv. 461; *Liber de Antiquis Legibus*, p. 156; *Annales Londonienses*, i. 83.

[22] *Appendix to* 31*st Report*, p. 12; Nichols's *Leic.* vol. i. pt. i. p. 21.

[23] *Ann. Winton.* ii. 113; *Waverley*, ii. 379; *Wigorn.* iv. 463.

[24] *Ann. Winton*, ii. 115; *Waverley*, ii. 381; *Osney*, iv. 256; *Wigorn.* iv. 464; *Flores Historiarum*, iii. 32.

[25] Rymer, i. 507.

[26] *Extracts from the Exchequer Rolls* (Pell Records), p. 96.

against them with Roger Mortimer and a considerable army, and they dispersed at his approach.[27]

Edmund claimed the office of seneschal for life on the day after his brother's coronation, 20 Aug. 1274.[28] There is also a charter of his dated Tutbury, 3 Sept. 1273 or 1274.[29] On 11 Nov. 1274 he lost his young wife, Avelina, who cannot have been more than fifteen years of age.[30] She was buried at Westminster Abbey with great pomp, the archbishop of Canterbury and the bishops of London and Winchester conducting the funeral service.[31] She left no children.[32] An inquisition of 3 Ed. I gives the four daughters of Hugh de Bulebec and one Ralph de Pleys, a minor, as her heirs;[33] but her lands seem to have escheated to the crown, which was in possession on 17 Jan. 1275.[34] Edmund thus lost the property he had hoped to gain by marriage. He seems again to have wanted to raise money, as on 17 Feb. 1275 he received license from the king to demise, to farm, or to term his lands, except castles, for three years.[35] Yet on 16 June 1275, at Westminster, he released a rent of 10*l.* to Walter de Helyon.[36]

Edmund soon consoled himself for the loss of the heritage of Avelina de Fortibus by an even better match. The kingdom of Navarre had been united to the county of Champagne by the marriage of the father of Thibaut IV, or le Chansonnier, count of Champagne, with Blanche, sister of Sancho VII, or the Strong, in whom the first race of the kings of Navarre died out.[37] Thibaut IV had succeeded to Navarre in 1234, in spite of the opposition of a party which favoured the claims of an illegitimate son of Sancho, and an arrangement made by Sancho with James I of Aragon by which they became each other's heirs.[38] He and his sons reigned over Navarre for forty years. Though Aragon revived its claims, it had at last to recognise the validity of the title of the house of Champagne. But the death of Henry III, the last of the three legitimate sons of Thibaut IV, on 22 July 1274, at the early age of twenty-five,[39] leaving only a daughter of eighteen months (his son had fallen over a precipice with his nurse at Estella),[40] led to aggressions on Navarre from all sides, and the Aragonese claim was renewed. Though his widow, Blanche, daughter of

[27] *Flores Historiarum*, iii. 31, 32. [28] Rymer, i. 515.

[29] *Appendix to 6th Report of the Deputy Keeper*, Inventory of Records in the Tower, No. 1172.

[30] Wykes, iv. 261. [31] *Historical MSS. Commission, 4th Report*, p. 184.

[32] Rishanger, p. 63, says, *cum tota prole mortem parentum praevenit.*

[33] *Calendarium Genealogicum*, i. 224.

[34] *Cal. of Pat. Rolls*, 3 Ed. I, in *Appendix to 44th Report of the Deputy Keeper*, p. 160.

[35] *Ibid.* p. 94. [36] Nichols's *Leic.* vol. i. App. p. 43.

[37] Arbois de Jubainville, *Histoire des Ducs et des Comtes de Champagne*, iv. 265.

[38] *Ibid.* iv. 268–9. [39] *Ibid.* iv. 437. [40] *Ibid.* iv. 438, 440.

Robert of Artois, brother of St. Louis, was able to pacify Aragon for a time by the promise of the hand of Jeanne,[41] the neighbouring powers, led by Castile, became again hostile, and Blanche thought the best course was to entrust Navarre to the protection of her cousin Philip III of France, on the condition that Jeanne was to be married to his younger son Philip.[42] The hand of Jeanne had been promised to Edward I of England for his son Henry before Henry III's death.[43] Edward I had thus hoped to strengthen his position in the south of France, but he now saw the coveted prize pass to the king of France. He had still, however, in the person of his aunt Margaret of Provence, mother of Philip III, a woman of energetic character, a powerful ally at the court of France. Through her influence the hand of the widowed queen of Navarre and countess of Champagne was bestowed on Edmund.[44] If we are to believe the annalist Trokelowe, a mutual attraction, excited by the reports they had heard of each other, was a factor in bringing about the marriage.[45] On 6 Aug. 1275 Edmund received a simple protection for a journey beyond seas. The marriage took place some time between 18 Dec. 1275 and 18 Jan. 1276. It did not please the anti-English party. Robert II of Artois, the brother of Blanche, who had entertained Edmund during his visit to France on the occasion of the knighting of Philip III in 1267, when Edmund may possibly have seen Blanche, returning from a visit to Italy, was very angry to hear of the marriage which had taken place during his absence, 'for he well thought that the king of England had no love for the king of France.'[46] To the Champagnards the rule of the English baron came as a sort of foretaste of their incorporation with the monarchy of France, and of the loss of that brilliant, independent life, centring round the court of their counts, which they had so long enjoyed.

Champagne was then at the zenith of its splendour and wealth. M. d'Arbois de Jubainville estimates the net revenue of the counties of Champagne and Brie in 1271 as equivalent to 3,789,330 francs at the present day, or 151,573*l.* 4*s.*[47] per annum (reckoning 25 fr. to 1*l.*) In 1284, when it was united to the crown of France, he estimates that it had risen to 4,348,060 francs, or 173,920*l.* 8*s.*, per annum.[48] The count's revenue was indeed equal to one-fifth of that of Louis IX of France.[49] There were six great privileged fairs of Champagne and numerous less important ones. To the great fairs held at Troyes, Provins, Bar-sur-Aube, and Lagny

[41] Arbois de Jubainville, *Histoire des Ducs et des Comtes de Champagne*, iv. 443.

[42] *Ibid.* iv. 444–5.

[43] *Ibid.* iv. 440.

[44] *Gesta Philippi III* ap. Bouquet, xx. 500 C; *Chronique Anonyme*, *ibid.* xxi. 94 H; Guiart, *ibid.* xxii. 211 B.

[45] Trokelowe, *Annales*, 70–1.

[46] *Gesta Philippi III* ap. Bouquet, xx. 500 c.

[47] Arbois de Jubainville, iv. 805.

[48] *Ibid.* iv. 808.

[49] *Ibid.* iv. 810.

came merchants from all quarters, from Barcelona to Ypres and from Rouen to Lucca.[50] Every branch of trade and industry seems to have had its special quarter in the narrow, booth-lined streets of these great towns. Provins boasted a population of at least 70,000, 30,000 artisans, 2,000 looms, 1,700 cutlery workshops, and twenty convents and churches, and was noted for its coinage and dyed cloths.[51] Troyes and other towns were equally thriving. To the thirteenth century belongs the most beautiful part of the cathedral of Troyes, and the best architecture in most of the other towns.[52] The counts could claim the service of over 2,000 knights, as well as of all the common people between sixteen and sixty, and even over sixty so far as the duty of providing a substitute went, though this service was subject in many cases to various curious limitations.[53] Twenty-one of the older abbeys of Champagne had to obtain the leave of the count before they could elect a superior; over thirteen he had the right of guardianship during a vacancy, and in twelve rights of entertainment.[54] He had also the enjoyment of the temporalities of the sees of Troyes and Meaux during a vacancy.[55] The nine collegiate chapters which were dependent on him gave him the patronage of 200 stalls.[56] He had also the right of garrisoning sixty-four of the castles of Champagne in time of war; no one could build a castle, or even make extensive alterations in the fortifications of an existing one, without his leave. The same license was required to divert watercourses or to hold land in mortmain.[57] Indeed, the counts drew a considerable revenue from licenses of this kind. In some places a butcher had to purchase a

[50] Bourquelot, *Etudes sur les Foires de Champagne*, in *Mémoires présentés à l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, série 2, tome v, pt. ii.; Arbois de Jubainville, iv. 738, note *a*). Compare the lines—

> 'L'endeman de la Pantacosta
> Dreg a Nemurs li cortz s'ajosta
> Bela e rica e pleniera.
> Et anc negus hom non vi fiera
> Ni a Liniec ni a Proïs,
> Que i agues tant e var e gris
> E drap de seda e de lana.'

(Flamenca, in P. Meyer, *Recueil d'Anciens Textes Bas-Latins, Provençaux et Francais*, 1re partie, p. 116, l. 184).

[51] Bourquelot, *Histoire de Provins*, i. 250–2, 254; *Etudes sur les Foires de Champagne*, ubi supra, vol. v. pt. ii. p. 12.

[52] A. Babeau, *Mémoires de la Société Académique de l'Aube*, vol. xxv. 3rd ser. pp. 26 *et seq.*

[53] Arbois de Jubainville, iv. 682, 690. When the count of Champagne wished to lead the people of Blancheville (Haute-Marne) in the direction of Bar-sur-Aube, Vassy, or St. Ménehould, he could only require from them one day's march; but in the direction of Burgundy, Lorraine, or Germany he had the right to lead them as far as he thought fit; only he must feed them (*ibid.* iv. 692–3). M. d'Arbois is inclined to think that the majority of the inhabitants of Champagne were serfs.

[54] *Ibid.* iv. 616 *et seq.*

[55] *Ibid.* iv. 622.

[56] *Ibid.* iv. 624.

[57] *Ibid.* iv. 684–6, 687, 757.

license from him; and the tables of the money-changers, which he gave in fee, reserving to himself certain pecuniary dues, were another great source of revenue.[58] The Jews too, if properly manipulated, formed an almost inexhaustible source of wealth. They paid an annual *cense*, or tax, to the count. Theobald IV, in a charter to Provins in 1230, specially reserved his rights over the Jews in the town.[59] At his accession he had made the Jews of Champagne pay a sum about equal to 283,694*l.* at the present day, and in 1285 Philip IV mulcted them of 100,531*l.* 12*s.*[60]

As one of the great feudatories of France the count could issue edicts binding on his subjects; and the edicts of the king of France were not all binding on his subjects. Even in the chartered towns, such as Provins, the count possessed a more than nominal supremacy; he held serfs, and the profits which they entailed;[61] he had his chancellor, constable, marshal, receiver, and a host of smaller officials.[62] Though most of his lands were held mediately or immediately from the king of France, some of them were held of the emperor.[63] He had palaces at Paris, Troyes, and Provins, as well as castles in most of the chief towns of the county.[64] Such wealth and power, joined to the eminence in knightly qualities which had distinguished most of the princes of Champagne, might almost justify the proud boast contained in their motto and war-cry, 'Passe avant le meilleur.'

For something over eight years Edmund held this great county in addition to his English lands. But as a ruler he showed little activity or interest in his dominions, though he seems to have been constantly crossing over from England to France. 'There are,' says M. d'Arbois de Jubainville, 'twenty acts emanating from him which concern Champagne, and seven only [to which may be added two more not known to M. d'Arbois, dated at Vitry-en-Perthois and La Ferté Milon respectively] which indicate a stay in or a passage through Champagne.'[65] Besides those mentioned above there is one grant enrolled in the cartulary of the abbey of St. Loup at Troyes.[66] During his absences Champagne was governed in his

[58] Bourquelot, *Histoire de Provins*, i. 284; *Etudes sur les Foires de Champagne*, ubi supra, p. 134.

[59] Bourquelot, *Hist. de Provins*, i. 199–206; also in *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes*, 4e série, tome ii. 205.

[60] Arbois de Jubainville, iv. 835.

[61] Bourquelot, *Hist. de Provins*, i. 282.

[62] Arbois de Jubainville, iv. 529 *et passim* in chap. xiv.

[63] *Ibid.* iv. 884.

[64] *Ibid.* iv. 387, 791; Bourquelot, *Hist. de Provins*, i. 240.

[65] Arbois de Jubainville, iv. 448; *Appendix to 6th Report of Deputy Keeper*, Nos. 1134, 1324. Philip III did not allow him to 'cut and exploit' the ancient forests of Champagne during his regency; nor did Philip IV allow him to do so in the five châtellenies which formed Blanche's dowry, which Edmund held till the outbreak of the war with France in 1294 (Archives Nationales, Trésor des Chartes, J. 631, No. 3).

[66] *Cartulaires du Diocèse de Troyes*, ed. Lalore, i. 267.

name by John of Acre, brother of Baldwin, emperor of the East and king of Jerusalem, who had been grand butler of France since 1258.[67] Edmund did homage for Champagne in January 1276.[68] He spent part of that month at Paris and was at Meaux on the 18th.[69] On 2 Feb. he was at Bar-sur-Seine,[70] and in May at Troyes.[71] On 9 June he visited Canterbury, having brought his wife to England to see his English possessions.[72] On 27 July he received, as about to proceed to the parts of Navarre, a grant, by the king's license, that in case of his death before his return to England the king would cause his creditors to be satisfied to the value of three years' issues of his lands, which would come to the king by his death.[73] So on 9 Sept. we find him at Montereau, and on 19 Sept. at Tours;[74] whilst in November, having perhaps since September visited the 'parts of Navarre,' he confirmed the privilege of the abbey of St. Loup at Troyes,[75] and on 22 Dec. granted a license to hold certain lands in mortmain to the abbey of Chapelle-aux-Planches.[76] On 12 Dec. Edward I issued a writ of military summons to Edmund and others to meet at Worcester and proceed against Llywelyn, prince of Wales.[77] He must have returned to England in obedience to this summons early in 1277, though he was still in France on 25 Feb., for on 29 April letters of safe-conduct were issued to him for journeying into the parts of La Marche.[78] He cannot, however, have been long abroad, since he was appointed the king's lieutenant in West Wales, and Edward I addressed writs of intendence and respondence in his favour on 14 June 1277 to Payn of Chaworth and others.[79] Llywelyn had not yet done homage, and when it was demanded only replied by complaint against the English. In this war which was now made against him Edward led an army into North Wales, while Edmund led one into South Wales, thus attacking Llywelyn on the other flank. Payn of Chaworth, Edmund's subordinate, laid waste South Wales, and took the castle of Stredewy (Strath Towy ?). On 8 Aug. Edward wrote to ask the troops to remain where they were with Edmund in South Wales.[80] After seizing the lands of Rhys ab Maelgwyn, who had fled to Llywelyn in Gwynnedd, Edmund seems to have occupied his troops in

[67] Arbois de Jubainville, iv. 449; Anselme, *Hist. Généalog.* viii. 518.

[68] Arbois de Jubainville, *Histoire des Ducs et des Comtes de Champagne*, 'Catal. des Actes,' in vi. 97, No. 3829.

[69] *Cat. des Actes*, in vi. 97, No. 3828.

[70] *Actes*, No. 3831.

[71] *Ibid.* No. 3836.

[72] Wykes, iv. 269.

[73] *Appendix to 45th Report of Deputy Keeper*, Cal. of Pat. Rolls, 4 Ed. I, p. 161.

[74] *Actes*, Nos. 3837, 3838.

[75] 'Cartulaire de l'Abbaye de S. Loup,' in *Cartulaires du Diocèse de Troyes*, ed. Lalore, i. 267.

[76] 'Cartulaire de l'Abbaye de Chapelle aux Planches,' *ibid.* iv. 67.

[77] Rymer, i. 537.

[78] *Actes*, No. 3840; *Appendix to 31st Report*, p. 12.

[79] Cal. of Pat. Rolls, 5 Ed. I, in *Appendix to 46th Report*, p. 152.

[80] Rymer, i. 544.

building the castle of Llanbadarn (near Aberystwyth) and went himself on a pilgrimage to St. Davids. He returned to England on 20 Sept., leaving Roger Myles as constable of the castle he had built, to protect the surrounding country.[81]

Edmund also took part in the two later expeditions against the Welsh in 1282–3 and 1294, which may for convenience sake be noticed here. In a letter from Edmund to his brother, dated La Ferté Milon, 15 May, which may with very great probability be assigned to the year 1282, he said that he had heard that the Welsh had commenced war against the king, and wished to know what retinue he should bring to his assistance;[82] for on 22 March David of Wales had surprised Hawarden Castle and taken prisoner Roger Clifford, the justice of Chester, and had been joined in rebellion by his brother Llywelyn. Edmund returned to England and commanded the king's army in South Wales. It is a good illustration of the insecurity of the country that his men bringing victuals were attacked between Northwich and Chester, and their horses and carts taken away. Llywelyn was so hard pressed by the army which Edward in person commanded in North Wales that he fled south, in the hopes of finding support there; but he was slain near Builth, being surprised by a detachment of Edmund's army.[83] In spite of Llywelyn's death the Welsh were not yet properly subdued, and on 24 Feb. 1283 Edward I wrote to Philip III requesting that the cause of his brother Edmund, then pending in the court of France, might be postponed until he could attend in person, as his presence was required in the expedition into Wales;[84] and on 21 March writs were issued for raising foot in his lands by Hugh de Turberville and Grimbald de Pauncefot.[85]

The next occasion on which we find Edmund in Wales was in 1294, when the Welsh around Snowdon rose under a certain Madoc, those in West Wales (*i.e.* the west part of South Wales) under Rhys ab Maelgwn, and those in East Wales (the east part of South Wales) under a certain Morgan. Carnarvon was burnt, and the earl of Gloucester driven out of Glamorgan. Edward I prepared to quell the insurrection, and recalled to his aid Edmund and Henry, earl of Lincoln, who were about to depart to Gascony with an army.[86] On 9 Nov. safe-conducts were issued to certain men sent by Edmund into Wales to provide victuals against his arrival.[87] Their

[81] *Annales Cambriae*, p. 105; *Brut y Tywysogion*, p. 369.

[82] *Appendix II. to 6th Report, Inventory of Records in the Tower*, No. 1324, p. 100.

[83] *Annales Londonienses* (in *Chron. of Ed. I and Ed. II*, ed. Stubbs), i. 90.

[84] *Cal. of Pat. Rolls*, Ed. I, ii. p. 49; *Appendix to 7th Report, Inventory of Records in the Tower*, No. 1652, p. 242.

[85] Ayloffe, 'Calendars of Ancient Charters and of the Welsh and Scottish Rolls now remaining in the Tower of London,' *Rotulus Walliae*, p. 89.

[86] Rishanger, pp. 144–5.

[87] Ayloffe, *Rotulus Walliae*, p. 100.

army suffered a repulse by the Welsh on 11 Nov. near Denbigh. The English army spent some time at Conway, where it was reduced to great straits through want of provisions, on account of a flood which prevented the passage of the river.[88] It is probable that a letter addressed by Edmund to John de Langton, the king's chancellor, and dated Aberconway, 25 March, belongs to the year 1295.[89] The disturbance in Wales was not quelled until May; but the English chronicler says that from this time there was quiet in Wales, and the Welsh began to live in the English manner, collecting treasure and fearing loss of property; [90] and, in fact, the next revolt, that of Llywelyn Bren, did not take place until 1315.[91]

To go back to the year 1277, Edmund seems to have remained in England about three months after his return from Wales. On 8 Jan. 1278 he received a protection for going beyond seas, and letters of attorney on the 10th.[92] He was at Provins on 24 July, and at Nogent-sur-Seine on 30 July of that year.[93] But he perhaps returned to England before 13 Oct., since he is mentioned as along with his brother Edward giving Eleanor de Montfort in marriage to Llywelyn of Wales, and therefore very likely attended the wedding which took place on that date at Worcester, in the presence of a great number of magnates.[94]

On 3 Jan. 1279 he received a writ of protection for going beyond seas on the king's business, probably the treaty with Philip III regarding Edward's claims in Aquitaine, and on 21 March was appointed ambassador to France, but must have returned some time before 25 April, for he issued letters of attorney in favour of Richard Fukeran on that date, as he was going with the king to parts beyond seas.[95] It thus seems justifiable to assign to Edmund an important share in the negotiation of the treaty with Philip III which was agreed to on 23 May 1279. Edward claimed the Agenois and Quercy, which had come into the hands of the count of Poitou, and so of Alfonse of Poitiers, brother of St. Louis, as part of the dowry of Joan, sister of Richard I of England, according to the English claim. Alfonse had died without issue, and it had been provided in the treaty of Abbeville (1258) that in that event Joan's dowry should go to the English king. The treaty of May 1279 ceded Agenois to the representatives of Joan of England. Philip pledged himself to discover by inquest whether Quercy, which Alfonse had possessed in right of his wife, also formed part

[88] Rishanger, pp. 145, 148.

[89] *Appendix to 7th Report, Inventory of Records*, No. 1993.

[90] Rishanger, p. 148.

[91] *Chron. of Ed. I and Ed. II*, ed. Stubbs, ii. 67–8, 215–8.

[92] *Cal. of Pat. Rolls*, in *App. to 47th Report*, p. 213.

[93] *Actes*, 3845, 3846, 3847.

[94] *Brut y Tywysogion*, p. 371.

[95] *Cal. of Pat. Rolls*, 7 Ed. I, in *Appendix to 48th Report*, p. 62; Doyle, *Baronage of England*, ii. 309.

of the dowry of Joan; he renounced as well an oath of allegiance which he had claimed from the vassals of Aquitaine in 1275.[96]

About this time Edmund seems to have contemplated going again to the east. A new crusade had been long contemplated by both Edward and Philip III of France. Edward I on 12 Dec. 1276 promised Pope John XXI that either himself or his brother Edmund would join it,[97] but matters nearer home prevented both the kings from fulfilling their projects. On 10 Sept. 1280 Archbishop Peckham wrote to Pope Nicholas III, saying that, as Edward had given up his intention of going on a crusade, he thought in good faith that to none of the magnates of England could the money collected for that purpose be assigned more usefully and beneficially for the whole clergy and people than to Edmund. His experience in arms and magnificent liberality made him much beloved by the large number of knights who surrounded him, and his love of Christ made him fervent to do what he could in a crusade. Peckham wrote another letter to Pope Martin IV, in almost identical terms, on 2 April 1282.[98] But Martin IV wrote to Edward on 8 Jan. 1283 regretting that he would not proceed in person to the Holy Land, and refusing to accept Edmund as his substitute.[99]

In January 1280 took place the only event of importance in the history of Champagne during Edmund's rule of that country. Provins was the capital of Brie and next to Troyes the greatest town in the count's dominions. The upper part of the town, situated on a hill and literally crowded with churches and monasteries, with the domed St. Quiriace dominating all, suggested to the natives of the country a comparison with Jerusalem. Indeed, the town, beautiful in its decay, must have presented a very imposing appearance. The great walls and towers which still form a continuous line on the north-west and south-west sides of the upper town, with the gloomy and forbidding four-turreted keep which stands close by the church of St. Quiriace, give one an idea of its strength. The miles of subterranean passages too, which penetrate deep down into the rock and honeycomb the upper town, were very likely made for defensive purposes. The houses of the workmen and traders were in the lower town to the east, in a marshy valley watered by three small streams. Like so many towns both in England and abroad, as it grew in wealth Provins had made a step towards municipal liberty by getting the amount of the tax due from it to its lord fixed. A charter granted by Thibaut IV to it in 1230 had fixed the tax due to the count at 6 deniers on the livre of movables annually, and 2 deniers on the livre of heritage, or a

[96] Langlois, *Philippe le Hardi*, p. 95.
[97] Rymer, i. 537.
[98] *Registrum Epistolarum Johannis Peckham*, i. 140; *ibid.* i. 190–1.
[99] Rymer, i. 624.

fixed sum of 20 livres. About the years 1248–50 he substituted for this a composition of 1,600 *livres provinois* a year. Sixteen years later his son Thibaut V re-established the old state of things; but in 1273 Henry III suppressed this tax on movables and heritage (called the *jurée*) by the special request of the citizens, and replaced it by duties on cloth, sold wholesale and retail, at fairs or out of fairs, wine, corn, skins, and other merchandise. This relieved property at the expense of the industrial classes. They rose against it, and the mayor, Eudes Corjous, was obliged to promise to ask the count to remove it.[100] Shortly afterwards Henry died, and the revenues of Provins were pledged by his widow, Blanche, to the king of France, for the expense of the defence of Navarre. The taxes which were established forced the commune to onerous loans.[101] A certain William Pentecost had been mayor of Provins in 1268 for the first time, and again in 1271. On 24 June 1277 he succeeded Jean Lacorre, and continued to be mayor for the rest of 1277, 1278, and 1279, relying, as it seems, on the support of the wealthier classes.[102]

Matters had meanwhile come to a crisis. The workmen, masters, journeymen, and day workers, employed in the preparation, carding, and spinning of wool, as well as in the dyeing and manufacture of cloth, unanimously refused to submit to the exorbitant tax imposed on them. The mayor thought to appease the discontent by putting still more of the burden on the people. He ordered the bell for ceasing work to be sounded an hour later. At the usual hour of curfew the workmen, not hearing the signal, left the workshops in a body, and assembled to the number of four or five thousand. Whilst the sound of the tocsin rang out through the evening air the huge undisciplined mob rushed up the steep slope of the east side of the hill through the narrow streets to the fortified palace of the mayor, formerly the palace of the counts, and situated close to the south wall of the upper town. Pentecost bravely came forth and attempted to bring them to counsels of moderation by his words; but he was murdered, along with several of his servants, and his house pillaged, with those of several *échevins* (30 Jan. 1280).[103]

The vengeance for this act of mob violence was swift and stern. Edmund of Lancaster and John of Acre appeared before the town with an army. The leaders of the revolt fled and the gates

[100] Bourquelot in *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes*, 4e série, tome ii. pp. 205–8. The charter of 1230 is given in full in Bourquelot's *Hist. de Provins*, i. 199–206. Arbois de Jubainville, iv. 450; Bourquelot, *Hist. de Provins*, i. 236–7.

[101] *Hist. de Provins*, i. 239, and *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes*, 4e série, tome ii. 208.

[102] Bourquelot in *Bibl. de l'Ecole des Chartes*, 4e série, ii. 226–7.

[103] Bourquelot, *Hist. de Provins*, i. 239–40; *Bibl. de l'Ecole des Chartes*, 4e série, ii. 208, 225; Arbois de Jubainville, iv. 450; *Chron. Anon.* in Bouquet, xxi. 138 A.

were opened. The conquerors began by forbidding all exercise of authority by the mayor and échevinage (Gilbert de Morry had been elected mayor in the place of Pentecost), and declaring the privileges of the town forfeited. Then they disarmed the inhabitants, billeted soldiers on them, had the iron chains which guarded the streets carried into the great tower, and the bell—that of St. Pierre, close to the eastern escarpment of the hill, and approached by a flight of steps from the lower town, which still exist, though the church has disappeared—which had sounded the tocsin broken. The leaders of the insurrection and those who had taken part in the murder were condemned to either death or banishment, and Gilbert de Morry was excommunicated.[104] John of Acre seems to have been specially prominent in the work of vengeance. The 'Chronicle of Rouen' says: 'About the Purification of the Virgin Mary the mayor of Provins was killed by the populace of that town; and after that crime several fleeing into monasteries, as into other places of refuge, were torn from them by the orders of Messire Jean d'Acre and hanged.'[105] The metrical 'Chronicle of Sainte Magloire' says: 'There was great trouble at Provins; how many were hung, how many mutilated, how many killed, how many beheaded! Messire Jean d'Acre did great wrong to interfere.'[106]

After a year and a half, at the intercession of Gilles de Brion, grand-maire of Donnemarie and brother of Pope Martin IV, the abbot of Jouy and Reuilly, and Henri Farimpin, canon of St. Quiriace, Edmund granted the townsmen a pardon in July 1281.[107] He gave them back their justice, their seals, and the authority which they had before,[108] pardoning all except the seditious persons banished for the murder of William Pentecost, and those who were or should be found guilty of the same crime. He gave them leave to construct at their own expense four new fountains, 'for the great default of water that there was in the town,' to buy buildings in which to hold their courts, and to found a new bell to sound 'the hour of the workmen and the curfew of the count.'[109] The heavy tax which these works entailed and the indemnity which he exacted pressed so heavily on the city that it never recovered its former prosperity, and in the course of centuries gradually dwindled away to its present size (about 7,000 inhabi-

[104] Bourquelot, *Hist. de Provins*, i. 241–2; *Bibl. de l'Ecole des Chartes*, 4e série, ii. 227; Arbois de Jubainville, iv. 451.

[105] 'Chronicon Rothomagense,' in Labbe, *Nova Bibliotheca Manuscriptorum*, i. 380.

[106] *Chronique de Sainte-Magloire*, in Bouquet, xxii. 84, 132.

[107] Bourquelot, *Hist. de Provins*, pp. 244–5; *Bibl. de l'Ecole des Chartes*, 4e série, ii. 228; Arbois de Jubainville, iv. 452. The charter of pardon is given in full, with the inspeximus of Philip III, in the 'Pièces Justificatives' to Bourquelot, *Hist. de Provins*, ii. 427–31. A letter of Edmund to Edward from Paris referring to a matter of Provins which has been ended by way of peace, and dated 20 July, but wrongly placed in the year 1283 in Rymer, most likely belongs to this year.

[108] *Hist. de Provins*, ii. 431. [109] *Ibid.* ii. 428–9

tants).[110] Rich as the town still is in ancient monuments, many have perished. The ivy, the wallflower, and the wall-rue flourish on its tree-embowered walls, and the most rural stillness reigns in its once busy streets. Gardens and waste land occupy the sites of houses. Of the palace where Pentecost was murdered nothing but a tower remains. The *grange aux dîmes* of the canons of St. Quiriace and part of the later palace of the counts (now turned into a school) still attest the former opulence of the town and its lords. But the gay and busy town of the counts of Champagne has now the air of a country village. It is interesting to note as a contrast to this the fact that the town of Leicester dates a great growth in its prosperity from the time of Edmund.

Edmund must have paid a visit to his English estates between his chastisement of the men of Provins and the granting of the charter of pardon, as on 1 June 1281 he received letters of protection from his brother Edward for going by license beyond seas.[111] The charter of pardon is dated at Paris in the following month.

Margaret of Provence, the head of the English party at the French court, was the bitterest enemy of Charles of Anjou, uncle of Philip III. The origin of this enmity was the settlement of Provence by Raymond Berenger VI of Provence on his youngest daughter, Beatrice, who had married Charles of Anjou, excluding the three elder sisters from any share. Of these Margaret, the eldest, had married Louis IX of France; Eleanor, the second, Henry III of England; and Sanchia, the third, Richard, earl of Cornwall. Margaret and Eleanor, the surviving sisters, put in a claim to at least a fourth of Provence for each of them. Margaret even succeeded in getting the emperor, Rudolf of Habsburg, to accept her homage for the whole. Negotiations were often tried with Charles, but she complained that it seemed to be his intention to put her off with empty words. Indeed Charles, far from being prepared to part with any of Provence, was negotiating a marriage of his grandson, Charles Martel, with Clementia of Habsburg, daughter of Rudolf; and one of the conditions of the marriage was the revival of the kingdom of Arles, which included all the country between the Rhône and the Alps, for Charles Martel and his wife. Alarmed at this prospect and at the growing Angevin sympathies shown by her son Philip in his rejection of the mediation of Edward with Castile for that of Charles of Achaia, son of Charles of Anjou, Margaret redoubled her efforts. She succeeded in getting a promise of active support from Edward, and had a strong party amongst the French baronage and those whom the growth of Charles of Anjou's power in Provence threatened. Indeed, in thus trying to prevent the growth of Charles's power in the

[110] *Hist. de Provins*, i. 246–7.

[111] *Cal. of Pat. Rolls*, 9 Ed. I, in *Appendix to 50th Report*, p. 77.

country between the Rhône and the Alps she was acting more patriotically than Philip III; for the rise of a middle kingdom there would stop the spread of French influence in that direction. She summoned a great assembly of her adherents at Mâcon in the autumn of 1281. At this assembly, which took place before 30 Oct., Edmund was present, and along with the others took an oath to meet in the following May, and if necessary prevent Charles from gaining the kingdom of Arles by force of arms. Philip III merely connived at these proceedings, but Edward I promised his active support, though he was very unwilling to break with Charles of Anjou and tried his best to bring about a peaceful arrangement of the matter. But a Welsh war broke out on 22 March 1282; Edward was forced to write, apologising to his aunt for his inability to give her any assistance, and she readily accepted his excuse. Meanwhile a sudden check was given to Charles's designs for the revival of the kingdom of Arles by the outbreak of the Sicilian Vespers on 30 March 1282. Henceforth he had to fight hard for his power in Italy and could give Provence but little attention. Margaret's claims were compounded for a few years afterwards by an annual rent of 2,000*l.*, chargeable on his lands in Anjou.[112]

Edmund was still in France in January 1282.[113] His participation in the Welsh war of 1282–3 has been already related. On 21 July 1283, at Liverpool, he confirmed a grant made by William Blundell to the abbey of Whalley.[114] His government of Champagne was only to last till Joan came of age.[115] The French king, whose son Philip Joan was to marry, claimed that she would be of age when she entered on her twelfth year, the age at which women attained their majority in France. But in Champagne, though a male subject became of age at 14 years old, the heir to the county had always remained under tutelage until he was 21. Edmund claimed that the same distinction held good in the case of an heiress; but after three months' negotiation he yielded. Joan had entered on her twelfth year on 14 Jan. 1284. On 9 May Edmund received power to nominate attorneys for one year, as he was going beyond seas. On 17 May a treaty was signed by which Blanche of Artois kept her dower—that is to say, the five chatellenies of Sézanne, Chantemerle, Nogent-sur-Seine, Pont-sur-Seine, and Vertus—and the king of France in the name of Joan renounced any pretension to half the property of Henry III

[112] E. Boutaric, 'Marguerite de Provence,' in *Revue des Questions Historiques*, 1867; Langlois, *Philippe le Hardi*, 125 *seq.*; Champollion-Figeac, *Lettres Royales*, i. 265, 297, 299; Fournier, *Le Royaume d'Arles*, pp. 229–55.

[113] *Actes*, 3854.

[114] *Coucher Book of Whalley Abbey* (Chetham Soc.), pp. 506–7. From this it is manifest that the letter in Rymer dated Paris, St. Margaret's Day, and placed in the year 1283, cannot belong to that year, St. Margaret's Day being 20 July.

[115] *L'Estoire d'Eracles, Empereur*, in *Hist. Occid. des Crois.* ii. 469.

(of Navarre) acquired during marriage, and held jointly by himself and his wife, to the joint property of Edmund and Blanche, and to the movables of the county of Champagne, save the arms which formed the equipment of the castles. He pledged himself to pay to Edmund and Blanche 60,000 *livres tournois.* The palace of the kings of Navarre at Paris remained in the joint occupation of Blanche and her daughter.[116] Edmund now probably returned to England. But the information about him during the next few years is very scanty.

Amaury, the youngest of the sons of Simon de Montfort, had been for some time a prisoner in England, having been captured while accompanying his sister to Wales in order to marry her to Llywelyn, and thus continue the alliance between him and the Montforts. He was released in 1282. But in 1284 he roused Edward I's anger by causing Edmund to be cited before the papal court, probably for some matter in connexion with his possession of the earldom of Leicester. Edward wrote severely on 28 Dec., forbidding Amaury to go on with the matter.[117] On 1 March 1285 Amaury protested the purity of his intentions, complained that the king had omitted all formulas of politeness in his letter, and declared that he renounced the suit, not on account of Edward's veto, but because he would be sorry to give pain to his cousin the king of England.[117] Edmund was at Marlborough on 23 Jan. 1286. On 26 April he received a protection for going beyond seas. On 29 Sept., at Lancaster, he made an agreement with the prior and canons of Burscough regarding the grant made by him to them of a free market in the vill of Ormskirk, to be held weekly on Thursdays. On 5 May and 25 Oct. 1287, and on 1 Nov. 1288, he received writs of protection with the statement that he was in attendance on the king abroad. He probably returned to England with his brother in 1289, but received another protection for going abroad on 12 Oct.[118] On 13 Dec. 1289 he received license to grant 100*s.* of rent and land in Tutbury for the maintenance of a chaplain to celebrate divine service in St. Mary's chapel in his castle of Tutbury,[119] from which we may conclude that he meditated making it his chief residence for a time. On 29 May 1290 he was one of the magnates who consented at Westminster to the grant of an aid *pur fille marier.* On 3 July he was at Havering. He must have soon after gone beyond seas, whither he was followed by his wife, Blanche, accompanied by the prioress of Ambresbury. He had returned by 5 Jan. 1291,

[116] *Cal. of Pat. Rolls,* Ed. I, ii. 120 (Rolls Series); Bouquet, *Rec. des Hist. de France,* xxii. 758 b, note (1), 756, h 40 a E; Arbois de Jubainville, iv. 452–3; vi. (*Actes*), 3856–60. The treaty is preserved in the Trésor des Chartes (J 199, No. 36).

[117] Rymer, i. 651; Bémont, *Simon de Montfort,* p. 258.

[118] *Cal. of Pat. Rolls,* Ed. I, ii. 218, 238, 268, 278, 302, 325; *Appendix II. to 36th Report,* p. 196.

[119] *Appendix to 31st Report,* p. 15.

since on that date he received royal license to fowl on the rivers of Lancashire during the current season. On the same day he received a grant of pontage for five years for the repair of his bridge at Lancaster.[120]

The county of Ponthieu had devolved to Edward I by right of his wife, through her mother, in 1279. On 23 April 1291 Edward doubtless thinking that Edmund had had some experience in dealing with French domains, commissioned Geoffrey de Joinville to deliver Ponthieu to him to hold until Edward of Carnarvon came of age, and the grant was repeated on 1 June.[121] On 13 June 1291 Edmund was present at that great gathering at Norham, on the Scotch border, in which the rival claims to the crown of Scotland were submitted to his brother's arbitration. He is one of the witnesses to the proceedings at that assembly, including the promise of the claimants to abide by Edward's award, and the oath taken to him as superior lord by the bishops and nobles of Scotland.[122] On 15 June he was at Jedburgh, probably in command of the castle, which amongst others had been handed over to Edward as a sort of pledge of his recognition as overlord.[123] He was at Westminster on 13 Dec. On 5 Feb. 1292 he was appointed one of a commission of five, with full powers to make and enforce ordinances for the maintenance of arms in the kingdom;[124] and in this year he was one of those who stood bail for Gilbert, earl of Gloucester, who had been carrying on private war with the earl of Hereford in the Welsh marches, both of them relying on their privileges as lords marchers.[125] He received power to nominate attorneys during a journey abroad on 12 April 1292, and was still abroad on 15 Oct. On 24 March 1293, or about that time, he is mentioned as dining with Edward the king's son, and his sons seem to have been frequent visitors of young Edward.[126] On 21 June he received royal license to castellate his house called the Savoy in London,[127] and on 28 June he and his wife, Blanche, founded the abbey of Nuns Minoresses in London, from which the street known as the Minories takes its name. It was the first house of this order founded in England.[128]

[120] Stubbs's *Select Charters*, 6th ed. p. 477; *Cal. of Pat. Rolls*, Ed. I (R.S.), ii. 372, 374, 413, 430.

[121] Rymer, i. 754, 757.

[122] 'Annales Regni Scotiae,' in Rishanger, *Chronica et Annales*, p. 253.

[123] *Catalogue of Documents relating to Scotland*, ii. 130.

[124] *Appendix to 31st Report*, p. 16.

[125] *Rotuli Parliamentorum* (Rec. Com.), i. 75 b, 77 a; *Cal. of Pat. Rolls*, Ed. I, ii. 480, 508.

[126] 'Household Roll, 21 Ed. I,' 'Household Roll of Edward the King's Son,' in *Extracts from the Issue Rolls of the Exchequer, Henry III to Henry VI* (Pell Records), p. 109.

[127] Nichols's *Leic.* vol. i. pt. i. App. p. 22; Rymer, i. 789; *Appendix to 31st Report*, p. 17.

[128] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vi. pt. iii. 1553. For a full account of the foundation and its history see article by Dr. Fly in *Archaeologia*, xv. 92–113. There were three

Towards the end of 1293 or beginning of 1294 he went to France.[129]

Meanwhile trouble had arisen between Edward and his suzerain, Philip IV of France. A quarrel between an English and a French sailor as to which should draw water first at a well in a Norman seaport, ending in the death of the latter, had begun a sort of irregular war between the English and Gascons on the one hand and the Normans, Bretons, and French on the other.[130] In May 1293 the former defeated a French fleet returning from a plundering raid in a great pitched battle.[131] The war still continued; and both sides committed great barbarities.[132] Philip IV called on Edward to answer as duke of Aquitaine for the crimes of the Gascons towards the subjects of their mediate lord. Edward sent the bishop of London with the reply that the French king's subjects would find justice done to them in his courts, and he refused to give up the offenders. The bishop was also to offer to settle the matter by a personal interview, or by the arbitration of the pope, the cardinals, or some other suitable persons.[133] Philip, on 10 Dec. 1293, cited Edward to appear personally at Paris.[134] Edward therefore asked Edmund to try and come to some compromise with Philip. Almost all the English accounts agree in ascribing to Philip IV the most glaring want of good faith in these negotiations, and a very great want of caution, not to call it foolishness, to Edmund and his brother. The French authorities, on the other hand, accuse Edward of being determined to go to war, because he did not obey the summons, and his subjects of committing acts of hostility after an agreement had been made.[135]

The English account is as follows: Edmund negotiated for

other houses of this order in England—Waterbeach, in Cambridgeshire, founded by Dionysia de Monte Canusio, 3 March 1294; Brusyard, in Suffolk, which was converted into one on 4 Oct. 1366; Denny, in Cambridgeshire, which was founded 15 Edw. I. Waterbeach was amalgamated with Denny about A.D. 1348. The nuns of the order of St. Clare, likewise called the Poor Clares, from their vow of poverty, were instituted by that person at Assisi, in Italy, according to Newcourt about A.D. 1212. This order was confirmed by Pope Innocent III, and after him by Honorius III in 1223, and was subsequently divided into a stricter and a looser sort. St. Clare, says Tanner, was born in the same town and lived at the same time as St. Francis, and her nuns observing St. Francis's rule, and wearing the same-coloured habit with the Franciscan friars, were often called minoresses, and their house without Aldgate the Minories. Thibaut IV of Champagne founded a convent of this order at Provins in 1237.

[129] Rishanger, p. 139.

[130] *Ibid.* pp. 130–1; Trivet, p. 323. [131] Rishanger, p. 137; Trivet, pp. 325–6.

[132] For the French side of the question see particularly Philip IV's citation in Rymer, i. 793, 800; E. Boutaric, *Philippe le Bel*, pp. 388–90.

[133] Rishanger, pp. 137–8.

[134] Rymer, i. 793; Boutaric, *Actes du Parlement de Paris*, série i. tome i. p. 282, No. 2858; Rishanger, p. 139.

[135] *Extraits d'une Chronique Anonyme Française finissant en mccccviii*, in Bouquet, xxi. 133: *comme celui qui de longtemps s'estoit pourveu de guerrier au roy*, Rymer, i. 793–800.

some time without success, until the two queens Mary of Brabant, the stepmother of Philip IV, and Joan, his wife, who was also Edmund's stepdaughter, offered to mediate. An agreement was then come to, negotiated by John de Lacy and Hugh de Vere on the English side. Because the Gascons had committed many contempts against the king of France, to satisfy his honour (and also to give him a good opportunity of punishing them) six castles of Gascony—namely, Saintes, Tallemont, Tournon, Pomerel, Penne, and Montfaucon—were to be delivered to him. He was also to place an officer of his in each of the other towns of Gascony, but the English garrisons were to remain in them. Edward was to give him as many hostages as he demanded. Geoffrey of Langley was sent with a letter recalling the constable of France, who had already set out with an army to seize Gascony.[136] Meanwhile the citation was to be revoked, and an arrangement was made by which Edward was to marry one of the French king's sisters (some authorities say Blanche, some Margaret), Gascony to form part of her dower and be entailed on the issue of the marriage, only returning to the elder branch of the English royal house in failure of such issue. To arrange about this marriage Edward was to come under safe-conduct to Amiens either the week before or the week after Easter 1294.[137] After the lapse of forty days Gascony was to be restored to the king of England at the request of the two queens, or either of them. Two copies were made of this agreement, and one kept by the queens, the other by Edmund.[138]

Edward sent his brother a letter commanding his officers in Gascony to give seisin of the six castles to the French king, and perform the other conditions of the treaty, to be sent when Edmund thought fit. The letter was countersigned by Walter Langton, treasurer of the wardrobe, as the king took away the seal from John Langton, his chancellor, who refused to seal it. Bartholomew Cotton remarks that this treaty was agreed to, and the letter sent, entirely without the consent of the magnates lay and spiritual. Edmund wished, before he sent the letter, to have a personal assurance from the king of France; so Philip, in the presence of Hugh de Vere, John de Lacy, Blanche, wife of Edmund, and the duke of Burgundy, swore to observe the agreement, 'as he was a true king.' He revoked the citation himself, and had it revoked in open court by the bishop of Orleans. John de Lacy was sent with

[136] Rymer, i. 794; Rishanger, p. 141.

[137] B. Cotton, p. 232; Rishanger, p. 140; Rymer, i. 795–6. There exists a long treaty in French for the marriage of Margaret to Edward, dated Feb. 1294, containing many interesting details as to the future regulation of appeals from the courts of Guienne to that of the king of France. But there is no seal to it, and on the verso are the words, *quedam conventiones quas petebant ante guerram sibi fieri gentes regis anglie sed dominus rex noluit consentire. Non est ibi sigillum.* Trésor des Chartes, J 631, No. 7.

[138] B. Cotton, p. 232; Rymer, i. 794; Rishanger, p. 140.

Edward's letter (dated 3 February) to Gascony, and John de St. John, the English lieutenant in Gascony, sold all the munitions of war he had been collecting and returned to England through Paris.[139] Meanwhile the letter sent by Geoffrey of Langley recalling the constable of France was annulled by a later letter.[140] The constable, Ralph de Nesle, entered Gascony, exacted a general submission of the land instead of the limited one specified in the treaty, and arrested all the officers of the king of England.[141] Edward had spent Easter at Canterbury, waiting for his safe-conduct.[142] John of Brittany wrote from Gisors on 28 March, promising that Edmund would meet him with the safe-conduct.[143]

Edmund and his wife very prudently provided against contingencies by selling part of Blanche's dowry, the village of Vordey, to the abbey of Moutier-la-Celle for 4,000 *livres tournois* 27 April 1294.[144] It was rumoured that Blanche of France would not accept Edward as a husband, and that treachery was meditated by the French king. He therefore, much to Philip's anger, relinquished the idea of visiting France.[145]

The forty days having expired, Edmund and his fellow envoys asked that Gascony might be given back to Edward. In a secret interview, at which only Joan was present, they were told not to be alarmed if the king gave them a negative answer in public, as some of his council were opposed to the idea of restoring Gascony, and he did not wish openly to resist them. They preferred their request to the king in his council and were refused. They waited till the council had departed, expecting the promised favourable answer. But they were finally told by the bishops of Orleans and Tournay that the king had given his final answer, and it was no use troubling him any more. Rishanger says that the French king denied all knowledge of any agreement. Edward was summoned to the court by proclamation on the day on which his last citation expired. He of course did not appear. His agents were not even allowed a short delay for consultation, and sentence was passed upon him for contumacy the same day. Bartholomew Cotton states that Philip ordered the seizure of Edward as a capital enemy of the kingdom of France.[146]

The French chroniclers make no mention of this treaty, simply relating the citation, Edward's failure to appear, and the sentence.[147] Besides this silence, which is capable of several interpre-

[139] Rymer, 793–4; Rishanger, p. 141; B. Cotton, p. 232.

[140] Rishanger, p. 142.

[141] Rymer, i. 794; Rishanger, p. 142.

[142] B. Cotton, p. 232.

[143] *Appendix to 7th Report, Inventory of Records in the Tower*, 2069.

[144] Arbois de Jubainville, iv. 453.

[145] B. Cotton, p. 232.

[146] Rymer, i. 794. There is a renewed citation to Edward, dated 28 April. *Ibid.* i. 800; *Syllabus*, i. 114; Rishanger, p. 142; B. Cotton, p. 232.

[147] *Extraits d'une Chronique Anonyme*, in Bouquet, xxi. 133. The *Chronographia Regum Francorum* (Soc. de l'Histoire de France), i. 41, says of Edmund's mission

tations, the only facts alleged in Philip's favour are the inconvenience of a war for his general policy,[148] and several acts of hostility of the most barbarous kind perpetrated after the treaty by Edward's officers and subjects.[149] But for these acts we have to rely on Philip's unsupported statement in an 'official' document, just as for the account of the negotiations we have to rely on exclusively English authorities, probably drawing most, though not all, their information from 'official' declarations. The treaty was certainly a very imprudent one for Edward to make. But, according to Edmund's statement, he was influenced to it by the desire for the peace of Christianity and the hastening of the crusade.[150] Indeed, a crusade was one of Edward I's favourite projects down to the end of his life. We need not assign to Philip so much guile, or to Edmund and Edward so much credulity, as seems at first to be their due. It is quite possible that Philip did not at first intend to retain Gascony, until the actual possession of it made the temptation too strong for him, and Edward was so anxious to settle the matter peaceably that he credited Philip with his own punctilious adhesion to the letter of an agreement. The dowry of Blanche in France, which Edmund still retained, of course made him even more desirous of peace than his brother.

As soon as he heard of the sentence on his brother, Edmund renounced his homage to the king of France and returned to England, accompanied by his wife, Blanche, and all his English household. With him returned John of Brittany, his and Edward's nephew, who had also renounced homage.[151] Edward I formally renounced homage to Philip, and with the almost enthusiastic support of the English baronage prepared for war.[152] On 1 July (1294) he wrote to the magnates of Gascony, apologising for his secret treaty and announcing his intention of sending Edmund to win back Gascony. On 3 Sept. he ordered the barons of the Cinque Ports to provide shipping for Edmund's voyage. He was to be attended by Henry de Lacy, earl of Lincoln.[153] But a Welsh war broke out,

that although *fuerit honorabiliter receptus, tamen nullum pactum facere potuit quod placeret duobus regibus*.

[148] According to a document in the French archives, J 631, No. 9, John de St. John on 21 Feb. 1294 at St. Macaire refused to deliver the duchy on the demand of the messengers of the constable of France, declining to recognise them as sufficiently authorised. The letter of the constable, which is cited in the document, demanded the most complete surrender, and made no mention of any treaty, simply requiring the deliverance of the duchy into the hands of the king of France, on account of Edward's many *excessus, contumacias, et inobediencias*.

[149] Rymer, i. 800.

[150] *Ibid.* i. 794.

[151] *Extraits d'une Chronique Anonyme*, in Bouquet, xxi. 133; *Excerpta e Chronico Gaufridi de Collone*, in Bouquet, xxii. 10 J; *Flores Hist.* iii. 271–2, 87; Rishanger, p. 142.

[152] B. Cotton, ii. 223; Rishanger, pp. 142–3; (Matt. Westm.) *Flores Historiarum*, ed. 1570, ii. 391.

[153] Rymer, i. 805, 809. Edward seems to have made great efforts to raise troops

their participation in which has already been described. It was at an end by May 1295, and on 5 Aug. Edmund was present at a council of magnates, lay and spiritual, in which he and John de Lacy explained the origin of the French war; and the offer of mediation made by the two cardinals sent by Pope Boniface VIII was refused unless the consent of the king of the Romans, with whom Edward had entered into an alliance, could be obtained. Edmund was amongst those who were loud in their cries for war at this assembly.[154]

Nineteen persons of rank were summoned to serve Edmund at the king's cost in an expedition to Gascony on 3 Oct. Edward wrote to Gascony announcing the expedition to the magnates on 19 Oct. But Edmund fell ill, so that it was not until the end of the year that the expedition, delayed by his illness, was able to set out.[155] The date of its departure is variously given. The continuator of Florence of Worcester gives 26 Dec., the 'Flores Historiarum' and the 'Annals of Worcester' about 15 Jan., and Rishanger about 25 Jan.; and while Hemingburgh says he landed in Gascony about the middle of Lent (27 Feb.), the continuator of Florence of Worcester makes it 3 Jan.[156]

He and Henry de Lacy, earl of Lincoln, had with them 353 vessels,[157] and, according to the Worcester annalist, 25 barons, 1,000 fully armed horse, and 10,000 foot; according to Hemingburgh, 26 bannerets and 1,700 men-at-arms.[158] But medieval numbers cannot, of course, be relied on. He at first sailed to the coast of Brittany, sending messengers before him to ask that his army might rest there for a few days. The Bretons replied by hanging his messengers.[159] When he approached the town of St. Mathieu the inhabitants fled with all the movable property which they could carry. Edmund sent messengers demanding their submission to the king of England. They asked for a respite until the sixth hour of the day, and meanwhile carried away nearly all their remaining portable property. Seeing them doing this, the English landed and entering the town carried away the few goods left, broke all the casks of wine they found and poured out their contents, and burnt one very large galley. Several of them entered the abbey of St. Mathieu, and despoiling it of its ecclesiastical utensils, along with

for this army. The Gascon rolls, transcripts of which, by the kindness of M. Bémont, I have been enabled to see, from the month of June till late in the autumn contain numerous writs for releasing criminals, even murderers, on bail, on condition of their serving in the army in Gascony. Various other privileges are conceded to those taking part in the expedition, *e.g.* immunity from certain suits at law during their absence

[154] *Flores Historiarum* (ed. Luard), ii. 93, 94.

[155] Rymer, i. 828, 829, 833.

[156] *Contin. Flor. Wigorn.* ii. 279 (E. H. S.); *Flores Hist.* iii. 96; *Ann. Wigorn.* iv 525; Rishanger, p. 154; Walter de Hemingburgh, ii. 72.

[157] *Flor. Hist.* iii. 96.

[158] *Ann. Wigorn.* iv. 525; Hemingburgh, ii. 72.

[159] *Ann. Wigorn.* iv. 525.

the head of the saint, presented them to Edmund, who ordered them to be restored to the monks. The Welsh troops of Edmund pursued the fugitive natives, slew some of them, and set fire to the houses. The army then proceeded to Brest, whence thirty of the galleys and some other vessels proceeded to St. Gilles les Bois, and remained a long time there, until the supply of drink ran short and they could not get out of the harbour owing to an unfavourable breeze. But some corn was discovered buried in chests, which they took to the ships. With this they would be able to brew the drink they wanted, which was probably not water, but beer or mead, without which a medieval army soon lost heart, considering it a great privation to be reduced to drinking water. Just after they had finished loading a favourable wind sprang up, and they sailed to Blaye, where Edmund and his army landed; then proceeding to Castillon they landed the horses there.[160]

John de St. John, who had been sent with a small force in the autumn of 1294, had taken Rions, Bourg, Blaye, Bayonne, St. Jean de Sordes, Aspremont, St. Sever, and other towns. Rions had been retaken by the French, as had also St. Sever, but the latter had been recovered by the English soon after.[161]

The castle of Lesparre surrendered to Edmund on 22 March 1296,[162] and on the 24th the English sailors attacked Bordeaux, and killed about thirty persons with the bolts of the balistae.[163] The English land army encamped near Bègles, about two miles south of Bordeaux, in a certain wood.[164] On the 28th the French suddenly sallied out from Bordeaux, in violation, so the English said, of a truce which had been concluded. A few English knights hastily armed themselves as best they could on the news of their near approach, and sallied out to meet them. Seeing them the French thought that their surprise had failed, and that the whole English army was ready to meet them. They hastily turned and fled, pursued by the English. The Dunstable annalist says that the English simulated flight at first, in order to draw the men of Bordeaux a greater distance from their city. At any rate the loss of the men of Bordeaux amounted, according to the English chroniclers, to 2,000 men. Five of the English army were taken prisoners through entering the gates of the city with the fugitives, two brothers of Peter de Maulee, a Gascon, two standard bearers of John of Brittany, and Alan de la Zouche.[165] On Friday, 30 March, the English maritime and land divisions, having taken counsel together, attacked the town, and, breaking through the outer wall, entered the suburbs, inflicting considerable loss. The inhabitants of the

[160] *Flor. Hist.* iii. 284–5. [161] Rishanger, pp. 144, 147, 149–50.

[162] *Flor. Hist.* iii. 285; Rishanger, p. 154. [163] *Flor. Hist.* iii. 285.

[164] Rishanger, p. 154; Trivet, p. 340; W. de Hemingburgh, ii. 72.

[165] *Flores Hist.* iii. 285; Rishanger, p. 154; Trivet, p. 340; Dunstable, iii. 397; Walter de Hemingburgh, ii. 72; *Chron. de Lanercost*, p. 170.

suburbs thereupon set fire to their houses and fled within the walls of the city.[166]

Edmund had not enough siege engines to undertake the regular siege of so large a city, and as it was rumoured that the count of Artois was at Langon, about fifteen miles further up the Garonne, with 900 fully armed horse, he left Bordeaux and proceeded thither. He did not find the count there, but the town surrendered to him. He then summoned St. Macaire, which lay about two miles east of Langon. The inhabitants obtained three days' truce from him to send messengers for help to Bordeaux, but finding that Bordeaux could not help them surrendered.[167]

The castle, commanded by Thibaut de Cheppoy, still held out. As soon as Edmund had surrounded it he directed against it twelve great engines, which threw large stones night and day, with which he battered down the roofs of the gates and towers.[168] Before long there was scarcely a building which had not its roof battered in, and more than 100 persons were killed by the engines. The women and children had to take refuge in the cellars (? *vaussures*). Edmund's men made one or two fierce attempts to carry the place by assault every day; but the besieged held their ground, though in course of time the fortress was so battered down that its defenders could not find refuge from the stones except in some little arches of the wall, which still stood. 'When the king of France heard how his castle of St. Macaire was besieged and oppressed, and how Messire Thibaut de Cheppoy had already long and valiantly defended it,' says the French chronicler,

> he swore by St. David that it should be succoured with all diligence, 'if it cost the lives of ten thousand men.' He therefore commanded count Robert of Artois that he should immediately provide himself with 1,000 men-at-arms, and arbalisters in proportion, in order to go and raise the siege of St. Macaire and maintain the war in these parts, which he did with good heart, as he much desired to avenge himself on the English for some outrages committed in his country.

Robert hastened a splendid and well-equipped army with the utmost speed to the relief of St. Macaire, but stopped for two days at Béziers to refresh his troops. Edmund hearing of his approach, and being in want of money to pay his troops, fell back towards Bordeaux, after raising the siege of the castle of St. Macaire, which had lasted three weeks.[169] Five messengers had come from Bordeaux, offering to surrender it and pay 5,000 pounds of silver if he would spare all bearing the sign of St. George. But the treachery

[166] *Flor. Hist.* iii. 285; Hemingburgh, ii. 72–3; Rishanger, p. 154; Trivet, p. 340.

[167] *Flor. Hist.* iii. 285; Hemingburgh, ii. 73.

[168] A full account of the siege is given in *Extraits d'une Chronique Anonyme intitulée 'Anciennes Chroniques de Flandre'* in D. Bouquet, xxi. 355.

[169] *Ibid.* xxi. 355; Walter de Hemingburgh, ii. 73; *Chronographia Regum Francorum*, i. 49.

of these five was discovered. On their return they were hanged, and the English who tried to enter the place were repulsed.

Want of money and the consequent desertion of the mercenaries he had collected now compelled Edmund to retire to Bayonne, where he was honourably received.[170] But the ignominious failure of his campaign preyed on his mind. About Whitsuntide (13 May) he fell sick, and died on 5 June.[171] In his will he left instructions that his body should not be buried until his debts were paid.[172] It was embalmed and kept for a time in the church of the Friars Minors at Bayonne.[173] After the lapse of six months it was conveyed to England.[174] On 24 March 1301 it was taken from the convent of the Minoresses in London to St. Paul's, and from St. Paul's to Westminster Abbey, where it was interred, in the presence of the king and many earls and bishops, in the centre of the altar of St. Peter.[175] His elaborately carved tomb is still to be seen, close to that of his first wife, Avelina, in the sanctuary.[176]

His widow, who seems to have accompanied him to Gascony, received a safe-conduct for her return to England on 17 Nov. 1296.[177] She received letters of administration as his principal executrix on 3 July 1297. By writs bearing the dates 26 April and 21 June 1298 she had her dower assigned to her, which consisted of the usual third.[178] She died at Vincennes on 2 May

[170] Walter de Hemingburgh, ii. 73–4; *Chron. de Lanercost*, p. 170. If his army was recruited in the same way as that of 1294, its behaviour is easily expla ned.

[171] Walter de Hemingburgh, ii. 74, where the date of his falling sick, *circa Pentecosten*, is given; Rishanger, p. 154; Trivet, p. 340; Dunstable, iii. 402, *anno* 1296 *quasi intrante*; Worcester, iv. 527; *Chron. Girardi de Nangiaco*, in Bouquet, xx. 578 A; *Chronica Girardi de Fracheto*, in D. Bouquet, xxi. 14 f.; *Chronique de St. Denis*, in Bouquet, xx. 663 A. The 'necrology' of the abbey of Huiron, quoted by M. d'Arbois de Jubainville, iv. 454, note (*a*), assigns his death to 17 March. This is contradicted by the account of his campaign, and only slightly supported by the indefinite expression in Dunstable. The exact date of his death *non. Junii* is given by the continuator of Gervase of Canterbury (Rolls Series), ii. 314. On 15 July 1296 Edward I issued letters from Aberdeen to the archbishop of Canterbury and the bishops of England, and to thirty abbots with the master of the order of Sempringham, asking for their prayers for the soul of his brother (Rymer, i. 842). We have also letters patent of Edmund dated 7 April 1296 (*Appendix to 7th Report, Inventory of Records in the Tower*, No. 2188).

[172] Walter de Hemingburgh, ii. 74.

[173] Dunstable, iii. 402.

[174] Rishanger, p. 154.

[175] Trivet, *Annales*, says the funeral took place in 1297 at Westminster Abbey, and that Edward immediately after went to St. Albans and released Ralph de Monthermer, the knight who had clandestinely married the widow of the earl of Gloucester, much to Edward's displeasure. But the French chronicle of Dover in the appendix to the *Liber de Antiquis Legibus*, p. 249, dates the funeral 24 March 1301, and gives the more precise account.

[176] An engraving of this tomb, with a description of it, is to be seen in Gough's *Sepulchral Monuments*, i. 69–75, and is reproduced, with an extract from the description, in Nichols's *Leic.* vol. i. pt. i. p. 222.

[177] Rymer, i. 832, where it is obviously misdated by a year.

[178] *Appendix to* 31*st Report*, p. 18. The grant of dower had been confirmed by Edward I on 29 Oct. 1276 (Rymer, i. 535).

1302.[179] Edmund had by her three sons—Thomas, who succeeded to the earldom; Henry, lord of Monmouth, who succeeded to the earldom some time after the death of Thomas; John, baron of Beaufort and Nogent l'Artaud, who seems to have died young, but was alive on 30 Dec. 1291—and one daughter.[180]

The convent of Nuns Minoresses in London, which he and his wife founded in 1293, has already been mentioned. The nuns who formed its nucleus seem to have been brought over by Blanche from France.[181] He was also one of the chief builders of the monastery of the Grey Friars at Preston,[182] and confirmed Simon de Montfort's benefactions to the brethren of the hospital of St. John at Hungerford.[183] He gave the manor of Bere, in Dorsetshire, of the annual value of 26*l.*, to the Cistercian nunnery of Tarrant-Crawford, three and a half miles S.E. of Blandford, founded by Ralph de Kahaines in the reign of Richard I, and rebuilt by Bishop Poor in 1230.[184] In the inventory of the vestry of Westminster Abbey he appears as the giver of a blue frontal, and a set of blue vestments, all embroidered with archangels, very possibly for use on Michaelmas Day. He also granted the advowson of the church of Skenefrith to the abbot and convent of Grâce Dieu, in frank-almoign for the souls of King Henry, his father, and Queen Eleanor, his mother.[185]

Of his personal characteristics we know little. It is scarcely possible that the epithet 'Crouchback,' which is not given to him by any contemporary chronicler, can have arisen from any deformity of his. John of Gaunt's statement that Edmund was humpbacked, made in 1394, was contradicted by the earl of March, who said that it evidently appeared from the chronicles that Edmund was a handsome man and a noble knight.[186] According to Hardyng John of Gaunt even went the length of procuring forged chronicles, in which this statement was incorporated with its companion statement that Edmund was really the eldest son, and placed them in the monasteries.[187] The explanation which attributes it to his having been on the crusade is much more probable, if even the name be anything more than a survival of half the Lancastrian fiction which its absence in contemporary authorities seems to point at its being. For all that we know of him points to his having been both handsome and well skilled in arms. Trokelowe

[179] Register of the Chambre des Comptes, quoted by Anselme, *Hist. Genealogicum*, i. 382.

[180] Arbois de Jubainville, iv. 454; Rishanger, p. 83; *Appendix to* 31*st Report*, p. 16.

[181] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vol. vi. pt. iii. p. 1553.

[182] Baines, *Hist. of Lanc.* i. 127.

[183] *Appendix to* 31*st Report*, p. 14 (20 May 1281).

[184] *Rotuli Hundredorum* (Rec. Comm.), p. 100.

[185] *Archaeologia*, lii. pt. ii. p. 210; *Cal. of Pat. Rolls*, Ed. I (R.S.), ii. p. 451.

[186] *Continuatio Eulogii Historiarum*, ii. 369.

[187] *Archaeologia*, xvi. 143.

even ascribes his marriage with Blanche partly to the accounts which she had heard of his prowess as a knight.[188] One French chronicler alludes in respectful terms to his military skill, though perhaps it was more that of a brave soldier than of a general of more than ordinary abilities.[189] One trait of his mentioned by a fourteenth-century writer is borne out by facts, as well as by Peckham's letter quoted above. He is called *flos largitatis,* i.e. a princely giver and spender of money.[190] This and the expense of his crusade account for the fact that he seems to have been continually feeling the necessity of providing for the payment of his debts, or letting out his lands to farm in order to raise money, in spite of his vast estates and fortunate marriages.[191]

As a brother and a subject his conduct was throughout steadfastly loyal and faithful, in spite of the power which his great estates with their anti-regal traditions placed in his hands. He took part in all Edward I's Welsh expeditions, although he had French as well as English estates to look after, and was always ready to help his brother in negotiations. Neither can Edward be said to have treated his brother in a niggardly manner; for he confirmed all his father's grants, and added to them.[192]

[188] Trokelowe, *Annales*, 70–1.

[189] *Quy sage chevallier fut en son temps. Extraits d'une Chronique Anonyme intitulée ' Anciennes Chroniques de Flandre '* in Bouquet, xxii. 355.

[190] *Eulog. Histor.* iii. 119. Mr. Haydon says that this phrase is a literal translation of an expression in the French *Brut*, '*flur de largesce* ' (introd. to vol. iii. of *Eulog. Hist.* pt. ii. note 1). The same quality seems pointed at in the phrase *velut homo facetus et largissimus* (Walter de Hemingburgh, ii. 74).

[191] On 24 July 1269 he made an agreement to repay a loan of 1,000*l.* borrowed from his mother, Eleanor, to pay Amicia, countess of Devon, for her share in the marriage of Avelina de Fortibus. On 25 July 1270 he obtained a grant that if he should die in less than seven years the revenues of his lands, which would thereby escheat to the crown, should be applied to the payment of his debts (*Appendix to* 31*st Report*, p. 12; Nichols, vol. i. pt. i. App. p. 21). On 28 July 1272 his mother, in virtue of the powers entrusted to her, let out some of his lands to farm to Edmund of Cornwall for four years for 3,500 marks (31*st Report*, p. 12). On 17 Feb. 1275 he received license to demise to term or farm his lands and tenements, except castles, for three years (44*th Report*, Appendix, p. 94). On 27 July 1276 he received a grant that his creditors should be satisfied in case of his death to the amount of three years' issues of his lands (45*th Report*, App. p. 161). On 28 October 1294 he received letters patent providing for the payment of a debt of 4,000 marks which he owed to Henry, earl of Lincoln, out of the revenues of his lands, should they come into the king's hands at his decease (31*st Report*, App. p. 17).

[192] The rights claimed and exercised in his lands, and his title to the lands he held, were inquired into by the *quo waranto* commission, just like those of the other great barons. In many cases too the answer given was *nesciunt quo waranto*, which involved a suit of *quo waranto* being brought by the crown against the earl. The disputed rights included those of *returnum brevium*, holding pleas *de namio vetito*, delivering impounded cattle, view of frankpledge, having a gallows, pillory, and tumbrel, and holding assizes of beer and bread. Among the offences of which his bailiffs were reported guilty were those of exacting excessive suit, exacting fines for respite of knighthood, delivering malefactors for money, and letting out wapentakes in his hands at so high a firm as to compel the lessees to extortion. See *Rotuli Hundredorum* (Rec. Comm.), i. 240, 271, 305, 306, 383; ii. 6, 9, 18, 19, 108, 116, 192,

Edward himself bore witness to the virtue and fidelity of this earl, who was the founder of a power destined to hurl his descendant from the throne, and the father of the man who was to be, next to Edward II himself, his son's worst enemy. He spoke of him as 'Edmund our most dear and only brother, who was always forward, devoted, and faithful in our business and that of our realm, in whom valour and the gifts of manifold graces shone forth.'[193] Indeed, Edmund's very loyalty and fidelity served to blind Edward to the fact that by confirming his father's grants and adding to them he was continuing in a dangerous path, and sharpening the sword that would not only chastise the follies of his son, but make its holder the real master of England for a time, and that he was preparing the tragedies of Pontefract and Berkeley.

WALTER E. RHODES.

293, 298, 302, 563, and elsewhere. According to R. Simpson, *History of Lancaster*, p. 217, in 1292 Edward I sued his brother for the castle and honour of Lancaster, the wapentake of Amounderness, and the manors of Preston, Riggely, and Singleton. The pleadings were adjourned to Appleby in the octaves of St. Michael. He refers for this to *Placita de Quo Warranto*, 20 Ed. I, *Lanc. Rot.*

[193] Rymer, i. 842. Cf. *Chron. de Lanercost*, '*strenuus miles et procerus qui socialis extitit et jocundus largus et pius*,' quoted in Doyle, *Baronage of England*, ii. 309. I have been unable to discover the authority for Dean Stanley's picturesque statement in the *Memorials of Westminster*, repeated in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, that Edmund introduced the 'red rose of Lancaster' from Provins. The true rose of Provins, which was introduced from Syria by Thibaut VI, is semi-double, and of a medium shade of red in colour, and its leaves, when dried, possess a particularly strong odour and medicinal properties.

Vanini in England

OF the foreigners who visited England in the reigns of Elizabeth and James I perhaps the most interesting figures are those of Giordano Bruno and Giulio Cesare Vanini. Although it would be absurd to place the lucubrations of Vanini on a level with the philosophical, if not always intelligible, speculations of Bruno, yet the similarity of the subject matter of their audacious writings, their wandering and adventurous lives, and perhaps most of all the similarity of their tragical fate, make us constantly link their names together, and perhaps have contributed to shed upon Vanini some sparks of the halo which surrounds the name of Bruno. We have hitherto had no contemporary account of the visit of either to our shores. We have known only what they themselves have been pleased to tell us in their works—in the case of Bruno a mixture of 'Wahrheit und Dichtung' which excites in us a desire to know how the matters recorded appeared to those eminent persons—Sir Philip Sidney and Fulke Greville among others—with whom it seems to be clear that during his visit he was intimately associated. But Vanini tells us hardly anything of his visit except that he passed two years in England, that his zeal for the catholic faith occasioned his imprisonment for forty-nine days, and that he was prepared to receive the crown of martyrdom with all the zeal imaginable.[1] There are, however, among the State Papers in the Record Office a number of letters, two by Vanini himself, others by those with whom he was immediately connected whilst in England, which give us a tolerably detailed account of his residence in this country, and throw an important though not altogether favourable light upon his life, his character, and his opinions.

Among the sources of information for the reign of James I, the

[1] *Amphitheatrum Aeternae Providentiae*, pp. 117–18. But he is not very accurate in his statement, and implies—if he does not actually assert—that he came to England on a religious mission:—*Ego sane vel minimus militantis Ecclesiae Tyro, cum anno praeterito Londini ad agonem Christianum destinatus essem, adeoque 49 diebus in latomiis tanquam palaestra quadam exercerer, eo eram pro Catholicae Ecclesiae authoritate defensanda effundendi sanguinis desiderio accensus, et inflammatus, ut mihi a Deo immortali vel majus donum, aut melius contingere nullo modo potuisset, ita quidem, si non superiorem, inferiorem certe nullo martyre propriae conscientiae testimonium me indicavit et confratrum, qui mecum in eodem erant Xisto et theatro fortissimi, et digni sane qui tale Deo spectaculum exhiberent.*

latter part of Elizabeth, and the first years of Charles I, an important place must be given to the correspondence between Sir Dudley Carleton—afterwards Viscount Dorchester—successively ambassador at Brussels, Venice, and The Hague, and John Chamberlain. Chamberlain, well described by Mr. Thompson Cooper in the 'Dictionary of National Biography' as 'an accomplished scholar and an admirable letter-writer, the Horace Walpole of his day,' during more than a quarter of a century was in the habit of writing long and frequent letters to his friends, especially to those who filled diplomatic appointments abroad, full of interesting details, including not only public events, but all the court gossip of the time. A private gentleman of good position and ample fortune, intimate with many men of eminence, and mixing in the best society of his time, he seems to have been singularly free from ambition, and to have desired neither place nor money. Copies (now in the British Museum) of a large number of his letters, made a century and a half since by Dr. Thomas Birch from the originals in the Record Office, form the principal and by far the most interesting part of two works entitled 'The Court and Times of James I' (2 vols. London, 1848) and 'The Court and Times of Charles I' (London, 1848). A volume of his letters written in the reign of Elizabeth has been printed by the Camden Society. Many others are to be found in Nichols's 'Progresses of James I,' and in Sir Ralph Winwood's 'Memorials.' A considerable number of Chamberlain's letters, however, are still in the Record Office and unprinted, many of these being as full of interest as those which have appeared in the volumes just referred to.

In the 'Court and Times of James I' there are several letters from Chamberlain and one from Carleton referring to two Carmelite friars professing to be protestants, who came to England from Venice in 1612 with an introduction from Carleton to Archbishop Abbot, by whom they were for some time entertained at Lambeth. Their names are not given, but in the published 'Calendar of State Papers,' besides many other letters not printed in the 'Court and Times of James I,' are two letters in Italian from one of them called in the Calendar Julio Cesare Vandoni; one to Carleton thanking him for the introduction to Archbishop Abbot, the other to Isaac Wake, then Carleton's secretary. The name certainly at first sight looks much more like Vandoni than Vanini, but on a comparison with the only other specimen of Vanini's handwriting known to exist—the oath taken by him on receiving the degree of Doctor, which has been brought to light from the Archives of the University of Naples by Professor Settembrini, and a facsimile of a part of which is given by Signor Palumbo in the book hereinafter referred to—the 'n' forming the third letter of 'Vanini' in the signature of the letters to Carleton and Wake will be seen to be identical with

the letter 'n' in the word 'spondeo' in the oath, and to have the same flourish resembling a 'd' at the end of it, whilst other similarities show that the handwriting of the oath and of the two letters is identical. That these two letters were written by Vanini and that the State Papers contain several references to his visit to England was first made known by Signor Raffaelle Palumbo in 1878, in a brochure of one hundred pages entitled 'Giulio Cesare Vanini e i suoi tempi, Cenno biografico-storico corredato di documenti inediti' (Naples). The object of this book, the author tells us, 'is to make known some documents discovered by me in London in the Archives of the State. These documents, which have remained unknown for three centuries, enable us to understand both the character of and many details respecting Giulio Cesare Vanini, who died at the stake at Toulouse and was one of the last of the philosophers of the Italian Renaissance.' Signor Palumbo is entitled to much credit, and ought to receive our gratitude, for the discovery that these documents refer to Vanini, but unfortunately he has made but little use of them in his book. He prints in full, indeed —though not quite correctly—the two letters in Italian from Vanini himself, which are really among the least interesting of the whole series, but of those of Archbishop Abbot and John Chamberlain, to which he refers, he gives very brief extracts and incorrect summaries. He was evidently unaware that several of these letters had been printed, and it is clear that he had only actually read the two written by Vanini, and that he was entirely ignorant of the existence of some of the most important of the rest, whilst he has contented himself with reading the summaries of the others given by Mrs. Green in the 'Calendar of State Papers.' On several important points—possibly from a want of familiarity with our language and our history—he has misunderstood and misstated the effect of these summaries, and has thus deprived his narrative of any value whatever, either for the details of Vanini's residence in England, or for enabling us to form any conclusions as to his character or his object in visiting this country.[2] Moreover, of the nineteen letters which I have been able to find in the Record Office relating to Vanini and his visit, Palumbo refers only to ten, and has not even noticed perhaps the most important of all—one from Archbishop Abbot to Sir Dudley Carleton, written 16 March 1614.

[2] Signor Palumbo's inaccuracies are not confined to English affairs. He speaks of Bayle (who was born in 1643) as a contemporary of Vanini, and states that Gramond the historian was president of the parliament of Toulouse at the time of Vanini's execution, that he presided at the trial and suborned the chief witness against him, Francon by name. Brutally as Gramond treats Vanini in his *History*, it is only just to him to say that he was in no way concerned in the trial. It was not until some years later that he succeeded his father, with whom he has been confounded, in the office of Président des Enquêtes in the parliament of Toulouse. But though his father then held that office, there is no evidence that he, any more than his son, took part in the trial of Vanini.

Signor Palumbo's work was reviewed by Professor Fiorentino in the 'Nuova Antologia' for September 1878, but so little attention did it receive in England that no copy of it is to be found in the British Museum, nor has it, or the remarkable discovery made by Signor Palumbo, so far as I know, been noticed by any English writer except the Rev. J. Owen, who in his recent work, 'The Skeptics of the Italian Renaissance,' has devoted several pages to Vanini's visit to England. But unfortunately Mr. Owen has not consulted the documents themselves, or even the printed calendars, and has merely based his account upon that of Palumbo, or rather, perhaps, upon Fiorentino's article in the 'Nuova Antologia,' borrowing all the Italian author's mistakes, and adding one or two of his own. He, like Palumbo, is entirely ignorant of the fact that several of the letters have been printed in 'The Court and Times of James I.' Both writers take a very favourable view of the character of Vanini, and neither of them has extracted from the letters any of the passages which tend to give an opposite impression. Each of them represents Vanini as a sincere and conscientious man, an orthodox but liberal-minded catholic, hoping to find in the Anglican Church greater intellectual freedom than in the Roman communion, and returning to the church of Rome when he found that of England not more but less liberal and giving less opportunity for freedom of thought. This is certainly not the impression the letters themselves give us. Mr. Owen's chapter on Vanini is, notwithstanding, one of the most interesting in his book, and it is greatly to be regretted that he has missed the opportunity of making himself acquainted with the facts as to Vanini's stay in England, and of giving them to the world. They would certainly—after making all allowance for the narrow-minded prejudices of Archbishop Abbot—have obliged him to modify his opinion of the character of Vanini, and to have represented it less favourably.

Lucilio, or, as he preferred to style himself, Giulio Cesare Vanini (perhaps copying a man for whom he more than once expresses great admiration, Julius Cæsar Scaliger), was born at Taurisano, near Otranto, in the kingdom of Naples, in 1585. His taste for learning induced his father to send him to the university of Naples, where he took the degree of Doctor *utriusque iuris* in 1606. Philosophy and physical science were his two favourite subjects of study, and his two masters were, as he tells us, John Bacon (*i.e.* Baconthorpe), 'the prince of Averroists, from whom I have learned to swear only by Averroës,' and Pomponatius, whose book 'De Incantationibus' he styles 'a golden book,' and of whom he writes—strangely enough, since Pomponatius was an opponent of Averroës and a disciple of Alexander of Aphrodisias—'that Pythagoras would have said that the soul of Averroës had passed into the body of

Pomponatius.' Renan, in his 'Averroès et l'Averroïsme,' seems hardly as fair as usual in attributing to Vanini a deliberate falsehood in this statement as to his masters, one of whom died two hundred and forty years and the other fifty years before his birth; and I agree with Mr. Owen that he only intended to express the obligations he was under to the works of these two philosophers, and not to suggest that he had actually been their pupil. His other favourite authors were Aristotle, Albertus Magnus, and Jerome Cardan. For the details of his life between June 1606, when he took his doctor's degree, and the spring of 1612, when we find him in Venice, we have only the scattered references to be found in his two extant books, the 'Amphitheatrum Aeternae Providentiae,' printed at Lyons in 1615, and his 'De Admirandis Naturae . . . Arcanis,' printed at Paris in 1616. That he became a Carmelite friar, and received priest's orders; that he studied for some time at Padua and there (probably) made the acquaintance of a fellow student, one Giovanni Maria Genochi[3]; that he travelled through Germany, having there Genochi as his companion, Bohemia, Holland, and Switzerland, disputing with atheists and protestants, and always professing himself to be an orthodox catholic; then for a time staying in France—probably in Paris, but (perhaps) driven thence by the false accusations of a certain Henricus Sylvius—is really all that we know of his history during these years. In the spring of 1612, then in the twenty-seventh year of his age, we find him at Venice, and it is there that our special interest in him in connexion with his English visit begins.

It appears from the letters which I shall shortly quote at length, that in or shortly before March 1612, Sir Dudley Carleton, then ambassador to Venice, and his secretary, Isaac Wake, had made the acquaintance of two Carmelite friars, men of considerable learning, who professed a secret attachment to the reformed doctrines and a desire to visit England. Carleton, who though a shrewd diplomatist was now at least a zealous protestant—he had been suspected of being a Roman catholic in his youth—was convinced of their sincerity: 'Their discovery of light even in the midst of darkness hath been very miraculous.' Accordingly he wrote to Archbishop Abbot, recommending them to him, and received from him a reply to the effect that if they visited England they would be well received. These letters I have not been able to find, but it seems from a letter of Chamberlain to Carleton of 17 June 1612, that, notwithstanding the desire as well of Carleton as of the two friars themselves that their visit 'should be with all secrecy,' the matter had not been kept private but had been talked of two months before their arrival: 'They were expected long before they came, and the

[3] Variously called by the biographers of Vanini, Genochi, Gennochis, Guinnochi, and Sinnochi.

bishop of Ely [Andrewes] could tell me two months since that two such were on their way . . . some while before they set forth.'

One of these friars was Vanini, the other—the younger of the two—called himself Giovanni (Battista?) Maria de Franchis.[4] They would seem to have started from Venice soon after April 29, furnished with a letter of introduction of that date from Carleton to Chamberlain, who had accompanied him on his embassy to Venice in 1610, and had lately (in November 1611) returned to England.[5]

Good Mr. Chamberlain,—You must be content to be troubled sometimes with commissions from your friends with which variety will make the quietness you enjoy so much the more pleasing. This that I now recommend to you is a work of charity to be assistant to two honest strangers, who were yet never nearer England than this place nor never spake with Englishman but with myself and some of my house : and yet as they are carried thither by their affection, so are they well settled in our religion. For this cause I have recommended them to my Lord Archbishop's grace, by whom I have good assurance they will be well received : and because it is difficult for strangers to find access, I will desire this of you ; if you are known to my Lord to bestow the conducting of them yourself ; if otherwise to address them to some one of his chaplains whom you hear to be of most trust about his Lordship for as their mission hath been with all secrecy, so I desire their reception may be. And as their discovery of light even in the midst of darkness hath been very miraculous, so those good parts of learning that are in them I promise myself will add much to the bright shining thereof through all the world. Of their outward appearance and manners you must respect no more than of those who have always lived in cloisters but their ingenuity will (I assure myself) give you the same satisfaction it hath done me. Their course of life you shall more particularly understand from themselves : and I pray you as for their first access so likewise for their other occasions let them be aided hereafter by your friendly advice : and as I shall be glad to have from you what satisfaction they both give and receive so where they will write I pray you to give their letters conveyance. And thus with wonted good wishes I commit you to God's holy protection. From Venice this 29 of Aprill, 1612.[6]

Of the two friars' journey from Venice to London we have no details, though it is not impossible that some of the adventures and

[4] Whether he is the same person with Giovanni Maria Genochi I shall consider later on.

[5] Signor Palumbo, as a foreigner, may be excused for knowing nothing of Chamberain, but it is strange that Mr. Owen should have failed to identify Carleton's correspondent—a man well known to every student of the reigns of James I and Charles I, whose letters, especially those to Carleton, are so frequently quoted by our historians and biographers. Signor Palumbo and Mr. Owen both erroneously and strangely describe him as *Mayor of Canterbury*, an office which he never filled, having, indeed, no connexion whatever with that city ; and Mr. Owen adds to the blunder of Signor Palumbo by knighting him and describing him as ' Sir somebody Chamberlain.'

[6] *Cal. St. P.* Dom. Ser. Jas. I, 1611-18, lxviii. 127, No. 103. Printed in *Court and Times of James I*, p. 165.

conversations which Vanini records as occurring in Germany, France, Holland, or Switzerland, may have taken place on this occasion. Fuhrmann[7] seems to have thought that he went to England by way of Paris, and, as well as others of Vanini's biographers, that his visit to this country was occasioned by some hostile proceedings on the part of one Henricus Sylvius, of whom he more than once speaks with much bitterness. Mr. Owen also writes: 'Driven out of France by the malevolence of a certain Enrico Sylvio [*sic*] we next find Vanini in England.' But I do not understand Vanini's words as necessarily implying this. Speaking of the different meanings or applications of the word 'fatale,' he writes:[8] *Alterum versatur circa exiliora, veluti dicam, fatale mihi fuit ut ab Henrico Sylvio iniustissime laesus Britanniam inviserem.* Dr. Ernst Münch ('Julius Cäser Vanini: sein Leben und sein System') says that Vanini took ship for England at Havre, but I have failed to find any authority for this statement. The two friars arrived in London (not Canterbury as Signor Palumbo and Mr. Owen strangely imply) shortly before 17 June,[9] on which day Chamberlain wrote to Carleton a long letter containing all the news of the day, from which the following is an extract:

'My very goode Lord: yor two Carmelites are come, and have delivered me yor letter of the 29th of Aprill, I have since received a letter of the 22 of May. Touching yor friars yt was my chaunce to be out of towne when they came and they unwilling to loose any time found accesse to the archbishop in my absence, wch came very well to passe, for I shold have proved but a bad conductor, having no manner of acquaintance in that house but Mr. Robert Hatton who is steward: neither can I tell wherein to pleasure them more than in conveying theyre letters which I send here inclosed whereby you shall receve from themselves a full relation of theyre present estate. They are now lodged at Lambeth in the bishop's house where the elder of them is still to remain, the other is to be sent shortly to the archbishop of Yorke by the king's appointment though I thinke he had rather have continued in these parts yf he might have been permitted. Theyre reception could not be so private as yt seems you wished for they were expected longe before they came and the bishop of Ely could tell me two months since that there were two such upon the way, wch yt seemes was some while before they set foorth. He told me likewise the other day of a certain bishop in the venetian territorie (but he had forgot his name) that is writing a worke against the Popes usurping jurisdiction. To tell you freely my opinion as far as I understand this business, though yt cannot be denied but that you have done a very goode and charitable worke in reducing these strayinge sheep,

[7] *Leben und Schicksale, Geist, Character und Meynungen des Lucilio Vanini* (Leipzig, 1800).

[8] *Amphitheatrum*, Ex. 42, p. 285. Rousselot, *Œuvres philosophiques de Vanini*, p. 166, states that this Sylvius was an alchemist who was put to death for his crimes at the time that Vanini was in France.

[9] It is clear that they did not arrive until after 11 June, as on that day Chamberlain had written to Carleton without any mention of them.

yet I doubt you wil reape no great thankes on either side, for I find our bishops here not very fond of such guests, and thinke they might have enough of them, yf they could provide them maintenance so that unless they be very eminent and men of marke they shall find little regard after a small time. . . .[10]

Their abjuration of the Roman catholic faith and their reception into the reformed Italian church took place on Sunday July 5, at the chapel of Mercers' Hall, then used as the place of worship of the Italian protestants, of which Ascanio Spinola was the minister.[11] Unfortunately for us, Chamberlain was not present, but he gives the following account of the matter to Carleton in a letter dated 12 July 1612:

My very goode Lord: yor two Carmelites made a publike confession of theyre fayth and conversion wth an abjuration of theyre former errors on Sunday last at the Italian Church in the pressence of a great assemblie, whereof sr Francis Bacon was the man of most marke. I was not there by the error of my man whom I sent to learne and he brought me worde the appointment held not that day: but I understand the elder acquitted himself best in point of learning and the other in language, as likewise he hath the voyce of my L. of Cannterburie's house of the more prompte and quicke spirit and they wish that they might kepe them both still, or yf they must part wth one that they might retain him. . . .[12]

It appears from a subsequent letter of Archbishop Abbot, in which he refers to the younger friar as the one that afterwards went to York, that Vanini was the one here referred to as the elder, and

[10] *Cal.* lxix. 135, No. 71; *Court and Times of James I*, i. 173.

[11] I have been unable to find any account either of Ascanio Spinola or of the Italian church in London (as reconstituted in 1609) prior to the arrival of the archbishop of Spalato in 1616. The only notice of them with which I am acquainted is contained in Baron de Schickler's *Les Églises du Refuge en Angleterre* (3 vols. Paris, 1892), i. 387–8: *La chapelle de Mercers Hall avait été rouverte et le culte rétabli en* 1609, *après une longue interruption, par un ancien moine venu de Bruxelles, Ascanio Spinola, avec le concours du Conseil privé, de l'archevêque Bancroft et de Ravis qui fut évêque de Londres de* 1607 *à* 1609. *Mais, ainsi qu'il s'en plaignait au consistoire flamand, Spinola avait vainement essayé de renouer les liens avec les deux autres Eglises étrangères: il avait demandé à plusieurs reprises à M. Burlamachi de parler aux frères français en vue de la rentrée de son troupeau dans l'ancienne union; il offrait de participer avec eux à la cène, s'engageait à n'y admettre de son côté aucun étranger sans leur consentement, sollicitait leurs conseils sur la discipline, priait ceux qui comprenaient la langue d'assister quelquefois à son culte 'pour nuire à l'Antéchrist qui cherche à empêcher l'existence d'une communauté italienne à Londres.' Les consistoires flamand et français persistèrent dans leur abstention, justifiée bientôt par le retour de Spinola au catholicisme* (1616). M. de Schickler quotes this letter from the *Memoirs of Simon Ruytinck*, published (in Dutch) by the Marnix Vereeniging (Utrecht, 1873). Ascanio Spinola seems to have left England about the time of the arrival of the archbishop of Spalato, who succeeded him as minister of the Italian church, for Chamberlain writes to Carleton on 18 Jan. 1617: 'Here is a rumour that the Italian preacher, Ascanio, is run away; being, as is said, enticed by one Grimaldi, kinsman of Spinola's, whom he accompanied on his way as far as Dover, and since his wife nor friends have no news of him' (*Court and Times of James I*, p. 389).

[12] *Cal.* lxx. 136, No. 1; *Court and Times of James I*, i. 179.

it appears that he made himself less agreeable and produced a less favourable impression upon the members of the archbishop's household than his younger colleague, though he was the more learned. It is probable that their sermons at the Italian church referred to in the next letter would be on Sunday 19 July, for before the 23rd the two friars had accompanied the archbishop by his invitation to his summer palace at Croydon, and from that place they wrote to Carleton, as appears from a letter of that date from Chamberlain to Carleton enclosing the friars' packet, the contents of which, however, are not among the state papers.

Yo^r two friers are gon thether [Croydon] wth him [the archbishop] and are not yet otherwise disposed of: they have both preached of late at the Italian Church wth reasonable approbation. Here is a packet from them wch I send as I received yt from Mr. Wimark to whom yt was delivered (as he sayes) in the dark from Dick Martin, and thinkeinge it to be somewhat concerning himself opened it before he was aware but finding what it was protests he sought no secrets in it.[13]

We have already seen from Chamberlain's first letter that by the king's appointment one of the friars was to be sent to the archbishop of York, and the younger, Giovanni Maria, was chosen. He accordingly started for Bishopsthorpe on or about 23 July, furnished with a letter from Abbot to Tobie Matthew, then archbishop of York. He arrived at Bishopsthorpe on the 27th, and two days later Matthew wrote the following letter to one of the high officers of the court, probably the earl of Suffolk then lord chamberlain, or Sir Thomas Lake who was then performing the duties of secretary of state though not actually appointed to that office.

My very good Lord,—I have thought meet with all convenient expedition to advertise your lo: that Mr. Johannes Maria the converted friar carmelite came hither unto me upon Monday last the xxvii of this month accompanied with a letter from the most reverend father my Lord of Cant: his grace, dated the 23 of the same to the effect of that his Majesty's letter which I formerly received from your lordship for entertainment of the said stranger who is and shall be welcome to me not doubting but he will well deserve so to be by his religious and civil carriage whereof I see no cause but to conceive a very good opinion. Thus loath to trouble your Lordship any longer than needs I must and eftsones intreating that my readiness to receive him into my house may be signified to his most excellent majesty. . . .[14]

Your L. ever most assured

TOBIAS EBORACENSIS.

Bishopsthorpe, 29 July 1612.

[13] *Cal.* lxx. 138, No. 12.

[14] *Cal.* lxx. 139, No. 16. This letter is not addressed or endorsed, but is described in the *Calendar* as 'Tobias Matthew, archbishop of York, to the earl of Suffolk or Sir Thos. Lake.'

Though we hardly gather from this letter that Archbishop Matthew was very much delighted to receive the guest whom the king had sent to him, yet it seems from a letter of Vanini to Isaac Wake that he received De Franchis kindly and hospitably.

We hear nothing more of either of the friars for upwards of two months; but then, under date of 9 Oct. 1612, we find two letters written by Vanini himself, one to Carleton, the other to Isaac Wake his secretary. The following are translations of these letters, which are printed in their original Italian, though not quite accurately, by Signor Palumbo. The first is addressed to Carleton, the second to Wake:

Most illustrious and excellent Sir,—After I have made my most humble reverence to your excellency, knowing your affection and anxiety for my welfare I write to inform you how much I am enjoying myself in these parts, and what affection I have for my respected lord the most illustrious archbishop of Canterbury. And it is so much the more pleasant to me that I am sure by showing gratitude to his illustrious and reverend Lordship I am doing what is agreeable to you who have placed me at this court, and since I am not able to render you any recompense I shall always remain your excellency's most obliged servant: to whom I make a profound reverence and pray that you may receive from our Lord all the happiness that you can wish.

From Lambeth, 9 Oct. 1612.

Di V. S. Ill.
Giulio Cesare Vanini.[15]

Milord,—I owe you a reply to your lordship's letter of last month which owing to my having been until now at Croydon I have not been able to reply to as I ought to have done.

To give you news of myself, I am well and happy, praise the Lord, and am treated most affectionately by Monsignor the most illustrious archbishop, who constantly entertains me at his table and gives me hopes that one day he will confer some office on me.

For three months past my brother Giovanni Maria has been at York at the court of the archbishop, by whom he is liked and treated with much kindness, and he has lately written to me that he is in so much favour that he expects to receive a benefice from the archbishop.

Mr. Josias Robinson tells me that he knew your lordship at the University of Oxford.

I have not yet seen Signor Chamberlain, but I shall not fail to go to visit him as soon as possible and to do what your lordship has written to me.

I beg you to let me know if my box or trunk of clothes which I left in the chamber of the chaplain has been put on board ship for London; if not, I beg you to send it to me.

I shall be very glad if any opportunity occurs to be of service to you (as I have been to my lord) by praising the admirable way in which your excellency has behaved in the embassy.

[15] *Cal.* lxxi. 151, No. 13.

For the rest I kiss your excellency's hands and those of the chaplain, praying for you from our Lord all happiness.

From Lambeth, 9 Oct. 1612.

Di V. S. Ill°.
Giulio Cesare Vanini.

P.S.—Chamberlain has just told me that my box has arrived. I thank you that it has not happened otherwise.[16]

Up to this time Vanini and his friend seem to have been well satisfied with their reception and entertainment in England. They were hospitably entertained by the two archbishops, and each of them was expecting a benefice. They had evidently believed that their zeal for protestantism would have led to some liberal preferment; and it is by no means improbable that, had their expectations been fulfilled, their faith would have been confirmed, and that Vanini, instead of perishing at the stake at Toulouse, might have lived and died a member of the church of England, and might probably have persuaded himself and his patrons that he was actuated by no other motive than that of zeal for the truth. But the benefices did not come. To do Abbot justice, notwithstanding his narrow puritanism, he never seems to have been very eager after 'convertitoes' (as he calls them in a subsequent letter) from the Romish faith, and seems always to have had a shrewd suspicion that they were looking after the loaves and fishes rather than after the word of life; while Tobie Matthew, who was more of a statesman than a divine (though a bitter persecutor of recusants), had no fondness for foreign converts, and still less any intention of paying them for their change of opinion. Vanini was beginning to be impatient for a benefice, and Giovanni Maria found Bishopsthorpe dull. A letter from Chamberlain to Carleton, of 14 Jan. 1612–13, first makes known to us the discontent of the friars:

. . . Your Italian friar was with me this other day with a long discontented discourse for want of money and that he was sometimes fain to make his own bed and sweep his chamber, things he was never put to in the place whence he came. I advised him the best I could to patience, and told him that seeing he was well provided for food and raiment he might fashion himself to endure somewhat *per amor di Christo*. It seems his companion Giovanni is no better pleased in the North, for

[16] *Cal.* lxxi. 151, No. 14. The name in this letter which I have printed as Chamberlain, is given in Palumbo's book as *Ciaberth*—an impossible name, at least for an Englishman—but as I read the original, it is 'Ciáberlá,' with marks which seem to indicate abbreviations over the 'a,' so that the name would be 'Ciamberlan,' a not improbable mode of spelling Chamberlain for an Italian. In writing that he had not yet seen Chamberlain—whose letter of 17 June, 1612, certainly implies that he had seen the friars, and who, indeed, we can hardly suppose would have been so neglectful of Carleton's wishes as not to have visited them as soon as he returned to London—I take it that Vanini's meaning is that he had not seen Chamberlain since the receipt of Wake's 'etter of last month.' He had probably only just returned to Lambeth from Croydon.

he wrote lately to him that his patron the Archbishop was *strettissimo di danari* and that they lived not in cities nor towns, but *in villa*, and thereupon subscribed his name *Johannes in Deserto*.[17]

This extract from Chamberlain's letter is translated at length by Signor Palumbo (p. 14), but he has not read the first few words accurately, for he translates them, *I due frati italiani da voi raccomandati vennero oggi da me*, whereas it will be seen that it was Vanini alone that called on Chamberlain, his companion being still at Bishopsthorpe.[18]

The presence of two Carmelite friars, professed converts to the reformed faith, and the fact that they had made public abjuration, and subsequently preached in the Italian church, were of course well known, and could not but have been very distasteful to the authorities of the church of Rome, and it is probable that at an early stage of their visit efforts were made to increase, or perhaps arouse, their discontent, and to induce them to return to the bosom of the church. Their movements were carefully watched by the emissaries of the Spanish ambassador, Zuñiga, whose house was the focus for intrigues of every sort for the furtherance of the faith, and who about this time was detaining as prisoner in his house a converted Italian priest, who had come to England for refuge, as appears from a letter of Abbot to the king, of 17 Aug. 1612. But the immediate agent in the matter was the chaplain of the Venetian ambassador, Hieronymo Moravi, who now appears upon the scene, and who seems to have played an important, though rather mysterious, part in the subsequent adventures of Vanini in England. Moravi is mentioned by name by Vanini in the 'De Admirandis Naturae,' p. 217. He is there described as 'a most excellent and very learned man, who was my confessor during my stay in London.' I have not found any mention of his name in the letters in the Record Office; but it appears from a letter of Abbot, of 16 March 1613–14, that the chaplain of Foscarini had admitted to him that 'now a year ago Julius Caesar upon his knees did beg of him to be

[17] *Cal.* lxxii. 167, No. 13; *Court and Times of James I*, i. 155, 156. This letter is dated 14 Jan. 1612, but is clearly 1613, according to our reckoning, treating the year as beginning on 1 Jan. There is much (almost inevitable) confusion in the *Calendars*, in the arrangement of letters dated in January, February, and March, as the writers seem sometimes to have used the legal, sometimes the common, year. Consequently, both in the *Calendars* and in the *Court and Times of James I*, several of them occur out of their proper place, and a year earlier than they should do. A careful consideration of these, however, has enabled me to arrange them in their proper order, and to ascribe to them their true dates.

[18] Mr. Owen, still possessed with the idea that Chamberlain lived at Canterbury, paraphrases the statement in the letter as follows: 'The day after, Sir —— Chamberlain wrote to Sir Dudley Carleton that his two *protegées* [*sic*] were come to Canterbury to find him. They were in great difficulties, which he had for the time relieved.' He has immediately before referred to a letter of 13 Jan. 1613, from the archbishop to the bishop of Bath; this letter, however, was not until a year later, *i.e.* 13 Jan. 1613–14.

a means to the Nuntio living at Paris to write to the pope that a pardon might be procured to the two friars for leaving their order; which accordingly he did.'

But as yet Abbot was quite unaware that his guests had begun to be dissatisfied with his entertainment. In a letter to Carleton, dated 24 Feb. 1612–13, he writes:

The two honest men whom the last year you sent unto me do very well, and as I trust receive nothing but contentment.[19]

In the meantime Giovanni Maria, who had probably not yet given up hopes of a benefice, had written a Latin poem upon the marriage of the Princess Elizabeth with the Count Palatine. The marriage took place on 14 Feb. 1613, and the poem would be printed about the same time that the other 'Epithalamia' appeared, namely, in February or possibly a little later. It is from this poem alone that we learn the surname of the author, or at least that by which he passed in England, for his christian names only are mentioned in the correspondence. A copy of the poem is in the British Museum, and the following is the title:

De auspicatissimis nuptiis illustrissimi Principis D. Friderici sacri Romani Imperii Archidapiferi et Electoris &c. Comitis Palatini ad Rhenum Ducis Bavariae, &c. cum illustrissima Principe D. Elizabetha serenissimi Magnae Britanniae &c. Regis Filia unigenita Poema.
Anno Domini 1613.

It has no printer's name or place, but the suggestion in the catalogue of the British Museum is that it was printed in London. No entry of it, however, appears in the Registers of the Stationers' Company. The book is a small quarto, the pages unnumbered; it commences with a brief dedication in praise of the elector Palatine signed Joannes Maria Franch. Then follow fifteen pages of hexameters, ending with an epigram of twelve lines in elegiacs.

Although dealing in terms with classical mythology, yet it is really directed to a large extent against the church of Rome, and lest the allegorical references should be misunderstood, the author is careful to make his meaning clear by his marginal annotations. Thus to the lines

Quippe cohors scelerata specu Phlegethontis iniqui
Exilit atra,

the marginal note is:

Innuit ad Iesuitas et transfugas qui ex orco mittuntur ad seditiones in Angliam infernalibus armis, nempe igne sulphure &c.

And to the line

Est pia credulitas dictus temerarius error,

[19] *Cal.* lxxii. 171, No. 39.

the note is :

Quia in novis articulis ab ipsis fundatis cum destituuntur a scriptura dicunt est Pium credere.

Another note is :

Praecipua ars Antichristi est simulare se Dei advocatum.

The poem, as printed, consists of one book only; but it appears that the author had written three books, and that his friends were so much pleased with it that one of them, Samuel Hutton by name, translated the whole of the three into English, and the translation was published about 7 June in the same year, on which day we find the following entry in the Stationers' Registers :

7 Junii Master Elde Entred for his Copie under th[e h]ands of Master Nydd and Master Warden Hooper a booke called 'of the most Auspicatious Mariage betweene the County Palatine and The Lady Elizabeth' Three bookes composed in Latyn by Master Johannes Maria de ffraunchis and translated in to English.

A copy of this also is in the British Museum. The title is as follows :

Of the most auspicatious marriage betwixt the high and Mightie Prince Frederick Count Palatine of the Rhine chief server to the Sacred Roman Empire Prince Elector and Duke of Bavaria &c. and the most illustrious Princess the ladie Elizabeth her grace sole daughter to the high and Mightie James King of Great Britain &c. In iii Bookes. Composed in Latin by M. Joannes Maria de Franchis and translated into English. At London. Printed by G. Eld for William Blaincker, and are to be sold in Fleet Lane at the sign of the Printers Press. 1613.

The volume consists of eighty-eight pages in all, eight at the commencement and three at the end unnumbered, and seventy-seven numbered. It is dedicated by the author to Charles, Prince of Wales, and the following is an extract from the dedication :

At the first I intended to have only a short and ordinary Epithalamium, but afterwards having considered better of it, I found it much fitter to divide it into three bookes. The first Booke I sent to the right Reverend Father the Lord Archbishop of York who presented it unto the King. . . . At length some of my friends having received this Poeme printed it being delighted with the novelty of the matter. . . . At the first it grieved me a little that my book being not fully perfected should be printed; but at last having no desire to have it printed again after that the solemnities were ended some of my friends began to importune me that I would impart my book unto them. I being easily overcome with their urging yielded unto their requests. This booke they have now translated into English, to the ende that the ladies may be partakers of this curious symetrie. This book I offer up to your Highnesse of whom I have heard many honourable relations at the Right Reverend Father in God my lord Archbishop of Yorke's house.

At the end is a short poem addressed to the Princess Elizabeth signed 'Samuel Hutton,' who seems to claim to be the translator. The name of Samuel Hutton does not appear in the 'Dictionary of National Biography,' and I have failed to find any notice of him. There was, however, at this date a prebendary of York of this name, a nephew of Matthew Hutton, Tobie Matthew's predecessor in the archbishopric, by whom, on 4 Feb. 1602–3, he had been collated to the prebend of Ulleskelf, which he held until 27 Nov. 1628.[20] He is probably the author of the translation, which is the merest doggerel. A single specimen will suffice:

> For sons of Jove, Earth tooke the slaves of hell;
> Babell was termed a Reverend Sanctuary;
> Idolatry Devotion; high pride Zeal;
> Rash error a religious credulity;
> Hypocrisie was called laws complement:
> Thus every vice got virtue's own accent.

I now come to the question whether Vanini's companion may not have been the Joannes Maria Genochius or Ginochius, who, as he tells us in the 'De Admirandis Naturae Arcanis,' accompanied him to Germany, and was with him at Strasburg when they embarked on the Rhine together. Genochius was at first unwilling to start, having seen a crow, which, as he thought, portended shipwreck. He here describes Genochius as *praeclarissimus theologus*, and mentions him with great praise in several other places—one in the 'De Admirandis (p. 160), where, discussing evergreen and deciduous trees, he cites, but dissents from, the opinion of 'Joannes Maria Genochius Clavaro-Genuensis Philosophorum praestantissimus' that the cause of evergreenness is that evergreen trees *caeteris calidiores sunt et sicciores.* Another mention is in the 'Amphitheatrum' (p. 304), where, discussing the problem of reconciling the existence of evil with that of a Divine Providence, he says: *Caeterum qui omnium optime de hoc argumento scripserit, est Dominus Joannes Maria Genochius Clavaro-Genuensis, vir sane Reipublicae colendissimus, in suo celebri opusculo de Gratia et lib. Arbitrio.* Now the friar who accompanied Vanini to England is generally called in the letters simply Giovanni Maria: once, however, in the letter of Chamberlain of 11 March 1613–14, Giovanni *Battista,* either a mistake for Giovanni Maria, or showing that his full Christian name was Giovanni Battista Maria. But in the translation of the Latin poem which he wrote on the marriage of the Princess Elizabeth with the Elector Palatine, he is called Joannes Maria de *Franchis.* It may be said that this is inconsistent with his being the same person as Genochius, but this is not, I think,

[20] Le Neve's *Fasti*, edited by Hardy, iii. 220; *Hutton Correspondence* (Surtees Society), pp. 13, 230. He is, no doubt, the person of that name who took his degree of B.A. at Oxford (college not stated), 11 July 1600: Foster's *Alumni Oxonienses.*

conclusive. The poem is a strongly protestant production: the pope is branded as Antichrist; yet at the very time of the publication of this poem it is certain that Vanini and probable that both the friars were planning a return to the continent, and a reconciliation with the church of Rome. It does not therefore seem improbable that in England he may have published his poem under a feigned name so as not to hinder his return to his own country if his hopes of a benefice in England turned out to be vain. Giovanni Maria was, as appears by the letters, younger than Vanini, and it may be thought that the language which the latter uses of Genochius is inapplicable to one who, at the date of the publication of the 'Amphitheatrum,' was certainly under thirty years of age.

I have searched ineffectually for any trace of the treatise on grace and free will which Vanini states to have been written by Genochius. I have, however, found a notice of the man himself in the 'Athenaeum Ligusticum' of Oldoini (Perusiae, 1680, p. 358), where the following brief account is given of him:

> Joannes Maria Ginocchius of Chiavari, a pious priest, a learned theologian, a zealous and eloquent preacher, and a poet of no common merit, published at Perpignan in 1620 'Cantica Centum Spiritualia,' in praise of the Blessed Virgin, in various metres. He also adorned the coronet of George, Duke of Centuri, with a poem.

Oldoini then refers to the 'Bibliotheca Mariana' of Hippolytus Maraccius (Romae, MDCXLVIII, Pars Prima, p. 756), where there is a similar statement, only making no mention of the poem upon Georgius Dux Centurionis. Genochius is also mentioned by Jöcher, who simply quotes Oldoini as his authority. No copy of either of the books of Genochius is in the British Museum, and I have been unable to meet with them. It would be interesting to compare them, especially the poem upon the Duke of Centuri, with the Epithalamium. Such a comparison might assist us in coming to a conclusion whether Giovanni Maria de Franchis was identical with Joannes Maria Genochius. The very meagre accounts of him given by Oldoini and Maraccius are in no way inconsistent with the opinion that he was the companion of Vanini and the author of the Epithalamium.

On 11 March 1612–13 Chamberlain wrote to Carleton a letter which contains a reference to the Latin poem:

> . . . Your Friar Giovan Battista (that is with the Archbishop of York) hath published a Latin poem upon this late marriage of the Lady Elizabeth with the Palsgrave and sent them to present to all his friends in these parts. The verses seem good, but the Invention old and ordinary and his Epistle to the young couple is altogether built upon a fabulous friarly tradition.[21]

[21] *Cal.* lxxii. 175, No. 74; *Court and Times of James I*, p. 234.

Among the best known of the Italian residents in England at this time was Giovanni Francesco Biondi, a convert to protestantism, not less distinguished as a diplomatist than as a writer.[22] He also was a correspondent of Carleton, and kept him well informed of various matters of interest from October 1612 to November 1613. Fifteen of his letters, all in Italian, are to be found among the State Papers in the Record Office. Biondi had of course heard of the arrival of the friars, and that they had been sent by Carleton; not improbably he had made their acquaintance, and had heard them preach at the Italian church. In a long letter from him to Carleton dated 17 March 1612–13 he writes:

> As I believe your Excellency has not yet seen the little book of Signor Giovanni Maria, one of the two Carmelites sent here, I also send it to you.[23]

Although this letter contains no other reference to either of the friars, it mentions a curious and interesting fact, not, I think, elsewhere recorded, and hitherto unnoticed, relating to the well-known Oxford 'Epithalamia' on the marriage of the Princess Elizabeth, a copy of which he sends also to Carleton, and concerning one of them he writes: 'The Spanish ambassador makes great complaints, and his people say that they [*i.e.* the 'Epithalamia'] will all be burnt, which I do not believe.' I have examined four copies of these 'Epithalamia,' with a view of ascertaining whether the Spanish ambassador had a substantial grievance, and whether any steps were taken to remedy it. I find on the reverse of folio F 3 (printed by mistake E 3) in two copies of the book in the British Museum (1213, l. 9,

[22] See his life and a list of his works in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. Signor Palumbo erroneously states that he accompanied De Dominis, archbishop of Spalato, into England, and then apostatised. In fact he had settled in England and become a protestant in 1609, seven years before the arrival of De Dominis.

[23] Signor Palumbo has strangely misunderstood this letter. He writes: 'G. F. Biondi, when sending to Carleton the Epithalamium written by the companion of Vanini and speaking of the apostasy of these two friars, states that the Spanish ambassador was in great fury against Vanini and his accomplices, threatening that they should be all sent to the stake.' But the passage to which he refers has nothing to do with the friars or the *operetta* of Giovanni Maria, but refers to the Oxford *Epithalamia*, and the words given by Palumbo in inverted commas, '*che sarebbero tutti mandati al rogo*,' are certainly not to be found anywhere in the letter, which it seems clear that he has not read, but has contented himself with reading (and misunderstanding) the summary given in the printed *Calendar*, which is as follows (vol. lxxii. no. 80, 17 Mar. 1613. Giov. Franc. Biondi to Carleton): 'His [Carleton's] conduct in Venice much praised by the Venetian Ambassador in England, who is not popular. The King favours him because he professes to be a Protestant, but the Councillors ridicule him. The King not yet returned. The nobles eagerly waiting for office. Sends a work of Giov. Maria, one of the two friars sent into England; also the *Epithalamia* [on the Palatine's marriage] written at Oxford. The Spanish ambassador complains of one of them, and his adherents say they will all be burnt.' Mr. Owen, who knows no more of Biondi than of Chamberlain, as usual somewhat amplifies the statement of Palumbo: 'Fallen from the good graces of English Protestants, Vanini and his companion had long become loathsome to the Catholics. A certain Biondi wrote to Sir D. Carleton on 17 Mar. 1613 that the Spanish ambassador was in a rage against Vanini and his accomplices on account of his apostasy, and threatened him with the stake.'

Tract 7 and 161, b. 43) the following ode signed 'R. Rands e coll. Trin. in Art. Mag.':

Ad Hispaniam.

Mitte, nimium importuna, mitte, perfida,
Legationibus novis de nuptiis
Agere: labori sumptibusque si sapis,
Parcas, peracta cum scias omnia: minas
Prodesse credis, aut dolos? Clades tuae
Veteres loquuntur arma, mentemque Britonum;
Para novam classem: secundó supplica
Iovem tuum, ut coeptis tuis benediceret;
Aut potius artes Patre cum sancto novas
Meditare; classem mitte, mitte pulverem
Bombardicum, quia suspicamur; Roma habet
Novas, inauditas petitas ab inferis
Artes nocendi: illinc novas technas pete
Et nuptias. Idola cum Christo, Bethel
Cum Bethaven constare qui possunt? pete
Romam; illa consortem tibi dabit parem,
Qualemque velles; nempe formarum ferax:
Quas si minus probas roga Papam, ut velit
Mutare sexum, non novo miraculo.

In my own copy of the book (formerly the Rev. W. E. Buckley's) this leaf is missing, but in the third copy at the British Museum (the Grenville copy, 17499) folio F 3 has been reprinted; the poem 'Ad Hispaniam' is omitted, and there are substituted for it sixteen inoffensive and commonplace elegiacs commencing

Ludite nunc Hilares pullam deponite vestem
Musae; pro tristi funere venit hymen.

On the reverse of folio P in the two first mentioned copies there commences a poem entitled 'Prosopopoeia ad comitem Palatinum':

I pete coniugium foelix foelicius illo
Quod, quae Teutonicis late dominatur in arvis
Austriacae generosa domus prosapia vestris
Dilectis potuit thalamis, Germane, dedisse.
Hic tibi pro dote eximii numerantur honores
Divitiaeque suis quas Anglia mittit ab oris,
Et quae divitias superat celeberrima virtus,
Quae tanto fulgore micat, miratus ut illam
Non semel in thalamos spretus voluisset Iberus,
Non semel uxorem petiisset Gallus. At illi
Alter habendus amor restat simul altera sedes.

It ends on the next page (fol. P 2) with the following verses:

Gordius Hispano non est resecandus ab ense
Nodus, et alterius laetetur Gallia taedis.
Post tot neglectos remanes, Comes inclyte, solus,
Qui nodum solvas, et tanta trophaea reportes.

Gu. Crosse Sancti-Mariensis.

In the Grenville copy, and also in my own, folio P has been reprinted, and instead of the 'Prosopopoeia ad Comitem Palatinum' are substituted eight feeble and commonplace elegiacs addressed 'Ad Regem,' with the catchword at the end 'Vere' instead of, as in the original impression, 'Gor.' But, notwithstanding this, folio P 2 has not been reprinted, but in both the Grenville and my own copies the original four verses appear, beginning 'Gordius Hispano non est resecandus ab ense.' In the Grenville copy I can find nothing to account for this, but in my own I find the following note on the flyleaf, in Mr. Buckley's writing: 'On P 2 at top some verses have been pasted over.' An examination of the page shows clearly that this has been the case, but unfortunately Mr. Buckley or some former owner has removed the paper that was pasted over the first four lines, and which no doubt contained the conclusion of the poem 'Ad Regem' beginning with *Vere*; of this a fragment containing a part of a single word alone remains. The conclusion to be drawn from an examination and comparison of these four copies is clearly this. The Spanish ambassador had made complaints, as Biondi states, concerning the 'Ad Hispaniam' and the 'Prosopopoeia,' but instead of the volume being burnt as his people (*i suoi*) expected, the two obnoxious pages were ordered to be reprinted, and inoffensive verses to be substituted for those which had given offence, and instead of reprinting P 2 the first four lines were ordered to be pasted over, and when this was done the book was allowed to be circulated.[24]

At the date of Biondi's letter of 17 March 1613, the two friars, so far from having fallen from the good graces of English protestants, were still in favour, and there seems as yet to have been no suspicion that they were otherwise than sincere in their professions of adherence to the reformed faith.

In the summer of 1613, Giovanni Maria, having become tired of Bishopsthorpe, returned to London on the pretext that he was about to print some other book—possibly the English translation of his poem. He asked to be placed with the bishop of London, and this was agreed to, but, as it seems, the bishop was unwilling to receive him until he had been discharged of an English converted Jesuit, of whom he was then the somewhat unwilling host. On his arrival in London, he was lodged in a private house until the bishop was ready to receive him. While there he fell sick, and, in order that he might have the company of Vanini, was brought to Lambeth and lodged there, at the expense of Archbishop Abbot, 'in an honest house,' where he remained until shortly before 10 Feb. 1614.

[24] I have been unable to find any further reference to the complaints of the ambassador, or to any order sent down to the university from the government as to the book. It would be interesting to know whether in the archives of the university any such order is to be found.

In the meantime, Vanini had become heartily tired of Lambeth and of England, and, as we have seen, was taking steps privately to obtain pardon for himself and his companion from the pope for leaving their order, through Moravi, whom he begged to write to the nuncio living at Paris, for this purpose, and one hundred crowns were sent to the nuncio to pay for the pardon. But he still professed himself a protestant, frequented prayers, received the communion in the chapel at Lambeth, and attended the sermons in the Italian church. On 25 Nov. 1613, we find the following in a letter from Chamberlain to Carleton :

I know not how yt comes to passe but the two friers you sent over are in poor case, and have been both lately sick specially the younger that was wth the Archbishop of Yorke but wearie of that place and belike lingering after this goode towne could not agree with that air forsooth, so that he was appointed to the Bishop of London who making stay to receave him till he might be discharged of an English converted Jesuit committed to him, he fell sicke in the meantime and the best relief I learn he found was that he was begged for in some churches and his companion goes up and down to gather the charitie of all their acquaintance and well wishers.[25]

About this time Vanini paid a visit to Cambridge, where 'he had good store of money given to him,' and shortly after Christmas he went to Oxford, where he had more money bestowed upon him. There he confided to one who had formerly been a Roman priest, that he was in heart a papist, and meant before long to leave the country; he seems to have spoken freely of his intentions, as well as 'undutifully' of the king and 'unreverently' of the archbishop. His visit to Oxford was only a few months after that of Casaubon, and he must have arrived immediately after the expulsion of Jacob the Jew, of whose stay at Oxford and simulated conversion Mr. Pattison has given us so entertaining an account in his Life of Casaubon. It seems probable from the mention of him in the 'Amphitheatrum,' that Vanini had made his acquaintance in England.[26]

Vanini returned to Lambeth shortly before Jan. 22 ; a report of his imprudent language there was sent to the archbishop, whose suspicions had been already aroused by information that Vanini had written to Rome, and, as the archbishop rightly conjectured, with a view of obtaining absolution for his departure from his

[25] *Cal.* lxxv. 212, No. 28 ; *Court and Times of James I*, i. 278–81.

[26] *Fuit quidam temporibus meis Iudaeus in Anglia, ut Christi fidem susciperet, et ab Oxoniensi Academia perhumaniter fuit exceptus ; cum vero ad sacrum lavacrum deducendus esset, aufugit, captus est. Rex ex benignitate dimisit. Offendi eum aliquo tempore post Lutetiae Parisiorum in aula regia, ubi in sermone mutuo quem duximus, Anglorum avaritiam mirum in modum sugillabat, ut tum prae caeteris nationibus vel maxime dediti sint uni liberalitati, illamque quibuscunque possunt rationibus erga extraneos ostendant, praecipue vero in ipsum Hebraeum, quem per duo annos magnificis impensis aluerunt, ut Christianam religionem amplecteretur.* (*Amphitheatrum*, p. 65.)

order. A watch was set upon the friars: they were found to be removing their effects from Lambeth, and were clearly preparing for flight. But they still made outward profession of protestantism, and attended the Italian services at Mercers Hall on Sunday the 22nd, when Vanini agreed to preach the following Sunday, having in fact made arrangements to leave England before that day. After service on the 22nd they were both separately examined and afterwards confined to their respective chambers, while Vanini was soon after removed to the Gatehouse at Lambeth.[27] Shortly before 27 January 1613–14 Abbot wrote full details to James Montagu, bishop of Bath, then in attendance on the king at Royston:

There is one thyng falen out here wherein I humbly crave his majestys direction as being in my opinion a matter of some importance. By motion from Sr Dudley Carleton at Venice his ma^tie was graciously contented that twoe Italian Carmelite ffriers shold come into England who pretended to fly hither for their conscience. They came and after the abode of him here for a month or twoe the younger of them was sent to my L. of Yorke where he was very well intreated for one year and since hath remayned at London, and in Lambeth detayned by sicknes that he was not placed in my Lo. of London's house, whither notwithstanding care this very weeke he hath been removed. The other also in my house being enterteyned with such humanity and expense as is not fit for me to report, but I am sure it was too good for him. Theise men in the Italian churche at London publiquely renounced their popery in a solemn form, preached there divers times, frequented our prayers and participated of the Eucharist after the manner of the Churche of England severall times. And yet it now appeareth they have all this time ben extreamely rotten. About 3 months since I by a secret meanes understood that the elder of them had written to Rome and I had cause to conjecture that it was for an absolucion for their departure from their order. I caused one to speake with him thereabout but he gave such an answere as I cold not contradict but yet thought fitt to carrye an eye over him.

But now about 16 dayes since he asked leave of me to go see Oxford which I granted unto him and tooke order that he was furnyshed with money to bear his charges. Being there he was most humanely entreated and had some money given him to the value of twenty markes as he sayeth but as some from thence write to the somme of twenty poundes. There to one or two who had been in Italy he let fall divers words declaring his dislike to our religion and shewing that his ma^tie had not dealt bountifully with him, and that I had not shewed myself liberall unto him

[27] There can, I think, be little doubt of the correctness of the date above given for the arrest of Vanini. Abbot's letter to the bishop of Bath, though undated, is clearly written shortly before 27 Jan. and speaks of the first examination of Vanini as on 'Sunday last:' this would be the 22nd. The letter was certainly written a few days later. Vanini's escape from the Gatehouse at Lambeth took place—as subsequently appears—shortly before 16 March. He tells us that he was imprisoned for forty-nine days. If his imprisonment commenced on 24 Jan., the forty-nine days would expire on 14 March.

together with divers other both unfitt and untrue speeches without honesty or shame. And divers intimacions he gave of his purpose to withdrawe himself out of England wyth all speed: w[ch] now he sayeth shold not have ben without the leave of his ma[tie].

These thynges are advertised unto mee from Oxford twoe or three severall wayes, Whereupon at his return causing him to be observed I found by his secret conveyance of some things out of my house and by the recourse of both of them extraordinarily into London that there was great cause to suspect that they intended to be gon. And hereupon in a fair manner I severed them both each from other and examined them aparte: where at first they seemed to contynue constant in our profession though upon a second examination it proved otherwise. By one passage your Lordship shall judge of the strange wickedness of the men. On Sunday last the elder of them upon his examination under his hand did say *quod renunciasset Papismo et pontificiis opinionibus; et se velle vivere et mori in fide Ecc̃lie Anglicane*, yesterday this being urged unto him and not seeing his former examination he said it was true *quod Papatui renunciasset quia non erat verisimile se unquam futurum Papam.* And touching *opiniones Pontificias* he expounded it that *si quis inter Pontificios opinaretur eum unquam in Papatum promerendum*, he did disclayme that from being a good opinion. And for his living and dying in the faith of the Church of England he expoundeth that to be the faith which was here a hundredth or two hundreth agone.

He now also sayeth that he was never otherwise than a Papist in his faith; and that their coming into England was for nothing but to evayd the hard measure which their Councell used to them and because they heard that strangers were enterteyned here with great humanity. Such hath been the strange dissimulacion of the men if they have all this while been Papists in their hearte, but I have reason to suppose that some instrument of a sovereign Ambassador hath been tampering with them, and hath both with money and faire promises corrupted them.[28]

On 27 January Sir Thomas Lake sent a copy of the archbishop's letter to Sir Dudley Carleton, accompanied by the following letter:

My lord Ambassador,—By this enclosed copie which is of a lettre of my lo. of Cantorburies to my lo. Bishop of Bath following his maj: at Court your lo. shall perceave what is become of your two friers you sent us. I am commanded to send to you, and to require you to advertise what you have heard or observed of their caryage here or of any traffike they have had there since their being in England. Their excusations of their submission here and abjuration are very grosse. But I never had anie great confidence in renegados there be few that do it upon religious respect but on worldly consideration. I fear much my Lo. of Canterbury hath of our owne country very many proseleytes wherein he much glories that be of none other temper for I marke that as soon as ever they come over to us they are gredy of wiffes and benefices. . . .

From the Court at Royston this 27 January, 1613–14.

THOS: LAKE.[29]

[28] *Cal.* lxxvi. 221, No. 9, I.

[29] *Cal.* lxxvi. 221, No. 9.

A few days later Chamberlain wrote to Carleton a letter containing the following passage:

I heard lately that the two friers you sent over are returned to their vomit and prove notable knaves professing now that they were never other than Romish Catholikes wherein they will live and die and that theyre come hither and theyre dissembling was only *per guadagnare et fornicare* they have solicited theyre return and to be received again into theyre mother church by the Venetian ambassador here and other meanes at Rome. How their jugling came out I know not but my L. of Caннterburie hath committed them to safe custodie and makes it appear that want would not drive them to any extremity for besides *victum* and *vestitum* they have had fifty pounds in money of him thirty of the bishop of London besides the Archbishop of Yorks the bishop of Elyes and other bishops bountys of whom they were ever begging as well as of meaner ffolks as Sr Harry Fanshawe and myself and they had of Burlamachi ten pounds of the Prince Palatine and the Lady Elizabeth ten pounds apiece with I know not how many more we shall hear of hereafter for I had this but at first hand of an Italian that says he spake with them since their restrainte, as I understand more of them you shall have it. . . .

3 Feb. 1613–14.[30]

A few days after the date of the last letter Giovanni Maria escaped from Lambeth, where he had been placed by the archbishop in the house of 'a sworn servant of the king, a warder of the Tower.' He let himself down from the window at midnight by means of his sheets, which he tied together, and fled to the house of the Spanish (or Venetian) ambassador, where he remained some twenty days, and then was conveyed out of England. On 10 Feb. Chamberlain wrote to Carleton and informed him of the escape:

I have been lately twice or thrice with the Bp. of Ely. . . . He confirmed the revolt of the friars from the king's own mouth, where he first heard it, and says he never had any great mind to new and sudden converts having had many trials of their knavery and inconstancy. I understand one of them has escaped to the Venetian ambassador's.[31]

On 18 Feb. Biondi writes to Carleton, 'Gio. Maria is fled, as your Excellency will have heard; the other is in prison, and ready as he says for martyrdom. I pray God it will be granted to him, but I doubt it, for his Majesty is more religious than politic.'[32]

[30] *Cal.* lxxvi. 222, No. 18.

[31] *Cal.* lxxvi. 223, No. 20. The sentence immediately following the above extract is as follows: 'I cannot learn that the King had any speech or conference of or with the fellow that lies at Alderman Bolles, and his return is not expected till towards his day the 24th of March.' I was at first disposed to think it referred to Giovanni Maria, and that Alderman Bolles' was the 'honest house at Lambeth' where, as appears by a subsequent letter, he had lodged. But as he had of late been in the house of a sworn warder of the Tower, and had escaped before this letter was written, I think it most probable that the sentence refers to some other person.

[32] *Cal.* lxxx. 274, No. 35. This letter is displaced, and inserted in the *Calendar* under date 1615 instead of 1614, to which it clearly belongs.

But Vanini was in no danger of martyrdom. He was imprisoned in the Gatehouse at Lambeth for a fortnight, and then brought before the ecclesiastical commission. There he was censured, excommunicated, and sentenced to imprisonment during the king's pleasure, and the help of the temporal sword was implored 'that he might be banished to the Bermudas, there to dig for his living.' Fortunately for Vanini—or perhaps unfortunately, for the Bermudas might have been better than the flames at Toulouse—he, like his friend, found the means to escape soon after this sentence was pronounced, and before any steps were taken for carrying it into execution. He was assisted in his escape by a Florentine—a servant of Lord Vaux—employed probably either by Moravi or the Spanish ambassador. The keeper of the Gatehouse was said to have been corrupted, but it is not improbable—as no one seems to have been punished for assisting his escape—that it was connived at by the authorities, for to send a foreigner to the Bermudas or Virginia for no other offence than abjuring protestantism would have been a high-handed measure which could hardly have failed to irritate—and justly—the Spanish ambassador, whom James was at all times desirous to conciliate.

As the friars had been *protégés* of Carleton, Abbot thought well on 16 March 1613–14 to write to him a long and most interesting letter, with full details as to their conduct while in England and as to their escape. It is partially written in cipher (which is, however, deciphered):

Your letter of the 28th of February is lately come into my hands and thereby I perceive that which formerly I heard from the king himself that Sir Thomas Lake had advertised you of the ill demeanour of the two Italian friars. There is no wiseman but must commend your endeavours and not judge of them by the event because you are a man and not in the place of God who only knoweth the heart. I cannot deny but that for outward show they did bear themselves well until January last, although for some months before I saw some private inkling of the trafficking of the elder of them by letters to Rome which I laid by in my memory, but did not very hastily give credit thereunto.

The manner of their entertainment here was thus. For about two months they remained in my house together, being lodged apparelled and dietted at my charge. The younger of them was proffered a place in Oxford where he should freely have had all things requisite for him to follow his study, but he desired rather to go to my Lord Archbishop of York which was yielded unto so that he was furnished with money thither, and there he remained for a year being fully provided for. In the meantime he frequented prayers, received the Communion, published a book in verse on the marriage of the Count Palatine, wherein he branded the Pope to be Antichrist. At a years end he desireth to return to London under colour of printing something else, moveth the king that he might be placed with my Lord of London which is yielded unto. But before the accomplish-

ment thereof, he falleth sick and lieth in a private house in London where he had physic freely and much money was given to his brother for him, and upon his amending, for the company of the other, was brought over to Lambeth, and being lodged there in a honest house was maintained at my charge till his final departure.

The elder from the beginning to the end was held in my house dietting at my own board or if that were full at my stewards table had lodging bed and utensils for chamber provided for him as well at Croydon when I lay there in the summer as otherwise at Lambeth so that besides meat and drink and lodging, they two in the time they were in England had in money from me for apparell and other necessaries abov lv^ls besides such money as the younger had from my Lord of York and more than six score pounds which came to their hands otherwise as may be showed by the particulars. In the time of his abiding with me he frequented prayers, received the Communion twice or thrice in my chapel, preached divers times at the Italian Church in London especially at his first coming as his brother also did.

Before Christmas I gave him leave to see Cambridge where he had some good store of money given unto him. After Christmas last I permitted him to go to Oxford where he had more money bestowed upon him. There to one who had formerly been a Roman priest and lived much in Italy he opened himself that he was in heart a Papist and meant before long to fly out of the kingdom. He gave to some other persons semblances of the like and could not forbear to speak undutifully of the king and unreverently of me, uttering many lies concerning his entertainment by me. All which things being by letter made known unto me I secretly learned that they had conveyed divers things of their own out of my house and questioning them for it had shifting answers for the time. In their first examination they avowed their constancy in our religion and strongly denied any purpose of flight, which indeed they carried so covertly, that on the day of their apprehension they were at the sermon in the Italian Church and the elder of them did promise to preach there the next Sunday when his purpose was to be gone in the meantime as since he hath confessed.

From the time of their first examination they were committed to their lodgings severally. Upon the second touch they discovered themselves to be resolute papists so that never did I find in all my life more impudent and unworthy varlets. It is beyond the wit of man to conceive the hight of wickedness whereunto they were grown. I will give you a short example. The elder of them had said in his first examination *Quod in ecclesia Italia Londinensi renuntiasset Papismo et Pontificiis opinionibus, et se velle vivere et mori in fide Ecclesiae Anglicanae ; et quod si ad vomitum rediret, mereretur haberi singularis hypocrita, et is cuius cor Sathanas occupavit.* In his third examination he explained all this with a strange qualification that by *Papismo* he meant *Papatui*, and that he had renounced any hope that ever he should be Pope, and for *opiniones Pontificiae* his intendment was that if any of that side did think that ever he should be elected Pope, he disliked that their conceite. He would live and die in the faith of the Church of England, that is the same faith which the Church of England possessed a hundredth or two hundredth years ago.

And if he did *redire ad vomitum*, that is of his evil life, or merely behaviour etc. which he might well mean, if Ascanio the preacher of the Italian Church do say true, for he hath long kept Julius Caesar from preaching in his church, as taking him to be of no religion, but a profane person, a filthy speaker and a grosse fornicatour, and could not be induced to think of him otherwise, although many of that congregation were sore offended with him for the same, which now they see was not without ground. And I had found both by the books themselves and by their own confession that the greatest matter which they have studied for many months past were the works of Petrus Aretinus and Macciavelli in Italian so virtuous was their disposition.

I imagine by this time you will ask of me two questions, first what is become of them, and secondly what hath been the reason of their desertion. To the former I answer that the younger of them being kept prisoner in his chamber at Lambeth Towne in the house of a sworn servant of the kings a warder of the Tower did about midnight break forth at a window and tying his sheets together, so escaped. I do guess where he lay hid

Ye Sp: Ambr

for 20 days that is in the house of 94 but since as I understand he is conveyed out of England. To keep the other safe I sent him to the Gatehouse where when he had remained about 14 days he was convented before the Commission Ecclesiasticall and there censured by excommunication imprisonment during the kings pleasure and the imploring of the help of the temporal sword, that he might be banished into the Barmudas there to dig for his living. But before the accomplishment hereof, by corrupting of the keepers, as I suppose, and by a trick played by some other Italian, he hath broken prison, to the great offence of the kings majesty which hath laid up diverse in safer custody.

The first overture to their desertion came as I think from the

c h a p l a n Sigr Fos-c[arini]

23 31 14 42 35 10 39 of 95 who is a very lewd man and hath done here many ill offices. This party hath confessed to me that now a year ago

Nuntio

Julius Caesar upon his knees did beg of him to be a means to the 100

Paris Ye pp

living at 177 to write to 230 that a pardon might be procured for the two friars, for leaving of their order, which accordingly he did. And Julius Caesar hath confessed to me that this was effected, and by the means of

Ye Nuntio

the party above named a hundred crowns were by him sent to 160 at

Paris

177 to pay for the said pardon. So that by this you may see that the friars were splendidly provided for here, when besides their viaticum to convey them into Italy they have so much money to spare to send out of

Ye Sp: Ambr

the realm before them. But 94 since his coming into England hath much bestirred himself in this and the like businesses which I conceive will procure him a rappe here before it be long for the eye of the state is upon

Ye K of Sp:

him. He hath much money from 124 and corrupteth almost all that

Amb^r^
come in his way. There is skant any 259 here residing but he winneth
c h a p l
his servants to his purposes as namely he hath gained the 24 32 14 41 36
Ye Fr. Amb. | Secretary Foscar.
a n
12 40 of 93 and the same domestic together with the 162 of 95 so that they are more his servants than the parties to whom they belong. The
his Mat^y^ | ye Ar. B | ye LL of ye Council
same laboureth in the house of 62 of 69 and divers other of 78.[33]

The 'works of Petrus Aretinus and Macciavelli' which were studied by the two friars, and which so scandalised the archbishop, were not, we may be certain, 'La Passione di Gesù,' or 'Il Principe,' but, of Aretin, either the comedies or the 'Ragionamenti,' and of Machiavelli, the 'Mandragola' or 'L'Asino d' Oro.'

Chamberlain refers to the escape of Vanini in a letter written to Carleton the day following that of the archbishop (March 17):

> . . . The elder friar that was in the Gatehouse[34] hath found the means to escape so that now they are both gone. The keeper is committed and a Florentine that serves the Ld Vaux is suspected to be privy to his escape. For my own part I am not sorry we be so rid of them, for though they were notorious rascals, yet I know not what we should have done with them, yet it was in consultation to send them both to Virginia but I see not to what purpose. . . .[35]

I find only one subsequent reference in the State Papers to Vanini and his companion. It occurs in a letter of Abbot to Carleton, of 30 March 1614:

> I know nothing of Signor Francesco Biondi but good, and therefore I will hope the best. But hereafter we shall be wary how we hastily entertain the Convertitoes of that nation so inestimable hath been the hypocrisy and lewdness of the two Carmelites lately remaining with us. I by my last wrote my mind at large concerning them.[36]

When writing this letter the archbishop little thought that he was soon to entertain a 'convertito' of much greater importance, and one who would cause him much more serious inconvenience and annoyance than the two Carmelites. Marco Antonio de

[33] *Cal.* lxxvi. 227, No. 48.

[34] Signor Palumbo tells us that the two friars were imprisoned *in the Tower*. He thinks he has identified the actual cell, a very small, dark, circular room, too low for it to be possible to stand upright in. And he draws a harrowing picture of the anguish of *il povero filosofo* at the silence and horror of the place *donde non si usciva che per essere consegnati al carnefice.* Mr. Owen, as usual, follows suit, and states that the two friars were committed to the Tower.

[35] *Cal.* lxxvi. 227, No. 49; *Court and Times of James I*, i. 23. This letter is ther undated, but is placed between a letter of Carleton of 12 March 1612-13, and one of Chamberlain of 25 March 1613. The word 'friar' is strangely enough printed 'Taylor,' so that it does not seem, as printed, to have any reference to the friar.

[36] *Cal.* lxxii. 178, No. 97. This volume contains the documents from January to May 1612-13, but it is clear that this letter was written a year later, and should have been inserted in vol. lxxvi., which contains the letters of that date.

Dominis, archbishop of Spalato, was already preparing to leave the church of Rome and to visit England, where he arrived in December 1616, and was forthwith handed over to archbishop Abbot for entertainment at Lambeth.

With his escape from the Gatehouse at Lambeth, Vanini disappears for a time from view. A few months later we find him in France enjoying the protection of the Marshal de Bassompierre, and probably receiving some consideration as one who had been persecuted in England for his attachment to the catholic faith. But catholic France proved in the end even more inhospitable than protestant England. In the prison of Toulouse, after hearing the brutal and terrible sentence of the parliament, and whilst awaiting the flames which were to consume him a few days later, he may well have regretted the Gatehouse at Lambeth. His tongue was cut out, he was then strangled, and his body burnt in the Place Saint Etienne on 19 Feb. 1619.

The letters of Chamberlain and Abbot are not calculated to give us a favourable impression of the character of Vanini, and I am therefore glad to be able to conclude this paper with a fact which, I think, deserves to be set down to his credit. He was certainly disappointed with the result of his visit to England, but in neither of his printed works is there an unfriendly word relating to this country or to those with whom he came in contact here. On the few occasions that he mentions England in his writings, it is always with goodwill and sometimes with admiration. He praises our temperate climate, and says that he never felt it colder here in the depth of winter than at Padua and Bologna in November. He speaks of the mild disposition of the English, which he attributes, curiously enough, to their habit of drinking cold beer (*frigida cervisia*), and, as appears by the passage already quoted referring to the Jew Jacob, he writes with high praise of the liberality with which foreigners were treated in England. Even when he speaks of his imprisonment he utters no word of complaint. It is pleasant to think that he did not follow the example of Jacob Barnet in railing at his English benefactors.

RICHARD COPLEY CHRISTIE.

The 'Memoirs' of Sir Richard Bulstrode[1]

BULSTRODE'S 'Memoirs' are frequently referred to as one of the minor authorities for the history of the great civil war, but the question of their historical value has scarcely been discussed, much less decided. They were first published ten years after their author's death. Two other posthumously published works by the author had previously seen the light. In 1712 a certain Edward Bysshe, best known as the author of a once popular book called 'The Art of English Poetry,' printed a collection of letters from Bulstrode to Arlington, written whilst the former was English agent at Brussels. They give an account of the war in the Netherlands during the year 1674. In 1715 Sir Richard's son, Whitelocke Bulstrode, printed a volume of his father's essays, mostly moral and religious. They are amongst the dullest of their kind. The 'Memoirs' themselves were printed in 1721, with a preface by Nathaniel Mist, the publisher, in which he gives an account of the manner in which they came into his possession.

> When I was last year in Paris it was my good fortune to contract some acquaintance with a younger son of Sir Richard Bulstrode, who then resided there, as governor in the family of the young earl of Fingal. I had not long enjoyed the honour of his conversation before he frankly gave me the copy of these 'Memoirs,' with free liberty to make them publick to the world, and assured me they were all wrote by the hand of Sir Richard, his father.

To this Mist adds, after mentioning the essays—

> If these sheets could stand in need of any other proof of their being genuine, than the assertion I have given from whose hands I received them, I could not desire a stronger concurring testimony than those essays. Every judge, who will do himself the pleasure of a comparison, will find both those and the 'Memoirs' penned in the same style, and with the same cast of thought and spirit of language.

The account given of the origin of the 'Memoirs' seems

[1] *Memoirs and Reflections upon the Reign & Government of King Charles the I^st^ and K. Charles the II^d^.* Containing an account of several remarkable facts not mentioned by other historians of those times: wherein the character of the Royal Martyr and of King Charles II are vindicated from fanatical aspersions. Written by Sir Richard Bulstrode.

sufficiently probable. Many members of Bulstrode's family were alive, and had no such reminiscences existed it would not have been safe to invent such a circumstantial story. And, moreover, the internal evidence appealed to is to a certain extent convincing. There are long passages in the 'Memoirs,' mostly moralisings and political reflections, which are written in a style very like that of Bulstrode's essays. On the other hand a close examination of the 'Memoirs' at once throws a doubt on their value, by revealing the fact that much that they contain is derived from previously published narratives of the civil war.

Clarendon's 'History of the Rebellion,' published in 1702–1704, is frequently followed with great closeness in the 'Memoirs.' In many cases it is summarised, adopting here and there a sentence of Clarendon's, and making the alterations necessary to fit the passage selected for the place it is to fill in Bulstrode's narrative.

1. The most flagrant case of this borrowing is the account of the scene between Charles I and Sir Richard Willis at Newark in October 1645. A comparison of pp. 127–30 of the 'Memoirs' with book ix. §§ 128–31 of the 'Rebellion' shows that the author of the account given in the former must have written with Clarendon open before his eyes.

2. In the account of the career and character of Lord Goring, given in the 'Memoirs,' reminiscences and adaptations of Clarendon's words are very frequent. The well-known parallel between Wilmot and Goring is continually plundered. Compare 'Memoirs,' pp. 68–71, 115, 149, and 'Rebellion,' v. 440, 441, viii. 169, ix. 102.

3. The account of Hopton's appointment to the command of the king's western army, and the description of the battle of Torrington, supply a third instance in which the 'Memoirs' summarise and adapt the narrative of Clarendon. Compare 'Memoirs,' pp. 151–4; 'Rebellion,' ix. §§ 134–9, 143. The description of the army left by Goring as 'a dissolute, undisciplined, wicked, beaten army' ('Memoirs,' p. 151) is an example of the unblushing manner in which a striking phrase is appropriated.

4. The character of Cromwell given by Clarendon (xv. 146, 147, 149, 152) is the source from which the brief character given on pp. 205, 206 of the 'Memoirs' is derived. A few sentences will serve to show this.

He could never have done half that mischief without great parts of courage and industry and judgment. And he must have had a wonderful understanding in the natures and humours of men, and as great a dexterity in applying them, who from a private and

He could never have done half that mischief he did without having great parts of industry, courage, and judgment. He must have had a wonderful insight into the affections and humours of men, who from a private birth, without any interest, estate, or alliance,

obscure birth (though of a good family), without interest of estate, alliance, or friendships, could raise himself to such a height, and compound and knead such opposite and contradictory tempers, humours, and interests into a consistence that contributed to his designs and to their own destruction. . . . What Velleius Paterculus said of Cinna may very justly be said of him, *Ausum eum quae nemo auderet bonus ; perfecisse quae a nullo nisi fortissimo perfici possent.* Without a doubt no man with more wickedness ever attempted anything, or brought to pass what he desired more wickedly, more in the face and contempt of religion and moral honesty. (CLARENDON.)

could raise himself to so great a height. He attempted that which no good man durst undertake, and performed that which none but a wicked valiant man could succeed in. There was certainly never a more wicked man, nor one that ever brought to pass what he designed more wickedly.

(BULSTRODE.)

Other passages from the character of Cromwell might be quoted, and other parallels of a similar nature might be adduced from the 'Memoirs,' but these are sufficient to demonstrate the manner in which the book was put together.

Another book laid under contribution in the 'Memoirs' is Whitelocke's 'Memorials,' first published in 1682. The 'Memoirs' contain not only statements of fact obviously derived from the 'Memorials,' but sentences and short passages copied with very slight verbal alteration.

Compare the following passages relating to Strafford :—

'Memoirs,' p. 39.	'Memorials,' i. 108, ed. 1853.
,, p. 44.	,, i. 128.
,, pp. 45, 46.	,, i. 132, 133.

'Thus fell this noble earl,' concludes Whitelocke, 'who for natural parts and abilities, and for improvement of knowledge by experience in the greatest affairs, for wisdom, faithfulness, and gallantry of mind, hath left few behind him that may be ranked equal with him.'

The 'Memoirs' adopts the first three lines verbatim, and continues, 'for wisdom, fidelity, obedience, and gallantry left no equal behind him' (p. 46).

A second instance is supplied by the account of the treaty at Oxford in the spring of 1643.

In this treaty the king manifested his great parts and abilities, strength of reason and quickness of apprehension, with much pa-

In this treaty the king showed his great parts and abilities, strength of reason, and quickness of apprehension, with much pa-

tience in hearing what was objected against him; wherein he allowed all freedom, and would himself sum up the arguments, and gave a most clear judgment upon them. His unhappiness was that he had a better opinion of others' judgments than of his own, though they were weaker than his own; and of this we had experience, to our great trouble. (WHITELOCKE, *Memorials*, i. 199.)

tience hearing what was objected against him, wherein he allowed the commissioners all freedom, and when he differed from them in opinion he would tell them, 'By your favour, my lord Northumberland' (who was the chief of the commissioners), 'I am not of your opinion,' or, 'I think otherwise,' and would himself sum up their arguments, and give a clear judgment upon them. The king's great unhappiness was that he had a better opinion of others' judgment than of his own (tho' weaker than his own), and of this these commissioners at that time had a sad experience, to their great trouble. (BULSTRODE, *Memoirs*, pp. 89, 90.)

Only one touch is here added to Whitelocke, and that touch, as it will be shown, is taken from Sir Philip Warwick.

On pp. 192, 193 of the 'Memoirs' is an account of Whitelocke's conferences with Cromwell in the years 1651 and 1652, which is simply a summary of pp. 372–4 and pp. 468–74 of vol. iii. of the 'Memorials.'

Whitelocke has a habit of making moral reflections of the most trite and obvious nature on the revolutions which he witnessed. In several places these are copied word for word in the 'Memoirs.'

'Memoirs,' p. 160. 'Memorials,' ii. 135, 140.
(On the revolt of the army against the parliament in 1647.)
'Memoirs,' p. 170. 'Memorials,' ii. 356, 357.
(On Hamilton and the Scots invading England in 1648.)
'Memoirs,' p. 195. 'Memorials,' iv. 6, 7.
(On the dissolution of the long parliament by Cromwell in 1653.)

The third author to whom the writer or editor of these 'Memoirs' was indebted is Sir Philip Warwick, whose 'Memoirs of the Reign of Charles I' were published in 1701. I print below the description of Charles's character from the 'Memoirs' of Bulstrode, p. 184, side by side with extracts from Sir Philip Warwick's recollections, taken from his 'Memoirs,' pp. 64–73.

There were few gentlemen in the world that knew more of useful or necessary learning than this prince did; and yet his proportion of books was but small, having, like Francis I of France,

But before I go further give me leave to give you this king's character. He was no great scholar; his learning consisted more in what he had seen than what he had studied: his judg-

learnt more by the ear than by study. His way of arguing was very civil and patient; for he seldom contradicted another by his authority, but by his reason; nor did he by any petulant dislike quash another's arguments; and he offered his exceptions by this civil introduction: 'By your favour, sir, I think otherwise on this or that ground;'[2] yet he would discountenance any bold or forward address to him. And in suits or discourse of business he would give way to none abruptly to enter into them, but looked that the greatest persons should in affairs of this nature address to him by his proper ministers, or by some solemn desire of speaking to him in their own persons. . . . He kept up the dignity of his court, limiting persons to places suitable to their qualities, unless he particularly called for them. Besides the women who attended on his beloved queen and consort he scarce admitted any great officer to have his wife in the family. . . . And though he was as slow of pen as of speech, yet both were very significant: and he had that modest esteem of his parts that he would usually say, he would willingly make his own dispatches but that he found it better to be a cobbler than a shoemaker. (WARWICK.)

ment was good and better than most of his ministers. The misfortune was that he seldom depended upon it, unless in matters of his own religion, wherein he was always very stiff. His arguing was beyond measure civil and patient. He would seldom or never contradict any man angrily, but would always say, 'By your favour I think otherwise,' or, 'I am not of your opinion.' He would discourage any bold address that was made to him, and did not love strangers; and whilst he was upon his throne he would permit none to enter abruptly with him into business. He was wiser than most of his council, yet so unhappy as seldom to follow his own judgment. He would always (whilst in his court) be addressed to by proper ministers, and still kept up the dignity of his court, limiting all persons to places suitable to their employments and quality, and would there only hear them, unless he called for them in particular. Besides the ladies and women who attended the queen he permitted no minister to have his wife in court. He spoke but slowly, and would stammer a little when he began to speak eagerly. He seldom or never made his own dispatches till his latter days, but would still mend and alter them; and to that purpose he would often say he found it better to be a cobbler than a shoemaker. As to his religion, he was very positive in it, and would hear no arguments against it. (BULSTRODE.)

A touch or two in Bulstrode's character of Charles I are added to Warwick's description from Clarendon. Clarendon it is who says of the king, 'He did not love strangers,' and praises the king's judgment. 'He had an excellent understanding, but was not confident enough of it, which made him oftentimes change his

[2] Compare the passage quoted from Bulstrode's account of the treaty at Oxford on p. 269.

own opinion for a worse and follow the advice of a man that did not judge so well as himself' ('Rebellion,' xi. 240, 241; cf. ix. 3). The similar phrase used by Whitelocke in his account of the Oxford treaty has already been quoted.

From all these examples it is perfectly plain that the author or compiler of the 'Memoirs' had read and used these three books. It may be argued that Bulstrode himself may have read the books and used them to assist his memory. He was born, according to all accounts, in 1610, and the 'Memoirs' were written in his old age at St. Germains,[3] whither he had attended his exiled master, James II. What more likely than that he should have read the 'Memorials' of Bulstrode Whitelocke, 'my cousin german,' as he is termed at p. 91 of the 'Memoirs'?[4] If Whitelocke's 'Memorials' alone were in question, this might easily be granted, but the use made of Warwick and Clarendon, and the manner in which passages from those works are interwoven with expressions from Whitelocke, requires that the compiler of the Bulstrode 'Memoirs' should have had all three before him at the time of writing. As Clarendon's 'History of the Rebellion' was not published till 1702–1704, the composition of the 'Memoirs' is thus thrown forward to 1704, when Bulstrode is stated to have been in his 94th year.

It is improbable that he carried a copy of Whitelocke's 'Memorials' with him to St. Germains, and still more improbable that he procured—when England and France were at war—an early copy of Clarendon's 'Rebellion' to be sent to him in his exile. But so far as the mere writing of the 'Memoirs' was concerned there is no reason to suppose that he was incapable of writing such recollections in 1704. His essay on 'Old Age,' of the advantage of which, he adds, 'I am at present a living testimony,' was written in 1706.[5] He prided himself on retaining undiminished his power of literary composition.

The poetic fire which is usually soonest extinct in men I have found by experience in myself hath lasted long beyond that period, of which I could give modern proof, but I will leave that to my sons; only this I can with truth affirm, that the poems I have made since my age of 70 have more of force and spirit than those I had written some years

[3] 'Our court at St. Germains, where we live upon alms' (*Memoirs*, p. 19. See also p. 4).

[4] In his *Essays* (p. 24) Bulstrode tells the following story of Whitelocke's behaviour at Stafford's trial. 'There was one eminent lawyer who urged very smartly against his lordship, but yet with great respect and civility of language. And when the earl came to reply as he did to every one, he said he had been very roughly handled by most of the pleaders; but that he was very much beholding to one civil gentleman amongst them (naming the former person) who though he had touched him nearer the quick than any other, yet he was obliged to return him thanks, because he had cut his throat with a clean knife.'

[5] *Essays*, p. 377.

before; but this is a particular grace of God, it being very unusual in the generality.[6]

The most probable solution of the question is that Bulstrode did write some autobiographical memoirs which came into Mist's hands, and that the publisher is responsible for putting them together and inserting the composite passages to which attention has been called. All through the first—the pre-Restoration—part of the 'Memoirs' there runs a thin stream of autobiography, which appears to embody genuine recollections told with simplicity and apparent truthfulness. On p. 2 Bulstrode gives an account of his entry into the king's service; pp. 72–9 contain an account of the opening campaign of the war, of Bulstrode's joining the earl of Northampton in Warwickshire, and of the battles of Edgehill and Brentford; pp. 92, l. 28, to 94, l. 18, contain an account of his services under the earl of Northampton up to the time he left him to accept a post under Lord Wilmot; under Wilmot's command Bulstrode appears to have taken part in the battle of Cropredy Bridge (pp. 100–1), and he gives detailed accounts of Wilmot's disgrace in Cornwall, of the surrender of Essex's army to the king (pp. 102–11), of the besieging of Taunton (pp. 116–7, very inaccurate), of the second battle of Newbury (pp. 117–9), of incidents in the war in the west (pp. 120–2), of the quarrels and disorders of Goring's army and of Goring's resignation, and of the battle of Langport (pp. 133–48). Here the autobiographical part of the first half of the 'Memoirs' ends, but a couple of incidental references show that Bulstrode was in England in September 1658 and February 1660 (pp. 207, 210). These autobiographical recollections are sometimes inaccurate in their chronology, but frequently contain information of some little value, which is confirmed by authorities to which it is not likely that the compiler of the interpolated passages had access.

Interspersed through the first part of the 'Memoirs' are what purport to be letters or summaries of documents, which demand a detailed examination. An investigation shows that they ought to be considered as recollections of documents rather than as reproductions or abstracts of papers under the author's eyes at the time of writing. On pp. 103–4 the memoir-writer gives the substance of the petition of the officers of the king's horse on behalf of Lord Wilmot in August 1644. A comparison of this with the original petition, printed in the 'Diary' of Richard Symonds (p. 106), shows that the memory of the writer was tolerably faithful. On p. 114 the 'Memoirs' give a summary of Lord Digby's answer on behalf of

[6] *Essays*, p. 382. The modern proof referred to is probably the 185 Latin elegies and epigrams, some selections from which are printed in the preface to his *Letters*. He died in 1711.

the king, which is also fairly accurate, if compared with the charge against Wilmot printed on p. 108 of the 'Diary.' These documents had also been previously printed in Rushworth's 'Collections,' v. 693–7.

On p. 125 the 'Memoirs' mention a letter from Lord Goring to the king, giving reasons for declining to raise the siege of Taunton, as ordered by Charles, and advising his master to avoid an engagement. This letter was intercepted, and was one of the reasons which led Fairfax to force on the battle of Naseby. The memoir-writer says—

I wrote the general's answer to the king, having kept the copy of it, which was to this effect: that he was certain in few days to be master of Taunton, and should leave that country free from any enemy, excepting Lyme (which was then, and had been for some time, blocked up); whereas if he should leave the siege the enemy would be masters of that country, and therefore he most humbly prayed the king to forbear any engagement, and to be upon the defensive, upon the river of Trent, which he might very well do, till the siege of Taunton was ended, and then he would bring his army to serve the king to his best advantage; and he did again desire the king to keep at a distance and not engage.

The intercepting of this letter is mentioned, with some hint at its contents, in Sprigge's 'Anglia Rediviva,' p. 52, ed. 1854, in Rushworth, vi. 49, and in a sermon by Hugh Peter entitled 'God's Doings and Man's Duty,' printed in 1646, p. 21. A letter of the same kind, probably taken at Naseby, is given in the 'Calendar of State Papers' for 1644–5, p. 581. A newspaper of the period, 'Perfect Occurrences of Parliament and Chief Collections of Letters from the Armie,' 13–20 June 1645, gives the following account of the letter and its capture:—

Friday, 13 *June*.—Wee have had so many considerable occurrences this weeke that I am troubled how to contract them into so short a pamphlet. We heard this day that the king had sent a letter to Goring to send him speedily 2,000 horse and 3,000 foot, that were to strengthen his armie to fight with S[r] Thomas Fairfax.

Goring receiving these letters returns answer, the substance whereof is thus: 'May it please your majestie we are now in a fair way of taking Taunton, and the whole West will be easily reduced to your obedience. This designe we are upon is of exceeding great consequence, and if we should send away any part of our forces, the rebels being 4,000 within the towne, our whole strength not above 9,000, our designe would be then quite spoiled and the west in danger to be lost if 5,000 should be drawne away; but I humbly desire that your majestie would be pleased to send your commands by this bearer (who will return within five dayes), to which I desire to submit and continue

'Your most affectionate servant,

'Goring.'

His majestie wondering that no answer came to hand sent again to Goring, for indeed the letter was intercepted which Goring wrote to the king, and therefore on the one side the king wondered no answer came, and Goring thought his judgement was approved of and that the king did not desire the forces; but Goring's back friends have done him such a courtesie at Court that hee may chance to loose his head by it, which S[r] Ralphe Hopton is no little glad of, because then he shall be rid of his corivall.

It is evident from this specimen that the letters given by the memoir-writer are at the most imperfect recollections of documents which he had once seen. This assists in determining the value to be attached to the letter from Goring to the king printed on p. 109 of the 'Memoirs,' which, if it could have been accepted as verbally correct, would have had great weight in clearing Goring of the responsibility for the escape of Essex's horse in September 1644. Some of the details given in the letter, however, cannot be reconciled with what is known from other sources, and, while accepting the statement of Bulstrode that some such letter was actually received by Goring, it would be rash to assume that Bulstrode's version of the words is trustworthy. The only one of these letters in the first part of the 'Memoirs' which appears likely to be a verbal reproduction of an original document is the jocular letter from Waller to Goring, printed on p. 120. Unfortunately it is a letter of no historical importance.

The second part of the 'Memoirs' relates to the reign of Charles II, and contains a certain amount of purely autobiographical matter. Bulstrode relates how he first came to be employed as English agent at Brussels (pp. 232-51), and narrates some of the negotiations and pieces of business in which he was employed. These desultory recollections end about August 1685, soon after the accession of James II. They contain a few interesting anecdotes, such as the account of an interview with Charles II (p. 424 [7]), but are inordinately swollen by long political digressions (pp. 215–18, 222–30, 391–423), and by the insertion of letters and documents. The digressions are very much in the style of the 'Essays,' which also contain some curious historical anecdotes.[8] The documents are of several kinds—a well-known letter from Shaftesbury to Lord Carlisle, which was circulated amongst the opposition peers in 1675 (p. 264; cf. Christie's 'Life of Shaftesbury,' ii. 200), and an equally well-known letter from Monmouth to Charles II (p. 356). There are several of the speeches of Charles II to his parliaments (pp. 288, 293, 299, 328), some addresses from the parliament to the king (pp. 284–7), and the dying speeches of Plunket and Fitzharris (pp. 318, 319). Letters containing political news from England and extracts from newsletters are very numerous, usually pre-

[7] See also pp. 280–4.

[8] *Essays*, pp. 10, 24, 56, 289, 325, 376.

faced by, 'I received this following letter from a very good hand at Whitehall,' or, 'I am told by a good hand at Whitehall' (pp. 321, 348, 360, 376, 383). But the greatest part of this inserted correspondence consists of official letters from Arlington, Henry Coventry, Joseph Williamson, and Leoline Jenkins, on subjects connected with Bulstrode's mission. There is no reason to doubt the authenticity of these documents, but it is very unlikely that Bulstrode himself strung together this peculiar jumble of autobiographical reminiscences, official papers, and political reflexions. We know from the unimpeachable evidence of his son Whitelocke that Sir Richard left a large mass of diplomatic correspondence. Speaking of his father's employment in Flanders the son observes, 'during which time he held correspondence with most of the courts of Christendom, as I find by his letters made up into annals, which I have by me.' [9] The collection seems to be now dispersed; at least many letters from it have recently appeared in sale-rooms and catalogues.[10]

Putting all these things together, the history of the 'Memoirs' published by Mist is probably something like this: Bulstrode wrote certain autobiographical recollections and some reflexions on the revolutions he had witnessed. Mist obtained possession of these, and of a small portion of Bulstrode's diplomatic correspondence, and by their aid put together the volume of 'Memoirs,' increasing their bulk by inserting characters of Charles I and Cromwell, and narratives of events in which Bulstrode was not personally concerned, and of which he had consequently given no account himself.

C. H. Firth.

[9] Preface to Bulstrode's *Essays*, p. ii.

[10] I have five or six which I bought from Mrs. Tregaskis of 232 High Holborn a few years ago.

The Permanent Settlement of Bengal

IT is now just a century ago that the permanent settlement of the land revenue of Bengal was completed. Financially this settlement involved the bold step (it would have been thought madness in any other department of the revenue) of stereotyping for all time the figures of the land revenue account which is the chief item of state income; it was carried out in apparent unconsciousness alike of the probable embarrassment of future governments, and of the incalculable changes in the value of money as well as of land and its produce that time was bound to bring about. Socially it gave rise to what was virtually a new class of (legal) landlords; and, albeit indirectly, it revolutionised the land tenures generally, by crystallising into legal rigidity relations which were gradually developing themselves with oriental laxness under the varying impulse of local circumstances.

Such a settlement has naturally left a heavy legacy of legal and administrative trouble not yet wholly disposed of. The history of the settlement is, therefore, something more than a mere matter of curiosity; it contains not a few lessons for modern times, and furnishes some parallels with agrarian troubles nearer home. Many accounts of it have been written, but the facts have not always been stated fairly; various and sometimes inaccurate presentations have been made, in the eagerness of advocates of this or that policy to establish their case.

In order to derive practical benefit from the history, there is still room to welcome additional information, especially when that addition comes in the shape of a more direct means of verifying conclusions and establishing disputed points. The four handy volumes which Sir William Hunter has recently issued [1] contain a classified abstract of the more important official letters received by and issued from the chief revenue office in Calcutta during the first twenty-five years of its existence. This marks a new departure; for the records throw a direct and original light on the working of the administration under Lord Cornwallis's system, a light different from that

[1] *Bengal MS. Records: a Selected List of* 14,136 *Letters in the Board of Revenue, Calcutta* (1782–1807), by Sir W. W. Hunter, K.C.S.I. 4 vols. London: Allen & Co. 1894.

given by the bare text of regulations, minutes, and parliamentary reports. The letters furnish us with concrete instances—with so many 'leading cases' showing the specific application and the real intention and effect of the rules. The abstracts will, it is true, find their fullest use in India, where further reference can be made to the entire document; but in general Sir W. Hunter's abstracts are so good, in spite of their necessary brevity, that they contain in themselves the essential information required. Naturally, in order to make good use of such material, the reader must have a certain familiarity with the facts and the law of the settlement, but this is now easily attainable. Moreover, in view of such a need, the list of letters is preceded (in vol. i.) by an illustrative dissertation on the settlement proceedings which in itself would entitle the work to take high rank among our authorities on the administrative history of Bengal.

The land revenue administration is so important that every large Indian province has found it indispensable to have a special department for its chief control. In Bengal, practically since 1782, there has been a 'board of revenue,' with whatever variety of official title or difference of internal constitution. Before this board every serious question of land revenue policy ultimately comes.

The period from 1782 to 1812 forms a distinct epoch in the history of the administration. It begins with the year in which it may fairly be said that the machinery of revenue control, local and central, had acquired its modern form, and had begun to work on defined lines of regulated procedure.[2] The capabilities of this machinery were first seriously tested in the making of the decennial settlement, which was declared permanent; and the details of this settlement, and the questions that arose out of it, naturally form the most important topic of the correspondence during the earlier years of the period. The latter part includes the years during which the difficulties created by the settlement began to be acutely felt, especially in connexion with the law of tenancy and rent recovery. Sir W. Hunter's volumes do not embrace the entire epoch; they end with 1807—taking the round term of a quarter of a century.

Never, perhaps, was an administrative experiment tried with such excellent intentions as the Bengal settlement, never was one which had results so different from those expected. In truth, the experiment was made under almost every possible disadvantage. If Bengal had been a well-managed native province, we might have

[2] From 1765 (the date of the grant of Bengal, Bihar, and Orissa) to 1771, the attempt was made to maintain the old native official system intact, but subject to a certain supervision. The years 1772–1781 may be regarded as a second stage, during which the essential features of modern organisation—the 'district,' with its collector and his assistants, the revenue 'division,' with its 'commissioner' (to supervise a group of districts), and the board of revenue (in direct communication with the provincial government)—were gradually, and with many retrogressions, evolved.

succeeded to a revenue system which would not indeed have conformed to English notions of precision or legality, but would have been practically workable in a paternally despotic fashion, and might have been gradually adapted to western requirements. As it was, the province came to us in the last stage of administrative decay. It had never been more than an outlying and imperfectly connected member of the Moghal empire, and not only soonest fell a prey to the disease that was infecting the whole system, but had never shared the fuller circulation of vitality which maintained prosperity in the provinces nearer the heart of the empire. Though nominally added to the dominions of the early Pathan emperors of Delhi, Bengal had become an independent kingdom in the fourteenth century; and it maintained its position largely by the countenance given to the old Hindu princes and chiefs who ruled a series of states, which, according to the usual Hindu model, were—regarded as kingdoms—always of small size. They were left in practical independence on condition of accepting a *sanad* or grant implying political subjection, and of passing on to the treasury of the Muslim king a considerable share of the land revenue locally collected.

The genius of Akbar enabled him once more to annex Bengal and make it a *sūba* or province of the Moghal empire. Sir W. Hunter is perhaps inclined somewhat to undervalue the extent to which Akbar's revenue settlement (*circa* 1582 A.D.) affected the province. It is true that the districts were not actually measured—that process was only carried out in Bihar—but a fair list was made out of the *parganas* or local fiscal subdivisions and of their assessments based on the rental of the village groups in each.[3] And there were subsequent formal settlements between 1658 and 1728.

The system of farming the revenues became general during the latter part of the reign of Aurangzīb; and in the last settlement (1728) we find the system fully established, as the accounts proceed solely according to the series of *ihtimām* or farmers' charges which had virtually superseded the official fiscal divisions established in the days of direct control. After this settlement, we only know of the continually increasing levy of 'cesses' (*abwāb*), imposed, on all sorts of pretences, in addition to the nominal land revenue. In the end we find a kind of *annual* settlement (or rather bargain) made with the farmers; and this had continued for some time before British rule began.[4]

[3] The second volume of the *Ayīn-i-Akbari* shows this clearly. John Shore (minute of June 1789, par. 11, *Fifth Report*, vol. i. p. 103, Madras reprint) wrote that the settlement comprehended not only the quota (total rents) payable by the villages, but, 'as is generally believed, by the individual ryots.' This assessment could hardly have been accepted and appealed to as it was, if it had been summary or incomplete.

[4] Warren Hastings wrote: 'For the last twenty years' (*i.e.* since 1756) 'the revenue has been collected on a conjectural valuation' with reference to past collections and the opinion of officials; and 'it was altered almost every year.'

No wonder then that for some years the British authorities feared to touch the tottering edifice of native management lest it should crumble to pieces under their hands, and contented themselves with trying to prop it up and remedy its worst abuses. When at last, in 1772, direct administration was forced upon the Governor-general, he had to begin the heavy task with a staff of officers numerically insufficient and, as a rule, without experience of land management. As if to add to our difficulties, a terrible famine had recently desolated the province; and what its effects were may be judged from the touching description in the 'Annals of Rural Bengal,' a book which was the first of that valuable series in which Sir W. Hunter has, with rare success, made the dry facts of Indian history to live and move, as it were, before our eyes.

The land revenue of Bengal had long been levied in money. This, however, was, comparatively speaking, an innovation. In a simple stage of society, it is convenient to levy the contribution in its original form, viz. by taking a share of the actual grain produce of each holding as it lay on the threshing floor. When this is done, no question arises about the tenure of the cultivator or the value of his land. The share belonging to the king is fixed by immemorial custom. But, in the course of time, circumstances both economic and political (which cannot here be discussed) are gradually found to necessitate the substitution of cash rates for each holding or for a certain unit area of land; and then it is that the more modern difficulties of revenue management begin. Attention is, in fact, diverted from the *land*, the produce of which is to be divided, to the *person*, who is to be responsible for the cash payment; and it is soon found (as the revenue-payer is not always the immediate holder or cultivator of the land) that the administration cannot long ignore the relations of that person to the soil cultivators as well as to the state.

All native governments adopted one or other of two methods. (1) They dealt direct with each separate village, sometimes collecting the individual payments of the cultivators, sometimes holding a headman, or other person, responsible for the village total.[5] Under this system—which marks the best days of native rule—there is a regular graduated control, from the accountant in each village, to the *kānūngo* in each small subdivision, and from him to the district officer, and finally to the *sadr-kānūngo*, or financial controller, who advised the *dīwān*, or chief civil officer of the

[5] In some parts of India, where the villages were held in shares by a joint body, the village revenue was in one sum, for which the body was jointly responsible, distributing the burden, according to their own custom. This was not the case in Bengal proper. The barbarous Bengal custom called *nājāi*, whereby the farmers made the solvent cultivators pay the arrears of a defaulter, was a pure act of tyranny and was soon abolished under British rule.

whole province. (2) A larger 'estate' was taken, the particulars of the component revenue divisions, villages, &c., being stated in a *sanad* or warrant of appointment, and a farmer was made responsible for the total sum, subject to certain specified allowances for charges and remuneration. Such an 'estate' might be only a single *pargana*, or might cover an extensive district. Under this system the local revenue control above spoken of, soon becomes atrophied and useless.

In Bengal the first of these methods had originally been adopted, at least over a considerable part of the country; but (as already stated) since the reign of Aurangzīb it had given way more and more completely to the second. The cause of the change was partly the weakness of the local government, and partly the fact that the surviving Hindu rājās had all along been allowed to administer (and farm the revenues of) their former territories. Wherever there was no rājā, or other local chief of sufficient importance, official farmers and speculators were appointed to manage the revenue. All that was really looked to was that the *total* sum specified in the warrant should be paid into the treasury.

In process of time all 'zamīndārs,' as these revenue farmers were officially called, became fused into one class, and their various origin was more or less forgotten. One of the most valuable parts of Sir W. Hunter's dissertation (vol. i. pp. 31 ff.) is that which places before the reader the different elements thus fused together. The fact that some of the 'zamindars' had old territorial claims dating back before the Moghal conquest, though, legally speaking, their only title was the imperial *sanad*, had no doubt much to do with the rapid growth of the power and pretensions of the whole class, of which we shall presently speak.

It may at first sight appear strange that the British revenue administration, after 1772, soon came to distrust the zamindars; but in fact the evils of the system as a whole were more obvious than the merits and claims of a certain class. Probably all zamindars were found to oppress the people a good deal, and certainly they intercepted a large proportion of the state revenue. Attempts were therefore made to set them aside and to substitute contractors, bound by short leases—for five years, or for one year—who would have no pretensions beyond the terms of their engagement. But the zamindars had by this time been too long and too firmly established to enable such a plan to work, or to make their own wholesale supersession other (in many cases) than extremely unjust. Consequently Pitt's act of 1784 (24 Geo. III. cap. 25) clearly pointed to the restoration of the zamindars (under due restriction) and to the making of a settlement with them. Lord Cornwallis was sent out in 1786 to carry the act into effect, and the instructions

of the directors of the East India Company hardly left him any option in the matter.

Any definitive arrangement of the land system must necessarily have in view three objects—(1) to determine the assessment of each 'estate,' and for what period it should hold good; (2) to give the persons responsible for the payment[6] a secure position which could be legally described and enacted; (3) to determine what was to be done to protect the village cultivators over whom the zamindar (whether as the once hereditary local ruler or as the officially appointed farmer) had grown up.

(1) As to the *amount* of the assessment, the only practicable plan (seeing that a land survey and valuation were deemed impossible or were never contemplated as possible) was to take an average of past collections, and so arrive at a round sum which could be further adjusted with reference to the various special arrangements of the settlement—a matter of detail which it is not necessary here to consider. As to the period for which the assessment was to be maintained there was a marked division of official opinion. Sir W. Hunter urges that Lord Cornwallis was not responsible for its being at once made perpetual, because his instructions were to make it so. This can, however, hardly be conceded. The act of 1784 provided nothing which required, or even implied, that the assessment should be fixed for ever.[7] Reliance is, however, placed on the terms of the directors' despatch of 12 April 1786 (par. 52), which said, 'The assessment now to be formed shall, as soon as it can have received our approval and satisfaction, be considered as the permanent and unalterable revenue,' &c. But this phrase should not be taken apart from the other instructions given; for these further distinctly declared that *at present* the settlement was to be made for *ten years*; and it was added that the directors felt 'that the frequency of change had created such distrust in the minds of the people as to render the idea of some definite term more pleasing to them than a dubious perpetuity.' There was no reason, then, why the ten years should not have been allowed to run out, so as to see how the new settlement worked; and it was in opposition to the best local advice that Lord Cornwallis urged the directors, when the gradual process of settling district by district was complete, at once to declare the assessment perpetual. The directors evidently had doubts also, and it was only after two years' deliberation that they (in the end of 1792) sanctioned the

[6] Or 'holding the settlement,' as the revenue phrase is.

[7] In reading the documents of this period it should be borne in mind that the term 'permanent,' *now* used only to indicate that the assessment is unalterable, was then just as often employed to indicate fixity of system—with reference to the former changing methods of working. This use of terms is well illustrated by the sentence in the *Fifth Report* (vol. i. p. 14), where the writer speaks of 'the introduction of a *permanent* settlement, afterwards made *perpetual*.'

governor-general's proposal, not without some apparent reluctance.[8]

(2) As to the second of the objects above stated, Sir W. Hunter urges that the settlement orders consolidating the position of the zamindars were 'neither consciously nor unconsciously an imitation of the English system of landed property' (vol. i. p. 45). If this is said in refutation of such crude objections as those of Mr. Mill, that the settlement was the result of Lord Cornwallis's 'aristocratic prejudices,' it may at once be admitted. But Sir W. Hunter seems at any rate to imply that the conferment of a landlord title was solely or chiefly the result of inquiries and conclusions as to the Indian law and constitution. It is not easy to see how the historical and local information obtained in Bengal could have led to the landlord law of the Regulations of 1793 without the strong influence of English legal ideas.

Allusion has already been made to the different origin which the 'zamindars' really had. Sir W. Hunter has, in his usual felicitous manner, sketched for us the position held by one of the old aristocratic territorial zamindars, and has been perhaps too kindly silent as to the position of some of the other class whose origin was purely official, and who had built up estates—adding village to village and field to field, often by fraud, violence, and other questionable means.[9] But while it is perfectly just to say of some of them that they had, on grounds of long possession and hereditary right, 'a good title to the zamindari estate' (p. 37), and that they were 'ancient hereditary lords of certain tracts, a status which enabled them to levy great incomes' from the land (p. 41), that admission does not suffice to determine the nature of the interest which time and circumstances had established. The question for the Bengal authorities was not so much whether there was a good title of some kind, but how they were to define the interest which it was desired to secure. And the mode in which they answered the question shows manifestly the influence of English ideas of landed property.

No doubt elaborate inquiries were made, with the object of throwing light on the local history of the zamindar's position. But waiving the objection that 'the law and constitution of India' is a mere phrase, and that no such thing practically existed, at any rate in the eighteenth century, it must be admitted that neither the old text of the Hindu or Muhammadan law books, nor the local

[8] Sir J. Kaye has stated Lord Cornwallis's position in this matter with much fairness (*Administration of the E.I. Company*, 1853, p. 182).

[9] Compare, for example, Dr. Buchanan (Hamilton's) account of the Dinājpur district (printed in 1833), in which the author describes how the great zamindari of Dinājpur attained its mushroom growth. The first founders were nobodies who grew rich and then sought for, and obtained, the title of raja, and ultimately mahāraja. The account was written within ten or twelve years of the permanent settlement.

custom (which mostly related to the village and its agricultural occupation) gave the slightest hint as to how the zamindar's gradually altered position should be classed or defined.

The original condition of right in land, broadly speaking, was this: The whole area of the cultivated districts (we may confine ourselves to the central populous parts) was, as usual, divided into groups which we call 'villages.' These were of the type in which no co-sharing body or single family is found claiming the whole; but the holders of land are separate units kept together by the authority of the headman and other village officers and formed into a 'community' by the local ties which result from residence together, from common interests, and from having all the simple wants of life provided for within the circle of the village, by a resident staff of artisans and menials.[10] In Bihar there is evidence of co-sharing families having obtained the chief position in the villages; but not in Bengal. Now under the Hindu, and equally under the (much later) Muhammadan law, the village landholders—descendants, or at any rate direct representatives, of the first settlers, were certainly owners of the land in some sense, though oriental texts could not be expected to formulate the nature or the legal elements of ownership. A right in the soil was, however, acknowledged as resulting from the first occupation and laborious clearing of the land; and that this was a substantial right is indicated by the many texts which refer to the maintenance of boundaries and fences, to repressing trespass, and to the succession to the land by inheritance as well as by gift and sale, the right of transfer being restricted only in much later times. Coincident with this direct soil right was, however, the right of the king to a share in the produce, and to the waste lands, and to certain transit and other dues and tolls leviable. When for any reason the rājā made a grant of a village, however exhaustive the formal terms of the document, all that was meant was that the grantee was to take all the royal rights, including the whole or a part (according to terms) of the revenue share, and the right to cultivate the waste. The rights of the original holders were not touched.

The more the old texts and the grants are examined, the more clearly it will appear that the 'law and constitution' contemplated two concurrent rights—(i.) a direct soil ownership in virtue of occupation and clearing; (ii.) an overlord right, which consisted in

[10] Each village had in those days an indefinite area of waste around it: this was in no sense the joint property of the village landholders, though they had the customary use of it for grazing and wood-cutting. When cultivation was to be extended, permission, express or tacit, was required to occupy the new fields. The waste remained the property of the state: and this is evident from the fact that when a *grantee* of the village appeared, he always took the waste as lawfully his own under the grant, subject, of course, to the customary provision for grazing, &c., which was necessary to the welfare of the original holders.

the revenue share and the other rights incidentally above alluded to.[11] The text-writers do not suppose that the first right is destroyed, or even diminished, by the existence of the second.

So long as the overlord right was exercised directly by the *ruler* himself, seated at his capital, in practice it was not found to interfere with the cultivator's right. But it contained in itself elements that might produce a change; for the rājā's share could be increased; [12] and if it was not paid, coercive measures might be employed. When, therefore, in later times not only did a conquering dynasty raise the revenue share, but grantees, or pushing families, or adventurers (in the local raids of unsettled times) got hold of villages, they exercised the overlordship at close quarters, so to speak, in a much more direct and self-assertive fashion. And especially when the state overlordship and revenue rights were farmed out, the farmers (of whatever class or origin) were brought into a close managing connexion, such as the dignified ruler at his capital, with his well-controlled officials, would never have thought of. Still, in theory, it is only the state rights that are the subject of the grant or farm.

But the more the local revenue became (virtually) the subject of a bargain with middlemen, the more the latter regarded it as a matter of course that they should make as much profit as they could; and accordingly they (without check from the now powerless officials) treated the *raiyats* as liable to anything they thought proper to impose.[13] They would eject insolvent cultivators, would buy up some lands under pressure, and, by standing security themselves for the payment due from others, would soon have opportunity to foreclose on the owner. Apart, however, from his private (family) lands and actual purchases, &c., the zamindar was never, on any possible theory, the actual owner of all the village lands; the hereditary rājā accepting a *sanad* from the Muhammadan ruler, was not, and *a fortiori* the official farmer was not. But the fact remains that when once the overlordship is transferred to the hands of some person, other than the territorial ruler for the

[11] Colonel Tod quotes a maxim of the Rajputāna illage landholders, which expresses correctly the facts in all the ancient Hindu kingdoms—

'Bhogrā dhani Rājhu
Bhūmrā dhani mājhu'—

i.e. 'the king's wealth' (or right) 'is his revenue share; the soil is my wealth' (or right).

[12] The share was one-sixth; but even in the *Institutes of Manu* we find it stated that in times of emergency the rājā might raise it to one-fourth. There is nothing about ejection for non-payment (and in practice such a thing was unknown), but the rājā is directed to *fine* a cultivator who neglects to till his field.

[13] The old aristocratic zamindar was not much better in this respect than the speculator. The former, under pressure from the imperial treasury, forgot too often the *noblesse oblige* that would have actuated him in the days of independence; and, besides, he left the direct management to a host of greedy underlings.

time being, it always tends to become a virtual but undefined proprietorship, and that in great measure by a series of steps the reverse of equitable. The difficulty is to attempt, at a later time, to question acts which, in some cases, have the prescription of several generations.

While grantees and farmers were gradually making good their pretensions, the old state right itself underwent a change. No trace of an assertion that the *ruler*, as such, is owner of all land can be found in the genuine Hindu or Muhammadan law.[14] But later princes—and especially the viceroys who assumed independence—all set up the claim, as conquerors, to be the sole owners of land. By the close of the eighteenth century this was certainly established *de facto*. Lord Cornwallis was thus confronted with a double complication. The state right to which his government succeeded, was *de facto* though not *de jure* : the zamindar's claim was not formulated, but it was long existent in practice. Both the one and the other had very little to do with the 'law and constitution;' not even with 'custom,' unless the results of unchecked aggression during a century can be called 'custom.'

It was, then, as a matter of deliberate policy that the governor-general renounced the state right to the land and conferred it, in a new form, on the zamindars.[15] The first part of this decision calls for no remark in this place; the second was largely prompted by the necessity for cutting the knot that could not (so it was felt) be untied. The terms in which this right was actually conferred on the zamindars by law are really more important than the expressions made use of in the governor-general's preliminary minutes. But it is impossible to read either minutes or regulations without perceiving that the idea of the English landlord of the eighteenth century (of course assuming a *good* landlord as the type) was present to the minds of the writers; indeed what other idea of legal property in land could they have had but that of a landlord, the owner of the estate, with all subordinate holders his tenants—to be cherished and protected, no doubt, but still 'tenants,' holding by agreement with him? And so we are not surprised to find in sect. 52 of Regulation VIII. of 1793 (this with Reg. I. constitutes the charter of the settlement) the provision 'that' (saving certain privileged holders whose title was obvious) 'the zamindar or other actual proprietor

[14] The celebrated modern digest of *Jaganātha* (written in Sir W. Jones's time and translated by Colebrooke), however valuable in many respects, shows the most pitiable confusion on this subject, in the hopeless endeavour to reconcile the older law with the then established doctrine that 'conquerors' had a 'protective property' (whatever that may be) 'in the soil of their territory.'

[15] In the preamble to the second regulation of 1793 it is expressly stated that of two measures taken by government to restore agricultural prosperity, one was that 'the property in the soil has been declared to be vested in the landholders (meaning the zamindars);' and this, it is added, 'had never before been formally declared.'

is to let the remaining lands of his zamindary, or estate, under the prescribed conditions, in whatever manner he may think proper.' The 'conditions' were that a written document was to be given, specifying one definite sum of 'rent,' and that no 'extras' were to be exacted. Moreover it was speedily enacted that the landlord was not to give his *pottah* for more than ten years, lest he should injure himself and his means of paying the state revenue. All this implies that the raiyat was a 'tenant' under contract; and it soon became accepted that rents could be raised.

(3) But this question of 'raising the raiyats' rents' invites a brief separate notice in connexion with the third object of the settlement above noted (p. 281). It never occurred to any one to restore the resident or permanent village cultivator to the position of owner of his holding; that would have been inconsistent with the declaration regarding the zamindar's rights. Still it would not much matter to the (resident) raiyat what he was called, provided it had been recognised that his tenancy was by custom, not by contract, and that his rent payment was, therefore, to be certain, and to be raised only at such intervals and on such terms as it could have been, under state authority, in olden time. It is undeniable that the official minutes contain directly conflicting pronouncements on this subject. On the one hand it was not forgotten that what now became the 'rent' payable to the 'landlord or other actual proprietor' (of the regulations) was merely the revenue payment that would, if there was no farmer, have been paid direct to the state collector. And Lord Cornwallis sometimes wrote as if these payments were fixed absolutely, at rates supposed to be ascertainable from local records.[16] It would have been possible, no doubt, to include in the proclamation to zamindars a reminder that they had originally no right to raise the raiyats' payments unless the state itself raised them; and it would then have been logical enough to declare that as the state had limited for ever its demand on the zamindars, and had presented them freely with the unoccupied waste adjoining their estates, and had given other advantages, they must forego any increase on all such raiyats as were not directly located by themselves on newly cultivated land.[17]

But, on the other hand, there was no obligation to make such a condition. There is no doubt that, if there had been no farmers or other grantees at all, the revenue demand from the original soil owners could have been revised from time to time. A good government would have made such a revision only at long intervals, and on such principles as are allowed to operate at the present day

[16] This idea of the intended fixity of 'rents' is the basis of the argument in the anonymous work called *The Zamindari Settlement of Bengal* (Calcutta, 1879, 2 vols.), quoted by Sir W. Hunter.

[17] Rents on this would, of course, be purely matter of contract with the owner.

in other provinces.[18] The grant of a certain legal status and other privileges to one party did not necessitate any grant or free gift to the other, unless, indeed, the grant to the first caused some direct injury to the second; and that it was neither intended nor supposed to do.

The question of raising rents was discussed in 1789, as appears from Harington's 'Analysis.'[19] It was at this time that John Shore put forward his 'Plan for the Ease and Security of the Raiyats.' He had already recognised (in his minute of 18 June 1789) that the position of the raiyat was anomalous, and he contemplated its gradual adaptation to the 'simple relation of landlord and tenant.' He proposed that every landlord should be compelled to agree to make a systematic inquiry, over the whole of his estate, for the purpose of fixing (and entering in a written note) the rent of every resident village cultivator.[20] This was to be done within a given number of years; the number Shore left blank in his minute, as a detail for subsequent determination. It was then believed that, what with the information from the local lists of rates (to be mentioned presently) and the necessity that the parties would feel themselves under to find some *modus vivendi*, terms would be settled.

Lord Cornwallis would not consent to defer the ratification of the settlement till such an inquiry was complete; nor did he do more than pass a regulation making the issue of *pottahs* compulsory on the landlords. There was, moreover, no means of enforcing the law; and it was soon found that 'tenants' objected to take the *pottahs*; some, because they feared that, unlettered as they were, terms which they could not read or understand might be imposed thereby; others, because they felt that accepting such a document meant admitting that they held of the zamindar and not by an independent, customary, or legal right. It is true that the *pottah* was not exactly what we should call a lease, but it certainly had this effect. The *pottah* regulation, in fact, failed altogether.[21]

[18] It should be borne in mind that in theory, the land revenue represents a certain proportion of the income or benefit derivable from cultivated land. Even in modern temporarily settled provinces (*i.e.* where the assessment is liable to periodical revision) an increase is taken, *not* to raise the proportion spoken of, but because, under existing conditions as to value of money, increased produce, or increased value of land, and higher market prices of grain, the sum paid under the last assessment no longer represents the proper proportion.

[19] Vol. iii. p. 461 ff.

[20] Other, it may be presumed, than those directly located by himself on new lands, and who were indisputably contract tenants.

[21] Its failure was owing largely to its own terms: it might naturally be thought that if the raiyat would not accept, or could not get, a fair *pottah*, the remedy would have been to allow (as the Madras zamindari law allows) either party to apply to the collector to fix a proper rate. The only provision, however, was that the landlord should post up a list of the rates he demanded; and if the raiyat did not contest them (by the to him impossible process of a costly suit at distant head-quarters) he could be made to pay at such rates.

Even if these difficulties could have been evaded, and present rates fairly ascertained in most cases, it was still necessary to decide whether the raiyats' rents were liable to any future increase or not. Obviously, if the intention was positively entertained to make the rates fixed, this was one of the very first terms to be set forth with all plainness in the regulations. As it was—and here we must perceive the influence of the English idea of landlord and tenant—not only was it directly enacted that (subject to the conditions indicated) the landlord 'was to *let his lands*' in any manner he chose, but it was specifically said that such raiyats as could prove a special grant or a prescriptive right were entitled to fixed rents. The inference, therefore, was inevitable (at least in English courts) that *otherwise* rents could be raised.[22]

The matter was further settled by the influence of two measures, which, though enacted with the best intentions, were productive of unforeseen results. One was the 'sale law,' which provided the remedy for revenue default. Within a short time after the settlement, the earlier practices of imprisoning defaulting landlords and distraining their personal property were abolished, as trenching on the dignity and freedom of the position. But it had been ruled from the first that the fixed revenue (which would gradually become lighter and lighter as land and its produce rose in value and as new land was profitably cultivated) must be punctually paid; and therefore the estate, or part of it, would be sold at once if default was allowed to occur. Now, as a careless or dishonest manager might burden his estate recklessly, and so destroy its sale value before defaulting, it was necessarily provided that contracts and charges imposed by the defaulter were, with certain exceptions, void or voidable as regards the purchaser. When a sale occurred—and, as Sir W. Hunter has explained, this at first very frequently happened—most rents had to be fixed afresh, practically at the pleasure of the new owner. The second measure was passed in 1799. The landlords complained that while the state demanded its revenue with strict punctuality, they had no correspondingly speedy means of recovering the rents, on which their ability to pay depended.[23] A power of summary distraint was accordingly given, and terms of the regulation (VII. of 1799) were found so to operate

[22] In 1806 Colonel Munro, whose authority on revenue matters will not be questioned, wrote: 'I make this conclusion upon the supposition that they' (the zamindars) 'are to be at liberty to raise their rents, like landowners in other countries: otherwise if they are restricted from raising the assessment . . . and are at the same time liable for all losses, they have not the free management of their estates and hardly deserve the name of owners.' The whole subject (including the various minutes written and the provisions of the regulations) is fairly summed up in Dr. Field's *Landholding in various Countries* (Calcutta, 1885, 2nd ed.), pp. 535 ff.

[23] The only remedy was the slow and costly process of a regular civil suit at the district head-quarters. See, for instance, the letters Nos. 3348–9 (Jan. 1794), in vol. ii.

that the landlord could realise very much what he chose to declare to be the correct rent.

These provisions, worked as they were under the influence of the idea that a rise of rents was only a natural feature of landed property, would nevertheless have been much shorn of their ill effect if there had been any standard by which to ascertain the proper rent rates, but this was almost wholly wanting. The real fact of the matter is, that no plan like Shore's, nor indeed any other plan for the comprehensive adjustment of the surviving privileges of the (now subordinate) landholders, nor any rule of fair rent assessment, could have been effective without a survey of holdings and a new record of rights; and both were impossible, or beyond the realm of practical contemplation, at the time.[24] It is not really a tenable view, that 'records of right' or satisfactory lists of customary rates prevalent in *parganas* existed—certainly not of such a kind as would have enabled protection to be given by written rules or regulations on the sole basis of their contents. Still less is it possible to conclude that the non-retention (*as government servants*) of the accountants of villages, and the abolition of the *kānūngos* of fiscal subdivisions, were the causes of the failure of the settlement to provide due protection for the raiyats.

The lists of village and *pargana* revenue rates (now become the middlemen's rents) were never records of right or title, as modern settlement records are; and the rates themselves had become so various and so unequal, that no just conclusion could be drawn from them in the case of a dispute.[25] And the settlement did not abolish the village control or its accounts. On the contrary Regulation VIII. expressly provided that if in any village a *patwāri* (accountant) did not exist, one was to be forthwith appointed. The government persisted in the effort to restore these officers for some years.[26]

But the whole ideal of the new position conceded to the landlords was, to leave them in as much independence as possible, and to refuse to pry into the internal affairs of their estates. As

[24] It was not till 1822 that Holt Mackenzie succeeded, in the N.W. Provinces, in enforcing (against considerable opposition) the necessity of a survey and record of rights. Even then for twenty years the authorities had gone on (in those provinces) trying to do without either. But by 1822 the necessary establishments were much more easily attainable.

[25] How much this was the case may be seen from the proofs collected by Dr. Field (*Landholding*, &c., pp. 606–7). Mr. Colebrooke's able minute of 1812 put in the clearest light how worthless these records were, when they existed at all. It is true that this minute was written some twenty years after the settlement; but long before that the zamindari management (hardly controlled at all by the state) had upset all regularity in the rates or in the lists of them.

[26] We find records in the volumes up to 1801, still asking if the orders had been carried into effect. See, for instance, No. 5831 (*Circular*), in June 1796; No. 6601, July 1797; No. 8730, January 1800.

the revenue payable was now fixed for ever, and (under such circumstances) was to be paid without regard to temporary profits and losses, the control of the *kānūngo* of each local subdivision ceased to be of any use.[27] The only thing such an officer could do would be to watch against oppressive acts of the landlord, and maintain the rights of his subordinate landholders; this was an impossible position, even if he had the moral courage to attempt it. And very much the same was true of the village accountants. How could they be maintained as servants of government—that is, in a position (as the lawyers say) 'adverse' to the landlord? Of course their accounts were kept, and had been increasingly so kept, long before the settlement, not so as to be a check upon the landlords, or to maintain the rates really due from the raiyats according to the last authorised adjustment of them, but so as to facilitate the collections of the landlords, at rates which the government had (in fact) long allowed them to dictate. Both *kānūngos* and *patwāris*, therefore, became useless as checks, and the government found it a useless expense to pay them.

The fact is that the old system of graduated local control was effective only on the supposition that direct dealings with the original village proprietors were continued. At the present day the system only works to advantage in provinces where government deals directly with the villages, whether with the individual holders, as in the great western and southern provinces, or with co-sharing village proprietary bodies regarded as jointly responsible units, as in North-West India. The ultimate abolition of government-paid local agents was the necessary outcome of the system of acknowledging great local landlords.[28]

It is not too much to say that the root of all the early tenant difficulties in Bengal was, just as in Ireland, the inability of the authorities to contemplate a relation which they might call a 'tenancy' if they pleased, but which was founded on *status*, not on *contract*. It is worthy of remark that at the time of the permanent settlement, the modern capitalist theory of rent was not invented; nor did it appear till some twenty-five years later. Still it was thought that rent was the result of a mutual agreement based on the intuitive feeling of either party as to what one was able to ask and the other would find it possible to pay. And under

[27] As early as February 1786 (vol. i. No. 1162) report was made that the *kānūngos* were of no use. In July 1793 (vol. i. Nos. 2916, 2928, 2970, and 3014) the orders were given for abolition. Attempts at restoration were made in 1816–9.

[28] In later times there has been an immense correspondence about the revival of village accountants; but the very fact illustrates what is said above: for the proposals only arose when the old zamindaris had been largely broken up (see Sir W. Hunter's remarks, i. 110–4) and a greatly increased number of much smaller estates had to be looked after; and above all when a great number of fixed subordinate 'tenures' and tenant rights were acknowledged by law.

the influence of such an idea, as the necessary concomitant of a landlord and tenant tenure, the framers of the regulations omitted to declare that permanent (or resident) raiyats' rents could not be raised, and left the perfectly natural inference [29] that they could. The worst feature in the uncertainty thus created was not so much that rack-renting became very prevalent, for that may be doubted; [30] but that year by year the means of distinguishing between tenants who were really the original landholders or their direct representatives, and those who owed their position to a subsequent personal contract with the landlord, became more and more difficult to find. Ignorant peasants do not know how to preserve proof of material facts; and in the end some arbitrary rule has to be resorted to, when the legislature desires to classify tenants into those who have rights of status and those who have not.

But the after history of the tenant question belongs to a period long subsequent to the records in Sir W. Hunter's four volumes. A few words may, however, be added to complete the story, at least as far as the first tenant law. An official inquiry was instituted in 1811, which produced (among others) a minute by Mr. H. Colebrooke, that attracted great attention and resulted in the passing of Regulation V. of 1812. This law endeavoured to limit the alteration of rents on the occurrence of a sale, and to find an equitable rule for fixing rents by comparison with those paid on similar adjacent lands. The law was unquestionably designed to be in redress of tenants' grievances; but unfortunately, being defective in itself, and also nullified by other legislation, it only added to the troubles it was meant to relieve. Next, Lord Moira wrote a notable minute in 1815, which indicates the change that had come over official opinion; but matters were not then ripe for a comprehensive tenant law. It needed the experience of another great settlement—that of North-West India—before a practical mode of dealing with tenant rights suggested itself. At last, in 1859, the first idea of a tenant law found expression. In the meantime some of the difficulties were obviated, or at least lessened, by the increased number of the courts, and their being more accessible and more speedy in deciding; the sale law was improved, especially as to the extension of the list of existing leases and tenures which were not voidable on a sale; there was also a gradual improvement in the mode of registering

[29] See Colonel Munro's remarks, quoted above, p. 288, n. 22.

[30] In spite of all the occasional or frequent harshness of landlords, custom, if only recent custom, and the fact that neighbouring lands of the same quality must naturally pay alike, gradually established a kind of standard which was not generally ignored. In his study of the Dinājpur zamindaris, Dr. Buchanan noticed that the landlords had an idea that resident raiyats could not have their rent (*eo nomine*) raised (without state sanction); but they made out an increase in other ways. The prohibition against 'extras' never was really effective as long as the tenants would submit to the demand.

subordinate interests and so protecting them. These interests are now numerous and afford a rather curious study. One large class, the modern *patnī* tenure, has been made the subject of some very interesting remarks by Sir W. Hunter. These tenures cannot, however, here be further noticed. The latest Bengal law (revision of 1885) has found it desirable to use the word 'tenure' in a special sense, to indicate these intermediate interests, which lie halfway, as it were, between soil ownership and contract tenancy.

One possibility of final solution for tenant troubles still remains unapplied. Alone among the provinces of India, Bengal has no cadastral survey, and consequently no agricultural statistics. Topographical maps, and to some extent surveys of the outer boundaries of estates and even villages, exist, but that is all. This is a subject which would require a separate article to explain. If Bengal has prospered under the permanent settlement, it is not because of the principles of the settlement or its law. It is because a firm, and on the whole good, administration, profound peace, a free and ever expanding market, and a naturally fertile soil, have produced their own ameliorating results. Education, too, is slowly filtering down to the tenant class, and has done something to make them more self-reliant and able to maintain their rights.

B. H. BADEN-POWELL.

Notes and Documents

THE POPE WHO DEPOSED HIMSELF.

The maxim that a man may not be judge in his own cause is commonly qualified by the exception that sometimes he has to be so by necessity—to wit, when he is the only competent judge. In the later middle ages a current illustration of this was the legend of the pope who was said to have condemned himself. A learned friend once told me that he had met with the story in an English book in some such form as this (the reference cannot now be found; it may be in one of the later Year Books) :

> Venit Papa ad cardinales et dixit: Peccavi; iudicate me. Responderunt cardinales: Nolumus te iudicare. Dixit Papa: Quis ergo me iudicabit? Responderunt: Iudica te ipsum. Tunc dixit Papa: Iudico me cremari. Et crematus est.

After I had wondered for some time whether this fable had any assignable connexion with real events I was put on the right track by the never-failing learning and courtesy of Lord Acton. The proximate historical origin seems to be in the alleged circumstances of Gregory VI's deposition at the synod of Sutri, A.D. 1046. That Gregory was then and there deposed for simony is a certain historical fact. Most of the contemporary authorities treat the proceeding, expressly or by implication, as an act of imperial authority. Bonitho or Bonizo, however, gives an elaborate account how Gregory asked the bishops what was to be done; how they replied, *Tu in sinu tuo collige causam tuam; tu proprio ore te iudica* . . . and how Gregory condemned himself in this manner: *Ego Gregorius propter turpissimam venalitatem quae meae electioni irrepsit a Romano episcopatu iudico me submovendum.* This would be likely enough, in the course of three or four centuries, to produce variants of which the form above given would be a very late and crude example. But the ultimate origin lies further back. Jaffé[1] points out that not only is a similar story told in the apocryphal acts of the council of Sinuessa concerning Marcellinus, who is said to have abdicated or deposed himself as having been guilty of idolatry,[2] but Bonitho

[1] 'Monumenta Gregoriana,' *Bibl. Rer. Germ.* vol. ii. p. 599.
[2] *Cf.* Döllinger, *Die Papstfabeln des Mittelalters*, p. 48.

has, in another work, dressed up this story in almost the same words that he applies to the case of Gregory VI. Accordingly Jaffé has a very bad opinion of Bonitho's veracity (*perfectum autem mentiendi artificem in hac re quoque se praebet Bonitho*). One or two recent writers appear to persist, notwithstanding Jaffé's exposure, in holding that something of the kind described by Bonitho did happen at Sutri.[3] I suppose it is just possible to believe that the fable of Marcellinus was acted on as an historical precedent.

The fiction was by no means purposeless. Its object, as Döllinger and Jaffé explain, was to reinforce the doctrine that the pope is not subject to any earthly jurisdiction. Perhaps some reader of the English Historical Review may be able to supply further links in the history of the legend. F. Pollock.

THE MURDER OF HENRY CLEMENT.

Any English document of the thirteenth century which shows us witnesses being examined separately as to the perpetration of a crime is of so rare a kind that the following extract from a Coram Rege roll seems worthy to be printed. It relates to the murder of Henry Clement in the year 1235 of which Matthew Paris has told us.[1] Clement was a clerk whom Maurice Fitzgerald, the justiciar of Ireland, had sent as envoy to the king. It will be seen from the following record—and this we might learn from Paris also—that the guilt of the murder was attributed to two very different persons. On the one hand suspicion fell on Gilbert Marshall, Earl of Pembroke, for Clement, it was said, had bragged of having a hand in the death of Richard Marshall, Gilbert's brother, who perished in Ireland in the year 1234. On the other hand there were some who laid the murder of Clement at the door of William de Marisco, whose father, Geoffrey de Marisco, was supposed to have taken part in the plot which lured Richard Marshall to his fate. This of course is strange; it is much as if we were certain that some modern Irish crime had been committed either by Fenians or by Orangemen, and yet knew not which party to accuse. It suggests that there was a triangular quarrel between the Marshalls, the Fitzgeralds, and the family of Marsh or Dumaresqe. The truth may be that Clement had been babbling and had thus incurred the enmity of all parties. The end of the matter was that Gilbert Marshall proved his innocence, while William de Marisco was outlawed, took to piracy, and in 1242 was hanged as a traitor. We know also that Gilbert Marshall was suspected of shielding William de Marisco from justice.[2]

[3] Baxmann, *Die Politik der Päpste*, ii. 206.

[1] Matth. Par. *Chron. Maj.* iii. 327, iv. 193–6; *Royal Letters*, ed. Shirley, i. 469–70; Sweetman's *Calendar of Irish Documents*, Nos. 2262, 2291, 2321.

[2] Sweetman's *Calendar*, No. 2321.

The following record stands on Curia Regis Roll No. **115** (18–19 Hen. III.), m. 33 d. It has been copied by Miss Salisbury. The roll is in bad condition; some words are illegible and the words here printed within brackets are barely to be read. I have endeavoured to write out in full the words which are contracted in the original document. I have read no other record of this age which shows us a similar attempt to obtain evidence of a crime from witnesses who are examined one by one.

F. W. MAITLAND.

MIDD. { *Henricus Clement nuncius Iusticiarii Hybernie occisus fuit apud Westmonasterium in domo Magistri Davidis le Cirurgien.*

Et Willelmus Perdriz nuncius domini Regis tunc fuit in domo illa et dicit quod post mediam noctem [3] ante diem Lune proximum ante Ascensci-onem Domini venerunt v. homines armati vel sex vel ibi circiter et plures alii [4] nec nescivit numerum ad domum praedicti Davidis et fregerunt hostium aule et postea intraverunt aulam et ascenderunt versus unum solium et hostium solii fregerunt et ibi occiderunt predictum Henricum et vulneraverunt predictum Magistrum Davidem. Et quesitus si sciret qui ipsi fuerunt dicit quod non. Quesitus eciam [5] ipse fecit dicit quod non fuit ausus aliquid facere propter metum predictorum armatorum et dixit predicti homines dicebant sibi quod teneret se in pace et quod non oporteret eum timere. Et dicit quod credit quod plures extra domum fuerunt in vico quia cum idem Henricus vellet in fugam convertere et abire et cum vellet exire per quandam fenestram retraxit se propter multitudinem gentium quam vidit extra in vico.

Et Brianus nuncius Iusticiarii Hybernie tunc fuit in curia in quadam domo forinseca in quodam stabulo et dicit quod neminem vidit nec aliquid scivit antequam factum illud perpetratum fuit et tunc levavit clamorem sed dicit quod nescivit qui fuerunt sed dicit quod homines Willelmi de Marisco minati fuerunt eidem Henrico de corpore suo quia dicebat quod idem Henricus fuit in curia et secutus fuit curiam domini Regis et ipsum et alios de Hibernia impedivit quod negocia sua facere non potuerunt in curia. Et dicit quod habet in suspicione ipsum Willelmum et suos et homines Marescalli sed dicit quod nescit aliquem nominare. Et dicit quod suspicionem habet de quodam valeto Ricardi Syward [6] sed nescit illum nominare.

Willelmus garcio predicti Henrici dicit quod iacuit in quodam stabulo in curia et quod nichil inde scivit antequam factum illud factum fuit [7] quod nescit qui illi fuerunt sed dicit quod predictus Henricus sepius dixit in hoc dimidio anno quod homines Marescalli ei minati fuerunt sepius. Et quesitus si aliquem nominavit unquam dicit quod non.

Et Willelmus homo ipsius Perdriz venit et dicit quod iacuit in aula

[3] This seems to be the night between 13 and 14 May 1235.

[4] *Et plures alii* interlined.

[5] Supply *quid*.

[6] Richard Siward was a friend of the Marshalls. This witness, who is a servant of Fitzgerald, seems to suspect both Marshall and Marisco.

[7] Supply *et*.

et dicit quod plures venerunt in domum circiter duodecim vel ampliores[8] videbatur ei quod domus plena erat sed non fuit ausus clamare sed cooperuit capud suum quadam barhudo. Et dicit quando recesserunt ipse secutus fuit eos cum clamore usque ad cimiterium Westmonasterii et unus eorum reverti voluit super eum et ipse in domum intravit et non fuit ausus ulterius sequi. Et dicit quod tres vidit euntes versus cimiterium cum gladiis extractis.

Sander Scot garcio Thome le Messager dicit quod iacuit in domo et dicit quod vidit sex armatos quolibet genere armorum et caligis ferreis et quidam tulerunt quandam grossam torchiam tortam in[9] manu sua usque ad hostium solarii et quando perceperunt quod Henricus fuit in solio tunc illam extinxerunt et intraverunt ad faciendum illud factum.

Alicia hospita ipsius Magistri Davidis dicit quod iacuit in quadam camera in domo sua et famula sua similiter et pueri sui cum ea et quando audivit frangere hostium aule versus vicum ipsa voluit exire sed non fuit ausa exeundi pro famula sua et ipsa levavit clamorem et aperuit quandam fenestram versus curiam et nullum de garcionibus qui iacuerunt in stabulo potuit evigilare. Quesita si aliquem cognoscebat vel videret dicit quod non, set dicit quod audivit eundem Henricum dicentem Dominica qua occisus fuit eadem nocte quod timebat sibi ne interficeretur et voluit potius esse in Hibernia quam in Anglia.

Et Hawisia famula ipsius Alicie dicit similiter quod fuit in camera illa sed neminem vidit nec aliquem cognovit. Et filia ipsius Alicie nichil aliud dicit.

Rogerus de Norwico qui iacuit in tentoriis ante portam domini Regis dicit quod audivit homines euntes super calcetam et vidit plures circiter sexdecim et quorum quidam fuerunt armati et habuerunt gladios extractos set neminem cognovit et dicit quod equi eorum fuerunt in cimiterio et plures illic tendebant et unus ivit versus villam.

Godefridus Sutor qui similiter iacuit in tentoriis dicit quod audivit equos et fremitum equorum et tunc post parvum intervallum fregerunt hostium aule et intraverunt sed nescit quid tunc ibi fecerunt sed audivit ictus gladiorum.

Johannes filius Rogeri de Norwico similiter dicit quod neminem vidit sed audivit tumultum sed nullam scit certitudinem.

Ricardus Tremle iuratus[10] dicit quod nichil inde scit nisi quod audivit clamorem nec ab aliquo audivit nec inquirere potuit si aliqui ei minati essent vel quod aliquis ei aliquid vellet nisi bonum.

[Dictus] Magister David[11] iuratus dicit quod neminem cognovit sed armati fuerunt circiter quinque vel sex de illis qui . . . ascenderunt in solium et ipsum vulneraverunt[12] et cum ipse Henricus aperuisset fenestram et vellet [exire retraxit se] propter multitudinem gentium qui fuerunt in vico. Et dicit quod ipsum Henricum interfecerunt . . . dominus Rex [esset] nuper apud Roffam venerunt quidam Henricus de Ponte Arche et Henricus de . . . [et] minati fuerunt ei ita quod insecuti fuerunt eum supra pontem Roffe cum quodam garcione et ille [garcio] habuit cultellum

[8] Supply *et*. [9] Three preceding words interlined; *quandam grossam* on erasure.
[10] It is not said of the previous witnesses that they were sworn.
[11] The surgeon in whose house the murder was done.
[12] The witness himself was wounded.

[semitractum] ut idem Henricus dicebat et quando cepit se ad cultellum suum ille garcio . . . et recessit et idem Henricus de Ponte Arche dicebat quod habuit spinam in pede et . . . recederet a predicto Henrico. Et dicit quod quidam parvus nuntius Willelmi Marescalli cum minutis butonibus [13] venit cotidie ad inquirendum . . . dictus Henricus ubi esset et hospitari vellet. Dicit eciam quod venerunt cum quadam magna torchia.

Willelmus de Cantilupo et Ricardus de Stafford milites de Hibernia iurati dicunt quod idem Henricus cum esset apud Roffam ita fuit insultatus ut ipse Henricus eis dicebat et secundum quod predictus Magister David dixit et eciam apud Suttone insidiatum fuit ei ita quod premunitus fuit a quodam milite familiare domini Regis. Dicunt eciam quod cum dominus Rex nuper esset apud Windesores venit Willelmus de Marisco et dicebat eidem Henrico quod ipse Henricus impedivit eum quod non potuit negocia sua expedire et promovere in curia quia majorem habuit graciam quam ipse habuit erga dominum Regem et dixit quod lueret de corpore suo et quod si ipsum interfecisset pacem faceret cum domino suo.[14]

. . . xxiiij^or^ [de vico] Westmonasterii et ultra la Cherringe et versus Tathulle dicunt super sacramentum suum quod nullam . . . veritatem nec aliquid audiverunt nec quis hoc potuit fecisse.[15]

. . .[16] qui interfuerunt morti ipsius Henrici et qui utlagati sunt Willelmus de [Marisco] . . . Burgundie Philippus de Dinant Thomas de Erdinton . . . de Ponte Archi Eustachius Cumin Rogerus de Marisco.[17]

A BIOGRAPHICAL NOTICE OF DANTE IN THE 1494 EDITION OF THE 'SPECULUM HISTORIALE.'

THE 'Speculum Historiale' forms, as is well known, the last division[1] of the 'Majus Speculum,' the vast encyclopædic work of Vincent de Beauvais. As Vincent is generally supposed to have died about the year 1264,[2] it was naturally not to be expected that his 'Speculum' should contain a notice of Dante, who was not born until 1265. Great was my surprise, therefore, on turning over the pages of the first Venice edition (1494) of the 'Speculum Historiale,' to find the name of 'Dantes alugerius' at the head of a paragraph consisting of a short biographical notice of the Florentine poet,

[13] The five preceding words are interlined. Instead of *Willelmi Marescall'* should we read *Willelmi de Marisco*? Can this be an early appearance of the boy in buttons?

[14] William de Marisco told Henry Clement that if William slew Henry, William would be able to make his peace with Henry's master, Maurice Fitzgerald.

[15] This jury of twenty-four is called in, not to draw inferences from the evidence already given, but to give, if possible, additional evidence.

[16] Supply *Nomina eorum* or the like.

[17] From other sources we learn that the names of the persons outlawed were William de Marisco, William of Pont de l'Arche, John Cabus, Walter Sancmelle, Philip of Dinant, Thomas of Erdinton, Henry of Colombieres, Eustace Cumin and Roger de Marisco.

[1] A fourth part, entitled *Speculum Morale*, is included in all the printed editions of Vincent de Beauvais; but this has been conclusively shown to be a later compilation.

[2] According to one account he was alive as late as 1276.

and concluding with the date of his death (1321). Plainly in the edition before me the chronicle of Vincent had been continued by some later hand. Accordingly, on making a careful examination of the book, I found that ninety-two chapters had been interpolated towards the close of Vincent's own work, the interpolation beginning in the middle of cap. cv. of lib. xxxii. (according to the division adopted in the Strassburg edition of 1473). Vincent's chapter commences as follows:

De temporibus presentibus. Ecce tempora sexte etatis [3] usque ad presentem annum summatim perstringendo descripsi qui est annus christianissimi regis nostri ludowici .XVIII. imperii vero friderici .XXXIII.^us Pontificatus autem innocencii quarti secundus . Qui est porro ab incarnacione domini millesimus .cc^us xliiij^us . A creacione mundi quintimillesimus .cc^us vj^us Et hoc duntaxat iuxta minorem numerum quem in hac tota serie secuti sumus. Porro secundum majorem numerum ex antiqua translacione sumptum, quem supra posuimus, annus presens existit ab inicio seculi sextus millesimus .cccc^us xlij^us. . . .

At this point, in the middle of the chapter, in the Venice edition of 1494 (as well as in that of 1591, which is practically a reprint of the former) the narrative of Vincent de Beauvais is suddenly interrupted with the remark: 'Hactenus Vincentii Historia. Quae vero sequuntur usque in tempus currens, anni, videlicet M.ccccxciiii. ex cronica nova sunt addita.'

Here, in the edition of 1591, follows a new heading: 'Rerum gestarum | Ex Historiis | Ac Chronicis fide dignis | collectarum, et excerptarum | Quae ab Anno M.ccxliiij. usque ad M.ccccxciiij. scitu digna visa sunt, | ad Speculum Historiale compendiosa appendix.' Then follow ninety-one chapters (unnumbered in the edition of 1494) of the interpolated chronicle. At the end of these is printed a Latin sapphic poem addressed 'Ad deum optimum maximum | de his quae mirabilia gessit pro iustissimo | et excelso Maximiliano Rege | Romanorum.' At the close of the ninety-first chapter is appended this notice: 'Haec habuimus quae ex chronica nova adjiceremus.' Then follows another interpolated chapter (the ninety-second), entitled, 'De morte, ac fine rerum;' which again is followed by two short Latin poems, one in hexameters, the other in elegiacs, on the same subject. The next chapter (ninety-three) resumes the narrative of Vincent at the commencement of his cap. cvi., 'De signis futurae consummationis,' and follows him to the end, the work being concluded in twenty-three chapters (cvi–cxxviii.) dealing with the Coming of Antichrist, Hell-fire, the Glorification of Saints, &c.

[3] Vincent divides the history of the world into six ages:—1. From the Creation to the Flood. 2. From the Flood to Abraham. 3. From Abraham to David. 4. From David to the Capture of Jerusalem. 5. From the Capture of Jerusalem to the Coming of Christ. 6. From A.D. 1 to the end of the world.

I have searched in vain through the well-known bibliographies, as well as through the various notices of Vincent de Beauvais, for any account of this interpolation. The only mention of it I have been able to find is in a meagre note by Clement Davy in his 'Bibliothèque Curieuse Historique et Critique'[4] in which he says of the Venice edition of 1494 of the 'Speculum Historiale:' 'L'on y a ajouté un petit supplément au "Speculum Historiale" que l'on a continué jusqu'à l'année 1494.' The circumstance of this addition having escaped notice is easily accounted for by the fact that it is not introduced as an *appendix*, but as an *interpolation*; so that the conclusion of the work, being the same in the Venice editions of 1494 and 1591, which contain the supplementary chapters, as in the Strassburg edition of 1473, which does not, presents no clue to the bibliographer. Among other interesting notices which occur in these interpolated chapters is one of Vincent de Beauvais himself, with a list of his works.[5]

The biographical account of Dante, referred to at the beginning of this article, runs as follows:[6]

Dantes alugerius[7] patria florentinus vates et poeta conspicuus ac theologorum[8] [*sic*] precipue tempestate ista claruit. Vir in cives suos egregia nobilitate venerandus: qui licet ex longo exilio damnatus tenues illi fuissent substantie, semper tamen phisicis atque theologicis doctrinis imbutus vacavit studiis. unde cum florentia a factione nigra pulsus fuisset parisiense gymnasium accessit. et cum circa poeticam scientiam eruditissimus esset opus inclytum atque divinum lingua vernacula sub titulo comedie edidit. in quo omnium celestium terrestriumque ac infernorum profunda contemplatus singula queque historice allegorice tropologice ac anagogice descripsit. Aliud quoque de monarchia mundi. Hic cum ex gallicis regressus fuisset friderico arragonensi regi et domino cani grandi scaligero adhesit. Denique mortuo cane principe veronensi et ipse apud ravennam Anno domini MCCCXXI etatis sue quinquagesimo sexto diem obiit.

[4] Vol. iii. p. 82, note 62.

[5] This seems of sufficient interest to warrant its transcription here. It will be noticed that the *Speculum Morale* is duly ncluded among Vincent's works, though it has no claim to rank as such, being largely a compilation from St. Thomas Aquina and other contemporary writers. 'Vincentius gallus patria burgundus belvacensis historicus et theologus ordinis predicatorum pater, per hoc ipsum tempus claruit. Et innumerabiles historias multis sub voluminibus comprehendit. Quatuor enim specula edidit de omni scibili materia: Doctrinale, Morale, Naturale, et historiale, quod usque ad annum domini M.ccliiij [a mistake for Mccxliiij—see Vincent's own account quoted above] produxit. Atque alia multa composuit videlicet Librum gratie, Librum de Sancto Joanne evangelista, Librum de eruditione puerorum regalium, et Consolatorium de morte amici. Et quammaxime de laudibus dive ac gloriose virginis Marie tractatum celeberrimum edidit.'

[6] It is placed at the end of Cap. 91 in the edition of 1591, between an account of the death of King John of Bohemia (1346) and a record of the marriage of Azzo VIII of Este to Beatrice, youngest daughter of Charles II of Anjou (1305).

[7] The edition of 1591 reads *Aligerius*.

[8] Some word has evidently dropped out here.

This notice is chiefly remarkable on account of the very interesting statement, which I believe to occur nowhere else, that Dante attached himself to 'the king Frederick of Aragon'—*friderico arragonensi regi adhesit.* There cannot be the least doubt as to the identity of the person intended. There was no king of Aragon of the name of Frederick, but there was a well-known prince of that name belonging to the royal house of Aragon who was the wearer of a royal crown: namely, Frederick, commonly known as Don Frederick, the third son of Peter III of Aragon, who in 1296 assumed the crown of Sicily, and retained it until his death in 1337. On the death, in 1285, of Peter III, king of Aragon and Sicily, his eldest son, Alphonso, became king of Aragon, while James, the second son, succeeded to the crown of Sicily. When Alphonso died, in 1291, James succeeded him in Aragon, leaving the government of Sicily in the hands of his younger brother Frederick. A few years later, however, at the instigation of Pope Boniface VIII, James, ignoring the claims of his brother, agreed to cede Sicily to the Angevin claimant, Charles II of Naples. The Sicilians, on hearing of this agreement, renounced their allegiance to James, and proclaimed his brother Frederick king in his stead, under the title of Frederick II (1296). Charles and James thereupon made war upon the latter, but in 1299 James withdrew his troops, and in 1302, on the failure of a fresh expedition against him under Charles of Valois and Robert, duke of Calabria, Frederick was confirmed in possession of the kingdom of Sicily under the title of king of Trinacria,[9] receiving in marriage at the same time Charles II's third daughter, Eleanor.

A peculiar interest attaches to this statement of the chronicler as to Dante's relations with Frederick of Aragon, owing to the fact that, as every student of Dante knows, the poet never mentions that prince's name, nor refers to him, save with bitter reproach and condemnation,[10] and this, though his reign was most beneficial to the island of Sicily, and he himself appears to have been greatly beloved by his subjects. It is generally supposed that the explanation of Dante's bad opinion of him is to be found in Frederick's

[9] This title was doubtless chosen in order to emphasise the fact that Frederick was king of the island of Sicily only, and had no title to sovereignty over the Two Sicilies, a designation which included the kingdom of Naples as well as that of Sicily proper.

[10] See *Purg.* vii. 119; *Par.* xix. 131, xx. 63. An apparent exception is in the passage (*Purg.* iii. 116) where he is referred to (as some think) as 'l' onor di Cicilia.' But even if the commentators who understand this of Frederick are correct in their interpretation, it does not necessarily involve an inconsistency on Dante's part; for the opinion may be regarded as being rather that of the speaker—namely, Manfred, the prince's grandfather—than that of the poet himself in this case. Manfred would naturally take a more favourable view than Dante of the character of his grandson, who had offered such a stout and successful resistance to the representative of the hated house of Anjou.

policy after the death of the emperor, Henry of Luxemburg, to whom Dante had looked as the saviour of Italy. During the emperor's lifetime Frederick had acted as his ally against his most formidable opponent, Robert of Naples, and had had the command of the combined Genoese and Sicilian fleets. On Henry's death (in 1313) he went to Pisa, and was offered by the Pisans the lordship of their city, in the hope that he would carry on the campaign against king Robert and the Tuscan Guelfs. But Frederick, for whom the offer had no attractions, imposed such hard conditions that they practically amounted to a refusal. Leaving Pisa, he returned to Sicily, and thenceforth, withdrawing as much as possible from Italian affairs, he devoted himself mainly to the consolidation of his own kingdom.[11] It was doubtless this want of sympathy with the fate of Italy which aroused the wrath and indignation of the Florentine poet.[12]

Whatever may have been the nature of Dante's relations with Frederick, it may be pretty safely assumed that they came to an end after the refusal of the latter to identify himself further with the Ghibelline cause in Tuscany.

The anonymous chronicler's laconic statement—*Friderico arragonensi regi adhesit*—opens up all sorts of curious speculations as to Dante's political position in the Ghibelline camp. He certainly regarded himself as a person of political importance : witness the tone of his several letters addressed to the princes and peoples of Italy (*Epist.* V.), to the Florentine Guelfs (*Epist.* VI.), and to the Emperor Henry himself (*Epist.* VII.) ; and this statement, if it were possible to accept it without question, would go far to prove that he was in direct and personal contact with some of the most exalted members of the imperial party in Italy. Unfortunately, explicit as the statement is, and difficult as it is to see what motive there can have been for its invention, it is impossible to regard it without grave suspicion. Not only is it unsupported by evidence from any other quarter, but we have in the very next sentence an equally explicit statement which is demonstrably false, as it involves a serious blunder in chronology. The chronicler goes on to state that

[11] 'Federigo re di Cicilia il qual era in mare con suo stuolo . . . aggiuntosi già co' Genovesi, sentendo della morte dello 'mperadore, venne in Pisa, e non avendo potuto vedere lo 'mperadore vivo, sì il volle vedere morto. I Pisani per dotta de' guelfi di Toscana e del re Ruberto sì vollono il detto don Federigo fare loro signore; non volle la signoria, ma per sua scusa domandò loro molto larghi patti fuori di misura, con tutto che per gli più si credette che, bene ch' e' Pisani gli avessono fatti, non avrebbe voluto lasciare la stanza di Cicilia per signoreggiare Pisa ; e così sanza grande dimoro si tornò in Cicilia.' Villani, ix. 54.

[12] Dante's earlier denunciations of Frederick in the *Convito* and *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, which were written probably between 1307 and 1310, were doubtless due to the contrast presented to his mind between Sicily as the centre of Italian letters under the Emperor Frederick II and the kingdom distracted as it was by the wars of Frederick of Aragon and his Angevin rival.

after Can Grande's death Dante himself died at Ravenna in 1321. As a matter of fact, Can Grande did not die until eight years after Dante, in 1329, as is correctly recorded in another part of the interpolated chronicle.[13] Under these circumstances the statement as to Dante's relations with Frederick of Aragon, though quite possibly based upon trustworthy information, must be received if not with scepticism, at any rate with reserve, until it can be substantiated from some independent source.

The only other item of special interest in this somewhat meagre account of Dante is the allusion to his straitened circumstances—'although,' says the chronicler, 'his means were slender owing to his being in exile for such a long period, yet he always found leisure for his favourite studies.' This remark lends some support to the theory recently propounded by Dr. Scartazzini that Dante earned his livelihood during his exile by teaching. We may suppose the chronicler's meaning to be that in the intervals of the profession by which he was obliged to support himself the poet found means to pursue his favourite philosophical and theological studies. It can hardly have been as a mere student that he went to the universities of Paris and Bologna during his exile. It is much more probable that he visited those places as being the centres of learning, where he would find the two things he most needed—pupils and books. We are told nothing in this account of the love affairs, the military service, and the embassies, of which we hear so much in the various biographies of Dante ; but details of this sort could perhaps hardly be expected in such a brief notice. It is singular, however, that so little should be said about the poet's writings, the only other work referred to besides the 'Commedia' being the 'De Monarchia.' This is all the more strange because Villani—whose chronicle, one would think, must have been well known and easily accessible—in his chapter on Dante (ix. 136) gives a complete list of the principal works of his illustrious fellow-citizen together with their titles.[14]

I have not, so far, been fortunate enough to discover the source whence this hitherto unnoticed account of Dante was taken. It has every appearance of being derived from some version quite independent of the half-dozen well-known biographies of the poet, and it is much to be hoped that the original may some day come to light.

[13] Cap. 33 of the additional chapters in the edition of 1591, which contains a notice of Can Grande. We here incidentally get another mention of Dante: 'Canis scaliger, qui ex rebus strenuè gestis magnus cognomento appellatus est, . . . erat multe eloquentie princeps comesque perhumanus, nec non et in omnes liberalis, atque doctorum virorum tum ecclesiasticorum tumque oratorum et historicorum ac poetarum assidua familiaritate conjunctus . Inter quos Dantem florentinum poetam ob eius doctrine prestantiam magnis honoribus semper prosequi voluit.'

[14] Save in the case of the *Convito*, which he describes as 'uno commento sopra quattordici sue canzoni morali.'

In addition to the biographical notice of Dante discussed above, the interpolated chapters in the Venice editions of the 'Speculum Historiale' contain an interesting, and in some respects novel, account of the murder of Henry, son of Richard, earl of Cornwall, king of the Romans, by his cousin, Guy de Montfort, in a church at Viterbo. The deed is usually represented as having been premeditated on the part of Guy;[15] but according to this version Guy committed the murder under a sudden impulse on unexpectedly finding himself in close proximity to the prince. It appears that Guy and his cousin both happened to attend mass in the same church at the same hour, and Guy, who entered the church shortly after the prince, being struck by the noble bearing of the latter, learned who he was, and without compunction stabbed him to death on the spot.

Venerat ad pontificem Heinricus, adolescens Richardi regis cornubie olim comitis tunc defuncti[16] filius, multa paterni olim regni[17] negocia apud sedem apostolicam tractaturus. Guido montiffortis et ipse adolescens cum Philippo rege Francorum eodem se contulit. Forte accidit utrumque ad rem divinam sancti Laurentii[18] ecclesiam, que Viterbii est celebris, eadem hora petere. Sed Guido posterior ingressus conspectu[19] liberali ac regia potius facie adolescentem caterva[20] famulatus stipatum [conspexit].[21] Quodam ex suis indicante Richardi filium esse didicit a quo Symon pater in anglia per dolum fuerat interfectus, nullaque loci tentus reverentia incautum aggressus interfecit. Equitibus inde suis et pariter Philippi regis deducentibus ad ruffum[22] etrurie prefectum incolumis pervenit.

I have not succeeded in identifying the 'nova chronica' which is mentioned by the interpolator as the source of his continuation of the 'Speculum Historiale.' Doubtless, as we gather from the remark inserted in the edition of 1591, his information was derived from various quarters. Ptolemy of Lucca ('Ptolemeus lucensis') is quoted as an authority more than once, but it is evident that

[15] See, for instance, the account of the murder in the *Grandes Chroniques de France*: 'Avant que le roy de France venist à Viterbe ne que il fust en la ville entré, Henry le fils au roy d'Alemaigne vint en la cité. Guy de Montfort sot bien sa venue, si se hasta moult de savoir son repaire et où il estoit. En moult grant pensée estoit coment il le pourroit occire.' (*L'istoire au Roy Phelipe III.* Chap. xii.)

[16] The chronicler is mistaken in supposing Richard, king of the Romans, to have been dead at the time of the murder. His death did not occur till more than a year after that event.

[17] The edition of 1494 reads *regna*, that of 1591 reads *regia*; the emendation adopted in the text was suggested to me by Mr. Charles Plummer.

[18] This again is a mistake. The real scene of the murder was not the famous church of San Lorenzo, the present cathedral, but that of San Silvestro, which was comparatively little known. (See Pinzi, *Storia di Viterbo*, ii. 288.)

[19] The editions read *conspectum*. [20] The edition of 1591 reads *catervam*.

[21] I supply *conspexit*, as some such verb is needed to complete the sense.

[22] Conte Rosso degli Aldobrandini, whose daughter Guy had married.

his chronicle was not systematically made use of, since the account given by him of the murder of 'Henry of Almain' is quite different from the one I have reproduced above.

PAGET TOYNBEE

THE ASSASSINATION OF THE GUISES AS DESCRIBED BY THE VENETIAN AMBASSADOR.

THE most direct evidence as to the events which took place at Blois on 23 and 24 Dec. 1588, is undoubtedly the deposition of Monsignor d'Espinac, the archbishop of Lyons, who was in the council chamber along with the cardinal of Guise, when his brother, the duke of Guise, was murdered in an adjoining room. Other contemporary testimony is to be found in the reports furnished to their respective governments by the representatives of foreign powers. Among these, however, I believe that the very full account supplied by the Venetian ambassador has, as yet, escaped notice. I publish the documents here, with a prefatory note of their chief contents.

The Venetian ambassador in France was Giovanni Mocenigo. He and the other diplomatic agents were lodged at the village of Saint Die, a few miles east of the town of Blois. His secretary, however, was constantly in that city to gather information. The States were in session; the Guise party was powerful in Blois; the duke of Guise, as grand master, held the keys of the castle; the king was profoundly suspicious. Mocenigo says that Henry had been warned both by the Duchess d'Aumale, and by Guise's brother, the duke of Mayenne, that there was a scheme on foot to seize his person and carry him to Paris by force. The duke desired to persuade the king that this was not the case. They were at mass together, and at the moment of the elevation Guise said to the king: 'Sire, by yonder true body of our Lord Jesus Christ, I never had such thoughts as these;' to which the king replied that he quite believed it, for no one could deprive him of his liberty; his life, rather, might be in danger. The dread of this danger haunted the mind of Henry, and the idea of murder was ripening in his brain. The queen mother, Catherine, who desired to smooth matters between Henry and the League, was lying in bed ill with fever and catarrh, which, owing to her advanced age, caused lively fears for her life, and quite prevented her from taking that paramount place in the councils of the king which it had been her habit to fill.

It is well known that Guise neglected the frequent warnings which he received; his scornful answer to the message left upon his plate at supper showed that he despised the king and was convinced that 'he would not dare.' But he was wrong. On the

evening of Thursday, 22 Dec., Henry resolved upon his line of action. He announced that the day following he intended to leave Blois, and ordered fifteen or twenty of his gentlemen of the chamber to remain all night in the castle. A council was summoned for Friday morning, early; and, as certain financial matters were to be discussed, the presence of Guise and the cardinal his brother would be necessary. The king retired to sleep. He rose two hours before dawn, and, calling his attendants, he explained in few though weighty words the intentions of Guise, and his own resolve to cause the duke to be slain; but he begged his adherents if they shrank from such a task to say so frankly. All replied that they were most ready to carry out his majesty's orders. Henry then began to unfold his scheme for the assassination: some were instructed to seize the duke by the arms the moment he entered the chamber, others were to deprive him of his sword, others again were to stab him; each one had his work allotted him. The king then left some of his suite in his bedchamber, placed others in a neighbouring cabinet, and himself retired, with Signor Alfonso Corso d'Ornano, to a second cabinet likewise opening off the bedchamber. When day dawned the council met in the council hall; the cardinal of Guise was absent, but appeared when summoned, and the sitting was opened. Meantime a message arrived from the king demanding the duke's immediate presence in his private chamber. The duke obeyed at once, and on entering the bedroom he inquired in which of the two closets his majesty might be; he was instantly surrounded and stabbed, Mocenigo thinks by Loignac; he uttered one great cry, 'This is for my sins,' and so died.

The noise of the scuffle was heard in the council chamber, where the cardinal, recognising his brother's voice, sprang to his feet and made as though he would go to his aid. But the Marshal d'Aumont and others, with drawn swords, barred his passage. The doors of the castle were instantly locked, and the cardinal of Guise and the archbishop of Lyons were made to enter a chamber which had been already prepared for them. The Cardinal de Bourbon, Madame de Nemours, the duke her son, Elbeuf and the duke of Guise's secretary, Pericard, were arrested in their own rooms. The provost of the merchants, one of the eschevins of Paris, and the president Neuilli were also seized in the hall which served as the meeting-place of the estates.

The king then went downstairs to his mother's room. He found Catherine awakened by the noise, and anxious; and he told her that the duke was dead, and he at last was king. He excused himself for not having informed her of his design on the ground that he did not wish to disturb her now that she was ill. The queen was so amazed at the news that she could hardly utter a word;

she merely said, 'I pray God to favour your majesty's acts;' then the king went to mass and to breakfast.

On the morning of the 24th the Cardinal de Guise was strangled, in the room where he had been kept a prisoner since the death of his brother. The depositions of the secretary to the duke of Guise seem to show that his master had been in receipt of one hundred and fifty thousand crowns a year from Spain. The king thought of publishing a statement of Guise's guilt, but that course was rendered difficult by a fact which the ambassador Mocenigo reports on 13 Jan. 1589 to his government. He says:

I am told by a person of the highest authority, that, on the morning of Guise's death, his secretary, who is now in prison, went to Madame de Nemours, and asked what he was to do with a casket of papers of great importance belonging to his master. The duchess told him to burn them at once, which he did without delay; and so nothing can be proved. The worst point is the receipt of the hundred and fifty thousand crowns from Spain; and as that is confirmed by the depositions of the archbishop of Lyons, it seems to be pretty well established; though no papers on the subject have been discovered.

Mocenigo's account of the way in which the news was received by the duke of Mayenne in Lyons, by the people of Paris, and by the king of Navarre, is not without novelty and interest.

The moment the double murder was accomplished Henry despatched Alfonso Corso to Lyons with a letter to the duke of Mayenne announcing the death of the duke of Guise and adding that it had been brought about in consequence of the information furnished by Mayenne himself. The letter ordered Mayenne to retire at once to his governorship. By 6 Jan. 1589, Henry received from the seneschal of Lyons the following account of the way in which Mayenne took the news from Blois. 'On the feast of St. Stephen I was with the duke at mass in the Jesuit's church; there were present M. de la Tremouille and many other gentlemen. A letter was handed to the duke and, on reading it, he was so visibly disturbed that I and all the other gentlemen present were aware of it. While turning this over in my mind, and wondering what it might mean, I heard the duke say, at the conclusion of mass, that he intended to go to S' Desir, where he has a very strongly fortified house, and the nucleus of his troops. I thereupon drew near to M. de la Tremouille and told him to pretend that on account of the gout he was unable to accompany the duke, and to retire into the city at once, to call out the soldiers and to take measures for its safety. I went with the duke to his castle, and when he got there and saw himself in a strong place he read the letter aloud. It contained the news of the duke of Guise's death, and Mayenne, declaring that he held us all for friends and brothers, begged our counsel as to the line of action he should take. After the expression of many and various opinions, he accepted mine, which was that he should obey the king and retire to his government.'

The seneschal, however, either deceived himself or wished to mislead the king. Mayenne entertained no intention of obeying

Henry's orders. By 26 Jan. he had arrested twenty-five members of the parliament of Dijon whom he suspected of being favourable to the king, had placed a strong garrison in that city, and had started on his way to Paris, where his presence was eagerly awaited by the populace, who had lost confidence in the Duke of Aumale. Henry was extremely suspicious of this movement on the part of Mayenne, and persuaded Madame de Nemours to write to the duke, imploring him, for the sake of his kinsfolk in the king's hands, to abstain from any attack on his majesty's person. This entreaty produced no result, and by 6 Feb. Mayenne was in possession of Orleans, was threatening Blois, and, as we shall see presently, very nearly succeeded in securing the persons of his relatives, the prisoners in Amboise.

The king of Navarre received the news in a manner characteristic of himself; he was at table when the information reached him; he remained silent for a space, and then exclaimed that the king of France had rendered him a signal service by killing the duke of Guise, the deadliest foe he had in all the world; but had the duke fallen into his hands he would never have dealt so ill by him.

The news of the murder of the Guises threw Paris into an uproar. The statues, the pictures, the arms of his majesty, were everywhere overthrown and destroyed. The well-known episodes of Lincestre's sermons in favour of revenging the death of the Guises, and of Achille de Harlai's refusal to raise his hand, are recorded by Mocenigo. The Sorbonne discussed the question of excommunicating the king, but resolved to invite the pope to do so instead. A million and a half of gold was raised for the defences of the city. Aumale, whose heartiness in the cause of the League was suspected, found himself obliged to consign his sons as hostages, and his right to grant passports was withdrawn. The first president of the parliament and fifty or sixty members were sent to the Bastille; the clergy of Notre-Dame and the Sainte Chapelle were arrested. The royal chambers in the Louvre were entered and an inventory taken; the same happened to the dwelling of the Cardinal Gondi; a price was set on the bishop of Frejus. Even the tomb of the queen mother did not escape; that beautiful monument which she had erected for herself in St. Denis, with so much skill and at so great a cost, was all destroyed, because popular opinion held her responsible for having trapped the Guises in Blois. An urn, said to contain the ashes of the murdered duke, became an object of veneration to the mob who thronged to kiss it. Mocenigo closes his notices of the state of Paris with a gloomy forecast for the future of Henry and of France.

Henry was in some doubt as to how he should deal with his prisoners, the duchess of Nemours, the Cardinal de Bourbon, and the Prince de Joinville, after the murder of the duke and his

brother. On 9 Jan., Loignac was at Blois with forty armed men, and this led Mocenigo to suppose that the king would send at least the Prince de Joinville a prisoner to that château.

No resolution was reached till 30 Jan., when Mocenigo's secretary reports from Blois that the king had given orders that the prisoners were to be taken to Amboise one hour before midnight. But before they could start the duke of Nemours succeeded in escaping; and this caused the king to rearrest the duchess, his mother, who had been enjoying partial liberty since 9 Jan. The departure for Amboise was delayed till the morning of the 31st, when the Cardinal de Bourbon, the archbishop of Lyons, the Prince de Joinville, the provost of the merchants, and the president Neuilli, were placed on board two boats and sent up the Loire to the château, under the charge of Loignac. But no sooner had they left than the king received news that the Marshal d'Aumont found himself unable to hold Orleans, and that Amboise was in danger of falling to Mayenne and the Guises. The king was now extremely anxious to recover the persons of his prisoners. He was alarmed at the proximity of Mayenne, and he was doubtful of Loignac's loyalty. On 14 Feb. he sent M. d' Arsian to Amboise to bring back with him the Cardinal de Bourbon and the Prince de Joinville. But Loignac, who had completely gained over the governor of Amboise, Guast (Gas, as he is called by Mocenigo), replied that he was aware that this step was dictated by suspicion of his conduct, but, being the faithful servant of his majesty that he knew himself to be, he intended to keep the prisoners. On 16 Feb. Arsian reached Blois with this answer, and on the 17th Henry sent the Cardinal de Lenoncourt, Loignac's uncle, to endeavour to persuade his nephew to yield. Lenoncourt, however, succeeded no better than his predecessor. He came back empty-handed, and bearing the alarming news that Loignac was in treaty with Mayenne to consign the prisoners on the payment of one hundred and twenty thousand crowns and the promise of the duke of Guise's daughter to wife. On the 18th Henry sent off the Abbé dal Bene to outbid the duke of Mayenne if that were possible. During the night the abbé was aware of large bodies of horse drawing round the castle of Amboise, and on the morning of the 19th he was present when ten thousand crowns were handed to Loignac as an earnest from Mayenne for the one hundred and twenty thousand which had been promised for the prisoners. This did not look hopeful for the success of dal Bene's mission; but by 27 Feb. Loignac seems to have made up his mind that after the ten thousand crowns he would not get much more from Mayenne, and on that day the prisoners reached Blois from Amboise; and Loignac retired to his government, where he presently died.

Horatio Brown.

1588, 15 *Dec.* *San Dier.* *Gio. Mocenigo amb*[r]*.*

Serenissimo Principe,—

Si è grandemente alterato il Duca di Ghisa, perchè da alcuni sia stato nominato compartecipe di quello, che li Parisini trattorno contra la persona di Sua Maestà Christianissima, sicome haverà inteso Vostra Serenità dalli precedenti miei dispacci. Ha però Sua Eccellentia con affettuosissima forma di parole affermato al Re, di non haver mai havuto simili pensieri, credendo, che quella voce fosse stata falsa; il Re le disse, che prestava compitamente fede alle sue parole, et essendo alla messa, in tempo che si levava nostro Signor, il Duca disse: Sire, per quel vero Corpo di Jesù Christo, che io non ho mai havuto pensieri simili, essendo volti tutti li miei spiriti al ben et fedelmente servir la Maestà Vostra. Il Re rispose, che ne era molto ben sicuro, poichè non conosceva, che alcuno potesse privarlo della libertà, ma bene della vita più tosto, quando si potrà più di lui.

La Serenissima Regina madre con la sua somma prudenza non manca di quei buoni uffici, che sono opportuni per levar quelle diffidentie, che possono alterare gli animi del Re, et del Duca de Ghisa; et per questo stà ogn' uno molto travagliato per il male della Maestà Sua ritrovandosi lei da sei giorni in quà nel letto aggravata di febre, che per la grave età, nella quale è già ridotta da temere assai della vita sua; con tutto che fin' hora non apparino accidenti di maligna infirmità. Martedì passato prese una legger medicina, la qual non potendo tenere, ributò insieme con tanta quantità di colore, che fu stimato da medici di così buon' effetto, come l' havesse ritenuta.

Li Stati non ritrovando fondi per assignare alle provisioni della guerra, et per altri occorenti bisogni stanno molto confusi, et forse saranno necessitati ritornar di nuovo le gravezze; le quali però Sua Maestà dice di non voler fare, per non disgustare li populi, che potriano attribuir tutto ciò alla volontà di lei; ma che conoscendo la necessità essi debbino di novo introdurle.

Pensano di dar a Sua Maestà Christianissima 120 mila scudi, perchè si possi dar principio alla guerra contra Savoia, conoscendosi, per quanto ha scritto il Signor Gerolamo Gondi, che quell' Altezza va proponendo partiti per tirar il negotio in longo, attendendo qualche occasione, che potesse deviar l' animo di Sua Maestà da questa impresa. Pare, che egli non trovando buono, di rimetter li stati nel Signor Duca di Nemurs, vorria darlo al Marchesino suo fratello, desiderando che questa Maestà le lasci quella piazza, fino a tanto che Ugonotti fussero scacciati dal Delfinato, promettendo di restituirle poi a satisfattione della Maestà sua, alla quale daria per ostagio un suo figliuolo per maggior sicurtà della sua volontà, mostrando insieme gran desiderio di abboccarsi con la Regina madre, tutte cose che essacerbano maggiormente l' animo di queste Maestà, vedendosi chiaramente a che verso caminano li dissegni del Duca, però si pensa di licentiar l' Ambasciator di Savoia, richiamar Pugni, et Monsignor d' Astor, ancora che alcuno vorriano prima far passar monsignor d'Umena in Savoia, et impossessarsi di qualche parte d' essa prima che devenghi in altra rissolutione. Et perchè si tiene, che il Papa possi far assai in questo negotio, vedendosi che il Duca parla in conformità di quello che la Serenità Sua ha fatto dire al Re, si starà forse attendendo un' altra risposta, per osservar se trova buono, come ogni ragione vorria, ch' el Marchesatto sia nelle mani del Signor Duca di

Nemurs cugino del Duca, et fratello di Ghisa, che non si può, nè per confidenza con Savoia, nè per dubbio di religione, addurre cosa alcuna in contrario.

L'ambasciator di Spagna, che camina forse con questi medesimi fini, dice, che saria conveniente, prima che divenir ad alcuna rissolutione di guerra, aspettar avisi di Spagna, che la Maestà del Re Catholico si offeriva così prontamente d' interponersi, perchè il genero si accommodasse a quelle conditioni d' accordo, che sono ragionevoli ; ma quì intendono, di non voler donar tempo al tempo, essendo ognuno in questo affetto di vendetta, di modo che li Ugonotti, per levarsi dal pericolo, la desiderano, altri per ragion di stato la persuadono, et quelli della lega per non si mostrar contrarij al servitio et dignità della Corona, non possono predicar manco questa impresa, che quella contra Navara, sicome Vostra Serenità potrà conoscer dalla quì occlusa lettera del Duca di Ghisa scritta al Pontefice. Gratiae et cet.

In lettere di 15 *Decembre di Francia. Copia d'una lettera scritta dal Duca di Ghisa al Papa.*

Santissimo Padre,—

Io tengo a grandissimo honore, et special favore, che habbia piacciuto alla Santità Vostra per le lettere scritte di sua mano di 14 del mese passato aprirmi la sua intentione, et il suo sommo giudicio sopra il fatto di Piemonte, havendo forte pensato le gravi, et importanti considerationi, che lei mette inanzi, che non possono venire, che da un vero, et paterno amore, desideroso del bene, et riposo universale de' Principi Christiani, non mostrando altra affettione, o interesse, che di mantener l' unione commune, piacerà alla Santità Sua d' iscusarmi, se con la riverenza, et sommissione di fedelissimo servo, et figliuolo d' ubidienza, che le sono, la supplico humilissimamente di voler bilanciare le ragioni del Re mio Signor Soprano, li giusti rissentimenti d' un potente stato, il valor, et il cuore d' una delle prime nationi del mondo, più nutrita et costumata alli conquisti, et all' accrescimento dei limiti della sua Monarchia, che a sopportar la diminutione, non stimando poterla sofferire da chi si sia senza ricorrere in un grandissimo biasimo della riputatione, et generosità francese. La Santità Vostra si rapresenterà similmente le cause, et occasioni che hanno mosso il Re mio Signor a convocar questi stati generali, et a qual fini tendono tutte le genti da bene, che non è, che di ristaurar la Chiesa, et estirpar tutti li errori, meritando questo santo desiderio esser confortato dalli voti di tutti li Re, et potentati, che fanno professione della medesima fede, che noi, tanto per la carità christiana, quanto per un commun beneficio, che ne redonda loro, et alla salute et tranquillità de loro popoli. Questa è la causa, perchè Santissimo Padre all' hora, che il moto di Saluzzo fu arrivato, io feci intender a Vostra Santità il dispiacere, ch' io haveva con gran dubbio, che questo novo, et subito accidente avvenuto sopra la tenuta di Stati, et in faccia di tutta la Francia non fosse un soggetto più, che sufficiente ad attraversar le sante rissolutioni che si prendeva di far la guerra irreconciliabile alli Ugonotti, per trattare una tregua con loro, et convertire l' arme altrove, dove ne seguiria la rovina della nostra santa religione, essendo una massima di stato, che le frontiere guardate, il resto del stato si può sempre rimmetter, et essendo, ch' io sono deditissimo, et affettuosissimo alla manutentione del

servitio di Iddio, et della sua santa fede fino all' ultimo sospiro della mia vita, io tenirò sempre la mano alla continuatione, et perseveratione di questa santa impresa, ma ancora sendo nato Francese, io ricevei per il dritto del mio nascimento, per la fedeltà dei miei Progenitori, et la mia particolar, per li beneficij dei Re miei Soprani Signori et per l' amor della mia patria, d' esser obligatissimo alla difesa del mio Principe, et della sua Corona, che per tutti i rispetti del mondo io non vorrei mancare per queste difficoltà importantissime, et che tirano dietro de pericolisissimi avvenimenti il ricorso, et rimedio consisterà, et riposerà nella prudenza, et autorità di Vostra Santità, la qual vi può apportare un tale accommodamento, che il Re mio Signore sia satisfatto per la restitutione delle sue piazze che siano messe nelle mani de si buon Catolico et da bene, et d' honore, che nè per la religione, nè per il debito, o inobedienza non se ne possa dubitare, et il Duca di Savoia resti buon parente, et la guerra contra li heretici sia proseguita con tutto il fervore, donde la gratia sarà dovuta alla Santità Vostra, et il suo nome, in infinito benedetto, et glorificato per tutti i secoli. Io ne la supplico humilissimamente di volere istinguer, et amorzare questa scintilla di fuoco, la quale negligendo accenderia in poco tempo le più pacifiche contrade della Christianità, et appresso havere in tutta humilità baciati i santissimi piedi di Vostra Santità, io supplico il Creatore santissimo Padre di darle con perfetta sanità lunghissima, et fortunatissima vita.

Di Bles a' 19 Decembre 1588.

Di Vostra Santità humilissimo obed^{mo} et fed^{mo} servitore,

Henrico di Lorena.

1588, 20 *Dec.* *Di San Dier.*

Serenissimo Principe *et cetera*,—

Il Re, che in quanto può va facendo con la sua somma prudenza riparo alli disordini del Regno, per sola inimicitia de grandi introdotti al presente in Francia, espedì l' altr' hieri monsignor di Massei a Signor Duca d' Epernon per comandarle, che deponga l' armi ; il qual' ufficio dovendosi far assai vivamente in nome della Maestà Sua, monsignor di Lognac cugino di Monsignor d' Epernon, et uno de favoriti del Re volendo escusar suo parente ha quasi talmente irritata Sua Maestà, che è stato in forse di perder la gratia sua. Si scopre assai chiaramente li fini del Re essere tutti buoni, et indricciati al riposo di questo Regno, ma giudicando gl' altri che le confusioni siano proprie a' suoi bisogni fanno ben spesso conoscere fallaci li dissegni della Maestà Sua, che per non voler dar cagione di maggior novità ha comandato a Monsignor d' Antrages in Orleans, che tenghi quella Città, et quel populo in ubbidienza de Monsignor de Ghisa, come le haveva accordato per li capitoli della pace. Non restava per ciò ancora satisfatto il Duca volendo, che si levasse il governatore per mettervi il figliuolo, ma non potendo per li medesimi capitoli levar quella piazza dal governo d' Antrages conviene per hora accommodarsi alle condittioni communemente giudicate ragionevoli.

Questi passati giorni si fece un grandissimo tumulto in Parigi da quelli, che stando lontani non vogliono mostrarsi appassionati per Ghisa, onde vedendo l' armi in mano a pochi seditiosi, che non studiano in altro, che calpestare le genti di tranquila, et pacifica intentione, et andare il governo in modo tale, che manco le venivano pagate le rendite della villa, andor

in gran numero a strepitare sopra tal fatto inanti al Parlamento, che in quanto può tenendo la bilancia giusta procurò di farli partir sodisfatti comandando i loro pagamenti, ma non già possono moderar la licentia populare, anzi, che a maggior confusione del vero servitio del Re hanno fatto entrare nella città il Duca di Humala, che alloggiava nei borghi, et al cavallier suo fratello data una casa, et lo spesano, come questi siano li propugnacoli della loro sicurtà, ma giovando così agli uni, come agl' altri nutrire la diffidenza, ben spesso sono essi medesimi gli instrumenti a darne nova occasione.

Il Re desidera grandemente la rissolutione di questi Stati, quali continuando pur a sollecitar la Maestà Sua a voler fulminar contra Navarra, le ha fatto intender, che attendino ad altre cose necessarie, che possono sollevar questo Regno perchè se bene le pare d' haver fatto a bastanza intorno a quest' instanza per il giuramento ultimamente seguito farà ancora ogn' altra cosa d' avantaggio in loro satisfattione, per dimostrar sempre più il pensiero, che prende di non lasciar giamai pervenir alla Corona prencipe heretico. A questo si muove la Maestà' Sua perchè Navarra forse non si volendo per qual si voglia modo fidare vuole continuar quel partito, che tiene, ancorche in quanto spetta alla religione publica, che desidererà sempre d' ascoltar chi le desse miglior instruttione di quella con la quale era stato nutrito, et allevato, ne sapeva mai d' haver cambiata come si decchiariva contra di lui.

1588, 23 *Dec.* *Di San Dier.*

Serenissimo Principe *et cetera,*—

Hora s' intende, che questa mattina inanti il giorno il Re mostrò di voler uscire di Bles per dar campo, che si potesse essequire il trattato, che intenderà Vostra Serenità con miglior occasione, poichè al presente non s' intende altro, se non che a giorno fu chiamato il Conseglio, nel quale Monsignor de Lognac uno de favoriti del Re diede una pugnalata a Monsignor de Ghisa, che havendo subito con molte pugnalate ammazzato esso Lognac fu egli Duca de Ghisa anco da altri, che le erano attorno, finito d' ammazzare. Nel medesimo tempo parte delle guardie del Re andorono a levare di casa il Cardinal de Ghisa, il quale condotto in Castello, fu subito serrato, ne fin' hora si può intendere quello, che dopo sia seguito, ma passa voce, che sia stato morto medesimamente il Cardinale, il Prencipe di Genuilla, il Duca di Nemurs, et il Duca dal Buf, et dentro nella bassa corte del Castello appicati il Prevosto de mercanti de Parigi, et il Presidente Nogli. Havendo havuto la morte del Duca de Ghisa per cosa certa, ho voluto come cosa di tanta consequenza quanta può per somma sua prudenza giudicare la Serenità Vostra espedirla per un mio lachè non potendosi levare cavalli da posta, et ho dato commissione, al Maestro di Poste da Lione, che per corriero a posta espedisca la presente mia a Vostra Serenità alla quale di mano in mano andarò avisando tutto quello che occorrerà.

Gratiae et cet.

1588, 24 *Dec.* *Di San Dier.*

Serenissimo Principe,—

Con tutto che hieri quando io espedii alla Serenità Vostra non havessi molti particolari intorno alla morte del Duca de Ghisa, et alla prigionia degl' altri, non stimai però di dover portare in lungo tal

espedittione, ma d' avisare immediate quello, che all' hora si puote intendere, come feci. Hoggi havendo inteso alcuna cosa di più col medesimo desiderio d' hieri, et coll' istesso, che ho havuto sempre, et haverò di servire quanto più compitamente mi serà possibile Vostra Serenità, ho voluto aggiongerle questa mia, acciò più chiaramente conosca quanto sia stata necessitata questa Maestà a devenire nella rissolutione già presa, et qual è la destra maniera nell' essequirla, che è stata tale, che di tanta attione non v' è persona che, per appassionata che sia, non cedi alla ragione, ne dopo d' essa s' è sentito altro moto, che quello, che lei dalla seconda mia lettera intenderà.

Haverà già inteso Vostra Serenità da più mano di lettere mie le strade, che teneva Monsignor de Ghisa non solo per impossessarsi d' ogni maggior autorità in questo Regno, et di privarne Sua Maestà, ma di ridurla anco a tale, che non potesse più d' autorità ne di libertà valersi; al qual fine era stato in Parigi trattato d' assoldar genti per inviare a questa volta, acciò egli potesse finiti li Stati condurre Sua Maestà a Parigi, come Monsignor d' Umala, che si ritrovò presente a questa deliberatione col mezzo di sua moglie ne fece avisata la Maestà Sua: andava egli anco del continuo procurando di levargli d' attorno i suoi più fidati, et devoti servitori, et con le instantie delli Stati astringendola a formare un nuovo consiglio conforme al gusto suo; ne finalmente lasciava cosa intentata per ridurre in breve il dissegno suo a quel fine, che per sua ambitione s' era proposto onde vedendosi del continuo Sua Maestà ridurre a' più stretti termini, ne aspettando quasi più altro, che d' essere affatto priva di poter più come Re comandare, et dal Signor Alfonso Corso, che capitò quattro giorni sono in questa città, essendole per nome del Duca d' Umena detto, che dovesse avertire molto bene a se medesima, perchè haveva inteso, che il Duca de Ghisa suo fratello haveva qualche intrapresa contra di lei, alla quale s' egli havesse creduto di poter riparare saria per le poste venuto a servire alla Maestà Sua, giovedì sera che fu li 22 del presente, rissolutissima Sua Maestà del rimedio che doveva porre a tanto male, diede voce di voler la mattina seguente uscire di Bles, et fece comandare a 15 ò venti de suoi gentil'huomini di camera, che restassero la notte a dormire nel castello, per essere presti al far del giorno, et disse, che nel consiglio della mattina seguente si dovesse trattare di certi negotii de finanze, nelli quali particolarmente era necessario, che intervenissero il Duca, et il cardinale de Ghisa; andato a dormire, la mattina due hore inanti giorno fatti chiamare nel suo gabinetto li gentil' huomini comandati la sera precedente fece loro con non molte, ma pregnantissime parole conoscere l'animo, et intentione che haveva Monsignor di Ghisa, et la necessità nella quale egli per ciò era di dover liberare con la sua morte se medesima, et questo Regno dalla sua tirannide; che però a loro, come a più domestici, et fedeli servitori, che havesse voleva commettere quest' impresa, la quale quando non havessero animo di condurre a fine per la libertà, et servitio suo, et di tutto il Regno li scongiurava, che le aprissero fedelmente le volontà loro; al che havendo tutti risposto uniformemente, che erano prontissimi d' esseguire tutto ciò, che da Sua Maestà fusse loro imposto, et volendo incominciar a divisare nel modo; disse loro la Maestà Sua, che attendessero quello che lei direbbe, et continuatamente a chi avisò, che quando il Duca fusse entrato nella Camera le prendesse le

braccia, a chi che le occupasse la spada, et ad altri, che lo ferissero, a tutti particolarmente commise la parte sua, et fattili una parte d' essi restare nella camera, et l' altra mettere in un gabinetto, entrò Lei in un' altro tutto contiguo insieme con il Signor Corso soprascritto, et venuto il giorno, e ridotto il consiglio, ne comparendo il cardinale de Ghisa fu mandato a domandare, il quale arrivato e principiato, che si fu à trattare, mandò il Re a chiamare il Duca de Ghisa, che uscito immediate, et entrato nella camera mentre addimandava in qual gabinetto fusse il Re se gli serrorono que' gentil'huomini attorno, dalli quali fu subitamente ferito, e morto, non havendo dopo un gran grido, che diede detto, per quanto s' intende altro, se non che quello gli aveniva per li suoi peccati, al strido s' alciò il cardinale, che cognobbe la voce del fratello, et volse uscire, ma il Marescial d' Umone, che doveva insieme colli Capitani delle guardie haver parte di ciò, essendosele con la spada ignuda parato inanti non lo lasciò movere, et quegl' altri fermorono immediate le porte del castello, senza che pur si sapesse a che effetto. Poco appresso fu il Cardinale fatto passare in alcune stanze preparate per questo, et con lui l' Arcivescovo di Lione, et fatti arrestare nelli loro appartamenti il Cardinale di Borbone, Madama di Nemurs, il Duca suo figliuolo, il Duca dal Buf, et il segretario di Monsignor de Ghisa, nel medesimo tempo fu mandato al luoco dell' adunanza delli stati a prendere il Prevosto de mercanti de Parigi, uno delli Essivini di quella città, et il Presidente Nogli, et ad intimare agl' altri, che non partissero della città sotto pena d' incorrere nella disgratia di Sua Maestà et la Maestà Sua discese alle stanze della Serenissima Regina madre, che poco prima s' era svegliata, et le disse che il Duca de Ghisa era morto, et ch' egli all' hora era Re ; et le aggionse, che non le haveva del suo pensiero prima, che metterlo ad effetto dato conto così perchè non haveva voluto alla sua precedente infirmità aggiongere tal passione d' animo, come per dubbio, che da lei non gli fusse sturbato quello, che era seguito per voler di Dio, et era certo che saria servitio, e quiete del suo Regno. La Regina non potendo a pena per così grande, et inaspettata nova formar parola le disse solamente che pregava S. D. Maestà che così fusse, et che felicitasse sempre tutte le attioni sue, andò poi il Re alla messa, et a desinare.

Questa mattina nel far del giorno ha fatto morire il Cardinale de Ghisa, che nella medesima camera dove hieri fu posto è stato strangolato, et si dice, che habbia determinato di mandare nel Castello d' Ambuosa il cardinale di Borbone, che è al presente con febre continua, et uscita di sangue, et il Prencipe di Genuilla ancora, non sapendosi degl' altri quello, che habbi ad essere.

Ha Sua Maestà espedito il Signor Alfonso Corso a Lione con carica di suo luogotenente generale nel Delfinato, et con lettere al Duca d' Umena, per le quali dandole conto della morte del fratello seguita anco per gli avisi havuti da lui, lo consola, et le comanda a retirarsi al suo governamento, assicurandolo, che se si diporterà come deve fare ogni buon vassallo verso il suo Prencipe, che le farà conoscere assai chiaramente la stima, che fà della sua persona, et del suo valore.

Graziae et cet.

1588, 24 *Dec.* *Di San Dier.*

Serenissimo Principe *et cet.*,—

Si tiene che la lettera scritta da sua Maestà Christianissima al Duca di Humena sia stata fatta per dargliela quando egli per sua buona fortuna non havesse saputa la morte, non potendosi credere che havendo la Maestà sua fatto essequire contra il Duca et il Cardinal di Ghisa la sua necessitata volontà, pensato di lassare in vita questo Duca, credendogli che in tal caso la morte di quei due non serviria ad altro, che ad un pungentissimo stimolo al core di questo, di venire con determinatissima volontà, et con quelle maggior forze, che potesse havere così da questi popoli, come da quei Principi, che gli hanno ancora agiutati, a vendicar la morte del fratello, et ad impatronirsi quanto potesse o di morire appresso a loro; Dal secretario di Monsignor di Ghisa si è fin' hora inteso, che haveva il suo patrone cento cinquanta millia scudi l' anno dal Re di Spagna. S' anderanno constituendo d' avantaggio, et sono tuttavia appresso li processi, che fa il Re formare contra il Duca, et Cardinale de Ghisa anchora per li quali consteranno manifestamente così l' insidie tese al Re, come li ecessi loro, commessi a pregiuditio della dignità di Sua Maestà nel Regno.

Con tutto che hieri fussero guardate le porte della città uscirono però alcuni delli Deputati delli Stati, li quali hoggi la Maestà Sua ha fatti per publico bando chiamare a dover in pena della vita comparire in termine di quattro giorni, intendendo lei, che si finiscano questi stati con sodisfattione universale.

Quelli d' Orleans intesa la morte del Duca de Ghisa si sono subito baricati per tutta la città, et hanno prese l' armi: Monsignor d' Antrages governatore d' essa, che si ritrovava a Bles partì hieri dopo il desinare, et con 60 cavalli s' andò a mettere nella cittadella, e vedendo che quei della città stavano saldi, e gliela volevano anco combattere ha incominciato a battere la terra, et la batte da tutte le parti con molto impeto; ma è capitato questa sera aviso al Re, che non potrà molto continuare, perchè essendo la muraglia debole molto, l' impeto dell' artigliaria la va rovinando si che sperano quelli di fuori di tirarla anco in breve colle zappe a terra; per il che pare, che Sua Maestà habbia immediate espedito a quella volta quattro compagnie d' archibusieri. Si starà attendendo quello che succederà, et come per tutto il Regno sarà sentita la morte di questi Principi, et io conforme al debito mio, non pretermettendo diligentia alcuna con tutte l' occasioni che me si offeriranno senza molto interesse della Serenità Vostra l' andarò riverentemente avisando di tutto quello, che occorrerà.

Gratiae et cet.

1588, 28 *Dec.* *Di San Dier.*

Serenissimo Principe *et cet.*,—

Continuando la Cittadella d' Orleans a battere la città, et li cittadini a ripararsi, et a battere la fortezza con due canoni, che hanno, espedirono a Sua Maestà Christianissima due delli Essivini che arrivati il giorno delli XXVI, in Corte esposero alla Maestà Sua, che quei populi suoi devotissimi sudditi erano pronti d' humiliarsi a lei et rendersegli, ma che la pregavano a spianarle quella fortezza, et a mutarle quel governatore dando quel carico ad ogn' altro, che a loro saria stato carissimo. Le rispose Sua Maestà che

non era più per permettere, che li suoi sudditi capitolassero seco, ma che toccando a lei, come a loro supremo Principe, et Re governarli le commandava, che deponessero l' armi, et le portassero le chiavi della città, il che facendo li riceveria in gratia, et perdoneria loro gli errori commessi; ma che se perseverassero nella loro ostinatione che resteriano tutte estinti, et la città desolata, aggiongendo, che quando il loro Governatore era accostato al partito della lega se ne contentavano, ma che hora, che ubbidiva a lei ne dimandavano un' altro; che però ritornassero, et in termine di due giorni rissolvessero le volontà loro: li quali partiti perchè tuttavia si continuava il battere, così da quelli della città la fortezza, come da quelli della fortezza la città, nella quale restavano molte case rovinate, et qualche persona morta; et dall' altra parte si dubitava, che la fortezza per quello, che pativa non venisse finalemente a cadere nelle mani de' Cittadini, inviò Sua Maestà altre quattro compagnie delle sue guardie, acciò arrivassero le prime, et s' unissero seco et parti anco il Marescial d' Umone, Monsignor della Ghisa, Monsignor di Beoves, il Gran Priore, et li due favoriti del Re Lognach, e Thermes. Le compagnie s' intende che si sono messe nel borgo vicino alla Cittadella, et che quei Signori parte sono entrati nella fortezza, et parte messisi in luoco vicino per adunar genti; ne essendo comparsa fin hora risposta alcuna da quelli della Città si comprende, che habbino pensiero di non voler cedere, et ciò si va maggiormente confirmando essendo pur questa mattina arrivato uno in Corte, che riferisce haver hieri veduto entrare nella Città il cavallier d' Umala con quaranta cavalli.

Questo medesimo ha anco detto, che il Duca suo fratello, che si ritrova in Parigi intesa la nova della morte di Monsignor di Ghisa fece immediate dar quei populi all' arma, et fatte tirare le catene per le strade retiratosi egli alla casa della villa mandò a chiamare il primo Presidente et altri, et dopo haver fatte molte espedittioni per avisare di ciò le ville collegate, fece arrestare il Presidente et quegl' altri che cognobbe essere dependenti dal Re, et dato ordine perchè fussero presi tutti li servitori, et affettionati a Sua Maestà fece andare per le case di quelli cercando, et parte svaleggiandone, levando tutti i cavalli, che ritrovavano, et hanno presi tutti quelli particolarmente che erano nella scuderia del signor Gerolemo Gondi. Di tutto ciò Serenissimo Principe non solo s' è potuto haverne riscontri con fondamento, ma non ne se può havere manco altra certezza, essendo di già tutto il Regno in arme parlando ogn' uno a modo suo, secondo le sue passioni, ne lasciando transitar li corrieri sicuramente, sapendosi quanto molti di questi populi fussero affettionati, et devoti alla Casa de Ghisa, et al Duca in particolare, che fin da suoi prim' anni s' incominciò a insinuare nella gratia loro, et perchè non capita alcun corriero, per ciò di Lione non si sà che dire, et se bene corre voce, che monsignor d' Umena intesa da suoi la morte del fratello si sia retirato a Viena luoco, che è assai forte, però non si sapendo chi ne sia l' auttore si stà aspettando altri avisi, li quali m' assicuro, che haveranno più espedito passo in Italia, et alla Serenità Vostra, che in queste parti tutte sollevate per poter arrivare a questa Corte. Li Principi pregioni restano tuttavia ben guardati nel castello di Bles; et il Prevosto de mercanti et quei due altri di Parigi ancora. Il cardinale di Borbone si trova molto meglio della sua indisposizione, et sta insieme con gl' altri con timore aspettando quello che habbia ad essere delle vite loro, delle quali pare che ne siano ogni giorno più assicurati, non si scoprendo

che Sua Maestà habbia altra intentione che di tenergli serrati per qualche tempo parte di loro, et parte perpetuamente. Quelli tre Parigini aspettano tuttavia la sentenza, che dopo formati i loro processi le sarà data dal Gran Conseglio, al quale ha Sua Maestà commessa la causa loro, volendo che per giustitia siano espediti conforme a loro demeriti, come haveria fatto anco de Principi, se dalla loro autorità et potenza non fusse stata rattenuta.

1588, 29 *Dec.* *Di San Dier.*

Serenissimo Principe *et cet.*,—

Monsignor Illustrissimo Legato, non havendo potuto il giorno delli 23 entrare nel Castello, ne li due appresso havere audientia da Sua Maestà, andatosi il sussequente le disse, che per debito suo non poteva mancare d' avertirla, come per haver messo le mani nel Cardinale de Ghisa era lei incorsa nelle censure de Sua Santità, et tutti li servitori suoi, con offesa di Dio, et dell' anima sua, et che però raccordava Sua Maestà di confessare il suo errore, et di dimandarne l' assolutione alla Santità Sua, che voleva pensare, che l' haverebbe ottenuta, non dovendosi sdegnare di farlo, poichè non doveva misurare il Papa dalle sue forze temporali, ma dalle spirituali, et riconoscerlo per Vicario di Christo in terra; persuadendo appresso la Maestà Sua, che havendo per liberarsi dalle loro insidie levati dal mondo questi Principi, che erano sempre stati crudeli inimici degli Ugonotti, si dimostrasse lei al presente più anco che habbia in altro tempo fatto inimica del nome loro, procurando per conservatione della nostra Santa religione, del suo Regno, et de suoi populi d' estirparli, et esterminarli affatto. Le rispose la Maestà Sua, che a Principi grandi era lecito il castigare ne' stati loro ogni sorte di persona, che lo meritasse, et che era particolar privilegio de Re di Francia di non poter essere escommunicati, che però non essendo egli incorso in censura alcuna non haveva bisgno di confessarsi di ciò, ne di dimandare l' assolutione a Sua Santità et havendole il legato replicato, che il Re Filippo il bello, et Lodovico Undecimo furono escommunicati, et poi fatta penitentia de loro falli, assoluti dalli Papi d' all' hora non però cavò altro dalla Maestà Sua se non che a Sua Santità porterà sempre quella debita riverenza, che si conviene, ma che non haveva bisogno d' altra assolutione, aggiongendo che continuerà come hanno sempre fatto i suoi maggiori a dimostrarsi Christianissimo così in effetti. come in nome; che era prontissimo senz' altra persuasione di continuare la guerra agl' Ugonotti, et per l' avenire sempre con maggior forze, poiche con l' aiuto del Signor Dio s' haveva levato quegl' impedimenti, che per tanti anni le hanno ostato a poterne unire tante in un luoco, come spera di poter fare; et assicurò con affettuosissime parole S. S. Illustrissima che haveva sei giorni continui pensato, come senza devenire ad effetto tale havesse potuto liberarsi dalla tirannide di Monsignor de Ghisa, ma che finalmente non vedendo, come poterlo altramente fare, haveva havuto necessità di devenire a questo. È venuto in Corte il Prencipe di Conti chiamato da Sua Maestà, la quale non ha per ancora proveduto ad alcuno degli officij, et carichi, che haveva il Duca de Ghisa, dicendosi solo, che ha conferito il vescovato di Rens, che haveva il Cardinal de Ghisa di rendita di 20 mila scudi nel Cardinal de Vandomo, et che un Abbadia di 10 mila darà al cardinal Montalto nepote di Sua Santità.

Monsignor di Masseis, che fu ultimamente inviato da Sua Maestà al

Duca d' Epernon per farle deponere l' armi è ritornato, et riferisce, che quel Duca vedendo che lei con così grand' animo, come conviene a un tanto Re haveva castigati li insidiatori della libertà, et vita di lei, et del Regno suo, che era prontissimo di deponere l' armi,e ch i governi, et tutto quello, fusse in mano sua ad ogni comandamento di Sua Maestà che tra lui, et il fratello havevano insieme 5, in 6 mila fanti, et fin' a mille cavalli, che tutte le forze, et vite loro offeriva alla Maestà sua per servirla dove più le piacesse di comandarle, al che non pare, che habbia Sua Maestà fatto alcuna risposta. Monsignor di Nivers s'intende esser alla Granassa et se bene da quelle parti manco v' è corriero alcuno, viene però detto, che Monsignor della Sciatra, che è sempre stato unitissimo con Ghisa, et contrario a Sua Maestà, huomo stimato di valore, et di molto seguito s' era retirato à Nantes insieme con il Duca di Mercurio ; li quali se movendosi il Duca di Lorena da una parte, et il Duca d' Umena da un' altra, et si congiongessero col Duca d' Umala, et con quest' altri col valore, col seguito, et col favore, che haveriano da una gran quantità di questi populi sariano di tanto danno a questo misero Regno, et potriano tanto travagliare la Maestà Sua, che appaririano maggiori miserie che mai, scoprendosi anco assai chiaramente che Spagnoli non volendo non solo vedere quiete in questo Regno, ma essendo per abbracciare ogni occasione di desunirlo, et desolarlo saranno hora, vedendo non essere mai più Monsignor d' Umena ne gl' altri Principi di questo sangue per accommodarsi col Re, prontissimi per aiutarli più gagliardamente, che in altro tempo habbino fatto ; et sentendosi pure da persone d' autorità, che li Parisini hanno mandato a domandare genti al Duca di Parma si teme ch' egli sia per destramente lasciar passar genti a questi confini, et perciò n' ha di già Sua Maestà Christianissima inviato delle sue verso Perona.

Gratiae et cet.

$158\frac{8}{9}$, 1mo *di Gennaro. San Dier.*

Serenissimo Principe *et cet.* (*omissis*),—

S' è detto, che Amiens in Piccardia intesa la nuova della morte di monsignor de Ghisa haveva fatto prigioni la moglie di monsignor de Longavilla genero del duca di Nivers, la madre, et tutti li suoi, che le erano appresso, et qualche d' uno dice ancora il duca medesimo, che viene negato da altri, che affermano, ch' egli era in campagna.

Burges s' era sollevata anch' essa, et la parte del Re, et quella della lega messesi in arme, ma acquietate dal mere della villa che è buon servitore di Sua maestà, con buone et efficacissime parole dimostrando oltre l' obligo, che havevano di servire, et ubbidire al loro re, quanto bene era per rissultar loro facendolo, et quanto male operando in contrario, haveva acquietata que' populi, che da monsignor della Sciatra governatore di quella città, che s' intende, che era per transferirvisi, all' amico suo seco si dubita, che siano di nuovo sollevati.

(*Omissis.*)

$158\frac{8}{9}$, 2 *Gennaro. San Dier.*

Serenissimo Principe *et cet.*,—

Il medesimo corriero venuto di Fiorenza ha confirmato l' uscita di Lione del Duca d' Umena, et ha detto che era andato a Digiuno città del suo governamento, et non a Viena come prima s' era divulgato, et io scrissi a

Vostra Serenità. Quale sia l' animo suo non si può sapere ancora di certo, ma si tiene che invitato dal desiderio della vendetta commune in ogn' uno, et molto maggiore sempre ne' Prencipi grandi, et dagli parenti, amici, et sollevationi di tante città di questo Regno, oltre quello che le possi esser fatto da prencipi stranieri, sia egli per armarsi, et venir a questa volta con quelle maggiori forze che potrà havere, che viene stimato dover essere molte, et di molta consideratione: Et con tutto, che venga assai diversamente parlato da quello che più l' intendono vien giudicato, che Parigi, Orleans, Burges, Amiens, et altre principal città senza devenire ad alcuna rissolutione attenderanno la volontà sua; et che ad ogni modo s' habbi a vedere questo nobilissimo regno più tribulato, più afflitto, et nelle maggiori miserie, che sia mai stato; il che prego il Signor Dio, che per sua infinita bontà non lassi succedere. Conoscendosi tutto questo molto bene da Sua Maestà attende lei ad ingrossarsi di genti, et dubitando forse di qualche surpresa ha fatto intendere agli ambasciatori che si ritirino a Vandomo sette leghe lontano da Bles, perchè vuole questo vilaggio per mettervi dentro delle genti d' arme. Fa anco un perdono generale a tutti li catolici di questo regno promettendo loro di volersi scordare tutti gli errori da loro commessi di che sorte si siano, perdonarli, et riceverli, come buoni fedeli, et devoti sudditi nella gratia sua ogni volta che deposta ogni loro passione veniranno, come devono, et sono per legge obligati, all' ubbidienza sua, il quale facendosi tuttavia non è ancora stato publicato.

Essendosi partita madama d' Umala di Corte per andare a Parigi le ha Sua Maestà detto, che affermi al Duca suo marito, che se egli si diporterà della maniera, che si conviene a un buon suddito, et vassallo conoscerà sempre più la bontà della Maestà Sua, et l' affettione che le porta: che però si retiri da quelle attioni, et s' assicuri, che il farlo gli sarà in ogni tempo più utile, et di maggior honore, che l' operare in contrario, che non le può apportare, che ogni male.

Si tiene, che il re si valerà delle forze d' Epernone, ma non della persona sua, et che chiamerà anco le genti, che ha nel Delfinato.

L' altr' hieri dall' illustrissimo legato è stato assoluto il Prencipe de Conti, che fu l' anno passato coll' essercito di Navarra, sicome li giorni passati assolse il conte di Soisone suo fratello del medesimo errore. È venuto aviso, che le genti del re di Navarra, che non perdono alcuna buon' occasione hanno surpreso Niort principal piazza nel Poitù, havendo di notte con un pettardo gettata una porta a terra, per la qual causa si crede, che monsignor de Nivers sarà inviato a quella volta, per ricuperare se sarà possibile quella città.

Li deputati delli Stati generali presenteranno uno di questi giorni li loro cagieri, o capitoli, che si voglia dire, et si lasciano intendere di volersi poi immediate partire, per non tenere più aggravate le provincie loro della grossa spesa, che sono in questa carestia di tutte le cose necessitati di fare.

È stata la Maestà sua alla solita solennità de cavallieri di San Spirito, ma non ne ha fatto alcuno, con tutto che vi siano sette, o otto luochi, ma ha fatto publicare di farne un' altro anno.

Dimani piacendo a Dio mi incaminerò per Vandomo secondo l' ordine mandatomi da questa maestà la qual avisata forse delle intelligentie che

tengono alcuni di questi ambasciatori dentro d' Orleans ha voluto con l' allontanarli levarle la commodità di intendere, et ricevere così spesso lettere, il che sarà con notabilissimo incommodo di tutti per la lontananza della corte, che sarà di 20 miglia per essere in luoco fuori di mano dove non capita persona, et perchè finalmente gli avisi non si potrano havere se non con molta difficoltà il che mi è di grandissimo dispiacere per il desiderio che io ho di ben servire Vostra Serenità. Gratiae.

158$\frac{8}{9}$, 6 *Gennaro. Di Vandomo.*

Questi giorni per lettere del Siniscial di Lione ha Sua Maestà inteso che essendo il giorno di San Stefano alla messa ne' Giesuiti col Signor Duca d'Umena, con monsignor della Tramoglia, et molt' altri gentil' huomini fu portata al Signor Duca una lettera, la quale leggendo fu causa, che si turbasse di maniera, che se n'avidde egli molto bene, et tutti quegl' altri, che gli erano appresso. Sopra che pensando il sopradetto Sinisciale, et cadendole nel pensiero quello, che poteva essere, sentendo poi, che finita la messa, fingendosi il Duca più che poteva allegro disse, che voleva andare a San Desir, ove è un palazzo molto forte, et haveva egli il nervo delle sue forze, s 'accostò' il Sinisciale a monsignor della Tramoglia, et destramente le disse, che fingesse egli, che è gottoso di non poter caminare, et si retirasse alla città per far stare in ordine li soldati, et tenerla guardata; et incaminatosi egli appresso monsignor d' Umena scrive, che gionti che furono al palazzo, et che il Duca si vidde in luoco forte, e sicuro lesse publicamente la lettera, che conteneva la morte di monsignor de Ghisa suo fratello, et disse loro, che tenendoli tutti per amici, et fratelli fussero contenti di consigliarlo, di quello che havesse a fare, onde essendo da diversi proposti diversi partiti s' attenne egli finalmente al parere del Sinisciale, che lo consigliava, e persuadeva a retirarsi al suo governamento: Dove andato, et confirmatisi gli animi di que' popoli, s' era di poi transferito a Scialone, nel qual luoco havendo trovati gli animi sollevati li haveva finalmente acquietati, et havuta la fortezza d 'accordo: ma andato a Macone era stato serrato fuori. S' intende, che anderà procurando di tenere in devotione le piazze, che erano sott' al governo di Monsignor de Ghisa, et si transferirà poi in Lorena per trattar, con quel Duca del modo di far la guerra a questa Maestà, sebene altri vogliono, che sia per andare a Parigi. Gratiae et cet.

158$\frac{8}{9}$, 6 *Gennaro. Di Vandomo.*

Serenissimo Principe *et cet.*,—

Non havendo potuto arrivar ad intendere il contenuto della lettera di monsignor de Pugni portata dal corriero di Fiorenza, come nelle precedenti mie diedi conto alla Serenità Vostra, ho però da persona principalissima, et quanto si può ben affetta a Vostra Serenità inteso, che havendo il Signor Gerolemo Gondi trattato col Pontefice, che nel Marchesato di Saluzzo si metti persona confidente, et havendo proposto il Marescial di Retz, non sodisfacendosi il Duca di Savoia di Monsignor di Nemurs, contentandosene Sua Santità et questa Maestà ancora; ha il Re espedito a monsignor de Pugni, perchè a ciò non metti difficoltà alcuna. Sono venuti deputati de Parigi, che hanno fatt' instanza al Re, perchè si contenti di liberare i loro pregioni, non havendo nominati li Prencipi,

alli quali ha la Maestà sua risposto, che quelli saranno o liberati, o condennati, secondo che la giustitia ricercherà, et che operino pur loro di maniera, che non habbino a cadere nella disgratia sua, ma ad acquistare la gratia, et il perdono, che concede a tutti li sudditi suoi che rimettendo la loro ostinatione veniranno all' ubbidienza sua.

Quella città [*scilicet* Paris] è con tutto ciò in arme, et non lasciando que' populi cosa alcuna, colla quale possino dimostrare rissentimento contra Sua Maestà tutte le effigie sue così scolpite, come depinte, et le arme ancora sono da loro state gettate a terra, et guaste; ma havendo il Duca d' Umala procurato, che il parlamento si levasse dall' ubbidienza del Re ha quasi havuto simile risposta a quella, che haveva un gentil'huomo di Sciampagna fatta ad alcuni de Magistrati della Città, che fattolo mettere prigione, et promettendole di liberarlo se si levava dal servitio, et giuramento di fedeltà fatto al Re, et s' accostava a loro, le disse egli molte ingiuriose parole.

Orleans si tiene tuttavia, et la fortezza ancora, ma resta ella in così mal' essere, che non potrà durare molti giorni: Sollecita però Sua Maestà il ritorno di monsignor de Nivers, il quale s' intende, che non potrà essere quì di dieci giorni ancora. Ha anco rimandato monsignor di Masseis al Duca d' Epernone per havere quelle forze, ch' egli si trova in essere, che saranno per quanto s' intende, 3 mila buoni soldati a piè, et 400 cavalli.

Ho inteso, che già un' anno hebbe Sua Maestà per un breve di Sua Santità facoltà di eleggersi un confessore con autorità d'assolverla di tutti li peccati etiam delli contenuti nella bolla in Cęna Domini, per il che tenendo la Maestà Sua di non haver bisogno di ricorrere a Roma per caso alcuno, nè d' essere questi giorni incorsa nelle censure; essendo da monsignor Illustrissimo Legato con efficacissime ragioni persuasa a doversi inviare ha detto, che manderà un gentil'huomo a Sua Santità per segno dell' ubbidienza sua.

S' intende de Savoyia quel Duca haver fatto tregua con Laodighiera, di che havendone di Piamonte Vostra Serenità come mi persuado aviso più certo et particolare non l' attediarò io con altra replica.

Sono già tre giorni in questa terra dove si ritrovano anco li Ambasciatori d' Inghilterra, Savoyia, et Ferrara non essendovi fin' hora comparso quel de Spagna, che si lasciò intendere di non voler venirvi perchè è questo luoco del Re di Navara, sebene sua Maestà Christianissima lo possede, tenendovi il governatore, la giustitia et ogn' altra autorità, et havendole il re fatto rispondere che se non voleva andarvi, andasse donque in Spagna; intendo che è in Bles, et essendole stato deputato Monte Ricciardo per stantia ha fatto adimandare un passaporto a Sua Maestà christianissima per poter andar à Aure di Graz a vedere una galeazza di quelle, che vi capitò spente dalla fortuna, la quale essendo all' ordine al presente di tutte le cose si tiene che habbia scritto in Spagna, et se haverà aviso di ritornare si imbarcherà in quella.

Gratiae et cet.

158$\frac{8}{9}$, 12 *Gennaro. Di Vandomo.*

Il re di Navarra dopo preso Niort haveva pres' ancora due buone piazze, et s' intende, che havendo in campagna 4 mila fanti et 600 cavalli, con tutto che Monsignor di Nivers le sia superior di numero di gente

potria però andar a soccorrer quella piazza. Vien detto, che ritrovandosi egli a tavola dopo desinare quando le fu portata la nova della morte del Duca de Ghisa, stato un poco sopra di se disse poi, che il re di Francia le haveva fatto un grandissimo servitio, havendo ammazzato il Duca de Ghisa ch' era il maggior nemico, ch' egli havesse al mondo, ma che egli però se l'havesse havuto nelle mani non l' haveria così malamente trattato.

Si dice medesimamente, che habbia inviato un suo gentil'huomo a questa Maestà, il quale non è però ancora comparso, et con tutto che qualche d' uno voglia, che sià quì, et habbia secretamente trattato colla Maestà Sua non viene però creduto, anzi da persona principalissima m'è stato affermato in contrario; con tutto ciò monsignor illustrissimo legato, per il zelo che ha del servitio della religione, per non pretermettere alcun buon' ufficio, et per servitio di sua Maestà, et di questo Regno ancora è stato alla maestà sua, et le ha detto, che correndo voce della venuta di questo gentil'huomo era andato per dirle, che non solo non doveva admetterlo alla sua presenza, ma decchiarire quel re secondo la ricchiesta, che le fecero li stati generali, et io scrissi alla Serenità Vostra; a che havendole risposto Sua Maestà che il giuramento fatto, et gl' atti passati lo dechiarivano assai per escluso dalla successione della Corona senza devenire ad altra dechiaratione, che non serviria ad altro, che a metterlo in desperatione; le rispose S. S. Illma che il farlo serviria a sua Maestà per levarle il seguito che ha, poichè molti sperando che possi un giorno esser re di Francia devono seguirlo; et in fine le protestò, che quando la Maestà Sua facesse accordo alcuno seco, ch' egli senz' altro dire monteria a cavallo, et se n' andrebbe; a che rispose il re, che accordo non farà mai, come mostra di non voler fare manco la dechiaratione.

Gratiae et cet.

158$\frac{8}{9}$, 12 *Gennaro*. *Di Vandomo.*

Serenissimo Principe *et cet.*,—

Non cessano li Parigini di fare, et di dire quel peggio, che possono, et sanno contra di Sua Maestà et havendo gettate a terra, et guaste quante delle sue effigie, et arme hanno ritrovate fanno stampare libri pieni di maledittioni, et predicare contra di lei, il che havendo inteso Madama de Ghisa, et particolarmente, che un predicatore persuadendo quel populo alla vendetta del Duca suo marito disse, che tutti quelli, che a ciò erano disposti alciassero una mano com' egli faceva in segno della volontà loro, et havendola tutti alciata, eccetto il primo presidente, che vi si ritrovò, aggionse il predicatore, et voi solo signor presidente sarete tra tanti buoni cittadini, che non assentirà a così giusta vendetta, e perche? che non alciate ancor voi, come gl' altri la mano? alle qual parole per dubbio di non essere offeso dalli circonstanti dicono ch' egli ancora l' alciasse, fece lei chiamare questo, et alcuni altri, et disse loro, che dovevano molto ben sapere, che le loro cosi fatte predicationi erano state causa della morte del duca suo marito; il quale poiche non le potevano restituire, si contentassero almeno di desistere da uffici tali, che potriano causare la morte de suoi figliuoli ancora, il che facendo haverebbe per ciò loro più obbligo, che per la dimostratione del buon' affetto, che havevano al duca di bona memoria. Quelli della Surbona ridottisi insieme trattorono d' escommunicare il re, et

di liberare quel populo dal giuramento di fedeltà fatto alla Maestà Sua, ma conosciuto, che non potevano, hanno scritto a Sua Santità perchè colla sua suprema autorità faccia l' uno, et l' altro; tra tanto andando li capi della città alle case di questo, et di quello domandando denari per servitio (dicono loro) della causa publica, et astringendo anco li facultosi in grosse sume, et quelli particolarmente, che sono conosciuti per servitori del re, non perdonando manco alli scolari, che se non hanno la commodità, conosciuti per dependenti dal re, sarrano prigioni, hanno mess' insieme una buona quantità d' oro, che s' intende essere più di mezzo million; et havendo preso in sospetto monsignor d' Umala dopo l'arrivo di sua moglie in quella città, è stato astretto quel duca per assicurarli di chiamare li suoi figliuoli, et consignarli loro per ostaggi. Hanno messo genti nel vescovato, et svalleggiate le stanze del cardinal de Vandomo, havendo riguardata la casa del cardinal de Borbone, nella quale Vandomo alloggiava. Hanno fin' hora assoldato qualche numero di gente, ma non però ancora considerabile, et particolarmente pochissimi forastieri, et havendo fatto uscire fin a mille fanti della città per andar ad assaltare il bosco di Vicena non più d' un miglio lontano dove sono 300 archibusieri, et fin' a 60 cavalli erano da questi la prima volta stati gagliardamente ributtati, ma ritornati poi in maggior numero non essendo usciti quelli di dentro, che non temono di cosa alcuna per essere in luoco forte, et ben munito havevano quelle genti rovinati tutti li vilaggi d'intorno. V'è qualche d 'uno, che dice, che habbino espedito monsignor di Bassompier con 100 mila scudi, perchè vadi prima in Lorena, et di là poi in Germania per levar cavalli, ma non se n' ha ancora certezza alcuna. Dicesi anco, che aspettano il Duca d'Umena che s' intende essere in Scialone, et ch' egli ha scritto a Madama de Ghisa che si ritroverà presto seco, ne di cio mancò v' è fondamento alcuno, anzi che si sà, che teme molto di Digiuno città principale del suo governamento, la cittadella della quale se ben' egli tiene ha però il parlamento fatto publicare, che se vi sarà alcuno, che si mostri contrario al re lo dechiariranno rebello et reo di lesa maestà. Si stà con timore aspettando la rissolutione ch' egli farà, essendo per dependere da quella la quiete, o la rovina, che Dio non voglia di questo regno, ne si può ben congetturare quale habbia ad essere, perchè se ben' egli ha qualche numero di gente fatto parte nella Borgogna, et parte di quelle, che l' han seguito da Lione, pare però, che se ne servi più per sua guardia che per altro, dandogliene non picciol causa la morte delli fratelli. Madama di Monpensier gionta in Lorena haveva ritrovati quel Duca a Nansi tanto addolorato per la morte di monsignor de Ghisa, quanto se le fusse mancato il proprio figliuolo, poi che l' amore, che si portavano l'un l' altro era grandissimo, et è aviso tra suoi, a quali non si può credere ogni cosa, che era per condurlo a Parigi per sodisfattione di que' populi, che non restando contenti di monsignor d' Umala, ne vedendo comparire monsignor d' Umena, lo desideravano. Alli Deputati de Parigi, che vennero in Corte ha il re dopo la prima audientia procurato di dar qualche sodisfattione per acquistarsi gli animì loro, et finalmente havendo havuto promessa dalli due Essivini di quella città, che haveva pregioni, che se fussero liberati sarian andati a far ogni ufficio, perche quel populo deponesse l' armi, et s' humiliasse alla maestà sua, gli ha fatti rilasciare, sono partiti, et si starà fin a qualche giorno aspettando d' intendere quello, che haveranno operato,

che non si crede, che possi essere di molto profitto a servitio della quiete, poichè sono passati tant' oltre, che a pena saprebbono, quando ben volessero, come retirarsi. Sua Maestà le ha levate l' assignationi delle loro rendite, che importano ogn' anno un millione, 400 mila scudi : non pensa a nessuna cosa maggiormente, che ad havere Orleans, et havuto che l'habbia non tarderà molto Parigi a pentirsi del suo errore.

Gratiae et cet.

$158\frac{8}{9}$, 13 *Gennaro. Di Vandomo.*

Serenissimo Principe *et cet.*,—

Havendo questa maestà havuto dalli Deputati delli stati generali li loro Caieri n' ha una parte inviat' al suo consiglio, perchè li consultino tra loro, pensa la maestà sua al resto, et si crede, che dentro di pochi giorni saranno espediti. Dominica prossima faranno la loro harrenga al re, che sarà l' ultima loro attione, nel qual giorno si teneva, che da sua maestà dovessero essere fatti publicare li processi del duca, et cardinal de Ghisa, ma intendo, che non saranno altrimenti, poichè considerandosi all' editto di pacificatione, et d' unione, che fece già, inanti al quale pare, che commette però tutte quelle cose, che potrebbono essere notate, et di poi non se ne ritrovando alcuna di molto momento non stima bene la maestà sua il farli publicare, essendo che apporteria dubbio in ogn' uno, che non fussero perdonati li errori precedenti, ma che coll' occasioni si dovessero castigare, et però appresso al dubbio disunione. Era anco detto, che si dovessero leggere scritture trovategli, ma son io avisato da persona principalissima, che la medesima mattina, che morì monsignor de Ghisa il segretario suo, che è hora prigione, andato a ritrovare madama di Nemurs le disse, che si doveva fare d' una cassetta di scritture di molt' importantia, che haveva del suo padrone, la quale disse, che dovesse immediate abbrussiarle, il che egli fece senza mettere tempo di mezzo, onde non può essersi trovato cosa alcuna, ne intendo, che vi sia fin' hora nel constituto del segretario cosa, che dispiaccia più, che quella delli 150 mila scudi, ch' egli haveva ogn' anno di Spagna, la quale havuta anco nel constituto dell' arcivescovo di Lione pare, che resti assai approvata, se bene non s' è trovato scrittura alcuna in tal proposito.

Li pregioni restano tuttavia guardati eccetto che madama di Nemurs, alla quale furono levate le guardie alcuni giorni sono, et ritrovandosi da quattro giorni in quà in questa città il capitano del castello d' Ambuosa con circa quarant' huomini si tiene, che sua maestà sia per mandarvi il prencipe di Genuilla solamente ritenendo gl' altri tuttavia quì.

$158\frac{8}{9}$, 26 *Gennaro. Vandomo.*

Serenissimo Principe *et cet.*,—

Dopo quanto delle attioni de Parigini scrissi a Vostra Serenità s' è inteso, che era andato al Parlamento uno di quei più seditiosi capi, et accompagnato da cento corazze le haveva addimandato tre cose ; che dovessero condennare ad essere abbruciato vivo quel Belloy, del quale scrissi già con altre mie alla serenità vostra, come heretico, et fautore delle divisioni, et dissidij della Franza ; che s' unissero veramente con i cittadini ; et che autenticassero la tassa fatta sopra le case per far la guerra, per diffesa, et servitio della causa commune : Alle qual dimande havendo il primo presidente risposto per tutti, che nella causa di Belloy, che da sua maestà

christianissima era stata già commessa al gran conseglio non si potevano più ingerire; che circa l' unione sariano sempre uniti nelle cose concernenti l' honor di Dio, et servitio del re, et che quanto alla tassa bisognava havervi sopra matura consideratione per non aggravare inconsideratemente tutte le famiglie ad un modo. Le fu da quel capitano replicato, che lo haveva sempre conosciuto per huomo politico, et di pessima mente, et che era a tempo d' haverne la pena, et fattolo prendere insieme con fin' a 50 o 60 di quegl' altri del Parlamento li fece tutti menare nella Bastiglia. Che havevano fatti pregioni molti preti da nostra Dama, et della santa Capella come fautori del re, et che a chi ammazzava la maestà sua promettevano 10 mila scudi d' entrata. Che erano entrati nel Lovero, et nelle stanze regie, dove havevano inventariate tutte le robbe; et andati nel vescovato havevano inventariate, et sigilatte quelle medesimamente del cardinal Gondi; et al vescovo di Frigius messo taglia di sei mille scudi. Che riscuotevano denari d' ogni casa, et d' alcuna più d' una volta, et minacciavano mancandogliene di mettere le mani anco sopra li calici, et sacrati argenti delle chiese; ne fidandosi più molto di monsignor d' Umala le havevano levata l' autorità di poter concedere passaporti et qualche d' uno dice ancora, che le tenevano guardie alla casa.

Arrivati li due Essivini, et que' Deputati, che furono mandati a sua maestà come sospetti non li havevano voluti vedere, et si dice anco, che havevano imprigionato uno di dett' Essivini che s' era pur sforciato di far qualche buon' ufficio, scoprendosi loro così inimici di sua maestà, che perseguitano anco quelli, che stimano non l' odiare.

Madama d' Angolême sorella di sua maestà uscita del bosco di Vicena haveva mess' in campagna 200 archibusieri a cavallo, che con altri 300 condotti da monsignor de Turé, et monsignor di Merú fratelli del Duca di Momoransi battevano tutte le strade d' intorno a Parigi.

Quelli della Surbona havendo appresso a quanto scrissero già a sua Santità aggionto anco la quì allegata scrittura l' inviorono medesimamente alla Santità sua: per causa della quale essendosi in casa del cardinal Vandomo fatta una congregatione de 20 vescovi, et 12 theologhi hanno concluso detta scrittura non essendo ne sottoscritta, ne sigillata non essere autentica ne approvata da quel collegio, ma poter essere supposita, forse per dar occasione a' Surbonisti di rimoversi, et concedere di non l' haver fatta.

Questa maestà conoscendo non giovare punto l' humanità sua per rihumiliare li Parigini ha pensato di tentare se con altra strada potrà retirarli all' ubbidienza sua, et le ha mandato uno ad intimarle la dechiaratione da lei fatta ultimamente, la copia della quale sarà qui aggionta; provisione, che viene stimata tale, che al presente non si potesse far la maggiore; per la quale, per la perdita del soccorso, che inviavano a Orleans, et per la poca speranza, che può loro restare, che quella città debbia sostenersi lungamente, et spetialmente dovendovi essere presto sotto tutto l' essercito di monsignor de Nivers come nell' altra mia ho scritto a Vostra Ser^{tà} si tiene da qualche d' uno, che se non saranno quelli, che hanon che perdere superati dall' infima plebe, che è quella, che più si dimostra ardita, et ostinata, non havendo fors' altro pensiero, che d' arrichire con i beni dei compagni; potranno facilmente pensare a casi loro, et prendere anco qualche buona rissolutione.

Gratiae et cet.

158$\frac{8}{9}$, 26 *Gennaro. Di Vandomo.*

Il signor duca d' Umena in Digiuno essendo entrato in sospetto d' alcuni di quel parlamento, che ha conosciuto sempre per buoni servitori di sua maestà li haveva in numero di XV fatti mettere prigioni, et havendo ben presidiata quella città, et tutte l' altre di quella provincia era uscito in campagna si dice per incaminarsi verso Parigi non havendo seco più che mille huomini tra fanti, et cavalli, che non viene stimato numero considerabile tanto, quanto di molta consequenza la sua andata a Parigi per l' animo che darà a quei populi, che non si fidando d' Umala, se non saranno retti da lui converanno finalmente cadere. Monsignor de Pugni ritornando di Piemonte alla Pelissa non molto di quà de Lione è stato da 12 mascherati preso, et menato con un solo servitore, per quanto si dice, in Borgogna. Sua maestà ha fatto rilasciar Pelicard fu secretario di monsignor de Ghisa che ha dato sicurtà di non partirsi di questa città.'

Li deputati delli stati sono una gran parte partiti; et quelli che restano vanno ogni giorno incaminandosi, il che io desidero, che faccino presto; sperando partiti, che siano tutti che doveranno li ambasciatori essere alloggiati a Bles, dove potrò più compitamente sodisfare al debito mio.

Gratiae et cet.

158$\frac{8}{9}$, 26 *Gennaro. Di Vandomo.*

Serenissimo Principe *et cet.* (*omissis*),—

Monsignor d' Umena, che uscito di Digiuno andò in Troia per confirmare a sua devotione gli animi di quei populi s' intende, che parti poi, chi dice con dissegno d' andare a Parigi, et altri vogliono di venire a Orleans, havendo inviato le sue forze verso Montargis, dove si dice, che siano fin' hora, non si sapendo certamente il numero, il che fa stare la Corte con non poco pensiero.

Mi è stato da persona principalissima confidentemente detto, che haveva sua maestà fatto tenere qualche ragionamento con madama de Nemurs, perchè trattasse, che monsignor d' Umena con qualche buona condittione s' astenesse dal moversi contra la maestà sua, la quale ha scritto tutto ciò a monsignor d' Umena pregandolo a sovenirsi di tutti quelli del suo sangue, che sono nelle mani di sua maestà, et a voler lasciare i moti, che possono ritrovar la morte de vivi, ma non la vita de morti; et le ha mandato anco un suo segretario. È stato da qualche d' uno detto che sua maestà habbia pensato di fare, che la detta dama vadi anco con la serenissima regina a Parigi, ma fin' hora non ve n' è fondamento alcuno; et la regina da hieri in quà si ritrova in letto con descesa di cattaro, che le travaglia il petto grandemente, ma per gratia del signor Dio senz' alcun' alteratione di febre, et però si spera, che starà presto bene.

Gratiae et cet.

In lettera seconda di Francia di 30 *zener.* 88 [*i.e.* 89]. *Copia d' una lettera scritta dal Signor Duca d' Umena al Signor Alfonso Corso.*

Sig^{or} Colonello,—

Io lascierò al vostro giuditio, et discrettione il venir quà, o non ci venire; ma ben vi voglio assicurare, che i propositi che havete tenuto passando per Lione a monsignor di Tranges per dirmeli intorno all' homicidio delli signori miei fratelli non mi possono contentare in modo alcuno; et non crederò mai, che ci sia cosa che possa scusare una sì

ingiusta vendetta fatta sopra quelli, che s' erano messi nelle mani del re confidati nella loro innocenza, nelle sue promesse, ne' suoi giuramenti si sovente reiterati, et sì solennemente pronontiati per la riunione di tutti li suoi sudditi catolici alla presenza delli stati generali di questo Regno. Ben ho saputo, ch' io era destinato all' istesso pericolo, ma Dio me n' ha preservato, et di voi non ho creduto quello, che m' è stato detto in questo sugetto, tenendovi io per cavallier d' honore et che non lo vorrebbe macchiare in così brutto misfatto contro di me, che mi sono così liberamente scoperto a voi facendovi vedere si chiaro il secreto dell' animo mio, et della mia intentione, che non potevi dubitare punto, ch' io non fossi interamente huomo da bene, et non desiderassi l' accrescimento della gloria di Dio, del servitio del re et del bene del regno. Hor questa medesima sincerità mi fa al presente rissolvere a quello, che è debito mio, et domandar a Dio, et agl' huomini giustitia della morte de miei fratelli, ben sicuro dei mali, che io con mio dispiacere preveggo dover avenire. Non mi potranno mai esser imputati, et che Dio non m' abbandonerà nel perseguire una si giusta causa la quale io veggo di già essere favorito da buon numero d' huomini da bene nel Regno, et fuori si presenterà forse qualch' altra occasione, nella quale voi mi potrete continuare l' amicitia vostra, la quale io ho con molta affettione desiderato, et io offerirvi la mia ; il che aspettando mi raccomanderò ben affettuosamente alla vostra buona gratia, pregando Dio, Sig^{r} Collonello, che vi conceda quello che più desiderate.

158$\frac{8}{9}$, 31 *Gennaro. Di Bles. Roberto Lio, seg^{io} dell' Amb^{r} Mocenigo.*

Serenissimo Principe *et cet.*,—

Essendo venuto in questa città mandato dal Cl^{mo} Sig^{or} Amb^{r} mio padrone a consignare l' alligate sue lettere per la Serenità Vostra ho trovato, che havendo hieri sera Sua M^{tà} Chr^{ma} dato ordine d' inviare li prencipi, et altri prigioni a Ambuosa, un' hora inanti mezza notte essendo fuggito il duca di Nemurs ha la M^{tà} sua fatto risserrare madama sua madre: et gl' altri, che sono il cardinal di Borbone, il prencipe di Genuilla, il duca del Buf, l' arcivescovo di Lione, il prevosto de mercanti de Parigi, et il presidente Nogli ha questa mattina fatti mettere in due barche, et accompagnati da tutte le sue guardie, non havendo ritenuto, che alcuni pochi svizzeri gli ha inviati a Ambuosa. Mentre ch' io scrivo parte anco S. M^{tà} et conduce seco madama di Nemurs, et mi vien detto, che dopo haver trattato con monsignor de Nivers, che deve egli ancora ritrovarsi hoggi in quella terra, ritornerà la M^{tà} sua in Bles ; di che ho stimato bene d' avisare con queste poche righe riverentemente la Ser^{tà} Vr̄a fin che il Cl^{mo} Sig^{r} Amb^{re} lo possi più particolarmente fare ; et humilissimamente me le inchino.—Di Bles l' ult^{mo} di gen^{ro} 1588. Di Vr̄a Ser^{tà} Humiliss^{o} e devot^{mo} ser^{r} Roberto Lio, seg^{rio} del Cl^{mo} Amb^{or} Mocenigo.

158$\frac{8}{9}$, 2 *Feb. Di Bles. Gio. Mocenigo, Amb^{r}.*

Serenissimo Principe *et cet.*,—

Quel timore, che li buoni servitori, et amici di sua Maestà hanno sempre havuto, che se con la prestezza accompagnata dalla forza, et mediocre rigore non faceva intimorir per la morte del duca de Ghisa quelli, che ostinatamente havevano seguitato il suo partito, per riportarne

la maestà sua buon frutto delle sue attioni; hora si vede per tutte queste cause essere riuscito a grandissimo danno, et pregiuditio della Maestà sua, la quale si come a viva forza è stata tirata a devenir nelle rissolutioni contra Ghisa, così inclinando la sua natural bontà a sperarne da suoi sudditi vera intelligentia di questo fatto, ha dato cagione, che altri fattisi più forti, et assicurati della bontà della maestà sua sono venuti rissolutamente a quell' attione, dalla quale posso dire habbi a depender tutto il servitio, et riputatione del re, perchè il duca d' Umena conoscendo qual' impressione era stata messa, così in Parigi, come Amiens, e Orleans contra il nome di sua maestà, assicuratosi non meno de molti capitani, che erano con il marescial d'Umone, et altri, che ritornavano di Poitù col signor duca de Nivers, chiamate d' ogni parte forze sott' ombra della religion catolica si è spinto inanti con 3 mila fanti, e 500 cavalli, in modo che gionse a 10 leghe lontano da Orleans, quando il marescial d'Umone per sei corrieri avertito, mandando a riconoscere queste forze le fu riportato essere quale ho sopradetto alla serenità vostra, del che havendo avisato la maestà sua, et havuta risposta di prender quella rissolutione a che la necessità l' astringeva, come esperimentato capitano fece attaccar immediate una grossa scaramuzza con quelli della città in un' istesso tempo, havendo dato ordine, che la cavalleria, bagaglio, et altri essercitii militari s' incaminassero verso Boiansi, fece caricar l' artigliaria con più balle, et abbondanza di polvere, lasciando 300 soldati nella cittadella, perchè retirata la scaramuzza nel far della sera, et dopo, che giudicassero esser egli con tutte le forze due leghe lontano uscissero tutti a seguitarlo dando in un' istesso tempo foco all' artigliaria perchè ella si spezzasse aiutati dalli artificii, con che fu caricata, et poche hore dopo vogliono vi entrasse il sudetto duca d' Umena; così havutasi la nova, pensò il re a salvar immediate li pregioni volendo egli medesimo transferirsi con quest' occasione a riveder la città, et castello d' Ambuosa, parendo alle maestà sua, come in vero effetto è non sapersi in chi fidare. Il duca di Nemurs, che più pensava alla Maestà sua di guardare, è fuggito havendo corrotte le guardie, et ogn' uno sa molto bene quanto il duca di Savogia si servirà di questo sogetto, perch' egli accresca quelle miserie in questo regno, et dalla bocca del suo proprio ambasciatore posso giudicare esser desiderate per havermi ben spesso detto 'garbuglio fa per noi.'

Così si diffida al presente il re di monsignor della Sciatra, et de molti capitani che erano nell' essercito di Poitù, delle quali forze si prometteva la Maestà sua, conoscendosi anco quasi apertamente, che Nivers si mostra poco inclinato in voler esponersi in servitio di sua Maestà contra quelli della lega. Quello che facci Parigi vostra serenità può havere inteso assai da mie lettere, et ogni giorno più s' intende quei populi per sdegno precipitarsi a tanto, che fino contra la morta serenissima regina madre mostrano il suo mal' animo, sendo andati a deguastar il monumento, che già con singolar artificio, et tanta spesa fece fabricare in San Dionigi, imputando a lei d'haver condotto Ghisa in Corte per far un tal miserabil fine. Di più mostrandosi un' ampolla di cenere, che dicono essere del già duca de Ghisa, tutti i populi come cosa di riverenza degna la vanno a baciare. Hor serenissimo principe convengo dirle in conformità di quanto li ho scritto da tanto tempo in qua, ch' io non posso pronosticar, se non

tutti quei mali, che io per ragione prevedendoli vorrei per servitio della christianità, et dell' Italia particolarmente havermi ingannato, et tuttavia ingannarmi, poichè il mio errore costerebbe a me solo, et forse senza pregiuditio di quel servitio, verso il quale impiego, et indriccio tutto il mio spirito per ben servire. Il re non ha havuto forze di superar Orleans a lui vicino ; di lontano sono venuti soccorsi a quella città, ogn' uno si sbanda ; si diffida, abbandonando il partito della Maestà sua ; che possi far il Re, vedendosi tutti li Catolici contra starà alla serenità vostra il discorrerne. Quale siano le città ove egli sia per salvarsi per necessità saranno di là da questa riviera ; et quì più si strepiterà, che egli si accosti a Navarra si l' aggiongeranno le calunnie, si decchiariranno le città dubbie, che fin' a quest' hora sono state per la rissolutione della Maestà sua aspettando qualche consequenza d' importanza. Sono state fin' hora, Roans ; Scialon in Sciampagna ; Rens, Tours, et questa città ancora con questa medesima espettatione, ma hora, che le sue forze appareno debilitate, che Parigi si è levato assolutamente dall' ubbidienza del re, che la Surbona per argumento di Christiana religione libera i populi dalla devota ubbidienza, che Orleans ha havuto vittoria sopra la cittadella, levato l' assedio, sbandate la maggior parte delle genti, che haveva il Marescial d' Umon, e ricevuto il duca d'Umena con tante forze, che viene a far quella città come un' antemural a tutte le terre, che sono di quà dalla Loira, è ben credibile, che queste più che mai unitesi saranno per correr la fortuna del duca d' Umena, et per non coadiuvar in ponto alcuno alla volontà del re ; il quale per quanto habbi potuto comandare non ha ricevuto debiti soccorsi da suoi sudditi. Il re è ritornato in questa città contra l' espettatione d' ogn' uno non sapendosi, come possi starvi sicuro, ne meno alcuno può discorrere ove anderà. Questo è quanto al mio gionger quì ho ritrovato di nuovo, il che subito al meglio ch' io posso espedisco alla serenità vostra per un gentil'huomo, che se ne viene a Lione ; havendo comandato, che sia fatta la debita diligenza in Turino, e Milano, come presupono sia stato sempre fatto, poichè tutte le mie lettere per l' importanza delli affari, che passano da un' anno in qua hanno sempre havuto da me tali commissioni.

158$\frac{8}{9}$, 14 *Feb.* *Di Vandomo.*

Serenissimo Principe *et cet.*,—

Havendo hieri scritto alla serenità vostra quanto fin' all' hora s' era inteso così intorno ai moti delle città di questo travagliato regno, come alle provisioni et forze, che hanno in essere sua Maestà, et il duca d'Humena, aggiongerò con l' occasione che mi si rappresenta d' un corriero, che parte per Lione essere partito questa mattina il signor de l' Arsian mandato da Sua Maestà a Ambuosa a levare di quel castello il cardinal di Borbone, per condurlo in questa città, non s' intendendo ancora a che fine.

Il cardinal de Gioiosa ha scritto a questa Maestà, pregandola a volerle conceder licentia di potersene venire in qua poichè per l' atto di sua poca riputatione, che da sua santità era stato astretto di fare nel concistoro non conosceva di poter più fermarsi con suo honore in quella città ; alla qual ricchiesta non farà per qualche giorno risposta la Maestà sua, che vorrà prima vedere come passeranno i negotii suoi a quella corte. Per le instantie di monsignor ill^{mo} legato, et delli vescovi di questo regno, che hanno pre-

muto assai li giorni passati sopra la publicatione del concilio, ha affirmato sua maestà, che sarà publicato liberamente, come a punto S. S. Illma et tutto questo clero desideravan, essendosi contentata, che non si risservi autorità, ne libertà alcuna, ma che s' habbi a dimandare in gratia a S. Santità quelle cose, che si desidereranno.

Ha la Maestà sua fatt' una dechiaratione, che è intitolata contra il tentativo, fellonia, et rebellione del duca d' Umena, et del duca, et cavallier d' Umala, nella quale accusandoli d' infedeltà, et rebellione, dopo haver narrato le male attioni, et cattivi pensieri di monsignor de Ghisa, in vendetta del quale si movevano, prononcia li sopranominati decadutì da tutti li stati, offici, honori, poteri, governi, carghi, dignità, privilegi, et prerogative, che hanno havuti così da lei, come dalli re suoi precessori: li decchiara convinti d' infedeltà, et rebellione, et de crimen laesae maiestatis, et vuole che sia proceduto contra di loro, et contra tutti quelli, che o con la persona, o con viveri, o con il consiglio, aiuto, forze, o commodità li favoriranno; salvo se dentro dal primo giorno di marzo prossimo, per tutti i modi riconosceranno i loro errori, et si rimetteranno all' ubbidienza, che per il comandamento, et parola espressa di Dio giustamente devono alla Maestà sua.

Questa è già un pezzo ch' era fatta, ma a persuasione di diversi, che non stimavano bene, che s' esasperassero gli animi di questi principi non è stata prima d' hoggi lasciata vedere, che conoscendo per esperienza sua maestà, che non tendono ad altro le attioni loro, che alla rovina di questo povero regno, con la condittione del tempo, che le dà di potersi rimettere per tutto questo mese ha voluto, che sia publicata.

158$\frac{8}{9}$, 17 *Feb.* *Di Vandomo.*

Serenissimo Principe *et cet.*,—

Andò monsignor de l' Arsian a Ambuosa, sicome dalla Maestà del Re le era stato comandato, per levare da quel castello il cardinal di Borbone et il prencipe di Genuilla, et condurli in Bles; ma da Lognac, che ritrovò essere ritornato, et tutto unito con Gas, che restò al governo di quella fortezza, le fu risposto, che conosceva molto bene ciò provenire dalla diffidenza, che sua Maestà voleva havere in lui, che ne sentiva molto dispiacere, perchè era buon servitore della Maestà sua, et che come tale voleva egli guardare quei prencipi, che però se ne poteva ritornare, perchè non glieli voleva dare a modo alcuno: onde se ne ritornò due giorni dopo monsignor de l' Arsian con questa risposta a sua Maestà che ne sentì tanto dispiacere, per veder si con così fatto tradimento levati personagi tali, quanto la serenità vostra si può imaginare. Riespedi la Maestà sua il giorno seguente a quella volta il signor cardinal de Lenoncurt, che è zio del sopradetto Lognac perchè con persuasioni, con promesse, et con ogn' altro possibil mezzo procurasse di piegarlo a volerglieli consignare, et appresso a lui mandò le compagnie delle sue guardie, ma essendo ritornata hieri sera S. S. Illma ha riferito non solo di non haver potuto ottennere cosa alcuna, ma anco che haveva ritrovato, che Lognac, e Gas erano in appontamento di dare li pregioni a monsignor d' Umena, che le haveva fatt' offerire 120 mila scudi, et la figliuola, che fu di monsignor de Ghisa per moglie a Lognac, onde se bene haveva tanto operato con ammonitioni, avertimenti, e promesse, che erano per sopra-

stare; che però non poteva promettersi, che non fussero per darglieli, nel qual caso, così resteria la Maestà sua priva di quei prencipi, et personagi, come la città di Bles della commodità della riviera, che da Ambuosa, et Orleans in mezzo delle quali è posta le saria serata.

$158\frac{8}{9}$, 18 *Feb.* *Di Vandomo.*

Serenissimo Principe *et cet.*,—

Non havendo ancora potuto Sua Maestà rihavere la sua pristina salute sta tuttavia retirata nelle sue stanze, nelle quali tiene mattina, e sera consiglio dove si pensa a provedere di denari. Et sentendosi tante sollevationi de città, vedendosi intercette le rendite, et il nemico molto potente a pensare anchora se si deve fermare in Bles sua Maestà christianissima o dove andare intorno al far provision de denari, viene proposto diversi partiti che sono di stampare monete grosse, di marcarne delle picciole, et spenderle per grosse, et ad altri simili modi, et quanto al fermarsi in Bles è messo in consideratione il pericolo per esser serrata la riviera, et quella città circondata dalle già ribellate et partendosi il lasciare la città et il paese in mano de nemici, ne si sa fin' hora, che si sia rissoluto cosa alcuna.

Rimanda la Maestà sua a Lognac l' abbate dal Bene, et con maggiori offerte, et promesse delle prime procura di divertirlo almanco dal dare la libertà ai Prencipi pregioni, ma non si sa, che frutto sia per fare, sapendosi, che quegl' altri stringono il loro trattato, et dicendosi per certo, che questa notte passata è stato veduto monsignor de Lagnac, et il fratello con buon numero di corazze, et d' archibusieri a cavallo venire di verso Orleans et andare alla volta d' Ambuosa si crede per levar, et menar via quei prencipi. Ha sua Maestà dopo la decchiaratione fatta contra il duca d' Umena, et duca et cavallier d' Umala fattane una simile contra le città ribelle nominando Parigi, Orleans, Abevilla, et Amiens, et aggiongendo contra tutte quelle, che s' adherirano a queste, et le favorirano d' aiuti, forze, denari, viveri, od altro, richiamando da quelle tutti li giudici, officiali, et altri, che o rendeno giustitia, o sono ministri nell' essequirla, et prononciandole decadute da tutte le gratie, honori, et beneficii fattili così da lei, come dalli re suoi precessori, se fin' alli 15 del mese di marzo prossimo riconoscendo il loro errore non si rimetteranno nell' ubbidienza sua. Ha comandato anco, che tutti li suoi feudatarii, tutti quelli che sono delle sue ordinanze, et ogn' altro senza eccettuar alcuno, che possi portar arme, che subito sentiti i proclami debbino montar a cavallo, et venir all' armata con tanta diligentia, che il temporizar non habbi ad apportar a loro causa di dispiacere, agl' altri di sospitione de loro cattiva volontà, et agl' inimici tempo di poter previne (*sic*) la loro fedeltà; che lei era rissolutissima d'insieme con loro spendere la roba, et la vita, per rimettere la sua autorità, et stato nel suo primo splendore, et dignità a l' honor di Dio, conservation della nostra santa religione catolica, apostolica, romana, et sollevamento de suoi buoni sudditi.

$158\frac{8}{9}$, 23 *Feb.* *Di Vandomo.*

Serenissimo Principe *et cet.*,—

L' abbate dal Bene, che alli 18 del presente partì di questa città, et di ordine di sua maestà andò in Ambuosa mentre che la mattina delli 19, trattava con Lognac, e Gas sopra il fatto dei prencipi pregioni si ritrovò

anco presente alla consignatione, che per nome di monsignor d' Umena fu loro fatta di 10 milla scudi per parte delli 120 milla promessili. Egli dopo haverli tutti due avertiti a non fidarsi di monsignor d 'Umena, che teneva per fermo, che si fussero ritrovati alla morte de suoi fratelli offerendoli la buona gratia di sua maestà, et assicurandoli, che da lei haveranno ogni maggior sodisfattione, se lasciata ogn' altra prattica le presteranno la debita ubbidienza, non hebbe per risposta altro da loro, se non che erano buoni servitori di sua maestà, contra il servitio della quale non faranno mai cosa alcuna, et che quando fussero assicurati della buona gratia della maestà sua farebbono apparire tutto ciò dagli effetti; con che essendo ritornato l' abbate diede causa di più dubitare della loro mala intentione, la quale s' è ogni giorno poi maggiormente scoperta, così per essersi inteso, che un fratello de Lognac è ultimamente andato a Parigi, come perchè essendo anco stat' a loro di commissione di sua maestà, monsignor de Rieus le hanno fatto dimande così essorbitanti, che quando bene si volesse non saria possibile di concedergliele, uno ricchiedendo d' essere messo nelli governi d'Angiù, Mena, e Turena, che le furono già concessi, dove non è stato volut' accettare per governatore; che le sia munito quel castello in maniera, che le munitioni costerebbono più di 20 milla scudi, et una summa de denari; ancora l' altro che le sia dato Bologna, et Valenza, monitioni in ogn'uno di questi lochi, et denari, si che si tiene, come per disperata la buona riuscita di questo negotio, che essendo di molto momento, è anco di molto pensiero ad ogn' uno.

(*Omissis.*)

Monsignor d' Umena s' intende, che fin' alli 21, era ancor in Parigi, di dove non s' era partito havendo veduto, che quelli buoni ordini, che haveva dato dopo i primi giorni non erano più stati osservati, e che tutto ritornava a riempirsi di confusione; onde haveva creato un consiglio di 40 persone delle più principali della città, il quale governasse, et procurava, che si facessero nuove provisioni de denari. Due giorni sono si disse in Bles che egli era gionto con le sue genti a Sciateodun, che è due picciole giornate da quella città, la quale si mise però in grandissimo terrore; ma espedito immediate uno a quella volta si certificò della verità la maestà sua la quale fatto fare inquisitione de chi haveva disseminato tal nova per castigarlo non potè ritrovarne l' inventore per molta diligentia, che si facesse.

Gratiae et cet.

158$\frac{8}{9}$, 27 *Feb.* *Di Bles.*

Serenissimo Principe *et cet.*,—

(*Omissis.*)

Se io sto quì o a Vandomo non v' è dubbio alcuno, che queste terre saranno combattute o da Navarra, o da Umena, nel qual caso non so, che possi assicurarmi della robba, che a questi tempi mette in pericolo la vita, le qual due cose toccando al mio solo particolare non mi danno quella molestia, che mi da il pensare a qualche accidente, che potesse interessar la dignità della serenità vostra.

(*Omissis.*)

In questo punto sono gionti li Prencipi pregioni, che erano in Ambuosa volendoli sua maestà presso di se, che è quanto giudico bene espedir questa sera, poiche forse dimani partendo il re non vi serà più simil commodità.

Gratiae et cet.

HERALDRY OF OXFORD COLLÉGES.

In 'Archaeologia Oxoniensis,' parts iii. and iv., 1893–94, were published 'Notes on the Heraldry of the Oxford Colleges' by Mr. Perceval Landon. These Notes in several places affect a dogmatic certainty which appears to me to be unwarranted by, and even contradictory to, the available evidence. I cite here a few cases in point.

I. In 'Arch. Oxon.' p. 143, Mr. Landon says: 'Anthony Wood mentions that in 1574 his father claimed and obtained exemption from the jurisdiction of King Clarencieux, as a member of Oxford University, probably as holding some elastic college appointment, since the university, the colleges, and their officials, only were privileged.' Anthony Wood's father matriculated, as a lad of 18, in 1600; so the date given may be conceded to be a slip of the pen for 1634. But the concluding part of the sentence perverts the evidence on an important point, viz. the classes of persons who claimed the privileges of the university. The presumption that 'privileged persons' were only actual members or officials of the university or the colleges is represented as being so strong that there is a 'probability' that Thomas Wood held some college appointment. But there is not a scrap of evidence to show that Thomas Wood ever held such an appointment, or that his title to 'privilege' was other than the fact of his being a graduate (B.C.L. in 1619), resident within the precincts of the university, though not on the college books. Anthony Wood himself certainly held no college or university appointment, even of the most 'elastic' description, and his name had long been 'off the books,' but still he claimed to be a *persona privilegiata*, e.g. in assessments for taxes, etc. (see his 'Life,' iv. 19, iii. 319: the vice-chancellor 'angry' because Wood was taxed by the town).

II. Citing Twyne's narrative of the unsuccessful attempt by the heralds to 'visit' the university and colleges in 1634, Mr. Landon adds, 'Nor were other attempts in 1566, 1574, and 1668 more successful.' This is a flagrant instance of the fallacy of induction from a single instance: because the attempted visitation in 1634 failed, it is assumed that the same was the case in the earlier years. What evidence would be necessary to establish this conclusion? The absence of record in the College of Arms would be quite inconclusive, because it is contrary to reason to suppose that these records are other than incomplete. The presumption is the other way, because in 1634 the heralds asserted that there had been a visitation in 1574. And, as a matter of fact, there is a double record of that visitation. In some colleges in Oxford (*e.g.* All Souls' and Lincoln), officially recognised and preserved by being pasted into the college *Registrum*, are the parch-

ment certificates then issued by Richard Lee, Portcullis Pursuivant. In the College of Arms is the official record of this visitation (MS. H. 6), with the arms of the university and several colleges carefully blazoned, and a certificate attached in each case that this was done by Lee *at his visitation.* It is true that only some of the colleges are found there, but it is an easy supposition that Lee did not complete the writing out of his notes in this most elaborate way—there is no need to suppose that the visitation was interrupted. Mr. Landon has been told of the existence of the certificate at All Souls', but takes upon him to assert ('Arch. Oxon.' p. 156) that the heralds, 'though officially repulsed by the university,[1] still did some private work, and Master Lee has the boldness, if not impertinence, to add to his notice *Now ratified and confirmed by me, Portcullers.*'

III. To Mr. Landon the impalement for the second founder on the shield of Lincoln College ('Arch. Oxon.' p. 199) is so undisputed and indisputable as to require no comment: 'vert, three stags trippant argent, attired or.' But, both in his carefully blazoned certificate left in the college and in the equally deliberate copy in the College of Arms (MS. H. 6), Richard Lee[2] in 1574 gives the coat as 'vert, three stags trippant or.' What reason is there for supposing that Portcullis in 1574 was capable of making such a bad blunder in his official copy of the college coat? If that were decisively proved, it would clearly bring into possibility of suspicion every statement in heraldry, for few coats can be as unmistakably given as these 'stags or.'

Certainly, in some notes of coats of arms in Oxford taken just before the great civil war it is stated that in glass in the college windows the coat appeared as 'vert, three stags trippant argent, attired or.' But these notes are unofficial, the casual jottings of a man interested in heraldry; and in the half-century which had intervened the glass *may* have become less distinct than it had been. The probabilities are in favour of the older record as giving correctly what was known in college about the college arms. This further has to be remembered, that at the earlier date there was in existence a genuine tradition as to Rotheram's family and coat, which would have served as a corrective of the arms painted in college. George Rotheram, elected fellow in 1555, is noted in the college register to be 'consanguineus fundatoris;' and there were also John Rotheram, elected fellow in 1582, and Thomas Rotheram, in 1586.

Mr. Landon says ('Arch. Oxon.' p. 199) that the arms of

[1] Who, reading this sentence, could fairly be expected to perceive that the 'official repulse' is a shadowy fancy of the writer, and not a recorded fact?

[2] The same blazoning is given in Faber's engraving (*circ.* 1700?) of Rotheram's 'portrait.'

Archbishop Rotheram ('vert, three stags trippant argent, attired or'), impaled by the ancient arms of York, are in York Minster and again in the parsonage of Bolton Percy, Yorkshire. Mr. Everett Green, Rouge Dragon, has kindly sent me a photograph of the same coat, similarly impaled, in the windows (I understand) of Sarnesfield Court, near Hereford. But here there is an assumption which deprives the conclusion of any logical validity. On what ground is this coat assigned to Archbishop Rotheram? Solely, as far as I find stated, because of the coat itself, with its three stags (for Rotheram). But three stags are not an unusual bearing, and the conclusion remains uncertain until the coats of Rotheram's proximate predecessors and successors in the see are all known, and it is thus shown that none of them bore 'vert, three stags trippant argent, attired or.'

Archbishop Rotheram's name, family, and coat have long been matters of debate among antiquaries; and the positive statement of Richard Lee in 1574 that the college coat showed 'vert, three stags or' is an important piece of evidence in the question, not to be passed over in silence nor to be set aside without equally positive evidence to the contrary.

IV. Mr. Landon's statements about the coat of Jesus College ('Arch. Oxon.' p. 206) are strongly to be condemned as involving grave moral charges, brought forward solely on the warrant of assumptions. He says, in effect, that this college, having no right to arms, annexed the Rotheram coat from Lincoln. This implies that the authorities of the college 'about the year 1590' were guilty of disreputable conduct, of a particularly foolish kind. What is the proof of this libellous charge? None is given by Mr. Landon that I can discover. His statements about the Jesus College coat, somewhat confused (it must be admitted), may be tabulated thus:—

1. The governing body of the college about 1590 took a coat of arms 'without authority.' It is plain that to establish this statement it must be shown that the records of the College of Arms contain the grant of arms to *all* colleges, and omit it in the case of Jesus College only: no such proof is even attempted.

2. The said governing body then annexed the coat 'vert, three stags trippant argent, attired or,' from the Lincoln College coat. Those who think this possible may believe it.

3. The coat the college now *ought* to bear is 'azure, three stags trippant or.' How he makes this agree with his former statements about Rotheram's coat he does not indicate.

4. The college has 'recently' changed from its proper *azure* to *vert*, following the 'colours' of the college. The date of college 'colours' is unknown, but no one, I presume, would assign to the green coat of the Jesus College boat-club a higher antiquity

than 1820 or 1830. Yet in the eighteenth century 'vert, three stags trippant argent, attired or,' was the coat used in Jesus College (Gutch's Wood's 'Colleges and Halls,' published in 1786, p. 583).

5. Mr. Landon gives a coat found in the margin of the will of Dr. Hugh Price, founder of Jesus College. He overlooks the fact that this is far from proving that Price was entitled to, or even claimed, that coat. If such a claim is made in the text of the will, the fact ought to have been stated.

The truth is that there is no evidence yet forthcoming as to the first appearance of the Jesus College coat, and that later statements of its charges are conflicting, possibly from confusion with the similar coat impaled by Lincoln College. The whole matter requires investigation in a temperate spirit with a view to discover facts, without inventing reasons and imagining motives.

ANDREW CLARK.

SIR EYRE COOTE AND THE 'DICTIONARY OF NATIONAL BIOGRAPHY.'

THE compilation of the 'Dictionary of National Biography' is attended with so much labour and research that criticism of it should be undertaken in no captious spirit. Mistakes should, however, be pointed out for correction in subsequent editions. This is more than usually needed in the case of Professor Morse Stephens's article on Sir Eyre Coote, one section of which, that relating to the second period of his service in India, can only be described as a travesty of the events it professes to relate.

The opening statement is incorrect. Coote, says the writer, joined his regiment, which had been raised at home for service in India, in 1759, at Madras. He did nothing of the sort; he sailed from England with it, under convoy of Admiral Cornish, and landed with it in Madras.[1]

> The first news he heard was that the comte de Lally was threatening the important fortress of Trichinopoly with a powerful army, and he at once marched south from Madras with 1,700 English soldiers and 3,000 sepoys.

First, it would be interesting to know what the authority is for the expression 'powerful army.' Coote himself speaks of Lally's force as 'a detachment,'[2] and we know from Lally that it consisted of a body of men separated from the main force, partially from prudential reasons and partially from necessity;[3] secondly, the sepoys of the English army are given by Coote as 3,500.[4]

[1] Orme, iii. 534.
[2] Despatch to Pitt, 13 Feb. 1760.
[3] *Mémoire pour Lally.*
[4] Despatch to Pitt, 13 Feb. 1760.

He moved with great rapidity and took the important town of Wandewash on 30 Nov. 1759, after a three days' siege, and immediately afterwards reduced the fort of Carangooly. His movements had their intended effect, and Lally, abandoning his attack on Trichinopoly, came against the small English army at the head of 2,200 Europeans and 10,300 sepoys, and at once besieged it in Wandewash.

Nobody would suppose from this statement that, having completely outmanœuvred Coote, Lally cut him off from Wandewash, and caused him to fight a battle to relieve it; yet that is what really took place. To begin with, strictly speaking, Coote did not take the town of Wandewash, after a three days' siege, on 30 November. Brereton stormed it, without a siege at all, at daybreak on the 27th. What Coote did take on the 30th, after a three days' siege, was the fort of Wandewash—a very different thing, as anybody acquainted with the three attacks on the place, by Brereton, Coote, and Lally, will readily recognise.[5] Then, on 10 Jan. Lally marched from Arcot, and made a feint in the direction of Trivatore. Coote, suspecting an attack on Wandewash, left Conjeveram and hurried off to intercept the movement. On the night of the 11th Lally doubled on him in the darkness, and made a dash with his cavalry on Conjeveram, which he looted and fired. Coote on hearing what had occurred marched precipitately back on Conjeveram. This was precisely what Lally had calculated on. He pushed straight for Wandewash, stormed the town, and laid siege to the fort. And this is what the writer of the article actually describes as Lally marching on Wandewash and besieging Coote in it. Again, as to the strength of Lally's force, the estimate given in the article is not that of Lally or that of Coote, whosesoever it may be. There is a generally accepted rule, that the effective strength of opposing armies shall be assumed from the estimates of their respective commanders. The strength of Lally's force as given by himself is 1,350 Europeans, 1,800 sepoys, and 2,000 Mahrattas, making him considerably weaker instead of stronger than Coote.[6]

Having got Coote, by this time, where on his own showing he was not, the writer proceeds to extricate him. 'Coote,' he says, 'closely watched the besiegers, and on 22 Jan. 1760 he suddenly burst out of the town, and, in spite of the disparity in numbers, he utterly defeated the French in their intrenchments.' As a matter of fact he was making strenuous efforts to retrieve his error. Leaving the roads, he plunged through the Palaur, and struck across the open country for Wandewash. When he reached Outramalore his infantry were so exhausted that he was forced to allow them three days' rest, whilst he rode forward with the cavalry to

[5] Coote's despatch to Pitt, 13 Feb. 1760; *Mémoire pour Lally*; Orme.

[6] *Mémoire pour Lally.*

reconnoitre. On the 21st he sent back word for them to advance to Tirimbourg, seven miles from Wandewash; they arrived there the same night. Next morning he advanced against Lally, with the object of forcing his way into the town. The battle of Wandewash was fought, and the French were defeated; but their only 'intrenchments' consisted of a dried-up tank on the extreme left and a small redoubt in their rear.[7] Such is the extraordinary account which the writer of the article has given of a campaign ending in a battle which he says was 'second only to Plassey in its importance.'

The siege of Pondicherry followed the victory of Wandewash. The writer alludes briefly to it. He chronicles the temporary supersession of Coote by Monson with a felicity of inaccuracy. 'At this moment,' he says, 'Major the Hon. William Monson arrived at Madras with a commission to take command of the forces in the Madras presidency.' The Monson in question was George and not William Monson; William Monson was a soldier of a later generation.[8] He, George Monson, did not arrive at Madras, for the sufficient reason that he was already in India. He had served under Brereton at the first siege of Wandewash, had commanded the second line of the English in the battle of 22 Jan., and was at the moment of the receipt of his new commission with the army.[9] Lastly, the 'Madras presidency' did not exist until the India bill of 1784. Monson, however, continues the account, 'soon fell ill,' and on 20 Sept. Coote reassumed the command. 'Soon fell ill' is about as extraordinary a way of conveying the information that he had his leg smashed in an attack on the outworks of the town [10] as could well be imagined. Finally, in a sentence of astonishing accuracy, the fall of the town is related. FREDERICK DIXON.

[7] Coote to Pitt, 13 Feb. 1760; *Mémoire pour Lally*; Orme.
[8] *Dictionary of National Biography*, arts. 'George' and 'William Monson.'
[9] Coote to Lord Barrington, 15 Oct. 1760; Orme.
[10] Monson to Lord Holdernesse, 30 Sept. 1760.

Reviews of Books

Primitive Civilisations; or, Outlines of the History of Ownership in Archaic Communities. By E. J. Simcox. 2 vols. (London: Sonnenschein. 1894.)

The spirit of historical research has the defect compensating its virtue. The increased wealth of material which it places at our disposal separates ever more and more widely not only the specialist and a public desirous of knowing results without processes, but even specialist and specialist. Yet one department may with advantage borrow from others by no means closely allied to it. Political economy, for example, has obviously much to learn from anthropology, and from legal and historical archæology, as to the solutions discovered by an older world or by the arrested civilisations of the immemorial east for the problems which, under changed conditions, we have to face here and now. The economist, however, can no longer resort, as heretofore, to Moses and Herodotus, directly and with little labour to the primary authorities in these fields. The languages in which they are couched he understands not. The historic setting of the facts they record he comprehends not. Even before the mass of secondary authorities he is helpless. If he is to mine at all the rich ore of the history of simpler economies, he must have recourse to some writer who of set purpose has laboured to mediate between him and those from whom he would draw. Such an effort at mediation Miss Simcox has made in 'Primitive Civilisations.'

The history of ownership in archaic communities would in its completeness be that of civilisation—nay, of mankind itself—up to the emergence of modern industrial conditions. Even in its outlines it affords such a view of the social organisation of the elder world as gives to politician and economist an effective background to their subject. Much in the background itself needs further setting in illustrative custom, analogous institution, and what not. And so the purpose of mediation between the economist and the results of archæology, expressed in the sub-title, merges in the larger anthropologico-historical aim conveyed by the main title. Either subject manifestly calls for philosophical largeness of grasp, no mean degree of learning in the spheres of history, ethnography, anthropology, law, and philology, and above all rigid faithfulness to authorities. All these gifts Miss Simcox manifests in a marked degree. Obviously in a work which surveys mankind from China in a volume to Peru in an appendix, and which in a single part reviews civilisation from Massalia to Malabar, originality would be out of place. Nevertheless there is material respecting Arabia from Dr. Glaser's privately

circulated advance sheets, and German reviews thereon, which has been hitherto altogether inaccessible to the reader of English only. There are some striking analogies drawn between special points in diverse civilisations, and there is some speculative ethnography. For the rest Miss Simcox is content to follow known authorities, such as Maspero and Revillout, and great names, such as Movers. And she has achieved a distinguished success. Whatever faults of detail specialists may find in Miss Simcox's volume, in reviewing each his own department, it is certain that to the non-archæologist or non-orientalist, to the general reader, politician, and economist, 'Primitive Civilisations' will offer much that is novel and true, and capable of quick verification.

The great fault of the book is, we venture to think, the absence alike of any explicit declaration of the authoress's degree of competence in the several languages and dialects of the primary sources, and of any critical estimate of the secondary sources. If knowledge of the primary is necessary for the checking of the secondary authorities, it were well to know how far the writer goes in such knowledge; for some skill in ideograms she undoubtedly has, and there is an appendix on the Accadian affinities of Chinese. A defect of less crucial import is lack of proportion. We could well spare the meagre appendix on the Inca civilisation and the chapter on Sparta. Miss Simcox is, perhaps, not on the safest ground when she becomes classical; she uses *rhetra* apparently as a plural, and talks of *suffeti* at Carthage. Either more should have been sacrificed to the comparative method—*e.g.* Chinese ceramics should have been left out—or the comparative method should have gone by the board. We confess to desiderate the latter course. Not much can be made even of such striking analogies as the antichretic mortgage customs of widely separated peoples, unless some 'method of adhesions' be employed, similar to that which Professor Tylor has used to such purpose. And Miss Simcox is at her best when, not thinking of parallels, she tells a history in its appropriate way. Even her account of Sumer and Accad, painstaking as her efforts are, does not compare with her presentation of Egypt. Her history of China, where there is least of analogy and most of straightforward narrative, is the best presentment of that curious civilisation ever accomplished in English. And the economist, amid much that is to him caviare, though not therefore to be spared, will find herein an economic history, which, from its record of currency expedients and experiments in taxation to its review of land tenure and foreign policy, will well repay his consideration. The Chinese seem so often to have missed the western solution of a problem. They seem still more often to have considered and rejected, somewhere in the days of the Sung or the Ming, the solution still approved in the west. The appendix on the Malabar marriage commission is an excellent 'first vintage' of the results of such a study as 'Primitive Civilisations' in its applications to politics. Maps, particularly a series of rough historical maps of China, would be an addition to the book. The index is admirable.

HERBERT W. BLUNT.

Chapters on the Principles of International Law. By JOHN WESTLAKE, Q.C., LL.D. (Cambridge: University Press. 1894.)

DR. WESTLAKE is well known as an authority on private international law; he has given us in these chapters the firstfruits of his activity as a teacher of public international law. His treatment of the subject is thoughtful and independent, but he has not taken time to work out his doctrines in detail or to support them by adequate references. Here and there his statements, though substantially correct, are lacking in completeness and precision. Thus on p. 19 Dr. Westlake says, 'With us the law of nations has come to mean exclusively the law prevailing between states.' Mr. Baron Parke, on the other hand, has told us that the 'law merchant' is a branch of the law of nations; and similar language might be used in describing, *e.g.*, the rules of canon law which form the historical basis of the marriage law in our own and other countries. The most valuable and interesting part of Dr. Westlake's book will be found in the pages which he has devoted to protectorates and 'spheres of influence' in uncivilised regions, and in the chapter on the empire of India. In discussing the relation of India to constitutional law it might have been useful to point out that British India must for many purposes be regarded as a group of settled colonies. When Englishmen first settled in Bengal and Bombay they held land under the Mogul and his feudatories, but they did not place themselves under Mohammedan or Hindoo law; they took their own law with them: and when the British power superseded that of the Moguls the Anglo-Indian law became a territorial law; it applies to all subject persons. Native customs are duly respected, but they must be regarded as personal laws, operating by way of exception to the general law of the land. Dr. Westlake's account of this matter is confirmed and in some points supplemented by Sir F. Pollock's recently published 'Tagore Lectures.' The extension of our authority over the native states is explained by Dr. Westlake (p. 209) not as a case of conquest and cession properly so called, but as 'a peculiar case of conquest, operating by assumption and acquiescence.' These and other facts of the modern world may be used to illustrate the distinction between territorial sovereignty, as defined by international law, and property in land, as defined by municipal law—a distinction which Dr. Westlake claims to have set forth more clearly than previous English writers on the subject.

T. RALEIGH.

The History of Sicily. By EDWARD A. FREEMAN. Vol. IV. From the Tyranny of Dionysios to the Death of Agathokles. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1894.)

THIS volume is yet to be followed by two more of the great Sicilian history which Mr. Freeman had hoped to be able to complete. Worked out as it was his purpose that it should be, it was a gigantic undertaking indeed. Three volumes were needed to relate the story down to the great Athenian disaster and the death of the illustrious Syracusan who did more than any one else to bring about that disaster. A fourth covers the century which separates the rise of the elder Dionysios to the end of the baleful career of Agathokles. The fifth will carry on the story to the

time when Sicily passes under the dominion of Rome; and we have then to leap across more than a millennium before we reach that Norman conquest of which Mr. Freeman has happily left his narrative practically complete in manuscript. But although his work for the several parts of his history was for himself virtually done with the completion of the text, its usefulness for the reader would be seriously impaired if it were put before him in the shape in which the author left it. It was Mr. Freeman's common practice to leave all or most of his notes of reference, and many of his historical and controversial notes, to be added during the task of revision; and the preparation of these notes, and more especially the verification of references, would for any one but himself involve a very arduous, if not altogether baffling, labour. This heavy toil his son-in-law, Mr. Evans, has not hesitated to undertake, and he has discharged the duty not merely with unwearied patience, but with a fulness and accuracy which entitle him to the gratitude of his readers. In fact he has in bulk contributed to this book something like a fourth part of its whole matter; and it is enough to say that from first to last the notes are such as Mr. Freeman would have heartily approved. Mr. Evans has worked for himself and thought for himself, and he frankly admits that he has, in some cases, found it necessary to make use of the notes as a vehicle for conveying dissent from the views expressed in the text. He is fully justified in adding that 'though on the whole the work in its present form seems to be such as Mr. Freeman, when he wrote it, desired to set before the public eye, there is no part that he might not have revised or modified had fresh evidence bearing on the points at issue come under his notice.' It is emphatically true that 'his mind was always open to fresh lights;' and some fresh evidence of no little interest and value has been embodied by Mr. Evans in five supplements, the most important of which deal with the coinage of the elder Dionysios, and also with the coins which belong to the age of Timoleon, and lastly with those of Agathokles.

The gaps left in Mr. Freeman's narrative have been filled up by inserting the necessary passages from his small 'Story of Sicily,' and in a few places by the introduction of one or two sentences. Nothing, however, has been altered in the text or taken away from it; and it is but in one or two cases that anything called for correction, among them being a passage which tells us that 'what Dorieus had failed to do Pyrrhos was to do for another moment, and Junius for a thousand years' (p. 77); and another which, speaking seemingly of Philistos, and of Philistos only, says that 'after his Gothic war he wrote *anecdota*; only this time the *anecdota* were not scandalous but flattering' (p. 694). I can only suppose that Mr. Freeman was purposing in some way to compare Philistos with Procopius, and that he forgot to explain his meaning, or that some words have fallen out of the text. This passage comes from a very valuable appendix on the authorities for the reign of Dionysios. Mr. Freeman's remarks strengthen, if there were any need to strengthen, our confidence in the soundness of his judgment and his ever-vigilant conscientiousness. This impression is left not so much by any formal examination of the materials for this portion of Sicilian history as by the way in which these materials are used. The loss of the work of Philistos is dwelt on with a fulness of regret which the case amply justifies. The

reputation of Philistos is not much less than that of Thucydides; and the measure of his influence over Diodoros and other later writers is brought out in incidental statements, which may be reasonably thought to throw light on the history of a time for which the evidence remaining is often as vague as it is meagre. Of the awful horrors which marked the siege and capture of Motya by Dionysios we hear a great deal. The story has all the vividness which belongs to the narrative of an eye-witness. Of its recapture by the Carthaginians we hear very little. Mr. Freeman is no doubt right in thinking that the difference may be accounted for by the hypothesis that the historian was at both times by the side of his master. The inference is legitimate, and in no way argues over-confidence in the testimony of a contemporary writer who was himself an actor in the drama which he narrates.

The only ground as to which there is any fear that Mr. Freeman may be betrayed into such undue confidence is when he has occasion to refer to statements of the two great men who stand, and must always stand, at the head of all writers of history. Timoleon is marching with his few thousands against the myriads of the invading host of the Carthaginians; and he may, Mr. Freeman rightly judges, have told his men that the odds against them were, after all, not so great as those under which the Athenians and Plataians marched to Marathon. The Carthaginians, he adds, 'were at least not, like the Medes on that day, unknown enemies whose very name was a name of fear' (p. 321). For this statement we are referred to Herodotos, vi. 112. Now it is quite true that the historian in this passage speaks of the Athenians as the first of all the Greeks who had courage enough even to look at the Median dress and at the men who wore it, and that so far the very name of Mede struck terror into the hearts of all Greeks. But, curiously enough, Mr. Freeman forgot to give any hint that this is one of a few utterly astonishing and bewildering statements which we come across in the pages of Herodotos. How Herodotos came to make this statement I do not know; but the plain fact is that it is not true. On Herodotos's own showing the Persians under Megabates had been repulsed at Naxos, Mardonios had been resisted in Macedonia, the Milesins and other Greeks had held out bravely against Persian generals, and one large Persian force had been completely destroyed in Caria. Mr. Freeman, however, receives it because it is made in the pages of an historian who was contemporary with many of the events which he records, and of whose honesty and love of truth there can be no question. So deep, nevertheless, is my sense of Mr. Freeman's learning, of his exactness and his conscientiousness, and so heartily do I share his enthusiasm for all that promotes true freedom of thought and freedom of speech, that the language of eulogy becomes for me quite superfluous. Yet though Mr. Freeman is always absolutely honest, he is not, I think I may say, always consistent. We have seen that he ascribes the great catastrophe of the Athenian enterprise against Syracuse to two causes—the impracticability and folly of the scheme and the utter incapacity of the general who wrecked a plan which but for him might have been brilliantly successful. These causes are represented as concurrent. They are really contradictory, and the one shuts out the other. Is it not possible that a like blending of two different things may

underlie his use of the word freedom when applied to the Hellenic world generally? and is it not a matter of regret that Mr. Freeman should treat the genuine Athenian idea of freedom and the idea of freedom put forth by the Spartans as though both stood on the same level? There are, unquestionably, certain characteristics which broadly separate Hellenic from barbarous tribes; and these characteristics may reasonably be regarded as national. But were not Athens and Sparta in the days of Perikles working out two absolutely contradictory theories, which must end in the destruction of one or other or of both? From this point of view there is no coherent Hellenic body, still less anything which may be spoken of as strictly a Greek people or nation. Yet throughout Mr. Freeman's history there is a constant naming of Hellas as possessed of freedom and independence. As opposing the Carthaginians, Dionysios is the Hellenic champion (p. 65), and Greek cities which join in any action are said to be supported by their countrymen (p. 71). By the success of Dionysios in his first Punic war Syracuse is said to be saved (p. 145), although elsewhere we are told that under a good Carthaginian administration Greek cities might be as well off as under a Greek tyrant. Dionysios during his long tyranny 'had on the whole done more against the Greek nation than for it' (p. 239), although the cities belonging to this nation were as vehemently opposed to each other as the cities of any barbarians could ever be. Mr. Freeman speaks with all reverence of the great purposes of the world's history, and says that if we strive to think of Agathokles as an Hellenic and European champion (p. 398) we shall see that character fast disappear.

But the point is whether there was, or could be, any true political growth in the Dorian tribes generally. Themistokles knew well, although he had never formulated the proposition, that the theory which put the city as the final unit of society was both wrong and absurd. Perikles was even more distinctly conscious that the basis of Greek political life was altogether wrong, if the establishment of a permanent order of things was the purpose to be aimed at. Their convictions were shared, and shared enthusiastically, by the vast majority of their fellow-citizens; and Athens entered on a work which was almost as warmly approved by the people of the cities brought under her alliance as it was by her own. The great undertaking of Brasidas brought out this fact with unmistakable clearness; and a society which had as much right to be called 'Hellas' as had the greatest of Dorian cities was growing up with safeguards for freedom of thought and speech, and for a righteous administration of justice, which were not known or were disregarded elsewhere. But the old eupatrids of Athens, whose philosophy was that of the Dorian folk generally, never submitted themselves, although in numbers they formed an insignificant minority, to the decision of the great mass of the Athenian citizens; and discontent led with them to conspiracy, which stuck at nothing. They had made up their minds that the existing constitution of Athens must be rooted up utterly, as the only effective means for destroying the great confederacy which had indeed been the salvation of all who had been included within it. And when it was overthrown what was the result? The repulse of the Athenians before Syracuse was followed by a long series of alternations, which in the end left things pretty much as they had been. The one bright interval in which Timoleon appears as a leader

not unworthy to be compared with Themistokles and Perikles is but like a passing gleam of sunshine on a cloudy day; and his work is practically effaced in the blood-steeped tyranny of Agathokles. The only remedy was the building up of a society which might continue and expand the work of the great statesmen of imperial Athens. But this remedy it was impossible to apply. Olynthos made the attempt; and the confederacy which she set up extended, like that of Athens, the benefits of law to all its members, compelling all to sacrifice just so much of their independence as was needful for the general welfare, and no more. This was enough for Dorian exclusiveness. The Spartans resolved, as they said, to burn the wasps in their nest. No better fate could be expected for a like attempt made by the men of Akragas in the time of Agathokles. The confederation came to an end; and the condition of things as compared with that which followed the destruction of the Athenian fleet and army was not unlike the effect of the shot exercise of military prisons. The full development of Athenian polity, which was a genuine product of the Ionian mind, must have altered the course of European history, and may have changed it immensely for the better. The Dorian theory was sure to ruin those who clung to it; and in the case of the Hellenic tribes it led first to the supremacy of Macedonian kings, and then to that of Rome. It would, I believe, have been a great gain in the interests of historical truth if Mr. Freeman had more clearly recognised this distinction.

GEORGE W. COX.

Cicero and the Fall of the Roman Republic. By J. L. STRACHAN-DAVIDSON, M.A., Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1894.)

MR. STRACHAN-DAVIDSON is not a whit behind any previous writer in admiration of his hero. He has given us a book charming to read, inspired by a profound study of Cicero's own works, and by a comprehensive knowledge of the best that has been written on the subject. As a contribution to our knowledge of the history of the period his book has the value which a review of well-ascertained facts by a scholar of wide and minute knowledge, gifted with clear insight and strong common sense, must always have. Even when we differ from some of his conclusions we have often to thank Mr. Strachan-Davidson for fresh light thrown on old statements, and for starting us on new lines of thought. His very partisanship gives a vigour and liveliness to the pages which a more impartial essay might have lacked. Still he is a partisan; and it will be necessary in reviewing his work in detail sometimes to hoist a warning signal.

To understand Cicero's constitutional views we must remember before all things that under the existing constitution he had himself succeeded. A provincial and a *novus homo*, he had by sheer ability forced his way into the charmed circle and gained the highest honours of the state. A constitution under which that was possible seemed to him on the whole worth maintaining, though he was not blind to its defects and dangers. He had lived through the monstrous times of Marius and Sulla, and there was ever before his eyes the fear that some one man should again win sufficient support from army and people to play a similar part, and attempt to cure the evils of the time by the sword or by the suspension of the constitution. Cicero was, therefore, always alarmed lest reforms

should bring ugly questions to the front and hasten what they were meant to avert. His one panacea for the dangers and difficulties of the time was the 'harmony of the orders.' If only the senatorial order and the equites would combine in the maintenance of the constitution and in putting down corruption, then they together would be too strong for any Catilines or Cæsars. The interests of the two orders were, however, continually clashing, and when they did coincide it was precisely where corruption required mutual connivance. Mr. Strachan-Davidson has given a graphic picture of the relations between the two orders in regard to the provinces and the state prosecutions for malversation (pp. 33–6). The immunity from such prosecutions enjoyed by the equites seems to have been partly the result of accident. The ultimate authority in the province rested with the proconsul or propraetor. If the *publicani* were oppressive, the remedy lay in the proconsular court. But as between the province and the Roman government the only person held responsible was the proconsul or propraetor himself. The various laws *de repetundis*, therefore, only applied to curule officers, and the *publicani*, if they escaped from the provincial courts, had nothing to fear at Rome. This worked badly when the juries at Rome were equites, because from an *esprit de corps* the equestrian juries were sure to be hard upon any governor who had been strict with the *publicani*. The most notorious case of this sort was that of P. Rutilius Rufus, ruined by an equestrian intrigue because he had been too honest in Asia. The immunity, again, which the equestrian jurymen enjoyed from prosecution for corruption arose by an oversight in making what we should call consequential changes in laws. Gaius Gracchus seems to have passed his law against the corruption of juries before that which transferred the right of sitting on juries from senators to equites. Of course the liability to the former law ought to have been extended at the same time; but in the confusion, perhaps, of the last months of the life of Gaius Gracchus this was not done, and therefore the equites had gradually come to look upon this immunity as their prerogative; and Cicero, in the passage from the 'Pro Cluentio' quoted by Mr. Strachan-Davidson (§ 151), tries speciously to maintain that Sulla had ratified the principle by not including them under any law of corruption. But of course Sulla had not done so because he restored the right of sitting on juries to the senators, and the equites were no longer involved. When, however, by the law of Pompey's consulship in 70 the equites were again admitted to a third of the seats on the juries, a third being filled by citizens next in rank (*tribuni aerarii*), and only a third by senators, no change seems to have been made in the law of corruption (*ne quis iudicio circumveniretur*), and therefore the equites still clung to their immunity. There are signs, however, that even from a strictly legal point of view many lawyers held them to be wrong; and at any rate there was a way of defeating a corrupt jury quite consistent with the constitution. The senate might direct a magistrate (usually a tribune) to bring in a bill dealing with a special case and constituting a court to try it. This was actually done in the notorious and scandalous case of Clodius's acquittal in 61. It is necessary to recall these facts, that we may see clearly what price Cicero was prepared to pay for his favourite 'harmony of the orders,' a piece of time-serving statesmanship which Mr.

Strachan-Davidson fully demonstrates, but has not a word to say against. 'It happened,' says Cicero, 'that I was not in the house when that decree was carried, and I perceived that the equestrian order was offended, though silent; so I took an opportunity to lecture the senate, and did it, so far as I can judge, with much force. The claim of my clients was hardly a reputable one, but I urged it at length and in a dignified tone.' So an immunity, which Mr. Strachan-Davidson elsewhere rightly calls 'monstrous,' and which Cicero himself heartily disapproved, was to be defended with solemnity by a consular in the senate, lest this precious object should be endangered. And when we remember that the 'harmony of the orders' meant the unchecked pillage of the provinces and the defeat of justice at Rome, we shall not easily be induced to think Cicero's action either wise or statesmanlike.

The great crisis of Cicero's life, however, on which he constantly rests his own claim to glory as a statesman, came in the last months of his consulship, when he had to grapple with the conspiracy of Catiline. His own estimate of his conduct is scarcely surpassed by that of Mr. Strachan-Davidson. 'There appears not a single false step to mark from the day when Cicero detached his fellow-consul from Catiline to the day when he broke the back of a formidable conspiracy by the death of five most guilty persons.' . . . 'Cicero's action throughout seems, then, to have been both righteous and prudent. He never lost his head, though pressed by open enemies without and beset with traitors within the city.' To this it may be answered that undoubtedly the position was one of great difficulty, but that Cicero's solution of the difficulty—that of encountering lawlessness by lawlessness—was, and always will be, the most dangerous. Mr. Strachan-Davidson seems to imply in his note (p. 155) that the execution of the Bacchanalians in 186 might have been quoted as a precedent. But though the issue of a commission by the senate for a *quaestio*, instead of by the comitia, was no doubt irregular, it was partly justified by the fact that the majority of the persons accused were Italians, not amenable to the ordinary criminal law of Rome, and over whom the senate had assumed, with at any rate tacit consent, a jurisdiction which, though indefinite, was real. Moreover the deliberate and careful manner in which that investigation was conducted, the observances of forms, and the sifting of evidence appear to contrast favourably with the manner in which Lentulus and the rest were hurried to their doom. But, letting alone the question of legality, was it wise? The *senatus consultum ultimum* had been passed, and the consul was believed to be invested thereby with absolute power of life and death; but, whether that supposition had any legal basis or not, it does not appear to have ever been acted on before, and it practically set up a 'state of siege,' in which, as has been said, any one can govern. It might dismay the opposition for the moment, but it would be likely to be some day turned upon the magistrate who so employed his powers by those who would better his instruction. Nor was there any such violent hurry. The conspirators, however guilty, were in safe keeping. Catiline was baulked of their expected co-operation, and the communication with the Allobroges for the moment was interrupted. If he were beaten in the field, the prisoners might have been safely brought to trial in the ordinary

way; and if he were victorious over the army sent against him, the death of half a dozen accomplices at Rome would not keep him from her gates. It must be clearly understood that the whole responsibility for this is Cicero's. The consultation of the senate and the taking of its sense on the matter gave him, as he conceived, moral support; but the execution of the prisoners depended for its legality, so far as it was legal, upon his absolute *imperium* as consul, revived, as it was held, in its full autocratic extent by the *senatus consultum ultimum.* But if he did not thereby really free himself from responsibility he did manage to commit the senate to irreconcilable hostility to the popular party, with disastrous results in the future.

In the civil war Cicero played neither a very important nor very dignified part. Under the despotism which followed Pharsalus he was constrained or resolved to live a retired life, and the literary fruits of those quieter years are carefully noted and criticised by Mr. Strachan-Davidson. After Caesar's murder he again engaged in politics with extraordinary vehemence, and his fierce controversies with Antony and his curious intercourse with Octavian once more offer numerous points of interest. The catastrophe is finely described, though perhaps more briefly than might have been wished. But the true note is touched in the explanation given (p. 411) of the failure of the policy of the tyrannicides, that under the despotism of Caesar (though, in fact, the process had been coming on for years before it) the real power lay with the army; and the legions had been accustomed to take their *sacramentum* not to the state but to their commander. Cicero was again, therefore, out of his element, and while he thought that he was playing the young Octavian (*laudandum, ornandum, tollendum*) was really a piece in the game played by that miracle of precocious astuteness. The end was inevitable when failure followed such a defiance as the second Philippic, which, in spite of its noble and touching conclusion, one cannot help pronouncing all but unpardonable.

One of the most agreeable and interesting features in this book is the description in the first chapter of the life of a country town in Italy. Not only is it excellently written, but it gives us one of those side-lights on Italian politics which are so instructive and so apt to be neglected amidst the greater glare and stir of imperial policy. E. S. SHUCKBURGH.

Nekyia: Beiträge zur Erklärung der neuentdeckten Petrus-Apokalypse. Von ALBRECHT DIETERICH. (Leipzig: Teubner. 1893.)

HERR DIETERICH's work on the 'Apocalypse of Peter' is so very indirectly connected with the ordinary subjects of the HISTORICAL REVIEW that it can receive only a short notice. He begins by attempting to prove that the newly found fragment which has been generally called the 'Apocalypse of Peter' is not a portion of the work which passed under that name in early Christian antiquity, but a second fragment of the gospel. The hypothesis has neither probability nor argument to recommend it, and serves no purpose but to create a feeling of distrust for Herr Dieterich's subtle but Teutonic methods of argument. The remainder of the book is devoted to the discussion of the extremely interesting topic, what was the origin and source of that conception of the other world which appears in the 'Apocalypse of

Peter' and which thence passed into later Christian literature? The discussion is learned and ingenious, but inconclusive. Its origin is Thrace. The Orphic cult which had its home there was combined with the Pythagoreanism in Italy, and the two together spread eastwards. Whereas it has usually been supposed that theories and pictures of the other world had their home in the east and their sources in the mystical religions of the east, more particularly in Egypt, we are to believe that the legends came to the east from Greece. The theory does not strike us as probable, and Herr Dieterich's method does not convince us. He has, however, collected an immense amount of material which will be of great use to subsequent investigators of a very interesting and difficult subject.

A. C. Headlam.

Die Wahl Gregors VII. Von Carl Mirbt. (Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1892.)

Die Publicistik im Zeitalter Gregors VII. Von D. Carl Mirbt. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung. 1894.)

It is not surprising that the life and work of Gregory VII should of late have attracted much attention from the newer school of historical research in Germany. The bulk of the evidence has long been before the world, and the subject is one that could never fail to command interest, but it has generally been treated in a more or less polemical manner, and this fact, combined with the extraordinary copiousness of the materials, has stood in the way of a complete and impartial survey of the whole of the evidence. An adequate biography of the great pope is still a work of the future, but the volume produced this year by Professor Mirbt supplies a most important contribution to the literature on the subject. Although it only professes to deal with a portion of the evidence, the method of treatment is so careful and complete that, as far as the controversial literature of the period is concerned, it leaves little more to be said. This literature, indeed, is so extensive—for Professor Mirbt deals with 115 works emanating from sixty-five authors—that a thorough examination of it is an indispensable preliminary to a history of the period; and, although the task was taken in hand by Helfenstein forty years ago, various important discoveries that have since been made, and the advance of the methods of historical research, have rendered a fresh investigation necessary. It could not have fallen into better hands. Professor Mirbt has treated the subject with a completeness, an accuracy, a lucidity, and an impartiality that deserve the warmest gratitude from all students of the period. The first division of his work gives a full account of all the extant writings of the period that can fairly be described as *Publicistik.* In the succeeding sections the attitudes of the writers towards the important questions of the time and their statements of facts are carefully examined and compared. These questions are the relations of Gregory to Henry IV, clerical celibacy and simony, the sacraments of married and simoniacal priests, lay investiture, the general relations between church and state, and various points of interest connected with the personal character of Gregory and his public life. The book concludes with a general criticism of the character and significance of the polemical literature.

It is impossible to review all these points in detail, but one or two instances may be given of the new complexion which a closer examination of well-known authorities gives to some of the events of the period. To take, for example, the proceedings of Canossa. Few historical events have taken a greater hold upon the imagination of medieval and modern Europe, and very various judgments have been pronounced on the conduct of both pope and king; but most writers are agreed in representing the scene as the very climax of the contest, the highest point of Gregory's triumph, the lowest depth of Henry's humiliation. If this, however, is a true representation, no contemporary writer had the slightest suspicion of the significance of the fact. Only six of the controversial writers, four of those on the king's side and two on that of the pope, take the trouble to comment on the episode at all. The king's adherents call it, indeed, a *humilitas*; but by this they mean, as the context abundantly proves, not a 'humiliation' but 'an act of humility.' The excommunication of the king had shaken Christendom, but, as he had been excommunicated, it was a perfectly natural and proper thing, in the estimation of that age, that he should do public penance. The scene at Canossa was an edifying spectacle, but not otherwise remarkable; it was strictly in accordance with precedent. Various accusations in connexion with it, for the most part plainly false, are brought against the pope, especially by the writer of the treatise 'De Unitate Ecclesiae.' But no one thought of accusing him, as modern writers have done, of inflicting an unwise and ungenerous humiliation on a fallen enemy; no one suspected for a moment that Henry had suffered a personal indignity. Such ideas belonged to a later age. As a matter of fact the king was the only person who gained by the transaction; his enemies were furious about it, and nothing could have been less in accordance with the wishes of the pope, whose great scheme of sitting in judgment in Germany to decide the strife between the king and the princes was shattered by it. Gregory, as he himself says, was *devictus* by the attitude of the king, and his only concern was to minimise and apologise for the event, not at all to exult in it. He may, perhaps, be justly accused of some want of straightforwardness afterwards, but at the moment he probably had no choice but to act exactly as he did.

To take another example, the interesting questions connected with Gregory's election as pope, which were the theme of much controversy during his lifetime, and which are still to a great extent unanswered, have been dealt with by Professor Mirbt in a separate treatise, and the results only are summed up in his later work. In spite of the abundance of contemporary evidence the facts are much in dispute. Even Gregory's adherents differ fundamentally in their account of his election, some representing it as the result of a sudden and unexpected outbreak of popular feeling, others as an ordinary legal process. Here, however, there is little doubt that Gregory's own representation of the facts, written within a few days after the event, to correspondents who were about to come to Rome, and who would, therefore, have no difficulty in ascertaining the truth, is to be preferred. And Gregory positively affirms the fact of a popular tumult which he himself was quite unable to withstand. The enemies of the pope, on the other hand, bring many and various charges against him. They accuse him of having thrust himself into office, of

having employed bribery and violence, of having broken an oath made to Henry III, and some add to Henry IV also, never to accept the pontificate, of having neglected to obtain the royal assent either before or after his election, and finally of having been elected at an unlawful time and in an unlawful manner. One weak point about all these charges is that it did not occur to any one to make them until three years or more after the event, when the conflict between the pope and the king had begun. Several of them are clearly afterthoughts ; others are involved in great obscurity. To take them in order, the accusation of having been ambitious of the dignity of pope is one which hardly admits of proof or disproof, and is too vague to be taken much account of. Even if it could be maintained that Gregory's repeated and emphatic assertions of his unwillingness to accept his great office may have been wholly or in part insincere or conventional, still almost the only evidence that has been alleged of his having schemed for election rests on the fact that at the moment he was on friendly terms with several of those who were afterwards his bitterest enemies, and this clearly does not prove much. The charges of bribery and violence may be summarily dismissed ; even Gregory's least scrupulous opponents do not seem to have set much store by them. The question of the alleged oath is a little more difficult, for the accusation was made with great publicity and from many quarters. But the accusers differ so fundamentally as to the time, the place, the occasion, and the purport of the engagement, and some of their statements are so plainly fabulous, that there is really nothing to outweigh the antecedent improbability of such an event. As to the royal assent, Professor Mirbt comes to the conclusion that no previous sanction of the election was or could have been obtained, but that the king did give his subsequent assent. With regard, however, to the actual election, he considers it to be practically certain that if the celebrated decree of 1059 is to be regarded as binding, it was, on Gregory's own showing, unquestionably illegal. He accounts for the silence of his adversaries in Germany during the following years, and for their subsequent failure to grasp the real point at issue, by the probability that the decree of Nicolas II was little known beyond the Alps, and that even where it was known it was ignored, as interfering with the royal prerogatives. The precise method of election was a matter of indifference to the German court, and, as neither Henry nor any influential party was at the moment in a position to set up an antipope, it was no one's interest to call attention to the informalities of the election. Thus Gregory obtained the advantage of an unchallenged tenure of office for three years.

This rough sketch of some of the results of Professor Mirbt's examination of authorities does scanty justice to the completeness of his research ; but the fact that he has succeeded in throwing new light on two much-debated events may suffice to show how invaluable an assistance he has provided for all who wish to make a careful study of one of the most important periods of medieval history. J. H. Maude.

Die Legation des Kardinalbischofs Nikolaus von Albano in Skandinavien. Von Dr. Robert Breyer. (Halle a. S.: Gebauer-Schwetschke. 1893.)

As an episode in the career of the only Englishman who ever sat in St. Peter's chair, the subject of this essay has a special interest for English

readers. As an episode in the ecclesiastical history of northern Europe its importance is considerable; and from this point of view Dr. Breyer's gathering up of the evidence which can be brought to bear on it from northern sources is doubtless not without value. The mass of foot-notes which overload his pages seem, however, to contain little that is actually new, and he totally misses the real significance of Nicolas's mission, as part of the great scheme planned by Eugene III and St. Bernard for the building up of national life and national government in the outlying states of Europe by means of a national organisation of the church. The main work which Nicolas was sent to do for Norway and Sweden, in freeing them from their spiritual allegiance to a Danish metropolitan, and launching them on an independent ecclesiastical career, each under a primate of its own—a work easily accomplished in Norway, but foiled in Sweden by political hindrances—has its counterpart in the work which John Paparo was sent to do for Ireland in the very same year, 1152. A lengthy discussion of many matters in which the share of Nicolas is, after all, probable rather than proved, might have been advantageously replaced by a comparative study of these two legations, whose coincidence is far more than one of time alone. With the earlier life of Nicolas, as told by English historians, Dr. Breyer deals in somewhat high-handed fashion. His argument against the authenticity of the name Breakspear, given to Nicolas by Matthew Paris, is hardly a logical deduction from the words of Dr. Liebermann (or rather of Sir John Evans), to which he refers (p. 5, note 6). His sneer at the *Jesuitenmoral* of Father Pfülf (*ib.* note 4) is as irrelevant as it is uncourteous; and the statement (p. 7) that the old Norse tongue was in 1150 'still used in some districts of what is now England,' with a reference to Noreen's 'Altnordische Grammatik' and to the German translation of Green's 'History of the English People,' calls for protest. The only 'district of what is now England' mentioned by Noreen is Northumberland, of which he simply says that the Norse tongue 'has long been extinct there;' while the words of Mr. Green—faithfully rendered by the translator—are, 'His language *differed little from* the English tongue,' and the reference of the possessive pronoun is to Cnut the Dane.

KATE NORGATE.

Der Einfall der Mongolen in Mitteleuropa in den Jahren 1241 *und* 1242. Von GUSTAV STRAKOSCH-GRASSMANN. (Innsbruck: Wagner. 1893.)

THIS is a good instance of the thorough way in which German scholars work at special epochs of history. Dr. Strakosch-Grassmann attempts no general view of Mongol or of European history in the middle of the thirteenth century, as his predecessors Ohsson and Wolff did; he merely picks out the great Mongol irruption into Europe under Batu Khan, and brings to bear upon it a minute and apparently exhaustive study not only of all the sources previously used but of the large amount of material which has accumulated since Wolff published his 'Geschichte der Mongolen' in 1872. Foot-references and admirable bibliographical indexes amply testify to Dr. Strakosch-Grassmann's laborious re-examination of all available European sources, manuscript or printed, and his appendices and foot-notes show that he has exercised a sound criticism in dealing

with his authorities. The main defect is that his work is admittedly one-sided: he has made no attempt to ransack the Oriental texts and manuscripts, and merely uses such Oriental data as his forerunners have published. On the European side, however, he has collected, as far as can be judged, every important source of evidence, and some of his documents (such as the letter of the French Templar Ponces d'Aubon to Louis IX on the battle of Liegnitz) are now brought forward for the first time. To the general reader perhaps the one commonplace of history connected with the Mongol invasion is that 'the valour of the Teutonic knights, in driving back the Mongol hordes at Liegnitz on 9 April, 1241, saved Europe.' Gibbon knew better than that, but even Mr. Freeman, in his 'General Sketch,' records the defeat of the *Teutonic* knights at Liegnitz. Dr. Strakosch-Grassman, however, shows not only that the Mongols won a complete victory, but that there is no evidence for Pompo of Osterna or any other knights of the Teutonic order having been in the battle at all, though there was a strong array of Templars. Nor was Europe saved by the valour of any European army. King Wenceslaus arrived too late and adopted a strictly defensive strategy, and after Liegnitz the Mongols carried their devastating raid into Moravia. The saving of Europe was effected by no battle, but by the death of the great Khan Ogotay, which compelled a general assembly of his kindred to choose a successor, and thus summoned Batu to Karakorum. The maps are a useful addition to this valuable monograph, and the indexes are all that could be wished.

S. Lane-Poole.

Geschichte des Deutschen Reiches während des grossen Interregnums 1245–1273. Von Dr. J. Kempf. (Würzburg: A. Stuber. 1893.)

This book gives a diligent and careful account of political events in Germany from the election of Heinrich Raspe to that of Rudolf of Habsburg, and is sure to be useful to future inquirers into the history of that period. But as a 'history' it is disappointing. It is true the subject does not easily lend itself to the epic treatment. Of much of the history of the great interregnum only fragments have been preserved. Our information as to the doings, the mere movements of even the chief actors on the scene is exceedingly limited, or rather intermittent, and it is, therefore, often impossible to form a sure estimate of their policy and motives. But these difficulties a more practised author would have taken account of in laying the plan of his book. As it is, the few facts on which we are more fully informed stand out in undue proportion, while in between come disquisitions as to what probably did happen in the interval. These disquisitions on special points, constantly interrupting the connexion of the narrative, go a long way towards making much of the book awkward reading. In our opinion these had been better placed in the notes,[1] and we also venture to think that by adopting a different plan from that of following the accidental movements of kings and anti-kings it would have been possible to make the narrative less bare and broken.

The fact is that the book under review gives the reader scarcely an

[1] As also the frequent references to Böhmer-Ficker and Potthast.

idea of the great political significance of the thirteenth century for Germany. The doings of the various kings and counter-kings, of electors and minor potentates; the prices the former paid for their crowns, and the side each of the latter took; the time at which such a town joined such a party, and who attended such a diet; all this is not in itself so important as the new start the general political development of Germany took during the period. If an account of those great political changes had formed the backbone of the book, all individual actions would have found their due place, and the enterprises of the various politicians and parties would have become much more intelligible. Everything depends on this. Selfish as the policy of the German princes and nobles was, it had at least a sound basis, the grand object of all being the consolidation of their territories. This was so both with laymen and ecclesiastics, and if this great movement had been well understood by the author, we should, *e.g.*, not have heard the assertion that, in contrast to the lay princes, the bishops and abbots, in taking either the papal or the imperial side, were actuated by no motive but honest conviction (p. 21). This great aim of consolidating and ordering their territories also explains why both lay and clerical princes were so extraordinarily greedy of money. Up to the thirteenth century Germany may be said to have had no constitution, properly speaking, at all; it was then that the constitution that was to subsist more or less for five hundred years began to form.

The spirit of Dr. Kempf's narrative is impartial enough, but personal conviction (*Gesinnung*) plays altogether too large a part with him in explaining political actions. Thus the opposition of the episcopal towns to their bishops is ascribed to mere loyalty towards the king (pp. 31, 34). Again, we see no reason to rail at Cologne for the conditions—*würdig einer misstrauischen Krämerstadt*, Dr. Kempf calls them—under which it recognised William of Holland (p. 53, cf. p. 209). Further, in speaking of the unsatisfactory turn things in Germany took during Frederick II's reign, too much stress is laid on his preference for Italy (pp. 102, 113, 122, 149). The author asserts that the re-establishment of a strong and independent central power in Germany was certainly not impossible, had Frederick at all cared for such a thing (p. 112). At the same time he describes that emperor as a weak and irresolute man, not knowing his own ends and having no definite policy (pp. 9, 91). If some elder historians of note have propounded views regarding the policy of Frederick not directly opposed to those expressed by Dr. Kempf, still we cannot think it the business of the investigator simply to reproduce those views in an exaggerated manner, and without advancing solid arguments in their support. Altogether the author manifests rather a strong tendency to lecture men who probably knew what they were about.[2] On the other hand, his impartiality appears too often due to his not having arrived at a definite judgment as to the questions at issue. One also misses a view of the anarchy which, the author says, obtained in Germany during the interregnum.

So much for the general character of the book. Of special points

[2] See, *e.g.*, p. 102 for a contradiction in which the author involves himself in consequence. As a contrast to his treatment of Frederick II, see p. 178 about William; also p. 157.

we will mention only a few. The author attempts to establish the genuineness of the letters published by Busson relating to a plan of replacing William on the throne of Germany by Ottokar of Bohemia (p. 157 and Excurs. 4). As to this question, we may refer the reader to Professor Grauert's review of Dr. Kempf's book in the August number of the *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen.* In another special chapter (Excurs. 1) the author puts forward a theory that the preserved text of Matthew Paris's 'Chronica maiora' includes additions by at least one other St. Albans monk, and that the trustworthiness of the chronicle would be greatly enhanced if these were expunged (p. 271). The severe criticism (p. 265 [3]) of Professor von der Ropp on the policy of Gregory X must be due to a misunderstanding of the passage in question. F. KEUTGEN.

I primi due Secoli della Storia di Firenze. Ricerche di PASQUALE VILLARI. Vol. II. (Florence: Sansoni. 1894.)

The two first Centuries of Florentine History. By Professor PASQUALE VILLARI. Translated by LINDA VILLARI. (London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1894.)

THE second and concluding volume of Professor Villari's studies carries the history of Florence to the death of Henry of Luxemburg. It is prefaced by a chapter on the relations of the family to the state, which, perhaps, the author would have done wisely in omitting. The subject has an abstract character, and necessarily conducts the reader into very ancient times; it thus seems out of place in what is virtually a concrete and continuous history of Florence. Nor can so wide a question be adequately treated in an essay, although it be so long as to give a lack of proportion to the volume. It is true enough that the relation of family to state is a factor in the antagonism between the Teutonic and Romanic elements of Italian society, which is the *refrain* of these volumes, and that Florence is the field whereon the latter won a signal, if Pyrrhic, victory. Nevertheless the detail given as to the actual conditions of family life in Florence is but slight, and for the purposes of the second chapter, where the subject is important, the reader has already learned almost more from the description of the family groups politically associated in the *Torri.* As an appendix Professor Villari has printed the chronicle traditionally, but falsely, ascribed to Brunetto Latini, or rather the portion of it which throws light upon Florentine history, and which, beginning in the eleventh century, ends with the year 1297. The earlier section, still unprinted, is a mere analysis of Martinus Polonus, and has little interest; the independent value of the chronicle may be said, indeed, to date from 1131.

Between the introductory chapter and the appendix lie three essays which treat of the ordinances of justice of 1293, of Florence in the time of Dante, and of the exile of the Whites in its relation to the expedition of Henry of Luxemburg. In the first of these Professor Villari is at his best, for he has to trace a definite constitutional movement in close connexion with a remarkable personality, and he is, as always, peculiarly skilful in keeping the scales of interest level. This chapter or essay we should be disposed to think the most artistic of the series. It

is clearly shown that the ordinances and their immediate results were rather the completion than the initiation of a popular programme. The Arts had already the monopoly of government, but by making membership more real—that is, more professional—they blocked for a time a surreptitious avenue to office. It was easy enough in Florence to create a constitution; the difficulty was to make administration effective. The addition of a gonfalonier of justice to the priors was a step in this direction. The ostensible government was brought into closer contact with the executive and with such military and police force as the republic could command. The podestà, as being a foreign noble, was open to the social prejudices of his class. It was certain that henceforth, apart from momentary reaction, the podestà would be the sinking and the gonfalonier the rising power.

The government was rather strengthened than altered. The main object of the ordinances was to curb the pretensions of the nobles, which since their services on the field of Campaldino had become intolerable. They had already been excluded from the supreme magistracy; the mutual responsibility of the family for pecuniary penalties incurred by its members had already been recognised; each noble had already been individually compelled to compound beforehand for the outrage which he was tolerably certain to commit. All that the ordinances of justice did was to stiffen the regulations, raise the penalties, and strengthen the arm of the executive. Democratic forms are of little avail where there is an inveterate habit of clique or caucus. At this very time efforts were made to render illegal the formation of 'rings' or unauthorised associations within the several Arts. On the other hand Giano della Bella realised that the chief obstacle to constitutional government was the existence of the Parte Guelfa, with its councils, its executive, its far-reaching foreign relations, its financial resources, which could be increased at need by fresh proscriptions on the charge of Ghibellinism. When Giano declared that he would break up his independent organisation, and merge its powers in those of the signoria, he suggested the specific for the chronic malady of all Florentine government, the existence of this or that external body which was always a force more powerful than the constitution.

Professor Villari shows that the ordinances were not technically the work of the man whose name they bear. Giano della Bella had no office at the time, and no share in proposing or carrying them. Yet it is not doubted that he exercised the necessary pressure from the street, and it was of importance that he sat in the first signoria which had to execute its predecessor's statutes. This popular leader was a noble estranged from his class, so runs the story, because another noble pulled his nose. He threw himself, however, not so much on the support of the wealthier *bourgeoisie*, but on that of the tradesmen and working classes, whose interests were not identical with those of the *popolo grasso*. Resolute and vindictive, he was a born demagogue save for his genuine love of justice. This caused his fall, for he not only inveighed against the violence and corruption of the judicial class, but offended the most unscrupulous section of his own supporters, the butchers. It was an easy matter for the nobles to combine against him the *bourgeoisie*, who feared

his popularity, with the lawyers and butchers, who hated his uprightness.

The fall of Giano della Bella led to some modification of the ordinances in favour of the nobles, and, indeed, their influence with the podestà and the capitano, who were men of their own class, and who practically owed their office to their selection, had rendered them in many cases inoperative. Partly through the agency of the Parte Guelfa, and partly through the social dependence of the lower classes, the nobles virtually controlled the government. This control might have been permanent but for the ineradicable vice of oligarchy, internal faction. Divisions were accentuated by the heterogeneous character of the noble class. Some had long been completely urban, while others exercised a patriarchal rule over wide stretches of the Apennines. Families of ancient wealth but citizen origin had received a brevet by traditional courtesy; others had been recently promoted by way of penalty for their opinions.

The author admirably traces the course of the conflict between Blacks and Whites, between Corso Donati, resting on the more violent section of the nobility and the working classes, and Vieri dei Cerchi, who found support in the *popolo grasso* and those more moderate nobles who were prepared to accept the ordinances. While the Cerchi rallied round the constitutional magistracy, the signoria, the Donati, more military and more unscrupulous, found a stronghold in the palace of the Parte Guelfa. Internal faction was complicated by foreign politics. The contagion of popular institutions had infected the Roman people, and Boniface VIII, absolutist and ambitious, determined upon a counterstroke against the republican government. Thus the pope allied himself with the Donati, and overawed the whites by inviting Charles of Anjou to Florence, while the Cerchi resisted foreign intervention. Professor Villari confesses that this was a conflict of persons rather than of principles, that the names Guelf and Ghibelline cannot properly be applied to the contending parties; yet he holds that at the moment of their defeat the Cerchi might claim, rather than the Donati, to represent Guelfic principles. In this we do not quite follow him. It is true that Corso Donati was in alliance with the nobility of the rural districts, lately Ghibelline, that he connected himself by marriage with the Ubertini, as afterwards with Uggucciono della Faggiuola. Yet the control of the Parte Guelfa is, perhaps, the better test, and the Blacks from the first clung to the champions of Guelfism, the pope and the house of Anjou. The Blacks at all events professed that the Ghibellinism of the Whites was the cause of their hostility. The difficulty would seem to arise from identifying the mercantile Romanic and the military Teutonic elements too closely with the respective political factions.

With the exile of the Whites faction by no means ended, for it broke out fiercely within the victorious party, and Corso Donati himself was in turn forced over into alliance with the Ghibellines of Tuscany. His death was due to a spasmodic fit of authority on the part of the signoria, which, however, was acting rather as the ally of the opposing faction than as the judge of the state. What surprises the reader most is the energy and capacity with which the dominant party in this faction-riven town first broke up the bands of exiles, and then successfully resisted the more

organised forces of Henry VII; to do full justice to those qualities he must turn to the actual documents printed by Bonaini in his 'Acta Enrici VII.' This period of confusion would not probably attract so much attention but for its adventitious interest in connexion with the career of Dante. The author naturally shows the relation of the poet's theories to this episode in the eternal struggle between liberty and order. Students of Dante will also find interest in a long note on the vexed question of his embassy to Rome, and in another on the genuineness of the letter to the cardinal of Prato.

The mercantile classes, the greater Arts, undoubtedly gained by the events here recorded. Their business was little affected by a *mêlée* of nobles on the Piazza Santa Trinità, and even when the emperor besieged the town the gates were opened on the further side. Each successive proscription weakened the nobility, and the great fire of 1304, which destroyed the very ὀμφαλός of Florence, contributed not a little to this result, while the sacrifice of merchandise was but momentary. The Arts, moreover, took positive measures in the same direction. They made their arm felt among the rural nobility of the distant Casentino and Mugello. Within the town the creation of an *esecutore di giustizia* in 1306 added some reality to the penalties of the ordinances, and it is noticeable that this office was closed not only to nobles, but to lawyers, whose corruption had proved the most serious impediment to the execution of the law. Mercantile law, moreover, lay outside the province of the ordinary judges, especially since the five leading Arts combined in 1308 to form the Corpus Mercatorum, a formal tribunal of commerce, which was shortly regulated by its own body of statutes. The nobles were, indeed, still indispensable for military service, but even this monopoly they lost on the introduction of mercenary companies. Noble families forced into trade and acquiring wealth found the same interest in order as did the *bourgeois*. Of the two wealthiest families of later days, the Pazzi and the Medici, the former were among the most violent adherents of Corso Donati, while the latter distinguished themselves by their cruelty in the persecution of the Whites.

It is, after all, difficult to sympathise with the policy of the victorious mercantile class. Its motive was not patriotism, but material wealth. Rejecting the traditional authority of the emperor, because it was supposed to favour the nobles and the rival Ghibelline towns, it accepted the dominion of a Walter of Brienne and a Charles of Valois, of Charles and Robert of Naples, neighbours far more dangerous to liberty than were the German emperors. Victory led not to popular government, but, in spite of popular forms, to an oligarchy of wealth. This, while discarding the military virtues of the aristocracy, plagiarised its vices, its factiousness, and its family conceit. It would be wrong to identify the nobles of Florence with the so-called nobility of Venice, yet it is interesting to compare the political results of the exclusion of the upper *stratum* of society from government in 1293 with its monopoly of the administration at Venice from 1296.

The first volume of this book has in the original received full treatment in this Review (vol. ix. 352–358). Professor Villari is singularly fortunate in his translator. Signora Villari adds to independent literary

gifts a competent knowledge of constitutional technicalities, the stumbling-block on which translators too often trip. She has done wisely in leaving official titles for which there is no English counterpart in the original Italian, adding at the first occasion on which the terms are used a short explanation or paraphrase. A brief glossary would have been an additional convenience. In translating from Italian into English it is extremely difficult to avoid a tone of artificiality or sentimentalism. This English version is, however, almost invariably simplicity itself, and is in this respect, perhaps, the most successful of Signora Villari's translations. We confess to having had doubts as to whether this series of lectures were not too technical for the English public, but we are disposed to think that in their new garb they will find favour with all who have an intelligent interest in Florence and her history. The book is profusely illustrated. It is at once pleasant and painful to be reminded of the Mercato Vecchio, now supplanted by the abomination of vulgarisation. The numerous plates representing Roman and Etruscan antiquities seem somewhat out of proportion to the importance of Florence in ancient history; there are many Tuscan sites—San Miniato dei Tedeschi, for instance, with its imperial keep—which would have added reality to the tale of the contest between Guelf and Ghibelline. E. Armstrong.

Social England. Edited by H. D. Traill, D.C.L. Vol. II.—From the Accession of Edward I to the Death of Henry VII. (London: Cassell & Co. 1894.)

The first volume of this rather ambitious attempt to secure a comprehensive 'record of the progress of the people' by the method of collaboration was subjected to some severe strictures in our last volume,[1] on the score of certain inaccuracies and inadequacies. These were held to be largely traceable to the choice of an editor who, with many general qualifications for the position, hardly possesses that intimate acquaintance with medieval English history which would have enabled him to exercise a sufficient check upon his contributors. Where the conditions under which such a work as this is published do not in every case permit the selection of contributors who are acknowledged authorities on the subjects with which they have to deal, it is all the more necessary that the editor himself should be a trained historian abreast of the latest advances in historical studies. The present instalment is much freer from the defects referred to. Their number, however, remains more considerable than it ought to be. Richard of Cirencester is kept in countenance by Matthew of Westminster, and Flodoard figures as an authority for the state of the English navy in the fourteenth century. One contributor sketches (p. 266) the travels of 'our own Englishman' Sir John Maundeville, with a faint reminder that 'it has been doubted whether he ever existed,' which we suspect the editor to have inserted in order to reconcile him with Mr. Beazley (p. 356). In the list of authorities there is no mention of the valuable chronicle of Galfrid le Baker of Swinbrook, and Sir Thomas de la Moor appears as the author of a life of Edward II, without a hint that the 'Vita et Mors' attributed to him is in all probability nothing more than an excerpt from

[1] Vol. ix. p. 721.

Baker. The rich store of French materials for the history of the Hundred Years' War might have been more fully indicated; Mr. A. L. Smith, we notice, still speaks of the battle of Châtillon, though Mr. Oman elsewhere uses the correct Aquitanian form Castillon. The editor, again, should not have allowed a well-known statement about the number of the Lollards to be attributed on p. 153 to Walsingham and on p. 290 to Knighton. Liège was not in Hainault (p. 52), nor can Cleobury Mortimer be described, without some danger of misleading the reader, as near the Malvern Hills (p. 225). Mistakes of this kind, trivial enough in themselves, and such uncorrected printer's errors as 'Wilkins' Consilium Magnum Britannicum' and Barnard's (for Baynard's) Castle point to imperfect editorial oversight. But, after all, they do not seriously mar the usefulness of this volume. Most of the writers have some claim to be considered as specialists on the subjects treated by them, and with one exception none of them falls conspicuously below the level which we have a right to expect in a work that purports to summarise the latest results of historical scholarship. Nothing better could be wished than Professor Maitland's most interesting account of the origin of the 'bar' and the relations of that 'ungodly jumble' the common law to the constitution and the court of chancery. Mr. Oman in explaining the victories of Crécy and Agincourt, Mr. Poole in dealing with Wycliffe and the Lollards, Dr. Creighton in tracing the history of the Black Death, and Mr. Beazley in recounting the scanty beginnings of English discovery and exploration, all speak with acknowledged authority on their respective subjects, and leave little or no scope for criticism. The growth of English commerce and commercial policy finds very competent exponents in Mr. Hubert Hall and Mr. Hewins. But does not the former come near to a confusion of ideas when he refers to the merchants of Aquitaine as representing the *colonial* interest of England? The only objections we would take to Mr. Hughes's articles on architecture and the related arts are that the fine effigy of Brian Fitzalan in Bedale Church should not have been omitted in an account of monumental sculpture in the first half of the thirteenth century, and that the perfect example of the Edwardian manorhouse, which can still be seen at Stokesay, in Shropshire, is ignored by him. He may be pardoned for still believing in the story of Queen Eleanor sucking the poison from her husband's wound (p. 52).

In thoroughness and accuracy the sections on English literature by Dr. Frank Heath will bear comparison with any in the book, but they suffer somewhat by being thrown into a form hardly in keeping with the rest. The other writers have kept in mind that they are not addressing themselves to an audience of specialists, and have all struck with more or less success the right narrative note. But Dr. Heath misses the happy mean between frothy superficiality and the conscientious heaviness of the *Handbuch*. He interrupts the flow of his narrative by foot-notes on points scarcely within the scope of a work like this, and by metrical analyses full of highly technical terms, such as *anakrusis* and *rime couée*, and unintelligible in the absence of illustrative examples. A critic of literature too ought not, perhaps, to speak of '*beautifying* middle English poetry'! The perfunctory sections on 'Social Life,' by a writer who wisely remains anonymous, are unworthy of their position. They are

disorderly in choice and arrangement of matter, repeat what has been more properly and more accurately given elsewhere, and are based upon no real acquaintance with contemporary evidence. The writer's calibre may be judged from his referring to 'Matthew of Westminster' and 'Holinshed (quoting Nicolaus Trivet).' Of course he follows Froissart in ascribing the institution of the order of the garter to 1344. It ought to be said, however, that, from whatever reason, the first of the three articles under this rubric is much the most unsatisfactory.

Where so many hands have been at work repetitions accompanied by divergencies of view must be expected. Two almost diametrically opposite opinions on the vexed question of the condition of the labourer in the fifteenth century are expressed in the space of twenty pages, while a third writer comes to the conclusion that 'there are statistics enough to bear out either view' (p. 413). Mr. Corbett, by the way, in quoting the contemporary story of the humble origin of the Paston family as an illustration of the possibilities of rising in the world enjoyed by members of the agricultural class, with a warning that it comes from a hostile source, does not seem aware of the rebutting evidence of the Paston archives printed by Mr. Worship in the fourth volume of the 'Norfolk Archæology.' Three separate mentions of the expeditions of the Cabots seem superfluous, the more so that they do not entirely agree with one another. Speaking generally, however, unity of treatment has been secured in a very satisfactory degree. This is greatly assisted by the terse and pointed summaries of the political history supplied by Mr. A. L. Smith, who unites a keen eye for salient features with the power of presenting them in a fresh and interesting way. We have noticed in his articles a few errors of detail of no great importance. Thomas of Lancaster was not executed in Pontefract Castle (p. 9), but on the little hill to the north of it, on which a church was built in honour of the martyr and which is still called St. Thomas's Hill. It is going too far, again, to say that Richard II, after dismissing the appellants in 1389, 'soon recalled them to power' (p. 155). They were restored to the council, it is true, but none of them except Nottingham henceforth enjoyed high office or the real confidence of the king. In the account of the battle of Towton (p. 308) the statement of a retainer of the house of Norfolk, who wrote in the sixteenth century, that the arrival of the duke and his men decided the battle, ought not, perhaps, to be implicitly accepted. Lord 'Manley' of course should be Lord 'Mauley.' On p. 313 Mr. Smith seems to have forgotten that the elder branch of the Nevilles, which held the Durham lands of the house, was not Yorkist but Lancastrian in its politics. The Cornish rising under Henry VII was in 1497, not in 1495 (p. 450). Some of the other writers are not always very happy in their references to general history. Mr. Clowes, for example, shows that he has hardly grasped the real position of the unfortunate Henry VI when he describes him as 'neglecting his navy and seamen, and disgusting the merchants by his lawless treatment of them' (p. 341). In his useful articles on the universities Mr. Blakiston repeats the old assertion that Archbishop Chichele, who founded a college at Oxford for the peace of the souls of those slain in the French wars, had himself encouraged them. This is by no means clearly proven. His reference to the 'learned *and unfortunate* Tiptoft' too seems to do more than justice

to 'the Butcher.' On the other hand the under-side of English political history in this period, without which that history presents so many difficulties, has never been given with such variety and fulness. As far as this volume is concerned the promise of the title-page is on the whole satisfactorily redeemed. It might have been better, but it is still good.

JAMES TAIT.

Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward II. Vol. I. A.D. 1307–1313. (London: H.M. Stationery Office. 1894.)

THE publication of the Calendars of Patent and Close Rolls is proceeding with all the rapidity which one could hope for. The contents of the first volume of the 'Patent Rolls of Edward II' are, of course, very miscellaneous. Many entries relate to Peter de Gavaston; thus in 1310 he receives a pardon 'for the death of Thomas de Walkyngham, of the county of York, and for all other felonies and trespasses with which he has been charged' (p. 277). There is much information about the lands of the Templars 'which for divers causes are in the king's hands.' In Hertfordshire the king's agents for the estates of the Templars met with resistance, and many entries refer to a riot in the town of Baldock (p. 536, &c.) The disturbed state of the country may be plentifully illustrated from these records; many complaints are made of organised disturbances in the towns, as at Bury St. Edmunds and Norwich; Winchester was declared to be suffering from a system of black-mailing (p. 534). The rolls throw much light on the victualling of the army in the Scotch war; Italian merchants were among the contractors (pp. 498, 500, 501, &c.) On p. 508 we have apparently an instance of land being bought at five years' purchase. The early endowment of Stapledon Hall by Richard de Stapeldon, which Mr. Boase mentions in his history of Exeter College, Oxford, is found in these rolls (p. 504).

Mr. Handcock seems to have done the calendaring work very thoroughly; the entries, so far as I can test them, are complete and full. Of course it is impossible to include everything in a calendar; *e.g.* the roll itself (1 Edw. II, part i.) calls Walter Jòrz, archbishop of Armagh, a friar preacher; this is omitted in the Calendar. The volume is almost entirely free from misprints; those which I have noted are unimportant—p. 541, 'Scholistica;' p. 694, 'Rhuddan.' Similar praise cannot, however, be given to the index. An entry relating to the Augustinian friars on p. 345 is not noticed in the index under 'Augustinian' or 'Friars.' The entry under 'Colchester, Friars Minor, 208' is wrong; it should be 202. Similarly 'Chichester, Friars Preachers, 269,' is wrong; it should be 268. Under 'Kerdif' we are told to 'see Cardyf:' there is no such entry; it should probably be 'Kaerdif.' Again, under the heading 'Templars, in Ireland,' pp. 192, 267 should be added; under 'Templars, inquisitors,' p. 213 should be added; and perhaps others. If the references under these special headings are incomplete they are misleading. It is, however, in the arrangement of the entries relating to the friars that the index is at its worst. At first sight it would seem as if they were all grouped systematically under the main title 'Friars,' with the sub-titles 'Augus-

tinian,' 'Carmelite,' &c. This, however, is deceptive. All the orders are not included; the Friars of the Penance are not mentioned under 'Friars,' but only under 'Penitentia.' Why should one entry about the Franciscans appear under the heading 'Friars, Minors' (p. 135) and another under 'Minorites' (p. 597)? Under 'Friars' there is no cross reference to 'Minorites,' nor under 'Minorites' to 'Friars.' Similarly some references to the White Friars come under 'Friars, Carmelites,, others under 'Carmelites.' In neither case are cross references given. Thus under 'Friars, Carmelites' we are told to 'see Northampton.' One would naturally conclude that this was the only convent of White Friars mentioned. Under 'Carmelites,' however, we are told to 'see Boston Newcastle-on-Tyne, Northampton, Oxford.' Now at last one might hope to have references to all the notices of Carmelites. In my private notes, however, to Pat. Roll, 3 Edw. II, I find a reference to the Carmelites of Drogheda. This is indexed only under Drogheda. A precisely similar case is that of the Augustinian Friars of Lynn. Even, therefore, supposing the index to be complete, supposing all the entries to be indexed under some heading, any one working at the history of the friars could not be certain of having found all the references to them in this volume, until he had looked up in the index every town in which any house of friars was established. I need not point out the enormous waste of time which this involves. Mr. Handcock in this matter has merely followed a number of bad precedents; but it is high time that the record office should adopt some uniform system in the compilation of indexes.

A. G. LITTLE.

Geschiedkundige opstellen, aangeboden aan Robert Fruin bij zijn aftreden als hoogleeraar aan de rijksuniversiteit te Leiden. ('s Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff. 1894.)

THIS is a volume of essays dedicated to the well-known Dutch historian Fruin on his retirement from his professorship at the university of Leyden. All the contributions which it contains, with one exception, are devoted to subjects bearing upon the history of the Netherlands, and several of them, dealing as they do with matters of local and limited interest, offer little attraction to the general reader. An exception should be made in favour of P. L. Muller's essay entitled 'Netherland and Switzerland: an Historical Parallel.' This writer has lately published a series of papers in Fruin's *Bijdragen* upon the history of the separation of the northern and southern Netherlands, and his studies on this subject probably led him to compare from a constitutional point of view the history of the rise of the Dutch and the Swiss republics. There is nothing really new or striking in the historical parallel that he has drawn, but old facts are presented in such a way as to lay correct emphasis on the marked dissimilarity in the development of the two countries. He points out that the beginnings of the Swiss confederation have nothing in common with the history of the Netherland provinces when united under the sway of the houses of Burgundy or Habsburg, and that only with the revolt can a comparison be fairly made. And yet, despite of the superficial resemblance between the 'Unie van Utrecht' and the 'Stanser Verkomnis,' on what different

lines does the history of the United Provinces run from that of the sister republic! In Switzerland there was no predominant partner, like the province of Holland in the northern Netherlands, no ruling family with the traditions and authority of the house of Orange, no world-wide commerce, no colonies, no position which provoked and entailed international entanglements. All these things inevitably led to a far closer tie between the constituent members of a great maritime power and the loosely connected cantons of a federation formed for self-defence by a number of small states differing in race, language, and laws, and sometimes separated from one another by impassable mountain barriers. Mr. Muller (p. 12) draws attention to the early history of Groningen, which bears in many respects a strong likeness to that of Bern. Both of these towns rose to greatness under the sway of a limited burgher aristocracy, and both brought into submission a large surrounding district. But again with a difference. The supremacy of Bern was too firmly established to be disturbed either by internal changes or by external assaults, and though shorn of a portion of its conquests, it still gives its name to the largest of the Swiss cantons, and is the federal capital of the Swiss state. Groningen already, before the close of the sixteenth century, had fallen from its high estate, the story of its decadence being told by Professor Blok in the second essay of this volume.

An account by Mr. H. C. Rogge of the diplomatic conduct of François van Aerssen in 1606 is a real contribution to the history of the complicated and involved negotiations which preceded the conclusion of the twelve years' truce. The part played by this very able and somewhat unscrupulous diplomatist and statesman in influencing and directing the policy of the United Provinces during a period of some forty years can scarcely be over-estimated. Mr. Rogge shows that Aerssen, then envoy of the republic at Paris, paid a visit to the Hague in 1606 upon a secret mission from Henry IV, which he concealed from Barneveldt, to sound certain leading people at the Dutch capital as to what the states would be prepared to offer the French king in consideration for his aid, and more especially as to whether they would offer him the sovereignty. The facts here revealed throw fresh light upon the story of the negotiations as told by Motley.[1]

Of the rest perhaps the most interesting essay is a critical discussion by Mr. M. S. Pols of the age and authenticity of the so-called 'Annales Egmundani,' in which the writer strives to controvert the views of Pertz and Richthofen. This discussion has an interest to English readers from the fact that the manuscript with which it deals is in the British Museum.[2] Mr. Pols appears to have satisfactorily established his contention that a monk of Egmond in the twelfth century found in the library of his monastery an historical writing treating of the history of Holland in the period 790–873, and that he took it in hand and completed it, so as to make it run continuously from 640 to about 1176, the last portion being the authentic narrative of an eye-witness, or at least contemporary, of the events described. Afterwards it was continued by other hands to the year 1205. This narrative thus worked up, and now to be found in the manu-

[1] *Unit. Neth.* iv. c. 46. [2] Cottonian. Tib. C. xi.

script above mentioned, forms, in the judgment of Mr. Pols, the foundation and chief source of the later 'Chronicon Hollandiae.'

GEORGE EDMUNDSON.

State Papers relating to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada, Anno 1588. Edited by JOHN KNOX LAUGHTON, M.A., R.N., Professor of Modern History in King's College, London. 2 vols. (London: Navy Records Society. 1894.)

THE full history of the Spanish Armada has yet to be written, but material is rapidly being accumulated which will make the task of writing it a possible one in the near future. The collection of Spanish papers relating to the disaster published by Captain Don Cesareo Fernandez Duro, of the Spanish royal navy, was a very valuable contribution to our knowledge of the subject, and the publication in these volumes of the English state documents telling the story of the preparations on the English side, and giving the official accounts of the eight days' fight in the Channel, is another distinct step in advance. The special professional knowledge of the sea possessed by the editor enables him to throw much new light upon the bearing and significance of the papers dealing with naval details, and it will be hard to praise too highly the latter portion of his lengthy introduction, in which the equipment, armaments, and movements of the respective fleets are discussed and criticised. The early portion of Professor Laughton's introduction, however, suffers greatly, although perhaps naturally, from the limited view taken of the great events that led up to the Armada. It is, perhaps, inevitable in compilations made under the auspices of sectional or professional societies that a tendency should be exhibited to magnify the importance of the interests which the particular society represents, and to make them the pivot upon which all events in the world turn; but nothing surely is to be gained, in an historical work of so much importance as this, edited by a competent scholar like Professor Laughton, by so entirely effacing the sense of proportion as to attribute the attempted invasion of England in a great measure to the defeat suffered by Drake and Hawkins at the hands of the Spaniards at San Juan de Ulloa (not de Lua, as Professor Laughton has it) in 1568. Professor Laughton says: 'Much of the nonsense that has been talked grew out of the attempt, not unsuccessfully made, to represent the war as religious; to describe it as a species of crusade instigated by the pope, in order to bring heretical England once more into the fold of the true church. In reality nothing can be more inaccurate. It is, indeed, quite certain that religious bitterness was imported into the quarrel, but the war had its origin in two perfectly clear and wholly mundane causes. The first and chief of these was the exclusive commercial policy adopted and enforced by the Spanish government in respect of its West Indian and American settlements.' And then follows an account of the depredations of Drake and Hawkins in revenge for their punishment in 1568. 'The other and perhaps equally valid reason was the countenance and assistance which had been given by the English to the king's rebellious subjects in the Low Countries.'

I am not in the least likely to underrate these facts as exacerbating

influences, but it is surely running counter to ascertained knowledge to represent them as prime causes. The germs of the war, in fact, were engendered before Spain had a fixed colonial policy at all, and long prior to any rebellion in the Netherlands against the house of Burgundy. For centuries it had been the traditional policy of the house of Burgundy to hold fast to its alliance with England, as a counterbalance to the close connexion of France and Scotland. Elizabeth was forced, by the very circumstances of her birth, to throw in her lot with the reformers; and it was clear to Philip—nay, even to Charles V and above all to Simon Renard—before Elizabeth's accession, that unless she could be married to the duke of Savoy, brought into the church, and made a fit ally for catholic Spain, in the event of her accession, an entire rearrangement of the balance of power and traditional combinations of Europe would take place, in which Spain would find herself bereft of her old ally, face to face with the growing power of protestantism the world over, and forced into an inferior position, or an alliance with her unstable and detested secular rival, France. A bolder and abler man than Philip would have taken the inevitable step to prevent this years before. For nearly thirty years he tried to avoid war, by marriage negotiations, treachery, meekness, threats, bribery of councillors, and other means, hoping that the accession of Mary Stuart, whom he had gained over, would enable him to renew his alliance with a catholic England without an appeal to arms. But for all those years it was evident to every one that Spain must, by fair means or foul, restore her close connexion with England or sink under the forces arrayed against her. The only real chance of doing it was that protestantism should be crushed in England as well as in the Low Countries; and from the first day of his reign Philip's wisest councillors told him so, but he was too great a craven to take their advice. The third volume of the 'Calendar of Spanish State Papers of Elizabeth at Simancas and Paris,' now in the press, will lay bare for the first time the extraordinary series of intrigues by which Sixtus V was led to contribute a million ducats to the cost of the Armada. For him, at all events, the invasion of England was veritably a crusade, and although it may well be that Philip's motives were quite mundane, he undoubtedly sought to gain them, in the first place, by forcing catholicism on the English nation, as the only possible means of having England on his side, which was necessary for the welfare of his cause. On the other hand Elizabeth's aid to the prince of Orange and the French protestants arose—like her own adoption of the reformed faith—from the knowledge that unless the enemies of Spain were rendered strong she would be forced into an alliance under conditions which would have denied her own right to reign, and have made her—what she would never have consented to become—a mere puppet in the hands of Philip. Professor Laughton all through seeks to dwarf the religious element in the struggle, but in fact the whole question, with all its vast, far-reaching consequences, turned upon that one point, Was England to be catholic or protestant?

When Professor Laughton comes to the Armada itself he is a much safer guide. He points out how great was the contempt of such men as Drake, Hawkins, and Winter for the sea power of Spain, and how much

landsmen have exaggerated it. In this he is right. The Spanish veteran infantry was the best in the world, but, notwithstanding the boasting of the ignorant—notwithstanding the prowess of such men as Pero Melendez, Pedro de Valdés, and the marquis of Santa Cruz—Philip's responsible advisers, years before, had warned him of his powerlessness at sea. Professor Laughton will find this curiously confirmed in a long manuscript report from Captain Luis Cabreta to Philip, dated Lisbon 1582, in the British Museum (Add. MS. 28420), in which the writer points out, almost vehemently, how utterly inadequate are his means of coping with England at sea. He tells him that he cannot even protect his own coasts from invasion, and that he is totally unprovided with all naval requisites, especially seamen and gunners, who are needed most of all, 'as without them nothing can be done.' He says that it is all very well for people to boast of the king's hundred galleys, but they are costly and wellnigh useless fair-weather boats. 'Only,' he says, 'let me have money to build fifteen ships *of the new invention*, and a hundred galleasses, and you shall be for ever supreme at sea, as you are on land.' But Philip had no money to spare, and the ships of 'the new invention' were never built. Long before this even a Portuguese spy in England, named Antonio Fogaça, writes (1574) to Requesens in the Netherlands begging him to warn Philip of the build and tactics of the English ships. He says the queen's ships are 'powerful vessels, of from 400 to 700 tons burden each, with very little top hamper and very light, which is a great advantage at close quarters. They carry much artillery, the heavy pieces being close to the water.' He says, 'If the fleets came to hostilities the ordnance flush with the water line should be discharged broadside on, so as to cripple their hulls and confuse them with the smoke. This is their own way of fighting, as I have many times seen them do it to the French, thirty years ago.[1] I advise his majesty to be beforehand with them, and at once to send to the bottom all the ships they bring against him.'[2] But gallant old Santa Cruz would not adopt these newfangled notions, and when Strozzi allowed his fleet to be grappled with and destroyed in the old way at the Azores, all attempts to introduce ships '*of the new invention*' into the Spanish fleet seem to have been abandoned. All this was well known to English seamen, who had learnt from experience how much more handy were their craft than those of the Spaniards, and how much nearer they could sail to the wind. A letter of advices from London to Mendoza in Paris says: 'Drake's sailors boast most inordinately of their prowess, and say their intention is, if it should be true that a fleet of ours should come hither, to go out with a strong force of ships, meet it at sea, and give it battle. They are so puffed up that they say one of their ships is worth three of ours, and they will be able to destroy a fleet of 300 sail of ours with sixty sail of theirs.'[3]

Professor Laughton appears somewhat to confuse the exact course of the events which immediately preceded the first engagement, and, as I believe, misconstrues Philip's intentions as to the movements of his fleet. In the Paris Archives Nationales will be found a letter from the king to Parma, dated 4 Sept. 1587 (which will be published in

[1] At the battle off Spithead, 1545.
[2] B.M. Cotton MS., Galba, C. v.
[3] Paris Archives Nationales, 13 Oct. 1587.

the fourth volume of my 'Calendar of Spanish State Papers of Elizabeth'), in which he lays down most precisely the orders he has given to Santa Cruz. He is to go straight to Margate and protect the passage of Parma's troops across the Channel, and he is on no account to allow himself to be diverted from this course until he is in touch with Parma himself. These orders were afterwards repeated to Medina,[4] and although they were subsequently somewhat modified, allowing greater liberty of action under certain circumstances (which did not occur), the main intention of the king was always the same—namely, that Medina was to avoid an engagement, if possible, until he had joined hands with Parma. Contemporary Spanish evidence seems almost unanimous in stating the following to have been the real course of events. On Friday, 19 July (O.S.), the Armada sighted the Lizard at four o'clock in the afternoon. On the same day a council of war was called by Medina on his flag ship, at which the orders he had from the king were communicated to the commanders. Strada, in 'De Bello Belgico,' gives an account of this council, and, although we may well disregard the long speeches he puts into the mouths of Recalde and others, it is undoubted that the experienced seamen of the fleet were much annoyed to find that they were to sail up the Channel to the Straits of Dover, leaving Plymouth, and perhaps the English fleet, behind them untouched. They so far prevailed upon Medina as to make him write to the king on the same day, or early next morning, saying that he was in entire ignorance of the whereabouts of the English fleet, and must so far disregard orders as to stay off the Isle of Wight until he heard from Parma, rather than venture up the Channel in uncertainty. At one o'clock on Sunday morning one of the pinnaces brought in four Falmouth fishermen, from whom they learnt, for the first time, that Drake and Hawkins, with the English fleet, had sailed out of Plymouth and were now off the Sound waiting for them. Previously to this Medina knew nothing of the movements of the enemy, and consequently the blame often laid upon him for his supposed refusal to take Plymouth after he had been told it was undefended is undeserved. At five o'clock on Sunday morning, 21 July, the first English vessels were seen from the deck of the 'San Martin,' and the whole fleet was soon in sight. The duke's intention still was, doubtless, to push on and avoid an engagement until the officer whom he had sent the previous day to the duke of Parma should come back with the reply. The first shot was fired by the English at about nine o'clock, and it soon became evident that the superior build and qualities of the English ships, and the greater skill of the seamen, would make it impossible for Medina to avoid an engagement in self-defence. The story of the next few days' fighting, from a naval point of view, is admirably told by Professor Laughton, although the accounts given of it in the state papers themselves appear to be rather meagre.

The papers in Professor Laughton's second volume are perhaps even more interesting than those in the first, since they give a more general view of events and contain the statements of many of the Spanish prisoners, that give us a glance at the other side of the picture. One of the results of

[4] The king to Medina Sidonia, 1 April 1583 (Duro

the publication of these records is to explode the old tradition that the Armada was scattered and defeated by a heaven-sent storm. From the first the Spanish ships, towering and unwieldy, were hopelessly overmatched by the handy English ships of the '*new invention*' and the superior seamanship of the English sailors. The Spanish commanders were puzzled by the ability of the English vessels to 'walk round' them and avoid grappling. The Spaniards at first began to boast that the English were afraid of them and ran away, but soon their boasting gave place to dismay and disorganisation when they saw that their ships were being sunk and disabled one after another, whilst the English vessels were suffering but little damage and had safe ports of refuge behind them. Those who have read Spanish diaries of the first few days' fighting in the Channel will have been struck with the rapid demoralisation of the men on the Armada, the pride and confidence of the first day shrinking swiftly to terrified apprehension when they came to anchor in Calais roads on the sixth day; and then, when the duke of Parma's cold comfort reached them, and the English fireships came flaring down upon them, paralysing panic and abject fear turning the great fleet into a hustling mob with only one thought, that of flight. That the storms on the northern and Irish coast wrecked and scattered them added dramatic completeness to their discomfiture, but the Armada was hopelessly beaten by superior ships, men, and pluck before the tempests overwhelmed it. No record shows this so vividly as an extremely interesting diary of the events in the form of a contemporary letter from a priest called Geronimo de la Torre, who was on board one of the Spanish galleons, which letter will be found in the British Museum (Add. MS. 20915), and which, although it is printed by Captain Duro, might well have been included in an appendix to Professor Laughton's book by the side of Medina Sidonia's official report.

The Naval Records Society has been well advised in commencing their publications with this series of State Papers on one of the noblest achievements of English seamanship. Professor Laughton's work has been well done, the appendices in the second volume being especially valuable. The lists of the ships on the English side, with their past history, their tonnage, armament, and officers, have been carefully compiled from many different sources by the editor, aided by Mr. Oppenheim; and if the volumes before us contained nothing more than this information they would be very welcome for its sake alone.

MARTIN A. S. HUME.

Der Ursprung des Planes vom ewigen Frieden in den Memoiren des Herzogs von Sully. Von THEODOR KÜKELHAUS. (Berlin: Speyer und Peters. 1893.)

THE 'great plan' of Henry IV described by Sully in his 'Memoirs' (or 'Œconomies Royalles,' &c.) has by this time so utterly lost its credit among historical scholars that the discussion which occupies this remarkable essay is practically restricted to the genesis of the 'chimera,' or, in other words, to the problem how the old statesman came to leave behind

him, in his pretended account of his royal master's last designs, a *tohu-bohu* of the very worst description. The author of this essay, who has accepted the challenge of Moriz Ritter to illustrate the origin of Sully's fiction with the aid of an intimate knowledge of the history and literature of the age of Lewis XIII, has proved himself possessed, in a signal degree, of the required qualifications. Already Philippson, in an essay on 'Henry IV and Philip III,' published in 1876, had suggested the 'Corolaire' appended to his 'Universal History' in 1620 by the Huguenot historian Théodore Agrippa d'Aubigné as the probable source of Sully's imaginings; but Dr. Kükelhaus succeeds in showing it to be still more likely that at the time when these imaginings were finally put into shape (the 'Memoirs' appeared in 1638) they were directly influenced by the remarks on Henry's schemes contained in Scipion Dupleix's 'History of Henry the Great' (1632). The point of view of Dupleix is a different one from that of the Huguenot d'Aubigné; but Dr. Kükelhaus is able, by a really masterly survey of the phases through which the conceptions entertained concerning Henry IV and his policy had passed in the interval since his death, to show how well prepared public opinion was for the new model. Stimulated by the criticisms of a writer who was far more anxious to sound the praises of Lewis XIII (and implicitly of Cardinal Richelieu) than those of Sully's master, and who was barely polite to the public services rendered by Sully himself, the aged statesman seems to have readily succumbed to the temptation of producing a series of revelations which would exhibit his master (and implicitly himself) in a light which would dazzle the age and contradict their detractors; and, as Dr. Kükelhaus rather cynically puts it, he would have been a fool had he lost the chance. The author of this essay has demonstrated satisfactorily how such a conception as that of the great plan—with its transformation of the map of Europe, its Christian republic, and its perpetual peace conditioned by a common crusade against the infidel—could be attributed by Sully to his master without apparent unreasonableness, and how it could come to be regarded by generation upon generation, except in the case of one or two isolated critics, without any distrust as to its origin. But although Sully's self-esteem and his disappointments account for much, and although his latest critic is not sparing of hard names, the 'psychological' explanation of the imposture can hardly be described as convincing. Dr. Kükelhaus, it is true, very skilfully endeavours to turn the difficulty by remarking with much point that the fact that Sully perpetrated such a fraud should help to determine our whole judgment of the man. But the paradox remains; nor is its hardness mitigated by the conjecture that Sully may have intended the notion of a crusade, undertaken by Lewis XIII in co-operation with the house of Habsburg, to meet the views of Father Joseph, the ecclesiastic who, at the time of the appearance of the 'Memoirs,' was thought likely to become Richelieu's successor as the head of the administration. In view of certain circumstances this conjecture deserves to be called ingenious; but Dr. Kükelhaus, who thoroughly understands the meaning of evidence, judiciously introduces it with a *möglicherweise*.

A. W. WARD.

Der niedersächsisch-dänische Krieg. Von Julius Otto Opel. III. (Magdeburg: Faber. 1894.)

The completion of this valuable work, of which the first and second volumes respectively appeared as far back as 1872 and 1878, has been long delayed, partly on account of a failure of health in its author. Since the actual publication of the concluding volume of his principal contribution to historical literature Professor Opel has passed away; but it is satisfactory to know that he lived not only to complete this enduring monument of his powers of research, but, on the occasion of the Halle-Wittenberg jubilee, celebrated last autumn, to present to the university, with which he had long maintained an honorary connexion, an edition of the minor German writings of Thomasius. Furthermore, the late Dr. Opel had in him a popular vein, as was shown not only by his well-known publication of the Memoirs of Spittenbach, a town councillor of Halle, but by the very instructive and entertaining collection of songs and squibs of the thirty years' war, edited by him in conjunction with M. Adolf Cohn, which I remember reviewing and enjoying more than thirty years ago. Professor Opel, who was born at Loitschütz, near Zeitz, on 17 July 1829, devoted the whole of his manhood to educational and literary work in the part of Germany of which he was a native, and is known to have been one of the most active contributors to the journal of the Thüringisch-sächsische Geschichtsverein. Only in September last he retired from his labours as a schoolmaster at Halle, and here he died quite suddenly on 17 February.

The third and last volume of the history of that division of the thirty years' war which is usually called the Danish, but to which Dr. Opel more appropriately gives a composite name, covers not more than two years and a half; but this brief period is one of great and varied historical significance. The spirit of Christian IV had not been entirely crushed at Lutter, although his council, when informing him of the fresh supplies patriotically voted by his estates, pointed out to him the shortcomings of his western allies and the untrustworthiness of the most recent signatary of the Hague compact, the well-informed and wily Transylvanian. The complete success of Wallenstein's Silesian campaign at last forced Christian to sue for peace, but even then he would not grant the terms demanded; nor was his attempt to continue the war at an end till the surrender of the Danish cavalry near Aalborg in October 1627, amidst the unconcealed disloyalty of the Jutish population. These events, which reduced Denmark to a defenceless condition and necessitated a definite understanding between her and Sweden, are narrated by Dr. Opel at considerable length, and in part with the aid of Danish authorities to which he offers special acknowledgments in his preface.

The efficacy of the Suedo-Danish alliance might have been speedily and seriously tested had the imperialist schemes for the establishment of a North German navy met with a readier response from the deputies of the Hanseatic towns who met at Lübeck in the early months of 1628. Dr. Opel's account of these transactions is full of interest, although it tends to show how exiguous was the basis of fact which underlay this much-vaunted development of imperial policy. How far Wallenstein's

acquisition of the Mecklenburg duchies and his very energetic endeavours to consolidate their government formed part of these schemes, and how far they were due to a personal ambition which at once found opponents near the emperor, are questions which receive fresh light from the inquiries of Dr. Opel, a particularly careful and critical student of Wallenstein's correspondence. On the solution of these questions must depend our interpretation of Wallenstein's policy in the matter of the peace of Lübeck, which he certainly promoted to the best of his ability, and which in point of fact saved the monarchy of Christian IV, though in some measure at the expense of allies who had done little or nothing to preserve it from ruin. In Dr. Opel's opinion Wallenstein's real motive in abandoning the siege of Stralsund, although disguised under various pleas, had been to avoid a joint intervention on the part of Sweden and Denmark. Such an intervention must have delayed the peace; and thus Wallenstein, if there was any truth in his assertion to the emperor that in a fortnight the town must have been his, deprived the imperial authority of the opportunity of victoriously asserting what Dr. Opel calls its climax.

The elaborate work which the present volume brings to a close will be indispensable to all future historians of the great war; nor is it likely that the digest of materials which it supplies will at any time require more than incidental revision. A. W. Ward.

Life and Times of William Laud. By C. H. Simpkinson. (London: Murray. 1894.)

William Laud. By W. H. Hutton. (London: Methuen & Co. 1895.)

Mr. Simpkinson writes with vigour, and has produced a work which will no doubt be read with pleasure by partisans, but which cannot be taken seriously by historians. He rides to death any point to be made in favour of his idol, and has produced the merest caricature of his idol's opponents. Nor is his knowledge sufficient to enable him to deal faithfully with the authorities he quotes. He finds fault, for instance, with the house of commons (p. 78) for not following Wentworth in 1628, whereas it was the king who, as a matter of fact, threw Wentworth over. After arguing, truly enough, that the dissolution of the short parliament was, partly at least, brought about by the king's persuasion that the commons 'would vote the war with Scotland to be unjust,' Mr. Simpkinson (p. 238) states in a note that 'the State Papers show that Pym had intended to raise this question, in the hope of confusing the issues.' Not a word about Pym's intention is to be found in the State Papers, and that Mr. Simpkinson should have added the phrase as if he had found it in his authority merely shows his incapacity for dealing with historical evidence. The king asked for money to fight the Scots. Pym was ready to grant money, but not for the purpose of going to war with the Scots. There was no confusing of the issues in the matter.

Mr. Hutton's work is very different. He knows perfectly well how to handle evidence, and the result is the production of a Life of Laud which, at least from the writer's point of view, has superseded all others. He does not regard Laud's antagonists as villains, and his

criticisms on other writers are usually acute. Occasionally, no doubt, he goes beyond his authorities in dealing with Laud's victims, as when he says (p. 134) that Prynne's ears after his condemnation for writing 'Histriomastix' were 'but touched, not shorn,' when all the evidence we have is that the ears, not being cut off close to the head, were capable of a second clipping. A little consideration, too, might have led him to the conclusion that Prynne, Burton, and even Bastwick had more to say for themselves in 1637 than he is inclined to allow.

It is not, however, on account of minor blemishes that Mr. Hutton's biography of Laud will fail to satisfy those who are looking for a complete account of Laud's influence on the world. Mr. Hutton, it is true, does not pretend to give them what they will naturally ask for. He describes his book (Preface, p. xi) 'as an attempt justly and historically to estimate the character' of his hero. Those, however, who admit that in this he has been completely successful may proceed to ask questions about the character of Laud's work and its impress upon England, which Mr. Hutton fails to answer. The truth is that he is so attached to what it is the fashion to call 'historic Christianity,' so delighted that Laud contributed to its restoration after the puritan interval, that he hardly takes sufficient account of the fact that Laud's church, as compulsorily including all English subjects, never revived at all, and that he is inclined to give Laud more credit for the church of the Restoration than he really deserves. What Laud really contributed to that church was its form. By resting his ecclesiastical principles on legality he handed down no mere body of traditional belief, but a complete system of ritual and discipline. On the other hand, his part in perpetuating the doctrine of the church and the intellectual breadth which Mr. Hutton rightly ascribes to him was very little. Those who were attached to his beliefs in the time of the Commonwealth, as opposed to those who sighed for maypoles and Christmas feasts, were of a restricted class. There were scholars ejected from the universities, clergymen ejected from their livings, a certain number of persons in London, and above all the royalist country gentlemen and persons under their influence, who had, for the most part, cried out against him in 1640, but had since learnt to admire the man hated by their own oppressors. Nothing is more remarkable than the absence of any popular feeling for the system of the Common Prayer Book under the Commonwealth and Protectorate. George Fox, for instance, wandered over every part of England, attacked by mobs wherever he went. Never once does he hint at the existence of a church of England mob. Never once does he mention any church of England argument as brought against him. It would have been impossible for him to travel through England in the early years of Elizabeth without meeting large numbers of Roman catholics, or in the years of Charles II without meeting large numbers of dissenters. The fact is that the restoration of the church of England in 1660 was owing chiefly to the strong feeling in its favour prevailing amongst the country gentlemen, and to the general dislike of the military government which had been the result of puritan success. SAMUEL R. GARDINER.

The Clarke Papers: Selections from the Papers of William Clarke, Secretary to the Council of the Army, 1647–1649, *and to General Monck and the Commanders of the Army in Scotland,* 1651–1660. Edited by C. H. FIRTH. II. (London: printed for the Camden Society. 1894.)

THE second volume of the 'Clarke Papers,' the first of which was noticed in the sixth volume of this REVIEW (p. 781), has a more general character than its predecessor. Besides some debates of the council of war, it contains letters, memoranda, and despatches by various persons on different subjects, ranging from May 1648 down to the Protectorate in 1655. These, like the documents in the first volume, are transcribed mainly from the manuscript papers in Worcester College, Oxford. But a few have been added from other collections. All students of this period are now aware of the importance of the Clarke Papers, especially of the shorthand reports of debates of the council of the army, first given to the world by Mr. Firth in 1891. As Mr. Gardiner truly said in his preface of that year, Mr. Firth's discovery 'throws every other accession of material into the shade,' especially in unravelling the intricate and triangular negotiations of 1647, 'the crucial year of Cromwell's career;' and we know the use which the historian of the 'Great Civil War' was able to make of the new material. We must refer readers to Mr. Firth's preface to his first volume for some account of Sir William Clarke, ultimately secretary at war after the Restoration and killed in battle in 1666, and also for an account of the papers he left, and of the great difficulties which beset the task of the modern editor. Mr. Firth's preface to his new volume gives us some further particulars of Clarke's chequered career, and also a few notes respecting his papers and some ultimate selections to follow, which we may hope to receive from the same hand.

In one sense the present volume is of more general interest than the first, inasmuch as it deals with many various questions arising in the course not of eight months but of eight years. And the discovery of three important and most intimate letters of Oliver (1648, 1651, 1655), and at least one very important speech (1649, on the expedition to Ireland), would alone make the present publication welcome. Of this speech, by the fortunate *entente cordiale* that exists between the editor of the 'Clarke Papers' and the historian, Mr. Gardiner has been able to make full use.[1] The new matter respecting the prisoners taken at Colchester, Aug. 1648, the debates as to the levellers and the fifth monarchy men, the speeches of Harrison, Hewson, and Ireton, and the account of socialist diggers in 1649, and some curious debates on religion are interesting and instructive, and serve to confirm some conclusions already maintained about the Commonwealth, its supporters and its difficulties.

In another sense it can hardly be said that the present volume has the special historical value of the first, as it does not throw much-needed light on one of the more obscure problems of the great struggle; it does not show us Cromwell wrestling in spirit with his own ironsides, for he is only present once out of twelve sittings of the council of officers from

[1] *Commonwealth and Protectorate,* i. 27–31.

Nov. 1648 to Feb. 1649, whilst Ireton and Hewson attended eleven. It is somewhat disappointing to find that Clarke did not join in the expedition to Ireland and has nothing to tell us about it; and, though he served in Scotland from 1651 to 1660, the portions of his notes and papers referring to this period are reserved by Mr. Firth for a volume to be published by the Scottish Historical Society. The series of Clarke's Papers relating to the trials of Hamilton, Capel, Holland, and Norwich in Feb. 1649, used by Mr. Gardiner under the title of 'Clarke Trials,' [2] have been found too long to be printed in this volume, and only a short debate at the committee of officers is given. Unfortunately the Clarke Papers are silent concerning the king's trial; and Clarke has left no reports of the council of officers later than March 1649, though the council continued to meet and debate down to 1653. Thus, with no new material relating to Ireland, to Scotland, to the trial of the king or of his prominent adherents, and but scanty reports of the army council, the present volume can only be regarded as an instalment, a promise of things to come. But those who may be inclined to feel any disappointment must accuse fate and William Clarke. Mr. Firth has given as much labour to the second as to his first volume, perhaps from its more miscellaneous character even more, and has performed his task with the same scrupulous accuracy and wide knowledge.

The most really interesting point in the present volume is the long speech of Cromwell to the officers, 23 March 1649, before his acceptance of the command in Ireland. It is entirely consistent with his other declarations as to his Irish policy, and with the burning manifesto of Jan. 1650, in reply to the Clonmacnoise declarations. It is given by Mr. Firth, pp. 200–7; and as we read it we can see what was preparing months later in Drogheda and Wexford, and the deep-seated passion with which Cromwell set forth on his Irish campaign.

> All the Papists and the Kinges partie—I cannott say all the Papists, butt the greatest partie of them—are in a very stronge combination against you . . . If these Confederate forces shall come uppon them, itt is more than probable, without a miracle from heaven, our interest will easily bee eradicated out of these parts. And truly, this is really believed: if wee doe nott indeavour to make good our interest there, and that timely, wee shall nott only have (as I said before) our interest rooted out there, butt they will in a very short time bee able to land forces in England, and to putt us to trouble heere . . . I had rather bee overrun with a Cavalerish interest than of a Scotch interest; I had rather bee overrun with a Scotch interest than an Irish interest; and I thinke of all this is most dangerous. If they shall be able to carry on their worke they will make this the most miserable people in the earth, for all the world knowes their barbarisme—nott of any religion, almost any of them, butt in a manner as bad as papists—and you see how considerable therin they are att this time.

And so Cromwell pours on, in a style which, after nearly two centuries and a half, we still hear—that England must master Ireland or Ireland will master England. He believes that the Confederates in Ireland have upwards of 20,000 troops, 'ready in conjunction to roote out the English interest in Ireland' and then to invade England; and his leading idea is, that liberty of conscience and freedom in England can only be secured by

[2] *Commonwealth and Protectorate*, i. 11.

assuring the ascendency of the predominant partner in Scotland and in Ireland, but first and foremost in Ireland. There is no doubt that this belief of his was as sincere as it was passionate; and it can be proved that it was the belief of the immense majority of serious and thoughtful Englishmen. Milton, Lucy Hutchinson, Thomas May, Ludlow, Fairfax do not disagree. This, as Mr. Gardiner says, was the tragedy of the situation. 'For evil as well as for good [Cromwell] stood forth, so far as Ireland was concerned, as the typical Englishman of his time.'

Next in importance to this speech of Oliver's to his officers come the new letters of his, of various dates between 1648 and 1655. The three letters addressed to Colonel Robert Hammond, found by Mr. Gardiner amongst the Newbattle MSS., one of them being in a slightly variant copy amongst the Clarke Papers, show in fuller light Cromwell's affectionate remonstrances with his beloved friend, that most weak vessel, 'Robin,' one of those 'hesitating spirits, under the bondage of scruples.' They agree with the Hammond letters in Carlyle, Nos. lii., lxxxv., and show the same affection and consideration for this half-hearted young man. 'Deare Robin, am I forgotten? Thou art not, I wish thee much comfort in thy great businesse, and the blessinge of the Almighty upon thee.' [3] Robin was in charge of the king at Carisbrook and half-inclined to listen to overtures. The beautiful letter of 13 May 1651, shows us Cromwell in all his sense of justice and aversion to nepotism. Hammond, who was removed from his command in November 1648, and never employed under the Commonwealth, sought for office in 1651, and thought he could bring himself to serve in Ireland, if not in Scotland. Cromwell refuses—most affectionately, but most positively—

> You hint somewhat of a willingnesse to bee againe engaged, but with this that the worke in Ireland goes smoother with you than this [i.e. the war in Scotland]. You will forgive mee if I wonder what makes the difference, is it not one common and complexed interest and cause acted in Ireland and Scotland?

So he said in the speech of March 1649. He goes on:

> The Lord hath noe neede of you, yet Hee hath fitted you with abillityes for the present dispensation, your freindes heere iudge soe, and will heartily welcom you, but *indeed I doe not thinke you fitted for the worke* untill the Lord give you a heart to begg of him that Hee will accept you into his service.

And so, in the letter of 6 Nov. 1648, presumed to be from Cromwell to Hammond, of which copies exist both in Worcester College and at Newbattle, he uses the same strain as in the Carlyle letter lxxxv., a few weeks later:

> Looke to thy hearte, thou art where Temptations multiply. . . . Howe easy is it to finde arguments for what wee would have; how easy to take offence at things called Levellers, and run into an extremity on the other hand, medling with an accursed thing. . . . I have waited for the day to see union and right understanding between the godley people (Scotts, English, Jewes, Gentiles, Presb^{ns}, Independents, Anabaptists, and all).

We note here that Jews and Gentiles are within the pale, but neither Catholics nor Irish! Cromwell in this letter evidently was contemplating

[3] Between January and April 1648.

a forcible calling of a new parliament, though he afterwards consented to a purge.

Cromwell's intimate letters during the Protectorate are so rare that it is very interesting to peruse the one to Lieutenant-Colonel Wilks so late as January 1655. It is found amongst the 'Clarke Papers' in two versions, and is here printed entire for the first time, p. 239. It is an intimate outpouring of heart over the dissensions amongst his old comrades, in accordance with his other letters and speeches of this period.

> If I looked for anything of helpe from men, or yet of kindnes, it would be from such as feare the Lord, for whom I have been ready to lay downe my life, and I hope still am, but I have not a few wounds from them.

He sees them ready to fall foul on one another, whilst the enemy is sure to unite to their common destruction.

These four new letters, to Hammond and to Wilks, give us indeed no fresh information as to facts, nor do they alter at all our conception of Oliver's heart and plans. Their interest lies in this, that they exactly correspond with all the other known expressions of his, whether public or private, of the same dates, and thus strengthen the sense of certainty with which we can form in our minds a definite image of Oliver as always true to himself and his ideals, though altering his course with circumstances, and invariably holding the same language to friends and to foes in public debate and in the most private friendship.

One of the most interesting papers in this volume is the account of the surrender of Colchester, 28 Aug. 1648, and the execution of the prisoners of war, pp. 28–39. The dramatic piece at the shooting of Sir Charles Lucas and Sir George Lisle, and the strange discussion between Sir Charles and Ireton, has a wonderfully vivid power. Ireton as usual shows himself a skilful debater and a stern soldier. The story of this execution has recently excited new acrimony, as may be read in full in Mr. J. H. Round's paper in the 'Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,' 1894.[4] No one can now doubt what were the exact facts, though men will continue to differ as to the justice and humanity of the proceeding. Both Lucas and Ireton state the case with precision, and except as to the meaning of 'treason,' they hardly differ about facts. It is clear that there was no case of breach of parole; as Mr. Gardiner shows[5] the deed may be explained rather than justified. Fairfax and Ireton considered that they were authorised to kill 'rebels' taken in arms in this renewed Civil War. Lucas and Lisle considered that they were fighting against usurpers under commissions from their lawful sovereign. To decide which were the 'traitors,' 'rebels,' 'lawful' government, is to take one side or the other in the great struggle. The letter of Fairfax to the speaker, 13 Oct. 1648, now for the first time printed in full by Mr. Firth in his preface, p. xiii, is of great interest, as bearing on the plea of the Earl of Norwich (Goring) at his trial, Feb. 1649. Fairfax distinctly gives it as his opinion that common quarter given to a prisoner on the field was simply an assurance of his life from immediate military execution, but not a guarantee against judicial procedure. The officers taken at Colchester, says Ireton, sur

[4] Vol. viii. N.S. 157.

[5] *Great Civil War*, iii. 462, 1st ed.

rendered 'at mercy,' but had no quarter. Even if they had, as Fairfax says, that is no indemnity in a trial for treason.

The various debates of the Army Council are interesting, but they cannot be said to give us any new information. Cromwell is recorded in the table as present at one only, 15 Dec. 1648, when no speeches are reported, though important resolutions were taken. The debate on the day preceding, Cromwell being absent, 'whether the civill magistrate had a power given him from God,' was attended by forty-five officers and was a striking example of the way in which the army regarded itself as a moral and spiritual congress. Ireton's long and laboured speeches in a political spirit are almost as obscure and as cautiously balanced as any of Oliver's. These debates have all the dulness of any parliament and the involutions of any Conventicle. These saintly warriors revolve in a vicious circle. They cannot conceive any authority not being derived from God and not conforming to the will of God, and yet they will not suffer any authority to prescribe to them in the matter of conscience.

The solemn debates of the godly men of war over the revelations of Elizabeth Poole of Abingdon, 29 Dec. 1648, and 5 Jan. 1649, are astonishing reading; men like Ireton and Deane gravely accepting these unsupported intimations from the spirit above. And hardly less curious is the trial of Mr. John Erbury, 8 Feb. 1652, for blasphemy, when various wild sayings are recorded—'therefore Christs body is in Babilon, and one clashing against another, and now I waite when the spiritt will appeare to make us allowe and convince us of being yet in Babilon,' and so forth, &c. Things grew wilder every day spiritually, as the fight at Worcester had put an end to the excitement of war.

Mr. Firth's second volume contains an excellent Index to both volumes, but it is much to be wished that he had given a table of contents with a numbered list of the various papers he prints, and also that he had supplied dates in his headlines for convenience of reference. With a hope that we may have a further selection from the 'Clarke Papers,' all students of this period will join in thanking Mr. Firth for the care with which he has enabled them to see and also to understand these most curious and important documents. FREDERIC HARRISON.

History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate. By SAMUEL RAWSON GARDINER. Vol. I. (London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1894.)

Letters and Papers illustrating the Relations between Charles the Second and Scotland in 1650. Edited by SAMUEL RAWSON GARDINER. (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society. 1894.)

MR. GARDINER is to be specially congratulated on the appearance of vol. i. of the last division of his great work, betokening, as it does, that with powers of application and research invigorated rather than weakened by his laborious task, he is now nearing its full accomplishment. Only those, perhaps, who have had occasion to study minutely certain special aspects or portions of this period of history can realise how thoroughly the task is being performed; but with each succeeding volume his mastery of the period becomes more apparent even to the general reader in the

luminous coherency of the narrative as a whole, not less than in the elucidation of many points hitherto obscure or dubious.

The present volume deals mainly with the troubles which the Commonwealth had to face, chiefly as a consequence of the execution of Charles I. The essential difficulty, according to Mr. Gardiner, was the impossibility for 'men of the sword to rear the temple of recovered freedom;' but, if this dictum be not too unqualified, how are we to account—to name only these palpable instances—for the creation of the United States of America, or the permanent success in our own country of the revolution by which the main line of the Stuart dynasty was finally expelled by the sword? Were the difficulties of the Commonwealth not, partly at least, traceable to the fact that it represented merely a reaction or an 'ism;' that the parliamentary party were, to a certain degree, the victims of self-deception; that their conceptions of freedom were somewhat lop-sided; and that in some respects their political aims were quite as tyrannical as those of Charles I? In any case, as Mr. Gardiner states, they 'found themselves in a vicious circle from which there was no escape. No government they could set up would be strong enough to remain erect unless the army were kept on foot; and if the army were kept on foot popular support would be alienated by its intervention in political affairs.' This was their dilemma as regards England. But, in addition, the Commonwealth was encircled with external perils. It had to guard itself against a hostile Europe, to repeat the subjugation of Ireland, and forcibly to demonstrate to the presbyterian Scots the mad folly of their attempt to impose upon England a so-called covenanted king. The triumphant manner in which it coped with such an array of imminent dangers is a striking witness not merely to the ability of its leaders, but to the integrity and marvellous resolution of the great mass of its adherents. At the same time these external perils were the immediate salvation of the parliamentary party, for they enforced the necessity of unity and cohesion. Moreover the English nation as a whole was disposed to resent any interference in its affairs from without. It was mainly by the conquest of Ireland and the chastisement of the Scots that Cromwell attained his predominance, and the naval achievements of Blake securely established it.

As regards the Irish campaigns, especially noteworthy is Mr. Gardiner's examination of the evidence bearing on the massacre of Drogheda. Carlyle's method of justifying his hero is by a brilliant impromptu on the theme of 'God's judgments to the enemies of God,' depicting, no doubt with great vividness, the feelings by which Cromwell, however mistakenly, was partly actuated. Mr. Gardiner, however, is of opinion that the massacre on the Mill Mound is ascribable to the fact that Cromwell supposed that those of the garrison who ascended it intended to sell their lives as dearly as they could, and that thus, as defenders of an indefensible position, they had no claim to quarter. This seems the most probable explanation of the origin of Cromwell's ungovernable wrath; but though Mr. Gardiner also shows that various statements regarding the subsequent massacre are fabrications or exaggerations, he quite admits the heinousness as well as folly of the general massacre. The truth seems to have been that in the crisis of a conflict Cromwell

laboured under almost uncontrollable excitement, and that his passions, especially his religious passions, occasionally drove him into frenzies, during which he was scarcely responsible for his actions. John Aubrey in his 'Miscellanies' states that he was informed by one who was present at Dunbar that 'Oliver was carried on with a divine impulse; he did laugh so excessively as if he had been drunk, his eyes sparkled with spirits.' The frenzy having passed, there is evidence that on cool reflexion, as Mr. Gardiner points out, Cromwell had some prickings of conscience for his excesses.

The bulk of the volume is occupied with details of the abortive attempt of Charles II to recover the throne of his father by the aid of the covenanted Scots. In 'Letters and Papers illustrating the Relations between Charles the Second and Scotland' (an invaluable guide to this portion of his 'History') Mr. Gardiner prints certain notes of Secretary Long, one of which he thinks establishes 'that Charles did the best he could—short of breaking with the covenanters—to bring Montrose off in safety;' and in his 'History' he more fully explains his meaning by affirming that 'there can be no doubt that before he signed the draft agreement he had assurances that if Montrose would lay down his arms, not only he and his troops, but the Scottish royalists in Holland should receive complete indemnity.' The evidence seems scarcely conclusive, at least as regards Montrose. No direct mention is made of an indemnity to him—only to 'all his officers and soldiers.' Montrose himself was 'to stay in safety for competent time in Scotland, and ship to lye provided for transporting where he pleased.' Does this not rather look like a private hint to Montrose to make good his escape? The copy of the order to Montrose to lay down his arms was read in parliament, and apparently contained no mention of an indemnity.[1] Mr. Gardiner thinks that the assurances were given not by the official commissioners, but by Will Murray, acting as Argyll's agent. That the commissioners on almost any conditions would have consented to an indemnity of Montrose—whom the kirk regarded as its arch-enemy—is, of course, hardly conceivable; but it is almost equally inconceivable that Argyll could have sincerely agreed—if he did agree—to the indemnity of Montrose or to his 'employment against the rebels' either in Ireland or England. The influence of Montrose was what Argyll had mainly to dread. It must be remembered also that while in his defence at his own trial Argyll asserted that he had taken no part in bringing Montrose to the scaffold, he made no mention of having, provisionally on Montrose laying down his arms, arranged for his indemnity, or for his escape.

Mr. Gardiner has done well to publish in full the sad, dignified, heroic letter of Montrose to Charles, 26 March, when he had reason to suspect that Charles was—he hoped unconsciously—betraying him to the covenanters. Also it may be added that nowhere is Mr. Gardiner's method seen to better advantage than in dealing with Montrose. Montrose required to be saved from his friends no less than from his enemies. No one was less in need of partisan advocacy. For his vindication all that was necessary was to state the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth; and the more simply it was stated the better. 'In this world of

[1] Balfour, iv. 25.

mingled motives,' as Mr. Gardiner remarks, 'the correctness of a religious or political creed does not form a test by which to distinguish the noble from the ignoble man;' and surely the time has now come when the nobility and greatness of Montrose may without compunction be admitted by all true Scots, of whatever creed.

As to Montrose's great opponent Argyll, it must be admitted that the nobility is not so evident. But has Mr. Gardiner not done him rather scant justice? His main quarrel with Argyll is that he was given to follow the multitude, in order that he might appear to lead it, and that he subordinated his convictions to his interests. There is some truth in the accusation, but is it the whole truth? Of the strenuous personal ambition of Argyll there can be no question; and the grasping policy of his house had become proverbial. But at the same time the sincerity of his patriotism can as little be questioned, and just as little could the wisdom and ability of his statesmanship so long as it was possible for his country to be saved even by the wisest statesmanship. It has been objected that at the beginning he did not openly side with the covenanters against Charles I until he knew that he had the Scottish nation at his back; but the fact that Charles was endeavouring to coerce the Scottish nation was the main reason for opposing him. It was the execution of Charles I that mainly upset Argyll's policy, and rendered him powerless to intervene with effect in the guidance of his countrymen. No doubt he cut a sorry figure in connexion with the recall of Charles II, and he himself admitted that his conduct was that of a man 'distracted;' but then had ever politician to face a situation of such complicated difficulty? Possibly he supposed that by the execution of Charles I the Commonwealth had sealed its own fate, and that the recall of Charles II was inevitable even as regards England. He made too little account of the personality of Cromwell; but who could have then dreamed that Cromwell had such a future before him? Moreover was there the slightest chance that Argyll could have persuaded even a moiety of his followers to cast in their lot with the Commonwealth? Then there was the immediate danger of the Montrose expedition. True it turned out a fiasco, but would it have done so had the covenanters not entered into negotiations with the exiled king? There seems every likelihood at least that but for these negotiations Seaforth would have instructed the Mackenzies to support Montrose, and if the example of the Mackenzies had proved contagious Montrose might soon again have overrun Scotland. Mr. Gardiner laments that 'no word of honest warning' to his countrymen sprang to Argyll's 'lips as he followed the multitude turning aside to what he knew to be stupendous folly.' But Argyll had used every effort to thwart the extreme demands of the covenanters, and while he had less than no influence over the royalists he also knew that he might as well seek to persuade the tempests as the covenanting leaders. Yet had he not been too timorous in regard either to his own interests or those of his house, he could scarce have incurred the shame of stooping to the mean and tortuous policy by which he fell.

Space will not permit a detailed consideration of Cromwell's conflict with the covenanters. One point, however, small in itself, but yet of some importance, possibly, in its bearing on the purpose of Leslie at Dunbar,

may be touched on. 'Cromwell,' says Mr. Gardiner in a foot-note, 'speaks of the fight as not beginning till 6, whereas on 13 Sept. the sun rises at 5.33. Cadwell, however, talks of fighting by moonlight, and Cromwell's well-known words, "Let God arise," &c., spoken after the tide of battle turned, coincided with sunrise.' Of course in those times accuracy as to the hour of day was scarcely possible; but the difficulty is that Cromwell, though he mentions that 'the time of falling on' was 'to be by break of day,' yet distinctly affirms that 'through some delays it proved not to be so.' In this he is corroborated by Hodgson, who is also the authority for 'Let God arise.' It is just possible that the sun, if not at first hid by the nature of the ground, was concealed by cloud. Of course if the day had well broken before Cromwell made his attack this would clearly show not only that Leslie had no expectation of an attack, but that his officers had been guilty of shameful carelessness. T. F. Henderson.

Lettres intimes d'Alberoni adressées au Comte J. Rocca. Publiées par Emile Bourgeois. (Paris: Masson. 1892.)

In this sumptuous volume published under the auspices of the university of Lyons, M. Bourgeois has printed the correspondence of Alberoni with his most intimate friend, Count Rocca, minister of finance to the duke of Parma. The letters form a continuous series from 1705 to 1719, while a few belong to an earlier or a later date. This series divides itself naturally into two groups. Alberoni until April 1713 writes in what must pass for French, whereas after that date he is, as his master's accredited representative at the court of Spain, instructed to employ his native tongue. For the convenience of the indolent or unlearned M. Bourgeois prefaces each Italian letter with a full summary in French, which, it may be said in passing, in some instances requires revision. The originals are preserved in the college San Lazaro Alberoni, founded by the statesman near his native town of Piacenza. Here the Abbé Bersani, the high priest of the Alberoni cult, has combined a *cartularium* with a *reliquarium*, and the care which he has bestowed upon the correspondence has, indeed, rendered its publication possible.

M. Bourgeois has been generally criticised for including in his collection the letters written by Alberoni during his service under Vendôme in Lombardy and Flanders. With this criticism we are at variance. They add, it is true, little or nothing to our knowledge of those well-worn campaigns, but their writer is a sufficiently interesting personality to make his fresh letters, written at such a crisis, well worth reading. They prove, moreover, that he was no unlicensed adventurer, but was attached to the *suite* of the French general in the interests of the court of Parma. It was only when Alberoni refused to abandon Vendôme upon his loss of royal favour that he was not acting on official instructions. Alberoni's observations during this period served him in good stead hereafter. He marked the contrast between the army of Italy, which was professional, and that of Flanders, to which thronged all the nobility of France. Here he saw the best troops in Europe become the worst, and this deterioration he ascribed to promotion by favour, and to the calculation of the great

lords that in risking their skins they risked their lucrative appointments. Hence when Alberoni reorganised the Spanish armies he resolved to make merit the sole path to promotion, and certainly with excellent results. But even apart from military matters the chief object of his administration was to oust the Spanish nobles from the monopoly of power which they had usurped. Alberoni's diplomatic methods during this early period consisted in the purveyance of Italian delicacies for the French officers. He acted on the fixed principle that gluttony was a constant quantity with which diplomacy must reckon: *Ce sont les petits présens de la table qui conservent le souvenir et l'amitié des Français.* The same system he afterwards applied to Spanish grandees and foreign envoys, ascribing the elevation of Elizabeth Farnese in great measure to his hospitality to the princesse des Ursins's household. It was partly through her appetite that he held the affections of his queen, and he jokingly confessed that he signed the commercial treaty with England to get rid of an expensive guest.

Were we disposed to criticise M. Bourgeois's selection of Alberoni's letters, we should suggest that for the later section of the letters to Count Rocca he should have substituted those to the duke of Parma, which still lie unprinted in the Archivio di Stato at Naples, except for extracts relating to the earlier part of Alberoni's career in Spain, which are given in the appendix of Signor A. Professione's unfinished work. The letters to the duke of Parma, as confidential as those to his friend, form the text of Alberoni's history, on which those here printed are a running commentary. The writer, knowing that Rocca saw the letters addressed to his master, refers to important events in terms which must often be unintelligible except to those who have read the fuller series. On the other hand we hear too much of the cheese and sausages ordered through Count Rocca, though these gastronomical details are not without their interest. Another unimportant thread which runs throughout the correspondence is Alberoni's anxiety for his nephew's education; yet we should be sorry to miss the lights thrown on Italian schooling by the uncle's criticisms and desires.

If these letters are less important than those of the Carteggio Farnesiano at Naples, they have the value of being written rapidly and naturally, and are less open to any suspicion of *arrière-pensée.* They serve in many cases to supplement the weightier despatches. Thus the hurried notes written to Rocca on 14 and 25 Dec. 1714 fully confirm the longer and later letters written to the duke, printed in this REVIEW, and which ascribe the expulsion of the princesse des Ursins to Alberoni's persuasions at Pampeluna, and to the elaboration of the plan of action during the journey to Quadraque. One veiled reference to Elizabeth's previous flirtation with the chaplain Maggiali is more remarkable than any of the outspoken comments to her father, and proves how very real was the Parmesan envoy's anxiety. So also it seems clear that Alberoni's alternate criticisms and panegyrics on his mistress were the genuine expressions of the moment, and represent the varying fortunes of the conflict between natural ability aided by good advice and a wretched education. Elsewhere we have dwelt upon the respectability of the Spanish court as compared with other contemporary royal circles. This receives curious illustration from a letter of 18 Nov.

1718: 'Three times a week their majesties make the Italian comedians come from Madrid, and so they spend an innocent life, unique, perhaps, among the courts of Europe.'

The two main subjects for which the reader naturally turns to these letters are Alberoni's determination to annul the 'treaties of twenty-four hours,' Utrecht and Rastadt, as being subversive of the balance of power and disastrous to Spain and Italy, and secondly, his efforts to develop the resources of Spain. These objects proved incompatible. Alberoni realised their incompatibility, but believed, perhaps rightly, that time alone was needed to reconcile his aims. They were, indeed, inseparably connected, for on the revival of Spain depended the restoration of the balance. As the duke of Parma's envoy his original object was the liberation of Italy from the Germans; no permanent peace, he wrote, was possible as long as a single German remained in Italy. Alberoni had a true Italian hatred for the Germans, the nation which was 'always insolent and unbearable in prosperity,' and which 'throughout history had been fatal to his country.' As early as 30 Jan. 1713 he had written, *J'aprens que les Prussiens et les Saxegottes s'en vont à tous les Diables. Dieu fasse qu'il arrive le temps que toute cette maudite race puisse s'en aller dans leur maudit pays!* When, however, he became in effect first minister of Spain, the reorganisation of her commerce and finance became his primary interest, to which the duke of Parma's pressure for immediate intervention was an unwelcome interruption. He begged for respite; sometimes three, sometimes five years were all he asked.

Unfortunately Alberoni's hand was forced by the brutal treatment of the octogenarian inquisitor-general Molinés at the hands of the Milanese governor. That his disappointment was genuine is proved by the fact that his invectives were directed as much against 'that pompous old fool Molinés,' whose indiscretion caused his arrest, as against the 'Turk of the west.' Of the expedition to Sardinia these letters say not a word, and little that is fresh on the occupation of Sicily, except that the disaster of Cape Passaro is ascribed to three weeks' delay at Palermo, whereas the Spaniards should have at once pushed forward to Messina. Alberoni's responsibility for the Sicilian expedition is a difficult problem. In a letter of 8 June 1719 he assured Rocca that he had protested against it both verbally and in writing, but that finding the king's obstinacy insuperable, his only duty was to strive to make it a success. Of more value than this late defence is a letter to the same effect in the Carteggio Farnesiano, written to the duke of Parma on 5 April 1718, before the disaster of Cape Passaro. There is, however, much evidence on the other side. Alberoni believed that an English whig government with commercial interests could not afford to allow the occupation of Sicily by a strong Mediterranean power, and that it was impossible that France should actively ally herself with England for the humiliation of Spain. These were the two maxims upon which Alberoni's adventurous policy rested. Disillusion had, indeed, come before the fleet sailed, and he then consoled himself with the thought 'that in great enterprises one cannot walk and act compass in hand; something must be left to chance.' [1]

Of the subsidiary chances, of the encouragement of noble or provincial

[1] Letter of 6 June 1718.

discontent against the regent's government, or of the hopes based upon a Jacobite rising, these letters have little to say. Yet they confirm the impression derived from those addressed to the duke of Parma that Alberoni relied much upon a Swedish-Muscovite diversion in England, and more especially in Germany. As early as 6 Dec. 1714, before he had any authority in Spain, he told Rocca that Spain, well administered, could subsidise the good king of Sweden, and that if he were minister he would send an ambassador to his court to-morrow. When Charles XII was killed, and when French armies, acting in concert with an English squadron, were invading Spain, he knew that the game was lost. 'If but one of my schemes,' he wrote on 26 April 1719, 'had succeeded, it would have been enough to render the enemies' plans abortive.' Whatever is Alberoni's responsibility for the commencement of the war, there is ample evidence to show that he was opposed to its continuation. In October 1718 he told Rocca that it was madness for Spain to make war alone, and in a letter of 29 Nov. 1719 assured him that he would have made peace in the previous autumn. These statements find full confirmation in the Carteggio Farnesiano. Alberoni never shared Philip's delusion that his manifesto would tempt the French soldiers from their colours.

Contemporary ambassadors were wont to believe that Alberoni's outbursts of passion were diplomatic tricks. These confidential letters would lead us to think them genuine. In no measured terms he reviles those who had been the cause of Spanish failure. He threatens the regent's government with future vengeance; he inveighs against the four English blackguards, sold to Hanover, who would divide the world into mouthfuls and distribute them at pleasure. But his invectives are most bitter against the sloth and cowardice of his countrymen, those Italians who were determined to be slaves, who would allow a single German regiment—nay, a corporal—to hold them down. Clement XI, who was 'just the pope to lose the small portion of Europe that was still left to catholicism,' is now reviled for his cowardice, now threatened with a second sack of Rome. 'Yet even in our days,' cries Alberoni, 'a resolute pope might be a somebody, and could find protectors.' Italian indifference brought home to Alberoni the incompatibility of his two aims. He realised at times that Spain was better without Italy, which had drained her of money, even as the Germans were draining Italy. 'If I were king of Spain,' he wrote to Rocca, 'I would not take back the lost states of Italy if they threw themselves at my head.'

It is often urged that Alberoni after all would only have replaced the Germans by the Spaniards. This would be true at most of the period previous to the birth of Don Carlos. When Alberoni saw that Elizabeth was 'made to give princes to half Europe' his ideas of the relations of Spain to Italy were altered. More than once he pledged himself to Rocca that under no circumstances should Parma become a tributary province. The queen herself would never have suffered the heritage or the conquests of her children to become the possession of the crown. A reviewer in the *Athenæum* of 19 August 1893 ridicules a suggestion thrown out by M. Bourgeois in his admirable preface that Alberoni had dreams of Italian unity under the house of Farnese. Neither in these letters nor in those at Naples have we found any evidence for such a supposition. We are,

however, at disaccord with M. Bourgeois's critic when he adds that the idea of Italian nationality did not as yet exist. There is all the difference in the world between a political union and a sense of common nationality. One instance out of fifty will prove that Alberoni, as Petrarch, looked not to his own little paltry state, but to the nation which lay between the two seas and the Alps. 'Let me again assure you,' he wrote on 17 June 1718, 'that not only to those states in which I have had the great advantage to be born, but to all Italy, if I can do no good, I will at least do no harm.'

Alberoni, even before reaching Spain, had conceived high ideas of her natural resources. Like other statesmen of his century he believed the rise and fall of nations to depend entirely on administration. His diagnosis of Spain's decline is very remarkable, as ascribing to its origin a much earlier date than was customary with his contemporaries. Spain, he wrote, was a vigorous tree, capable of bearing an infinite quantity of fruit, but for the swarms of insects which, owing to mismanagement, had made it their home, devouring leaves and fruit directly they began to form. 'If you wish to realise what Spain really is, you must reflect that from Ferdinand the Catholic until now each successive king has done his best to ruin her. That Don Quixote of a Charles V first introduced the system of *juros* to pay for all his mad schemes. Philip II with his atrabilious humours thought of nothing but creating councils, and out of an absolute monarchy manufactured an oligarchy, an inveterate complaint which it has caused me infinite difficulty to exterminate.' This oligarchy, Alberoni elsewhere declares, was responsible for the miseries of Charles II, driving him from his favourite Escurial from want of means, forcing his coachmen to strike from lack of pay, compelling him to sell a grandeeship for his dinner. The multiplicity of councils added, no doubt, to the delays of which the original cause lay in the natural indolence of the Spanish aristocracy. A good war, held the Italian, was the only means of reviving the energies of Spain, which must be braced by alternations of fortune. He had as little liking for provincial as for class privilege, regarding the humiliation of Aragon, Catalonia, and Valencia as an incalculable boon. Hitherto they had been the most fortunate mortals upon earth; henceforth they would be forced to contribute to the necessities of the monarchy in the same proportion as Castile.

Of the reorganisation of the Spanish marine and of the attempts to regularise the sailing of the galleons for the Indies the letters to Count Rocca say much, but little that is new. In these matters Alberoni's French predecessors had laid some slight foundations; in others he has recourse to the thrifty court of Parma. Rocca is consulted on the reform of the coinage, and on proposals for simplification of taxation by the introduction of a land tax. He is to suggest a scheme for the regulation of the markets; for the butchers sold diseased meat, oil was adulterated with every kind of impurity, and weights and measures varied with the retailer's fancy. Notwithstanding her colonies not a pound of genuine cocoa could be bought in Spain; it must needs be smuggled from Genoa; there was not a mechanic in the country who could mend a clock, not an upholsterer who could hang a curtain. Alberoni believed that Spain could never be prosperous until the lower classes were tempted

back to agriculture. He complained, as many others, that there was not a country house nor a tree within twenty miles of Madrid. 'What are you to say,' he asked, 'of people who have governed the finest states of Europe, and yet have always preferred to live like Moors?' Three hundred cows were roaming wild in the woods of Aranjuez, and yet the queen could not get a pat of butter. As there was no power of initiation in the Spaniards, Alberoni was a pioneer in the foundation of foreign colonies, a system which was afterwards greatly to be extended. But the Parmesan peasants whom he settled at Aranjuez were so badly treated that they begged to be sent home. This caused one of the reformer's outbursts: 'This is an evil race, and, if I were not under infinite obligations to their majesties, I swear I would leave it to its own vile nature. They will not do any good themselves nor suffer any one else to do it.'

It is impossible to read many of Alberoni's letters without feeling that he was a genuine and even a generous character, without sympathising in his alternate fits of hopefulness, anger, and depression. He was the one man in Spain, perhaps, who sincerely regretted the death of Philip's courageous Savoyard wife, expressing his disgust at the indifference of those who to her owed everything. Sociable by nature, he felt the loneliness of his life; his sole exercise was to walk backwards and forwards to the royal apartments; his reforms were interrupted that he might act as nurse or gossip to the queen. He confessed to Rocca that the idea of reforming the world was the sign of a lunatic, and that the wise man leaves it as he finds it; yet he could not resist the pressure of the king and queen. 'I realise,' he wrote, 'that my wish to reform the nation is utter madness. The tortures which I suffer surpass those of the first martyrs. In the end, I see, I shall be forced to leave her to her own bad principles, which have dragged the monarchy down to the grave in disgrace and beggary, whereas, well governed, she might play the leading part in Europe.' Alberoni was probably honest when he wished that those who envied him would take his place for two or three months. Even his enemies never doubted his industry and ability. Yet, although he had a long life before him, he began to feel his age. When it was certain that Spain must fight single-handed against the three great powers, he wrote to Rocca, 'The worst of it is that I am old and broken, and so the consolation will be reserved for others. If I were only forty I should not despair of seeing the foreigner driven out of Italy.' Amid the miserable intrigues which led to his disgrace the gardener's son was the only figure who showed dignity and courage; his fall, he told Rocca, was the least sacrifice that he could make for peace.

That Alberoni was interesting and honest does not make him a great statesman. M. Bourgeois's critics exclaim in chorus that his hero was no statesman, because all his projects failed. Is this so certain? Is it not rather that even intelligent readers close their Spanish history on Alberoni's fall for the very inadequate reason that the rest is dull? Was Pitt a failure because he died after the defeat of Austerlitz? To test the question it would be well to tabulate in parallel columns Alberoni's aims and the changes in the relations of Spain to the great powers and Italy during the half-century which followed his disgrace. To prove his abiding influence on the internal administration of Spain it may suffice

to quote from his own letter of 18 March 1717 the first notice of his greatest pupil: 'One man alone so far have I found to help me, and that is a certain Don Giuseppe Pattigno, of Spanish family, but born and educated at Milan; a man of ability and great industry, and whose hands are clean.' E. Armstrong.

The Marquis d'Argenson: a Study in Criticism; being the Stanhope Essay, Oxford, 1893. By Arthur Ogle. (London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1893.)

This essay deserves high praise as a careful and a conscientious study in historical biography, which carries out with firmness and force a distinct method of treatment. It is, moreover, freshly and effectively written, although in the matter of style—or, to adopt his own distinction, 'stylishness'—I cannot confess myself able to applaud all the devices of the author. An historical scholar who takes pains to so much purpose will probably before long come to think less of this minor department of 'the critic's craft,' and will perceive that an author full of matter commands attention even when he writes at his ease. Such was, for instance, the case with the marquis d'Argenson himself, whose pen was rarely out of his hand, and who, as has been remarked before now, even in his 'Matériaux pour l'Histoire de sa Vie et de son Temps' seems to have been quite aware that he was not writing for his own satisfaction only.

As I have indicated, Mr. Ogle's method is genuinely biographical; and it is this which sustains the interest of the reader. The evolutionary process through which the inherited elements of Argenson's character passed in the successive phases of his career has of course been pointed out long since; nor was any special insight required for comparing the most noteworthy of this powerful thinker's Platonic speculations with the actual political remedies which the French or other nations have since swallowed at a gulp. Since to explain was accordingly here of more importance than to interest, Mr. Ogle may be congratulated on having succeeded in conveying within a couple of hundred short pages an adequate notion of the individual solution which actually resulted from an antithetical mixture of practical energy and proud reserve, of a noble trust in theory and a singular susceptibility to personal antipathies, of an eagerness to dare and a readiness to hold aloof, and of much else of action and reaction which nothing but the art of a true portrait painter could in perfection mutually reconcile.

Here I must content myself with a few remarks on a single portion of Mr. Ogle's varied but well-ordered researches. The marquis d'Argenson, whose highest praise it was to have carried into official life the aspiring single-mindedness which had pervaded the irresponsible deliberations of the *Entresol* club, actually held an important position in the administration of French affairs for a period of less than three years only; nor is it possible to deny that, so far as the relation between intention and effect is concerned, the history of his foreign policy must be summarised in the word 'failure.' Yet Mr. Ogle is not merely justified in refusing to judge the foreign minister's action by the standard of a note, or commentary, indited by him seven years previously in reference

to the worthy abbé de St. Pierre's contribution to the perpetual project of a perpetual peace, but he is even better warranted in inquiring whether or not Argenson's 'system' of forcing a policy was sound in itself. This special issue need not be too readily confounded with the broader question involved in the assertion, effectively if rather rhetorically put, that although it was not till 1789 'that the French monarchy surrendered its charter to the French people, it had resigned it,' a generation 'before, into the hands of Maria Theresa.' Beyond a doubt the momentous revulsion in French foreign policy which found its complete expression in the Versailles treaty of alliance of May 1756 was no sudden achievement of Kaunitz and Madame de Pompadour. But how far did Argenson, whom its consummation crushed as a practical statesman, foresee, and in what measure did he labour to avert, this fatal political blunder?

France had entered with few misgivings into the treaties with Prussia and Bavaria which preceded the second Silesian war, and had, early in 1744, declared war against Great Britain and Austria with a light heart. A patriotic love of peace was then, as ever, a drug in the French political market, and the effect of the successes of the French troops in Flanders under the personal command of King Lewis XV was only heightened by his recovery from the illness which had overtaken him at Metz. But Frederick II's invasion of Bohemia ended in disastrous failure; and Argenson's first important task as minister of foreign affairs was to meet or make use of the Prussian king's overtures towards extricating himself from an apparently hopeless situation by diplomatic means, in which he sought the aid of his French ally. Argenson, as his abortive draft of a reply to the pacific proposals of Prussia shows, was prepared to fall in with them in principle; but he had reckoned without his master, and this premature readiness must have weakened his position at the outset. He had therefore to direct his energy to advising the best means of carrying on the war; but this endeavour was rendered more difficult by the French reverses of the close of the year, and was further complicated by the death of Charles Albert in January 1745, which took the heart out of Argenson's scheme of making the reinforcement of the Bavarians an essential part of the French military operations. His endeavour to carry out this portion of his plan, and thus prevent the definitive detachment of Bavaria and the German south-west from the allies of Frankfort, was frustrated by the supineness of his own government; and the peace of Füssen subordinated Bavaria to the house of Austria for a generation.

While Mr. Ogle is clearly right in claiming for Argenson the credit of having opposed the policy to which the break-up of the league of Frankfort was partly due, his exposition of the ensuing series of events is too much condensed, and here and there unconvincing. If the advice of Frederick II to Lewis XV had for its object the bringing of pressure to bear upon the maritime powers, then the glory of Fontenoy cannot have been so 'utterly vain' as Mr. Ogle is pleased to assume; for the captures to which it led had for their result the withdrawal of the British troops from the continent. Moreover, in spite of Frederick's previous protestations to the French king, there is no doubt that the successes of his ally in Flanders encouraged him to the daring operation which at Hohenfriedberg

(Mr. Ogle should not call it 'Friedbourg') turned the tide in his favour. The withdrawal of Conti, which followed, was no doubt a most unwelcome sequel for Frederick, but the augmentation of the French forces in Flanders hastened the conclusion of the convention of Hanover, of which the high spirit of Maria Theresa weakened the immediate, but could not destroy the enduring, effect. Argenson's policy had in the meantime been chiefly occupied with the design of gaining over Saxony-Poland from Maria Theresa's side by dangling before Augustus III the prospect of the succession to the vacant imperial throne. A more futile project hardly ever engaged the attention of a responsible statesman; for there is no reason for supposing that it was seriously viewed by any of the principal partners in the negotiation—least of all by Frederick II, who merely used it as a means of producing mutual distrust between Saxony and Austria. When, therefore, the announcement, on 13 Sept. 1745, of the election of Francis of Lorraine as emperor seemed to French patriots to imply a direct menace to the integrity of the French monarchy, Argenson could not escape at the same time the discredit of a deserved diplomatic defeat. As is well known, the efforts to which Maria Theresa was inspired by the consummation of one of her chief hopes ended in discomfiture, most dire for her Saxon ally, and in the abandonment or postponement of her design for the recovery of Silesia. But at one point in the struggle a different result had seemed more than probable, and it was then that she had made a final attempt to detach France from the Prussian alliance. The success of this attempt must, by setting free the Austrian forces employed in the Low Countries, have led to the overwhelming of Frederick in Silesia. It would seem that, although the French ministry accepted the invitation to enter into negotiations with Austria, Argenson's instructions, based on this acceptance, were couched in so significantly cold a tone that when they arrived at Dresden (where Frederick was, however, already master) Vaulgrenant, the French envoy there, had little inclination to interfere. Thus the peace of Dresden was signed; but though it is manifest that Argenson had in some measure smoothed the way for Frederick, he can hardly be said to have materially contributed to the Prussian king's political triumph.

Mr. Ogle recognises the ineffectiveness of Argenson's policy in these transactions so clearly that the appreciation which he claims for its insight seems to me excessive. A practical politician must be primarily judged by the effect of his influence upon the actual course of public affairs; and in Argenson's case this amounted, so far as the Second Silesian war was concerned, to almost less than nothing. I have left myself no space to speak of the negotiation of Turin, of which the failure was even more conspicuous than that of Argenson's German policy. But the historic foresight—if the expression be permitted—which it displayed was even more remarkable; and on this quality Argenson's reputation as a foreign minister, taken altogether, must, I fear, fall back. A. W. WARD.

Un Précurseur du Socialisme: Saint-Simon et son Œuvre. Par GEORGES WEILL, docteur ès lettres. (Paris: Perrin. 1894.)

THIS small volume is not quite fairly described by its first title. It is a careful and well-written account of St. Simon and his writings in all their chief aspects, and not only in their bearing on socialism. We hear not only of St. Simon's influence on Bazard and Enfantin, but of his relation with Augustin Thierry and Auguste Comte. Like most founders of schools, St. Simon had the good or ill fortune to be left behind by his own followers; and these were not merely socialists. It is difficult to do justice to a writer who never expressed himself fully and at large, but only in a succession of short papers, unequal to his wishes and not always in harmony with each other. Organisation was always his watchword; he is always confronting the intellectual and religious anarchy of the Revolution, as well as its political anarchy. But in the course of his lifetime his view of reform changed. At first he thought (as Comte afterwards) that the moral world cannot be reformed till the world of science and opinion has been altered for the better before it. At a later time he thought that the two reforms must proceed *pari passu*. At first he thought (as did Fourier) that the law of gravitation extended to both the physical and the moral worlds, and explained every difficulty in either. At a later time he dropped this notion, and attached perhaps undue importance to changes in the system of industry. Even on this last point he shifted his ground a little. After insisting strongly on the importance of captains of industry he came to see that fraternity was more important still. Hence to his watchword, Organisation, his disciples usually added Association. He expected great things from the collaboration of scientific workers, himself to be the leader of the group. He was more than once successful in securing this end; but his discernment of merit was only too acute. Thierry and Comte were of too high quality to work long under his leadership, though he inspired them quite as much by his character as by his ideas.

The story of his life is not uneventful. Claude-Henri de Rouvroy, comte de Saint-Simon, was born in 1760, of noble family. He studied Alembert and Rousseau, and became *philosophe*. Then, like his hero Descartes, he served in the wars. He took part (1779–83) in the French expedition in aid of the American colonists. He was present at the siege of York Town; and in the operations at St. Christopher and Martinique he was made prisoner, and confined in Jamaica till the peace. He was impressed with the practical bent of the Americans and the high estimation of industry in their country. It appears, too, that before returning to France he made an unsuccessful attempt to persuade the government of Mexico to set on foot a canal between the two oceans, as in 1788 he vainly sought to induce the Spanish monarch to make a canal between Madrid and the sea. Although never all his life quite free from pride of birth, he was an ardent champion of equality in 1789. His temporal wealth suffered by the Revolution; but he had talents for business, and his speculative purchases of crown lands in 1791 restored his fortunes in 1794, when he emerged from an eleven months' imprisonment under the convention. Unhappily he spent his wealth rapidly, and from 1803 on-

wards his life was a struggle with poverty, in the intervals of which he devoted all he had to the causes he had at heart.

His eccentricities are well known. *Inter alia* he divorced his wife in order to propose marriage to Madame de Staël, who was unkind enough to refuse him (1802). When at Geneva on that fool's errand he published his first book, 'Letters of an Inhabitant of Geneva' (1802). His admiration of Napoleon broke down many years before the fall of the emperor, and he addressed him in very free criticisms (1813), following them up with a proposal that Napoleon should give a prize of 1,000,000*l*. for the best plan for the reorganisation of European society. How much there was in common between St. Simon and Robert Owen besides their socialism appears from this incident.

St. Simon's influence did not extend widely abroad, and is sometimes regarded as very limited even in his own country. Yet among Englishmen he profoundly impressed John Stuart Mill. His relations with Comte and Thierry have been mentioned. Thierry at least never ceased to respect him. Béranger defended him in a poem, and Rouget de l'Isle composed for him 'Le Chant des Industriels.' He made disciples among 'captains of industry,' especially among Jewish bankers, one of whom (Rodrigues) secured his latter years from want. The poet Halévy became his friend and secretary. On his death-bed in 1825 he continued with his latest breath to speak of his 'plans.'

Of the nature of these 'plans' this is not the place for a full account. His reasoning starts from the conviction that there has been enough of destruction. A new 'Encyclopédie' is wanted, one which will build up instead of pulling down. In the 'Letters of an Inhabitant of Geneva' (1802) and in the 'Introduction to the Scientific Labours of the Nineteenth Century' (1807) St. Simon himself gives suggestions for this new 'Encyclopédie.' He would unite the *a priori* method of Descartes with the *a posteriori* of Newton. He preaches a gospel of labour, as did Carlyle later. He recommends a bipartite government, an intellectual or spiritual hierarchy on the one side and an industrial (of great capitalists) on the other. His notion [1] that 'astronomy, physics, chemistry are already positive, and physiology and psychology will soon become so' after the other sciences, sounds like an anticipation of Comte; but (as Dr. Weill remarks) it is a recollection of Burdin, with whom St. Simon had studied fifteen years before. Comte may have learned something from St. Simon's classification of the sciences,[2] and more from the emphatic assertion that the military epochs are giving place to the industrial. Finally, though Comte, after his breach with the master in 1824, considered St. Simon to have been too much led by 'a religious tendency,' it is remarkable that Comte himself displayed the same feature in later life. St. Simon's view of religion was at least an essential feature in his scheme of history. Unlike the eighteenth-century *philosophe*, he sees in history no record of mere failures, but the best guide to humanity in its future development. He sees good even in the Saracens and in the middle ages. He regards the religion of a people and time as summing up its philosophy and science; the clergy are to him not a troupe of knavish confederates, but the teachers and leaders of humanity.

[1] *Mémoires sur la Science de l'Homme*, 1813. [2] *Ibid.* p. 88.

In the manner of Condorcet he traces the progress of the race through a long series of steps from savagery through barbarism to civilisation. We can only expect in this 'epoch of transition' to make further progress by study of the past. Instead of considering 'past, present, and future' we ought to consider the present last of all, when we have found out from the past what the future has in store for us. Condorcet's view of history as a long struggle against superstition and despotism seems to St. Simon, as to Comte, too narrow. History has been considered too much as a chronicle of kings instead of a record of the life of peoples. Thierry and he were at one in this matter. St. Simon's criticism on Thierry's 'Norman Conquest' is that it exaggerates the evils of the Conquest and under-estimates the social progress it occasioned.[3] Towards England the master's attitude was remarkable. As long as England had the same religion as the rest of Europe, he says, the ambition of the English was moderate; as soon as they had a religion of their own (*l'anglicanisme*) their desire of empire knew no bounds, especially on the sea. The safety not only of France but of Europe is that France and England, the only two countries constitutionally governed, should enter into a league, an Anglo-French federation directed by an Anglo-French parliament.[4] The idea was, perhaps, less visionary than some of his schemes of social reform, and it showed St. Simon's consciousness that political stability is not to be taken for granted by social reformers. A federation of all Europe was his desire; but he saw that so large a change was not to be made all at once.

Dr. Weill's book should do something to revive interest in St. Simon. Comte's work has been more abiding, because far more systematic and thorough, while less brilliant and pleasing in form; but Dr. Weill seems right in contending that Comte owed more to St. Simon than he was always willing to acknowledge. J. BONAR.

Glimpses of the French Revolution. By JOHN G. ALGER. (London: Sampson Low, Marston, & Co. 1894.)

THIS little book does not claim the rank of a regular history, but it contains much that will be new to persons who have some historical reading. Mr. Alger begins with the myths of the Revolution, Cazotte's vision, Mademoiselle de Sombreuil's draught of blood, the last supper of the Girondins, the tannery for human skins at Meudon, and Tom Paine's providential escape from the guillotine. Then he touches upon the utopias of the Revolution, and gives (what is, historically, the most solid part of his book) a very full account of Cloots' Deputation of the Human Race. Next he illustrates the part played in the Revolution by women and children. The working of the revolutionary tribunal is exemplified in the trials of Sir William Codrington, General Dillon, and J. J. Arthur. The pathetic stories of the women of Verdun and the Compiègne Carmelites are told once more, and a highly interesting chapter on the prisons during the reign of terror concludes a book which affords evidence of wide reading, a judicial temper, and historical insight. F. C. MONTAGUE.

[3] Weill, p. 93.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 84; cf. pp. 67, 68, 81.

The Empire of the Tsars and the Russians. By ANATOLE LEROY-BEAULIEU. Translated by ZÉNAÏDE A. RAGOZIN. Part II.: The Institutions. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1894.)

THE second volume of M. Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu's famous book on Russia is devoted to the discussion of some of the most interesting questions connected with that colossal empire. Most people want to know about the *mir*, the *tchinovniks*, and the *zemstvo*. Not second in importance is the system of the administration of justice, coupled with its penalties, and above all the exile to Siberia, about which such contradictory accounts have been published. Before the sensational stories of Mr. George Kennan have died away from the ears of an astonished audience Mr. De Windt steps in with quite as much experience of the country and gives us an entirely different story. Book v. of this volume treats of the press and the censorship. Many will be glad to get something of the truth about these matters. The last book attempts to put before us no less a subject than nihilism and the revolutionary committees. Perhaps, therefore, this second volume is the most interesting of the three, although it may not have the same charm for the philologist and the ethnologist. The great thing that strikes us and gives us confidence in the author is his unmistakable *bona fides*. Here we have not to do with a man who, goaded by some slights put upon his egotism, or baffled in the career which he had marked out for himself, would involve Russia in a sanguinary revolution and create a situation out of which it is difficult to see the exit. The author thoroughly understands Russia, sees the problems she is called upon to solve, and assists her in the solution. Like all true friends of the country he looks to the establishment of constitutionalism, but it must be established *gradatim* (see p. 537).

The account of the *zemstvo*, as given by M. Leroy-Beaulieu, will be read with much interest. It has probably not realised all that was expected of it, but it has done a great deal, and will probably do more as time goes on. Some think that by proper expansion it may bring back the old Russian *zemskaya duma*. How few people realise that even in that country an autocracy has arisen upon the ruins of something like a representative system! Even the *mir*, which many think must become extinct as the country advances, has not been without its use in the political training of the people, and we have courts not only of the *mir*, but also of the *volost*, another territorial division. Into these latter M. Leroy-Beaulieu goes at considerable length, and tells how a customary law is administered in them by the peasants.

Perhaps the safeguard of Russia as she advances in constitutional progress will be the conservative and even patriarchal character of her population. The west has not much to give her in exchange for it. This character may free her from what Tennyson called the blind hysterics of the Celt. There is great patriotism among the Russians themselves and great solidarity, but there is a large alien element in the country. There are difficulties connected with the Polish question, many of which apply as much to Prussia as to Russia, and her large oriental population is conterminous with the central European race. These circumstances are all understood by M. Leroy-Beaulieu and enhance the value of his book.

A few words must be said about the translation. Mme. Ragozin

gives us a spirited and clear version, with the exception of here and there a strange word which is not familiar to us and must, we think, be an Americanism. She also adds useful little notes, sometimes explaining, at others controverting the views of her author. W. R. MORFILL.

London and the Kingdom. By REGINALD R. SHARPE, D.C.L. I. II. Printed by Order of the Corporation. (London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1894.)

THERE is a large public of patriotic Englishmen who naturally feel a sincere and special interest in a history of London produced by order of the corporation in honour of the 700th anniversary of the mayoralty of the city. To the historical student the announcement of 'a history derived mainly from the archives at the Guildhall in the custody of the corporation' is an event of capital importance. The design of the corporation is worthy of all honour, and, fitly carried out, must have added a new distinction to the list of earlier benefactions to the public. It is, therefore, deeply to be regretted that the work itself does not justify the anticipations which might reasonably have been formed. The plan of the book is laid down in the preface, where the author explains that, in view of the amount of labour already expended by others on municipal, ecclesiastical, and social history, these subjects are to be set outside the scope of the present work. We are left in some doubt as to whether the corporation or the author should be held responsible for the very remarkable view that the municipal organisation and growth of London have already been so far made clear as to render it possible to give a satisfactory account of the influence of the city in the national development; but, on whatever grounds this opinion has been formed, we have no choice, save to submit to the limitations which the author has seen fit to adopt. In all the great matters of civic life, and the problems as to its growth which are so profoundly exercising historical students, we must expect no information ; nor, indeed, is any offered to us. If the author chooses to allot the same space to the critical question of the great conflict between the guilds and the citizens for the control of the common council as he gives to the personal appearance and fate of Alice Perrers, he allows the vexed reader no remonstrance. We must judge the book for what it proposes to tell, not for what is deliberately set aside.

Undoubtedly the subject chosen—the political relation of London to the kingdom and the influence exercised by it—might form the theme of a book of first-rate importance and enduring interest. The subject might be looked at from two points of view. On the one hand London might be seen as the centre not only of the island Britain, but of England as the conqueror of the seas, the founder of a world-wide empire, the capital of a universal commerce. In this sense Michelet has pictured it to us as seen with the eyes of the historian and the poet: '*Tous les autres pays ont leurs capitales à l'ouest et regardent au couchant : le grand vaisseau européen semble flotter, la voile enflée du vent qui jadis souffla de l'Asie. L'Angleterre seule a la proue à l'est, comme pour braver le monde,* unum omnia contra.' It was within the period of which Dr. Sharpe writes in his first volume that London first entered into successful rivalry with the old lords of commerce, that it formed its companies of foreign traders with peculiar and interesting privileges, that it scattered abroad merchants who served as envoys and political agents of the crown in an extended foreign policy,

that the city claimed to dominate and control the whole commerce of the land, and to become the ruling capital of a commercial society that should reach out to the very ends of the earth. The movement had already begun which was ultimately, as but one of the incidents of its history, to make of a group of merchants in Leadenhall Street the founders and rulers of an Indian empire. Of the beginnings of this commercial development, however, one of the most astonishing in history, Dr. Sharpe has nothing to say. This branch of the subject is wholly omitted, and that without any explanation or reason given.

There is, however, another aspect of London life—its internal relations to the kingdom considered as a separate unit unconnected with the outer world. Here, unfortunately, Dr. Sharpe has thought it necessary to fetter himself in such a way as to make his task impossible and his work entirely useless. Assuming that his readers come to the book with no previous knowledge, he has devoted nearly the whole of his space to recounting obvious facts which may be found in every school handbook, or in chronological tables. Questions of succession, lists of coronations, banquets, wars, and rebellions form a book of annals which is unnecessary alike for the learned and for the ignorant; and the scanty space which remains is not occupied by any serious account of the influence of London on the kingdom. For example, though Dr. Sharpe gives a statement, incoherent and insufficient, of the part played by London in the wars of Matilda and Stephen, he offers no suggestion of the real problem which here awaits solution. It was in the twelfth century that our foreign kings were carrying out in their continental dominions a very definite policy of centralisation, by destroying the political autonomy of the towns, and forcing upon the communes, from Rouen to Bayonne, a form of government which gave to the people the smallest amount of rights that a commune could possess, and substituted for self-government the unlimited power of the king and a military organisation under the mayor. It is very possible that while the foreign kings were thus forcibly imposing on the continental towns the system which was most favourable to the exercise of their own authority there may have been a similar attempt to control local government in England in the interests of the crown. Many things seem to indicate a conflict of this kind during the twelfth century between the crown and London, and to suggest that London, while seeming only to fight for its own local interests, became the true defender of municipal freedom throughout the land, and made it impossible for our foreign kings to lay on the necks of Englishmen the yoke which they had imposed on Normandy and Anjou. If this be the case, London takes a pre-eminent and honourable place as the inheritor and defender of English liberties in their most characteristic form, and the discussion of the subject would be more profitable than the record of how often its citizens attended a coronation or witnessed a riot.

Dr. Sharpe's second volume extends from the death of Elizabeth to the death of Anne. As he approaches modern times he is on more familiar ground, and though he continues to distract the reader with matter hardly, if at all, germane to his subject, the thread of the relations between London and the kingdom is tolerably well preserved. His knowledge of general history is, however, still defective; and even when, as in his account of the quarrel between the city and the army

in 1647, he makes no positive mistakes, he often fails to convey any adequate impression of the meaning of the facts he adduces. Perhaps the most interesting thing in the volume is the facsimile of an extract from the minutes of the common council on 29 May 1641, ordering the taking of the parliamentary protestation. This entry, like so many others, is shown to be 'disclaimed and repealed' by lines drawn crossways over it by order of Pritchard, the lord mayor intruded on the city by Charles II. Even in the height of the reaction in 1660 no elected lord mayor thought fit to erase from the journals anything that the duly constituted authorities of the city had inserted therein.

Unhappily London still awaits its historian. The failure of the volumes before us to supply the want is profoundly to be regretted, because, from the position of the author and the distinguished patronage under which the book has been produced, it may be too commonly assumed that the end has been achieved, and the industry of young scholars may be thus diverted to other and less important work. Such a result would be a grave calamity. X. Y. Z.

Early London Theatres (in the Fields). By T. Fairman Ordish, F.S.A. With Illustrations and Maps. (London: Elliot Stock. 1894.)

A history of the original London theatres has long been required by students, for the late Mr. Payne Collier's 'History of Dramatic Poetry and Annals of the Stage' is so untrustworthy in details that for some years no one has felt safe in using any fact in that book without verification. Mr. Ordish's work, therefore, will be welcomed as a valuable contribution to the true understanding of this history. Unfortunately, although certain important facts relating to these theatres have come down to us, we are left very much to conjecture in respect to a great part of the history. There appears to be little doubt that the Theatre and the Curtain were built about the same time in the fields of Shoreditch, the former in 1576 and the latter shortly afterwards. When we consider the primitive state of the drama at this period, we must feel surprise that separate buildings should have been required for the performance of the plays then in existence, and we are forced to admit that they were required quite as much for other forms of entertainment, like bear-baitings, wrestlings, &c., as for plays; and this suggests that the buildings were round, as were the theatres afterwards built on the Bankside. This, however, is not certain, and the only definite statement on the point is that of De Witt that there were in 1596 four amphitheatres in London, two on the north side of the river and two on the south. Mr. Halliwell Phillipps supposed that the 'wooden O' referred to in the prologue to 'Henry V' was the Curtain, in opposition to the general belief that it was the Globe. Mr. Ordish takes this for granted, but we are scarcely prepared to give up our belief in the 'wooden O' being the Globe until fuller evidence is produced. The Theatre had only an existence of twenty-one years, and after the expiration of the original lease in 1597 the timber was removed to the Bankside and re-erected there as the building renowned under the name of the Globe. The Curtain remained until the suppression of the stage in the period of the civil war and the Commonwealth. Mr. Halliwell Phillipps in his valuable 'Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare' placed the history of these two theatres on a firm basis.

The history of the buildings on the south side of the river is rather more confused. We know that the Rose was opened about 1592, the Swan about 1596, the Globe in 1599, and the Hope in 1613, but there are some doubts as to the localities of the Bear Gardens. Mr. Ordish disputes the existence of a Paris Garden Theatre before the erection of the Swan in 1596, and he certainly succeeds in throwing doubt on the received opinion by proving that Collier's quotations from the 'Northumberland Household Book' (17 Henry VIII), and from the 'Duke of Najera's travels in 1544,' are incorrect, as no specific references to Paris Garden are found in the originals, these being interpolated by Collier. On the other hand we must remember that the tradition of a theatre in this place is older than Collier, and Crowley's reference in 1550 seems to infer a building of some sort. The stage that broke down in 1583 is said definitely to have been in Paris Garden. Mr. Ordish's explanation of this is that a mistake was made for the Bankside, but the people of that day knew too well what the Paris Garden was to make any such mistake. With regard to one of the theatres on the Surrey side, viz. the Swan, we are sorry to see that Mr. Ordish speaks rather depreciatingly of De Witt's view of the interior, first published by Dr. Gaedertz in 1888, and doubts its being an original drawing made in the theatre. This opinion is partly grounded on the incorrect copy printed in his book. The words *Ex observationibus Londinensibus Johannis de Witt*, as seen on Dr. Gaedertz's copy (and reproduced in this work), were discussed at a meeting of the New Shakespeare Society, and it was generally felt that it was not easy to explain them. When, however, the original was sent over to England for examination at the British Museum, it was found that the words *Ex observationibus*, &c., were at the head of the written description and not on the drawing at all. It then became quite clear that the description and drawing were copied by Van Buchell into his commonplace book from De Witt's original description and drawing made in London in 1596.

Although we have found it necessary to differ from Mr. Ordish in a few points, we hold this volume to be a real addition to the literature of the stage, and we look forward to the appearance of the companion volume on the 'London Theatres in the Town,' which is promised.

HENRY B. WHEATLEY.

Materials for the History of the Church of Lancaster. By W. O. ROPER. (Chetham Society.) Vol. II. 1894.

ONE is always sorry to criticise severely such a work as editing a cartulary, but the second volume of the work before us does not alter the opinion previously expressed in this REVIEW (vol. viii. 185). As this volume contains only the texts and translations of charters without a table of contents or index, it is difficult to say exactly what it includes; but the documents seem to be nearly all of purely local interest, and to relate to small parcels of land. We cannot think that an editor who renders 'Apud Cenom' [Le Mans] in a charter of King John as 'at Cenom' is qualified to undertake a cartulary, nor can one admire the rendering of 'Sees' (Séez), and even of *Sagium*, by 'Sees' merely, throughout. Surely an editor with local knowledge could do better than render 'Ricardi filii Waltheni' as 'Richard son of Walthen,' and, in the next charter,

'Vetredi filii Huk' as 'Vetred son of Huk.' 'Walthenus' is clearly 'Waltheuus,' *i.e.* 'Waltheof,' and 'Vetred' must be 'Uctred,' *i.e.* Uchtred. Both names have a local flavour. The most interesting document in the book, perhaps, to the student of records is a plea from a Roll of 8 Ed. III, in which is recited *in extenso* a fine of 1196. The *pes finis* in the treasury of which the king ordered a transcript for the purpose of this suit was printed only last year by the Pipe Roll Society. But in the interval of more than five centuries it had been greatly damaged. The transcript, therefore, enables us to fill in the blanks in the Pipe Roll Society's version, while the latter enables us to correct the wild misreading of William 'de Gunevill' for William 'de Chimilli,' archdeacon of Richmond.

J. H. Round.

English Records: a Companion to the History of England. By H. E. Malden. (London: Methuen & Co. 1894.)

The idea of a handbook supplying facts not given in the text-books, tabulating those which are there scattered, and directing the student to fuller authorities is a good one, and on the whole has been well carried out by Mr. Malden, though we cannot think his title happily chosen. The arrangement is by subject up to the Norman Conquest; afterwards under reigns subdivided into sections—dominions, wars, officials, government, acts and documents, authors—serving as a general framework, into which special paragraphs, such as 'Cinque Ports,' 'The Reformation,' and so forth, are introduced at suitable points. This involves a good many repetitions, and some of the details of wars might be left to the text-book; but the classified lists of great officials, including in later times the lords-lieutenant of Ireland and governors-general of India, the short surveys of special subjects, like the composition of the medieval baronage or the local character of the Marian persecution and pedigrees, showing *inter alia* the connexion of the Anglo-Saxon kings with other northern houses and of the parliamentary nobility of the civil war with each other, can be unreservedly praised. The book is disfigured by a few errors, such as that Edward the Elder built the county towns of the midlands, that there were no 'acts or documents' of validity or importance in Stephen's reign but the treaty of Wallingford, that the first duke of Norfolk was son (instead of grandson) of Edward I's granddaughter Margaret, and that the Lollard statute was passed in 1402. It is not made clear that though the earl of Westmorland in 1399 received the lands of the earldom of Richmond they did not carry the title, and considering the predominance of the house of York in the march of Wales it is rather hard to number the Welsh borderers among the unruly elements of society who supported the Lancastrian dynasty. There are a number of printer's errors, such as *Saintogne.* J. T.

In *The Gelasian Sacramentary, Liber Sacramentorum Romanae Ecclesiae*, edited, with introduction, critical notes, and appendix, by H. A. Wilson, M.A., Fellow of St. Mary Magdalen College (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1894), we are given the first critical text of the so-called 'Gelasian' sacramentary preserved in one of Queen Christina's manuscripts, dating from about 700, at the Vatican. Mr. Wilson has collated it with two other manuscripts, one from Rheinau (now at Zürich), the other from St. Gall, of not much later date, which often serve to restore good readings, as well

as with three manuscripts of less importance. He also supplies for purposes of comparison frequent citations from various Gallican, 'Leonine,' 'Gregorian,' and other sacramentaries, and adds throughout references to them in his margin, which enable us to see at a glance what portions of the collection belong to the normal Roman type and what present peculiarities. The edition is one of admirable scholarship and the introduction is learned and complete. On p. xxxv Mr. Wilson says that in the Rheinau manuscript 'the Good Friday prayers mention the "king" as well as the *Christiani imperatores*, and the *imperium Francorum* as well as the *imperium Romanorum*.' The first phrase no doubt refers to the eastern imperial house and presents no difficulty; but we question if the editor has rightly interpreted the second. The Vatican manuscript has *Romanum* [sic] *sive Francorum imperium* (p. 76), while that of Rheinau, having previously distinguished the emperors and the king by *vel*, reads *Romanorum atque Francorum imperium* (p. 78, n. 29). The difference seems to be designed, and it is worth noticing that this latter title (in the personal form) is actually found later, though very rarely, in documents of Otto the Great. It is, in fact, only known to occur in six documents (three coupled with *et* and three with *ac*), all passed under the chancellorship of his son Liudolf, and dated between January and July 966 ('Mon. Ger. Hist.' Diplom. i. Nos. 318, 322, 324–26, 329). It would be interesting if we could discover whence the title, thus experimentally introduced and then abandoned, was derived.

In the fourth and concluding volume of the illustrated edition of Green's *Short History of the English People* (London: Macmillan & Co. 1894), Mrs. J. R. Green and Miss Kate Norgate have brought their pious task to a worthy conclusion. With the increasing wealth of illustration at their disposal, they have, perhaps, been able to make this final volume the most notable of the four. Page after page gives the reader the very form and pressure of the age in portraits of notable personages, in serious and satirical sketches, in topographical illustrations, in representations of manners and customs, of machinery, and of the countless other objects which, once placed before the eye, vivify our knowledge of the past. It may be pointed out, on the other hand, that in the useful map of London and the suburbs, showing the accretions to the city at different dates, we have our attention drawn to a strongly marked 'Boundary of Jurisdiction of Metropolitan Board of Works.' As it is hardly to be supposed that the editors had never heard of the county council, the inference appears to be that the publishers thought it more economical to use an old map than to engrave a new one. In the map of Europe after the peace of Lunéville Piedmont is wrongly shown as forming part of Liguria.

CORRESPONDENCE

The Birthplace of Salutati

I am indebted to Mr. W. Kenworthy Browne for calling my attention to a mistake which I made by inadvertence in my review of the 'Epistolario' of Coluccio Salutati (January 1895). The humanist's birthplace was not Settignano, as there given, but Stignano, in the Val di Nievole.

E. Armstrong.

Periodical Notices

[Contributions to these Notices, whether regular or occasional, are invited. They should be drawn up on the pattern of those printed below, and addressed to Mr. R. L. Poole, at Oxford, by the first week in March, June, September, and December.]

The book of Tobit and the first Sargonide kings of Assyria: by F. DE MOOR [who defends the historical character of the book].—Rev. Quest. hist. lvii. 1. *Jan.*

Early Christian monuments.—Edinb. Rev. 371. *Jan.*

Note on an edition of Gregory of Tours' 'Historia ecclesiastica Francorum' prepared by Gilles Bouchier [1576–1665]: by H. OMONT.—Bibl. École Chartes, lv. 5.

The 'Martyrologium Hieronymianum' [of the end of the sixth century]: by B. KRUSCH [with reference to the new edition in the 'Acta Sanctorum,' Nov., i. 1].—N. Arch. xx. 2.

On the Acts of the synod of Tribur [895]: by E. SECKEL. II. 1: An unnoticed source of the vulgate text of the Acts [the 'Collectio Canonum Hibernensis']. 2: An unknown recension of the 'Collectio Diessensis-Coloniensis' [entitled 'Capitula Theodori,' but having nothing to do with archbishop Theodore of Canterbury]; with further textual notes, collations, and supplements.—N. Arch. xx. 2.

Supplement to the second volume of 'Diplomata' in the 'Monumenta Germaniae:' by W. ERBEN [charters of the Saxon emperors doubtful, spurious, or wrongly assigned]. N. Arch. xx. 2.

On a manuscript at Graz containing the treatise 'de Continentia Clericorum' attributed to Udalricus, and Bruno of Segni's book 'de Symoniacis:' by J. LOSERTH [giving various readings].—N. Arch. xx. 2.

The 'Epistolae Viennenses' and the oldest chronicle of Vienne: by W. GUNDLACH [contesting U. Chevalier's date (the tenth century) for the manuscript of the latter and maintaining that the chronicle furnishes no argument against the proposition that the collection of 'Epistolac Viennenses' was forged *c.* 1100].—N. Arch. xx. 2.

The collection of canons in the 'Regesto di Farfa' [its object, origin, and author] by P. FOURNIER.—Arch. R. Soc. Rom. 67–68.

A forgery of Egidio Rossi: by P. SCHEFFER-BOICHORST [tracing the model on which a false charter of Henry VI was concocted].—N. Arch. xx. 2.

Description of a manuscript of medieval poems (Berlin, Cod. theol. oct. 94): by W. WATTENBACH [the manuscript contains many poems printed as the work of Philip of Harvengt, abbot of the Premonstratensian house of Bonne Espérance in the diocese of Cambrai; but for this attribution professor Wattenbach finds no evidence. The manuscript also contains poems here printed for the first time: these are of various origins, but come for the most part from northern France and Belgium. Among the contents is a flattering epitaph on William II of England].—K. Preuss. Akad. SB. 1895, 8.

The Irish 'Mirabilia' in the Norse Speculum Regale [written about 1250]: by K. MEYER [who considers these accounts to be derived exclusively from oral and local tradition].—Folk-Lore, v. 4. *Dec.*

Two medieval Christmas offices [according to the uses of Sarum and of St. Donat at Bruges]: by F. E. GILLIAT-SMITH.—Dublin Rev., N.S. 13. *Jan.*

Dietrich von Niem and the 'Liber pontificalis:' by J. B. SÄGMÜLLER [arguing that Niem did not actually write any papal lives, but that the resemblances between portions of the biographies from Benedict XII to Martin V, printed by Duchesne

as an appendix to the 'Liber pontificalis,' ii. 527–545, and Niem's books, indicate that their writer borrowed from the latter, and explain how Niem came to be credited with the authorship of papal lives].—Hist. Jahrb. xv. 4.

The so-called Waldensian Bible and master Johannes Rellach: by F. Jostes [giving reasons for considering this Dominican friar, who preached the crusade against the Turks in Germany in 1450, as the translator of the printed pre-Lutheran Bible].—Hist. Jahrb. xv. 4.

The 'Doctrinale' of Alexandre de Villedieu [de Villa Dei] *and the 'Epithoma Vocabulorum' and other works by Guillaume le Moine of Villedieu*: by L. Delisle [chiefly a bibliography, of interest for the history of education at the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth centuries. Guillaume le Moine furnishes notices illustrating popular opinions, &c., in Normandy].—Bibl. École Chartes, lv. 5.

Josse Bade [Jodocus Badius Ascensius] *and the translations of Claude de Seyssel*: by E. Coyecque.—Bibl. École Chartes, lv. 5.

A silver bull of Thomas Palaeologus and other documents: described by F. Patetta [an account of fourteen Greek, thirteen Latin, and two Italian deeds of a refugee family from Patras; with the text of six, granted by Carlo I Tocco, despot of Romania, Carlo II, Saint-Exapery, vicar-general of Achaia, T. Palaeologus, despot of Achaia, and others. Carlo I uses an imperial hanging seal and red ink; Carlo II, having lost Gianina to the Turks and Patras to the Palaeologi, has abandoned these distinctions].—N. Arch. Ven. viii. 2.

The will of Antonio de Herrera, chronicler of Castille and the Indies [an elaborate document containing notices as to his writings, and his difficulty in obtaining arrears due to him]: printed by C. P. Pastor.—Boletin R. Acad. Hist. xxv. 6.

The school of chartography at Antwerp in the sixteenth century: by P. Wauvermans [chiefly on Mercator and Ortelius].—Bull. Soc. roy. de Géogr. d'Anvers, xix. 2.

The beliefs, rites, and customs of the Jews connected with death, burial, and mourning: by A. P. Bender.—Jew. Qu. Rev. 26. *Jan.* (continued from 25).

Mixed forms of government according to Aristotle: by H. Francotte.—Compte rendu 3e Congr. scient. internat. des Catholiques (Louvain).

Alexander the Great and Hellenism: by J. Kaerst.—Hist. Zft. lxxiv. 1.

The legend of Caesar in Belgium: by A. & G. Doutrepont.—Compte rendu 3e Congr. scient. internat. des Catholiques (Louvain).

The Roman tenure of land in the time of the emperors: by I. Grevs.—Zhur. Min. Narod. Prosv. *Jan.*

The primitive church and the papacy, part ii.—Church Qu. Rev. 78. *Jan.*

The early history of baptism and confirmation: by J. R. Gasquet.—Dublin Rev., N.S. 13. *Jan.*

The Stylites; St. Symeon and his imitators: by H. Delehaye.—Rev. Quest. hist. lvii. 1. *Jan.*

The treaties of the popes with the Carolings: by W. Sickel. I: The pope and the East-Roman empire. II: The Frankish intervention. III: The pope's territorial dominion. IV: The treaty of protection for the Roman church. V: The alliance between the Frankish king and the pope. VI: The Roman patriciate.—D. Zft. Geschichtswiss. xi. 2.

The restoration of king Eardulf of Northumbria by Charles the Great and pope Leo III: by K. Hampe [who rejects the date, 807–808, assigned by Haddan and Stubbs, 'Councils' iii. 561 *a*, to Eardulf's expulsion, and examines in detail the course of the proceedings which led to his restoration].—D. Zft. Geschichtswiss. xi. 2.

Was Gregory III a monk? by P. Scheffer-Boichorst [who accumulates evidence against W. Martens's denial of the fact, and brings together a variety of particulars with reference to Hildebrand's personal history].—D. Zft. Geschichtswiss. xi. 2.

Henry IV's penance at Canossa: by G. Meyer von Knonau [accepting in the main O. Holder-Egger's strictures on the credibility of Lambert of Hersfeld's account, but differing as to the site of the emperor's three days' waiting, and suggesting that the chapel of St. Nicolas may have stood at the foot of the hill].—D. Zft. Geschichtswiss. xi. 2.

The origin of medieval town constitutions: by H. PIRENNE. II.—Rev. hist. lvii. 1. *Jan.*

The date of Alfonso of Castile's resignation of his claim to the imperial crown: by H. OTTO [before 28 July 1275].—Mitth. Inst. Oesterreich. Gesch.-forsch. xvi. 1.

Critical observations on the trial of the knights templars: by H. PRUTZ [in connexion with J. Gmelin's defence of the order].—D. Zft. Geschichtswiss. xi. 2.

On the prophecies of John de Rupescissa: by F. KAMPERS [dealing specially with his utterances concerning the empire and Charles IV].—Hist. Jahrb. xv. 4.

Memoir on Tamerlan and his court written by a Dominican in 1403: printed by H. MORANVILLÉ [from two manuscripts supplying a more correct text than that given as an appendix to the early printed 'Fleur des histoires d'Orient' of Hetoum the Armenian.]—Bibl. École Chartes, lv. 5.

The Franco-Italian question in history [in connexion with J. Reinach's work]: by E. ARMSTRONG.—Scott. Rev. 49. *Jan.*

The alliance between Alexander VI and Louis XII [the marriage of Louis XII and of Caesar Borgia; the alienation of Alexander VI from Milan]: by L. G. PÉLISSIER [with numerous documents].—Arch. R. Soc. Rom. 67–68.

Erasmus [with severe criticisms on J. A. Froude's work].—Quart. Rev. 359. *Jan.*

James Anthony Froude and his lectures on Erasmus.—Edinb. Rev. 371. *Jan.* [For strictures on this article see the 'Athen.' 23 Febr., p. 252.]

New documents on Giovanni da Empoli [the merchant's will executed on the ship Spera off Belem before his voyage to Sumatra and China, 1515, and papers relating to it. The will contains details as to the freights of Gualterotti e C. of Bruges, and directions as to the disposal of the testator's 'Yellow Book']: by A. GIORGETTI. Arch. stor. Ital. 5th ser. xiv. 2.

Creighton's 'History of the Papacy,' v.—Church Qu. Rev. 78. *Jan.*

The regulations of the court of Charles V: by A. DE RIDDER [from documentary sources].—Messager Sciences hist. Belg. 1894, 3.

The financial decree of Philip II [1575] *and the Fuggers*: by K. HÄBLER.—D. Zft. Geschichtswiss. xi. 2.

Alessandro Tesauro [poet and architect in the service of Carlo Emanuele I]: by G. SANESI [giving two sonnets on the duke's triumphs, and four letters to a Sienese friend relating to the Savoyards' designs on Provence and his attack on Geneva, Sept. to Dec. 1589].—Arch. stor. Ital. 5th ser. xiv. 2.

Gibraltar and the regent Orleans [1717–1720]: by P. BLIARD [insisting on the importance of the French support in securing the retention of the fortress by England]. Rev. Quest. hist. lvii. 1. *Jan.*

The Russo-French alliance in the reign of Catherine II: by V. TIMIRIAZEV.—Istorich. Viestnik. *Dec.*

The embassy of count P. Tolstoi at the court of Napoleon in 1807–8: by V. PETERSEN.—Istorich. Viestnik. *Dec.*

Metternich's mission to Paris in 1810: by A. BEER [with state papers on the negotiations for a commercial treaty and for the extension of Austrian trade with which he was charged].—Mitth. Inst. Oesterreich. Gesch.-forsch. xvi. 1.

Chernishev and Michel: an episode of the relations between Russia and France before the war of 1812: by V. TIMIRIAZEV.—Istorich. Viestnik. *Feb.*

Kutuzov in the year 1812: by K. SCHILDER.—Russk. Starina. *Dec.*

Belgium and the fall of Napoleon I: by P. POULLET [combating the opinion that the Belgians under French dominion lost the feeling of national individuality; showing, by quotations from the reports of the French prefects in the national archives at Paris, the discontent which prevailed during the empire; and explaining the social, political, and military reasons which prevented the Belgians rising against the French in 1813].—Rev. gén. 1895, 1, 2.

Fieldmarshal von Müffling and Justus Gruner during the occupation of Paris by the allies in 1815: by J. VON GRUNER [giving an account of Gruner's plan for the establishment of a police fund from the profits of gaming-houses to be set up under authority].—D. Zft. Geschichtswiss. xi. 2.

Bentham's influence upon lawyers and politicians in Spain as portrayed and criticised by Don Luis Silvela: by C. KENNY.—Law Qu. Rev. 41. *Jan.*

The Servian constitution: by F. Morel [an examination of the constitutions of 1835 and 1838, the first national, the second entirely foreign in its origin, showing the defects of the constitution of 1838 and the modifications made in it by the laws of 1858–1862].—Ann. Sciences Polit. x. 1. *Jan.*

The origin of the war of 1870: by H. Delbrück [drawing attention to memoirs of the king of Roumania which contain important information on the Hohenzollern candidature for the Spanish throne, and show that it had been strongly supported by Bismarck].—Preuss. Jahrbb. xcii. 2.

Prince V. A. Cherkaski and the civil government of Bulgaria 1877–1878: by D. Anuchin.—Russk. Starina. *Feb.*

Count E. Todleben and M. Skobelev: by prince Obolenski [incidents of the Russo-Turkish war and the last days of Skobelev].—Istorich. Viestnik. *Feb.*

France

The city and church of Auch: by R. Twigge.—Dublin Rev., N.S. 13. *Jan.*

The servile classes in Champagne from the eleventh to the fourteenth century: by H. Sée, concluded.—Rev. hist. lvii. 1. *Jan.*

The household of Philip VI of Valois: by J. Viard [who prints the 'Ordonnance de l'hostel du roy Philipes VI.' Part I].—Bibl. École Chartes, lv. 5.

The expenses of the kings' notaries' and secretaries' dinners at the hôtel des Célestins in 1422 *and* 1427: by A. Spont.—Rev. Quest. hist. lvii. 1. *Jan.*

The war of Charles VII in Gascony [from 1442], *and the dauphin's conspiracy in the summer of* 1446: by A. Breuils.—Rev. Quest. hist. lvii. 1. *Jan.*

The fourteen of Meaux [1546]: by H. M. Bower.—*Proc. Huguenot Soc. of London*, v. 1.

Guy Chabot de Jarnac, a statesman of the sixteenth century [1562–1568]: by D. d'Aussy.—Rev. Quest. hist. lvii. 1. *Jan.*

Specimens of controversial pieces written in the seventeenth century [with refrains taken from the 'Ave Maria,' the 'Pater noster,' &c.]: by C. Garrisson.—Bull. Soc. Hist. Protest. franç. xliii. 12. *Dec.*

Saint-Cyr and La Beaumelle, from unpublished documents: by A. Taphanel.—Rev. hist. lvii. 1. *Jan.*

General La Fayette: by E. Charavay [1757–1790].—Révol. Franç. xiv. 8. *Feb.*

The conversion of the nobility in 1789: by E. Champion.—Révol. Franç. xiv. 7. *Jan.*

Letters of Thiroux de Crosne to Louis XVI: printed by A. Brette [reports on the state of Paris, 20–30 April 1789].—Révol. Franç. xiv. 8. *Feb.*

Mirabeau and the count of Provence [1789–1790]; *the charges against the marquis de Favras and his trial and execution*: by M. Sepet.—Rev. Quest. hist. lvii. 1. *Jan.*

The Terror at Marseilles: by J. Viguier [founded on a manuscript in the possession of the author].—Révol. Franç. xiv. 7. *Jan.*

The mission of Lequinio and Laignelot: by C. L. Chassin.—Révol. Franç. xiv. 8. *Feb.*

Germany and Austria

On a fragment of the 'Annales Ottenburani' preserved at Melk: by E. E. Katschthaler [it is of the first half of the twelfth century, whereas the only other known copies of the Annals were written in the eighteenth].—Mitth. Inst. Oesterr. Gesch.-forsch. xvi. 1.

The origin of the college of electors: by G. Seeliger [who opposes T. Lindner's theory (1) of nomination by a single elector, who was afterwards supported ceremonially by a select body of princes sharing his title, and (2) of acceptance (*laudatio*) by the assembled princes in the double form of (*a*) fealty sworn by them as subjects and (*b*) homage as vassals].—Mitth. Inst. Oesterreich. Gesch.-forsch. xvi. 1.

On the date of the so-called 'Rationarium Austriacum' [or terrier of the Austrian possessions]: by W. Erben [placing its original composition under Leopold VI, instead of under Ottokar].—Mitth. Inst. Oesterreich. Gesch.-forsch. xvi. 1.

On the history of the idea of an hereditary German empire after the fall of the house of Hohenstaufen: by C. Rodenberg.—Mitth. Inst. Oesterreich. Gesch.-forsch. xvi. 1.

On the authorities for Thuringian history: by O. Holder-Egger. I: The 'Chronica Thuringorum' printed by Pistorius as the 'Historia de Landgraviis Thuringiae' and its sources, and the later chronicle published under the same title by Eccard [both proceeding from Eisenach, the one the work of a Dominican, 1395–1396, the other of a Franciscan nearly half a century later].—N. Arch. xx. 2.

The contest of Raban von Helmstadt and Ulrich von Manderscheid for the archbishopric of Trier [1430–1439]: by Dr. Lager.—Hist. Jahrb. xv. 4.

The description of Luther's death by a citizen of Mansfeld: by N. Paulus [who identifies the writer with Johann Landau, the apothecary at Eisleben, and takes occasion to reject emphatically the story recently revived that Luther committed suicide].—Hist. Jahrb. xv. 4.

The Jews at Prague in the time of the thirty years' war: by M. Popper.—Rev. Études Juives, 57.

Wilhelm von Humboldt's retirement from the ministry in 1810: by B. Gebhardt.—Hist. Zft. lxxiv. 1.

Great Britain and Ireland

The Culdees: by A. Allaria [who makes them canons regular].—Scott. Rev. 49. *Jan.*

The text of Henry I's coronation charter: printed by F. Liebermann [with a description of twenty-eight texts and a full collation].—Trans. R. Hist. Soc., N.S. viii.

Pike's history of the house of lords: by sir W. R. Anson.—Law Qu. Rev. 41. *Jan.*

The statutes of the synod of Exeter held by bishop Quivil in 1287: by W. R. Brownlow, bishop of Clifton.—Dublin Rev., N.S. 13. *Jan.*

The expulsion of the Jews from England [1290]: by B. L. Abrahams. II.—Jew. Qu. Rev. 26. *Jan.*

Notes on the register of the Walloon church of Southampton and on the churches of the Channel islands: by J. W. de Grave.—Proc. Huguenot Soc. of London, v. 1.

Navy records of the Spanish armada [with reference to J. K. Laughton's collection of state papers].—Edinb. Rev. 371. *Jan.*

The commonwealth and protectorate [on S. R. Gardiner's 'History,' i., and C. H. Firth's edition of Ludlow's memoirs].—Edinb. Rev. 371. *Jan.*

The history of the cabinet before 1760 [treated in connexion with W. M. Torrens's work].—Edinb. Rev. 371. *Jan.*

Rural Scotland in the first half of the eighteenth century: by H. G. Graham.—Scott. Rev. 49. *Jan.*

James, first duke of Chandos, and the university of St. Andrews [1720–1744]: by J. M. Anderson.—Scott. Rev. 49. *Jan.*

The life of Edward Bouverie Pusey, iii.—Church Qu. Rev. 78. *Jan.*

The derivation of English surnames.—Quart. Rev. 359. *Jan.*

Italy

Miscellanea diplomatica cremonese [deeds of foundation and gift to Cremonese monasteries (990 and 996); award by cardinal Guido da Somma, and Oberto, archbishop of Milan, in a dispute between the bishops of Cremona and Bergamo (1148)]: by F. Novati.—Arch. stor. Ital. 5th. ser. xiv. 2.

Summary of the deeds drafted by C. Cristiani, 1391–1399: by G. Romano [giving abstracts and in some cases the text of documents relating to the rule of Gian Galeazzo Visconti, *e.g.* the protection of the Certosa of Pavia and its tenants; the alleged treason of the humanist secretary Capelli; oaths of fealty from Pisa, Leghorn, Urbino, and Siena], concluded.—Arch. stor. Lomb. ser. iii. 4.

On the short Venetian Annals published by H. V. Sauerland: by H. Simonsfeld [maintaining that they are a copy of the Annals printed from a Vatican manuscript in the 'Monumenta Germaniae,' xiv].—N. Arch. xx. 2.

The Diario Fiorentino of Bartolommeo di Michele del Corazza, vintner [1405–1438]: by G. O. Corazzini. [Of this diary a portion, relating chiefly to ecclesiastical ceremonies, is printed from the Codice Estense in Muratori, xix. To this is now added

from the Strozzi manuscript the portion relating to Florentine affairs, full of interesting references to the vintners' guild; the capture of Pisa; the peace with Ladislas; *palio* races; jousts and public dances; the death of Salutati; Antonio d'Arezzo's lectures on Dante, 1429; the completion of the cupola of the cathedral, 1436; influenza, 'una pestilentia d' infreddati,' Feb. 1414].—Arch. stor. Ital. 5th ser. xiv. 2.

Critical remarks on the authorities for Veronese history: by G. Sommerfeldt. I: The chronicle published by Orti Manara [based on a source common to the chronicle of Boninsegna de' Mitocolo, but compiled not earlier than the first half of the fifteenth century].—N. Arch. xx. 2.

The court of Ferrara in the fifteenth century: by count Gandini.—Scott. Rev. 49. *Jan.*

The constitutional reforms forced upon Maximilian Sforza by Milan [11 July 1515, caused by the rapacity of the Swiss, and confirming the transference to the municipality of the canals and irrigation system, the election of the financial chamber and of certain municipal officers]: by E. Verga.—Arch. stor. Lomb. ser. iii. 4.

A Milanese precursor of Cagliostro [a biography of Borri, mystic, alchemist, charlatan, and scientific physician]: by G. de Castro.—Arch. stor. Lomb. ser. iii. 4.

Census of Rome under Clement VII [taken immediately before the sack]: by D. Gnoli. [It gives head of house and numbers of household in the thirteen rioni: houses 9,285, population 55,035. Half the population were foreigners, many of them women. The large establishments of cardinals may be noted: e.g., Farnese, 306; Cesarini, 275].—Arch. R. Soc. Rom. 67–68.

Bibliography of recent works on Italian history: by C. Cipolla.—N. Arch. Ven. viii. 2 (continued).

The Netherlands and Belgium

The chartulary of the church of St. Lambert at Liège published by S. Bormans and E. Schoolmeesters: by E. Reusens [a severe criticism].—Anal. Hist. eccl. Belg. xxv. 1, 2.

Grant of land [1295] *in Nieuwland* [in Delfland] *for the use of the poor* donec ad transmarinas partes generalis transitus moveatur, *to be sold when the crusade takes place*: printed by J. de Fremery.—Arch. nederl. Kerk geschied. v. 2.

The credibility of Jacques de Guyse, the chronicler of Hainault: by A. Wauters [adverse].—Bull. Acad. roy. Belg. 3rd ser. xxviii. 9, 10.

Adriaan Stolker and his plan for the extension of remonstrant congregations abroad: by H. C. Rogge.—Arch. nederl. Kerkgeschied. v. 2.

Russia

The measurement of land in ancient Russia: by V. Vladislavlev [with reference to the origin of the desiatina].—Zhur. Min. Narod. Prosv. *Feb.*

The fate of Ivan Antonovich [for a short time emperor, but dethroned on the election of Elizabeth].—Russk. Starina. *Dec.*

An examination of the materials of the Voskresenski chronicle [on the affairs of the principality of Moscow]: by I. Tikhomirov.—Zhur. Min. Narod. Prosv. *Dec.*

The union of Curland with Russia [in the time of Catherine II]: by V. Bilbasov.—Russk. Starina. *Jan.*

The battle of Macieowice and the surrender of Kosciuszko: by E. Albovski.—Russk. Starina. *Jan.*

Memoirs of M. Olshevski [descriptive of the war in the Caucasus in 1841–1846].—Russk. Starina. *Dec.*

Switzerland

Place-names in the Vallais: by L. E. Iselin [rejecting the Arabic etymologies proposed for Mischabel and Allalin; with notes on the legendary derivations of Aroleid and Leichenbretter].—Anz. Schweiz. Gesch. 1894. 5, 6.

The Swiss name for 2 January [Berchtoldsdag, probably a mistake for Berchtendag, named from Bertha the queen of Rudolf II of Burgundy]: by M. Estermann.—Anz. Schweiz. Gesch. 1894. 5, 6.

The first reformation-ordinance at Basle: by T. Burckhardt-Biedermann [who dates it not in 1522 or 1524, but in April or May 1523].—Anz. Schweiz. Gesch. 1894. 5, 6.

A narrative of the French attack on Disentis [6 March 1799]: printed by R. Hoppeler. Anz. Schweiz. Gesch. 1894. 5, 6.

Obituaries of Swiss historians deceased in 1893, with full bibliographies.—Anz. Schweiz. Gesch. 1894. 5, 6.

America

Letter of Philip II [28 Feb. 1566] *on the Florida massacre of* 1565 [translated from the published Spanish original].—Bull. Soc. hist. Protest. franç. xliii. 12. *Dec.*

The constitutional beginnings of North Carolina: by J. S. Bassett [insisting on the view that the organisation of the county palatine of Durham was the model followed in forming the constitution of Carolina, tracing the history of the 'Fundamental Constitutions,' and concluding by an analysis of the constitution as it existed during the first quarter of the eighteenth century].—Johns Hopkins Univ. Stud. in polit. and hist. Sc. xii. 3.

The Carolina pirates and colonial commerce [1670–1740]: by S. C. Hughson [based on the records of the colony. The pressure of the navigation laws led the colonists to tolerate the pirates, and successive governors connived at piracy. With the death of captain Teach and the capture and execution of major Stede Bonnet in 1718 the era of piracy ended. The author's researches confirm and illustrate Charles Johnson's 'History of the Pirates,' 1724, which he considers remarkably accurate].—Johns Hopkins Univ. Stud. in polit. and hist. Sc. xii. 5–7.

List of Recent Historical Publications

I. GENERAL HISTORY

(Including works of miscellaneous contents)

ALTAMIRA (R.) La enseñanza de la historia. 2nd ed. enlarged. Pp. 479. Madrid: Suárez. 5·50 pes.

AVENEL (vicomte G. d'). Histoire économique de la propriété, des salaires, des denrées, et de tous les prix en général [1200–1800]. 2 vol. Pp. 726, 916. Paris: impr. nationale.

BEER (R.) Handschriftenschätze Spaniens. Pp. 755. Vienna: Tempsky. 12 m.

BRY (T. de). Emblemata nobilitatis: Stamm- und Wappenbuch [1593], mit einem Vorwort über die geschichtliche Entwickelung der Stammbücher bis zum Ende des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts, herausgegeben von F. Warnecke. 58 plates. Berlin: Stargardt. 4to. 40 m.

—— (J. T. de). Emblemata saecularia: Kulturgeschichtliches Stamm- und Wappenbuch [1611], mit einer Einleitung über die Stammbücher des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts, herausgegeben von F. Warnecke. Pp. 56; 100 plates. Berlin: Stargardt. 4to. 50 m.

BUYS (J. T.) Studiën over staatkunde en staatsrecht. II, 1. Pp. 1–160. Arnhem.

CARA (C. A. de). Gli Hethei-pelasgi: ricerche di storia e di archeologia orientale, greca, e latina. I: Siria, Asia Minore, Ponto Eussino. Pp. 749, illustr. Rome: tip. dell' Academia dei Lincei.

CASINENSIS, Bibliotheca, seu codicum manuscriptorum qui in tabulario Casinensi asservantur series per paginas singillatim enucleata notis, characterum speciminibus ad unguem exemplatis aucta, cura et studio monachorum ordinis s. Benedicti. V. Pp. 96, 224. Monte Casino: typ. Casinensis. 12 l.

HAUKE (F.) Die geschichtlichen Grundlagen des Monarchenrechts. Pp. 146. Vienna: Braumüller. 3 m.

LEGRAND (E.) Bibliographie hellénique, ou description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés par des Grecs au dix-septième siècle. 3 vol. Paris: Picard. 75 f.

MADAN (F.) A summary catalogue of western manuscripts in the Bodleian library at Oxford which have not hitherto been catalogued in the quarto series. III. Pp. 651. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 21/.

MILLER (K.) Mappae mundi: die ältesten Weltkarten, herausgegeben und erläutert. I: Die Weltkarte des Beatus [776 nach Chr.] Pp. 70, illustr. Stuttgart: Roth. 4to. 5 m.

PETITOT (E.) Origines et migrations des peuples de la Gaule jusqu'à l'avénement des Francs. Paris: Maisonneuve: 12 f.

RAMBAUD (J.) Eléments d'économie politique. Paris: Larose. 10 f.

SAY (L.), FOYOT (L.), & LANJALLEY (A.) Dictionnaire des finances. 2 vol. Paris: Berger-Levrault. 90 f.

SCHWARZ (F. von). Sintfluth und Völkerwanderungen. Pp. 552, 11 illustr. Stuttgart: Enke. 14 m.

SHAW (W. A.) The history of currency [1252–1894], being an account of the gold and silver monies and monetary standards of Europe and America, &c. Pp. 431. London: Wilsons & Milne.

STEINMETZ (S. R.) Ethnologische Studien zur ersten Entwickelung der Strafe. Leyden: Doesburgh. 12 fl.

VALLÉE (L.) La Bibliothèque Nationale: choix de documents pour servir à l'histoire de l'établissement et de ses collections. Pp. 525. Paris.

VERDEGAY Y FISCOWICH (E.) Historia del correo desde sus orígenes hasta nuestros días. Pp. 480. Madrid. 4to.

WEIGAND (G.) Die Aromunen: ethnographisch-philologisch-historische Untersuchungen über das Volk der sogenannten Makedo-Romanen oder Zinzaren. II. Pp. 383. Leipzig: Barth. 8 m.

WISLICENUS (W. F.) Astronomische Chronologie: ein Hülfsbuch für Historiker, Archäologen, und Astronomen. Pp. 163. Leipzig: Teubner. 5 m.

II. ORIENTAL HISTORY

Aegyptische Urkunden aus dem königlichen Museum zu Berlin. Griechische Urkunden. II, 1-3. Pp. 1-96. Berlin: Weidmann. 4to. Each 2·40 m.

Colvin (sir A.) John Russell Colvin, the last lieutenant-governor of the North-West under the Company. (Rulers of India.) Pp. 214, portr. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 2/6.

Cumont (F.) Textes et monuments figurés relatifs aux mystères de Mithra. Publ. avec une introduction critique. 1, 2. Pp. 464, 3 plates. Brussels: Lamertin. 4to. 22·50 f.

Dümichen (J.) Der Grabpalast des Patuamenap in der thebanischen Nekropolis. III. Mit Vorwort von W. Spiegelberg. 31 plates. Leipzig: Hinrichs. Fol. 50 m.

Egyptian book of the dead, ed. by C. H. S. Davis. Illustr. London: Putnam. Fol. 30/.

Harlez (C. de). La religion et les cérémonies impériales de la Chine moderne, d'après le cérémonial et les décrets officiels. Pp. 556. Brussels: Hayez. 10 f.

Huth (G.) Die Inschriften von Tsaghan Baisin. Tibetisch-mongolischer Text mit einer Uebersetzung und Erläuterungen. Pp. 63. Leipzig: Brockhaus. 3 m.

Josephi (Flavii) opera, edidit et apparatu critico instruxit B. Niese. VI: De bello Iudaico libros VII ediderunt I. a Destinon et B. Niese. Pp. lxxvi, 628. Berlin: Weidmann. 26 m.

Kohler (J.) & Peiser (F. E.) Aus dem babylonischen Rechtsleben. III. Pp. 64. Leipzig: Pfeiffer. 4 m.

Louw (P. J. F.) De Java-oorlog van 1825-1830. I. Pp. 734, with atlas. Batavia.

Maspero (G.) The dawn of civilisation: Egypt and Chaldaea. Ed. by A. H. Sayce. Transl. by M. L. McClure. Pp. 806, illustr. London: Society for promoting Christian knowledge. 24/.

Matheson (G. B.) Life of Warren Hastings, first governor-general of India. Pp. 574, portr. London: Chapman & Hall. 18/.

Moor (F. de). Un épisode oublié de l'histoire primitive d'Israël et l'Asie antérieure sous le règne des deux Aménophis III et IV, d'après la correspondance d'El Amarna. Pp. 45. Arras: Sueur-Charruey.

Niebuhr (C.) Studien und Bemerkungen zur Geschichte des alten Orients. I: Gideon und Jerubbaal; ein Buch Levi; Kaleb und Juda in Richter I; Tukulti-Aschur-Bil; Chanirabbat und Mitani; zur Lage von Alaschja. Pp. 102. Leipzig: Pfeiffer. 6 m.

Petrie (W. M. F.) A history of Egypt, from the earliest times to the sixteenth century. Pp. 268. London: Methuen. 6/.

Rea (A.) South Indian Buddhist antiquities, including the stûpas of Bhattiprôlu, Gudivâda, and Ghantasâlâ, and other ancient sites in the Krishna district, Madras presidency. Pp. 52, 47 plates. Madras. (London: Luzac). 4to. 12/6.

Schwartz (E.) Die Königslisten des Eratosthenes und Kastor mit Excursen über die Interpolationen bei Africanus und Eusebius. Pp. 96. Göttingen: Dieterich. 4to. 10 m.

Snouck Hurgronje (C.) De Atjèhers. II. Pp. 438. Batavia.

Wellhausen (J.) Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte. Pp. 342. Berlin: Reimer. 7 m.

Winckler (H.) Altorientalische Forschungen: III. Pp. 197-303. Leipzig: Pfeiffer. 6.50 m.

—— Sammlung von Keilschrifttexten III, 1. Pp. 40. Leipzig: Pfeiffer. 4to.

III. GREEK AND ROMAN HISTORY

Allard (P.) Le paganisme au milieu du quatrième siècle; situation matérielle et légale. Pp. 51. Besançon: impr. Jacquin.

Aristotle's Politics. A revised text, with introduction, analysis, and commentary, by F. Susemihl and R. D. Hicks. Books 1-5. Pp. 694. London: Macmillan. 18/.

Hammond (B. E.) The political institutions of the ancient Greeks. Pp. 122. London: Clay. 4/.

Hochart (P.) Nouvelles considérations au sujet des Annales et des Histoires de Tacite. Paris: Thorin. 8 f.

Inscriptions juridiques grecques, Recueil des. Texte, traduction, commentaire, par R. Dareste, B. Haussoullier, et T. Reinach. III. Paris: Leroux. 7·50 f.

Inscriptionum Latinarum, Corpus. VI: Inscriptiones urbis Romae Latinae, collegerunt G. Henzen, I. B. de Rossi, E. Bormann, C. Huelsen. IV, 1. Pp. 2459-3001. Berlin: Reimer. Fol. 58 m.

Kern (O.) Die Gründungsgeschichte von Magnesia am Maiandros: eine neue Urkunde, erläutert von. Pp. 27, plate. Berlin: Weidmann. 4to. 4 m.

Lehmann (K.) Der letze Feldzug des Hannibalischen Krieges. Leipzig: Teubner. 2·80 m.

Meyer (E.) Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Gracchen. Pp. 33. Halle: Niemeyer. 1·60 m.

Mommsen (T.) History of Rome, transl. by W. P. Dickson. New ed. revised throughout and embodying recent

additions. I, II. Pp. 510, 530. London: Bentley. Each 7/6.

Pullen (H. W.) Handbook of ancient Roman marbles; or, a history and description of all ancient columns and surface marbles still existing in Rome. Pp. 190. London: Murray. 18mo. 2/.

Ramsay (W.) Manual of Roman antiquities. 15th ed. revised by R. Lanciani. Pp. 580. London: Griffin. 10/6.

Seeck (O.) Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt. I. Pp. 404. Berlin: Siemenroth & Worms. 8·50 m.

IV. ECCLESIASTICAL AND MEDIEVAL HISTORY

Acta Sanctorum Novembris collecta, digesta, illustrata. II, 1. Pp. 624, Brussels: Schepens. 75 f.

Alberdingk-Thijm (P.) Les ducs de Lotharingie et spécialement ceux de Basse-Lotharingie du Xe–XIe siècles [933–1023]. I. Pp. 34. Brussels: Hayez.

Arbois de Jubainville (H d'). Études sur le droit celtique. I. Paris: Thorin. 8 f.

Breyer (R.) Die Legation des Kardinalbischofs Nikolaus von Albano in Skandinavien. Pp. 23. Halle: Gebauer-Schwetschke'sche Buchdruckerei. 4to.

Clément IV [1265-1268], Les registres de: recueil des bulles de ce pape, publiées ou analysées, d'après les manuscrits originaux des archives du Vatican, par E. Jordan. II. Pp. 113-256. Paris: Thorin. 4to. 10 f.

Chronica minora saec. IV. V. VI. VII. edidit T. Mommsen. (Monumenta Germaniae historica. Auctorum antiquissimorum tomi XIII pars 1.) III, 1. Pp. 222. Berlin: Weidmann. 4to. 8 m.

Dahn (F.) Die Könige der Germanen: das Wesen des ältesten Königthums der germanistischen Stämme und seine Geschichte bis zur Auflösung des karolingischen Reiches, nach den Quellen dargestellt. VII: Die Franken unter den Merovingern. II. Pp. 273. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel. 8 m.

Dodu (G.) De Fulconis Hierosolymitani regno. Pp. 72. Paris: Hachette.

——Histoire des institutions monarchiques dans le royaume latin de Jérusalem [1099-1291]. Pp. 381. Paris: Hachette.

Douais (C.) L'Albigéisme et les frères prêcheurs à Narbonne au treizième siècle. Pp. 149. Paris: Picard. 5 f.

Egils saga Skallagrímssonar, nebst den grösseren Gedichten Egils. Herausgegeben von Finnur Jónsson. Pp. xxxix, 334. Halle: Niemeyer.

Froissart, The chronicles of, translated by John Bourchier, Lord Berners. Edited and reduced into one volume by G. C. Macaulay. Pp. xxx, 484. London: Macmillan. 3/6.

Führer (J.) Zur Felicitas-Frage. Pp. 36. Leipzig: Fock.

Gachon (C.) Pièces relatives au débat du pape Clément V avec l'empereur Henri VII. Pp. xliv, 79. Montpellier: impr. Martel.

Goetz (C.) Die Busslehre Cyprians: eine Studie zur Geschichte des Busssacraments. Pp. 100. Königsberg: Braun and Weber. 2 m.

Gregoire IX, Les registres de: recueil des bulles de ce pape, publiées ou analysées d'après les manuscrits originaux du Vatican par L. Auvray. III. Pp. 529-784. Paris: Thorin. 4to. 9 f.

Grupp (G.) Kulturgeschichte des Mittelalters. II. Pp. 466, illustr. Stuttgart: Roth. 6·80 m.

Guldenchrone (D. de). L'Achaie féodale: étude sur le moyen-âge en Grèce [1205-1456]. Paris: Leroux. 10 f.

Hagiographica, Bibliotheca, Graeca seu elenchus vitarum sanctorum Graece typis impressarum ediderunt Hagiographi Bollandiani. Pp. 144. Brussels: Polleunis. 6 f.

Heck (P.) Die altfriesische Gerichtsverfassung, mit sprachwissenschaftlichen Beiträgen von T. Siebs. Pp. 499. Weimar: Böhlau. 12 m.

Hesseling (D. C.) Over het Grieksch der middeleeuwen. Pp. 23. Leyden: Brill. 1 f.

Jüngst (J.) Die Quellen der Apostelgeschichte. Pp. 226. Gotha: Perthes. 4 m.

Krüger (G.) Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten. (Grundriss der theologischen Wissenschaften. 2. Reihe. III.) Pp. 254. Freiburg: Mohr. 4·80 m.

Maltzew (A.) Der grosse Buss-Kanon des heiligen Andreas von Kreta. Deutsch und slavisch unter Berücksichtigung des griechischen Urtextes. Pp. 108. Berlin: Siegismund. 12mo. 3 m.

Martens (W.) Gregor VII, sein Leben und Wirken. 2 vols. Pp. 351, 373. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. 16 m.

Mitrovic (B.) Cipro nella storia medioevale. Pp. 108. Trieste: Schimpff. 3·20 m.

Pastor (L.) The history of the popes from the close of the mindle ages, drawn from the secret archives of the Vatican and other original sources. English translation, edited by F. I. Antrobus. III, IV. Pp. lviii, 424, 537. London: Kegan Paul.

Segovia (Ioannes de). Historia gestorum generalis synodi Basileensis. Ed. R. Beer. Vol. II. Liber XVII. (Monumenta conciliorum generalium seculi XV.

Concilium Basileense. Scriptorum tomi III pars III.) Pp. 539–946. Vienna: Tempsky. 4to. 20 m.

SATHAS (C.) Bibliotheca Græca medii aevi. VII: Anonymi compendium chronicum. Pp. 680. Paris: Maisonneuve. 20 f.

SCHENKL (H.) Bibliotheca patrum Latinorum Britannica. III. 1: Die Bibliotheken der englischen Kathedralen. Pp. 79. Leipzig: Freytag. 1·60 m.

TANGL (M.) Die päpstlichen Kanzleiordnungen [1200–1500], gesammelt und herausgegeben von. Pp. lxxxi, 461. Innsbruck: Wagner. 14 m.

TARDIF (A.) Histoire des sources du droit français: origines romaines. Pp. 528. Paris: A. Picard. 8 f.

TSCHACKERT (P.) Ungedruckte Briefe zur allgemeinen Reformationsgeschichte. Pp. 57. Göttingen: Dieterich. 4to. 6·40 m.

WAGNER (J.) Dictionnaire de droit canonique, ou le Dictionnaire de Mgr André et de l'abbé Condis, revu, augmenté, et actualisé. II, III. Pp. 830, 857. Paris: Walzer. 30 f.

WOLF (T.) Johannes Honterus, der Apostel Ungarns. Pp. 186. Kronstadt: Zeidner. 2·40 m.

V. HISTORY OF MODERN EUROPE

BARBARICH (E.) La guerra serbobulgara nel 1885: le operazioni nei Kodza Balkan. Pp. 239. Turin: Casanova.

BARTHÉLEMY, ambassadeur de France en Suisse [1792–1797]. Papiers publiés par J. Kaulek. V: septembre 1794–septembre 1796. Paris: Alcan. 20 f.

BITTARD DES PORTES (R.) Histoire des zouaves pontificaux. Pp. 401. Paris: Bloud & Barral. 5 f.

BONACINI (E.) Guerra franco-germanica del 1870–1871. 45 plates. Florence. 4to.

CHIALA (L.) Politica segreta di Napoleone III e di Cavour in Italia e in Ungheria [1858–1861]. Pp. 204. Turin. 16mo.

CHUQUET (A.) La guerre 1870–1871. Paris.

DAWSON (S. E.) The voyages of the Cabots in 1497 and 1498. (Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, xii. 2). Montreal: Foster Brown.

GIODA (C.) La vita e le opere di Giovanni Botero. II, III. Pp. 397–795, 331. Milan: Hoepli.

GUILLAUME. Code des relations conventionnelles entre la Belgique et la France. Brussels: Falk. 4to. 12 f.

LARIVIÈRE (C. de). Catherine II et la révolution française d'après de nouveaux documents. Paris: Le Soudier. 12mo. 3·50 f.

LAVANCHY (J. M.) Le diocèse de Genève (partie de Savoie) pendant la révolution française. II. Pp. 797. Annecy: Burnod. 7 f.

LEGRELLE (A.) Notes et documents sur la paix de Ryswick. Pp. 136. Lille: Desclée & de Brouwer.

MAAG (A.) Geschichte der Schweizertruppen in französischen Diensten vom Rückzug aus Russland bis zum zweiten Pariser Frieden [1813–1815]. Pp. 568, illustr. Biel: Kuhn. 10 m.

MONTESQUIEU, Voyages de. Publ. par le baron A. de Montesquieu. I. Pp. xlviii, 373. Paris: Picard. 4to.

MONTGAILLARD (comte de), agent de la diplomatie secrète pendant la révolution, l'empire, et la restauration. Souvenirs publiés d'après des documents inédits par C. de Lacroix. Paris: Ollendorf. 7·50 f.

OMPTEDA (L., Freiherr von). Irrfahrten und Abenteuer eines mittelstaatlichen Diplomaten: ein Lebens- und Kulturbild aus den Zeiten um 1800. Pp. 435. Leipzig: Hirzel. 6·50 m.

POULLET (P.) La Belgique et la chute de Napoléon Ier. Pp. 44. Brussels: Société Belge de Librairie.

PROFESSIONE (A.) Storia moderna e contemporanea, dalla pace d'Aquisgrana ai giorni nostri. I. Pp. 406. Turin.

SCHLITTER (H.) Pius VI und Josef II von der Rückkehr des Papstes nach Rom bis zum Abschluss des Concordats: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Beziehungen Josefs II zur römischen Curie [1782–1784]. (Fontes rerum Austriacarum. II: Diplomataria et acta. XXXXVII. 2.) Pp. 225. Vienna: Tempsky. 3·40 m.

SCHIMPFF (G. von). 1813: Napoleon in Sachsen; nach des Kaisers Korrespondenz bearbeitet. Pp. 278. Dresden. 6 m.

SPANISH armada, State papers relating to the defeat of the, [1588], ed. by J. K. Laughton. II. (Publications of the Navy Records Society. II.) Pp. 418. London: Printed for the Navy Records Society.

STOERK (F.) Nouveau recueil général de traités et autres actes relatifs aux rapports de droit international. Continuation du grand recueil de G. F. de Martens. 2e série. XIX, 2. Pp. 287–760. Göttingen: Dieterich. 20 m.

A. FRANCE

AUBERT (F.) Histoire du parlement de Paris de l'origine à François Ier [1250–1515]. 2 vol. Pp. 400, 340. Paris: Picard. 16 f.

AULARD (F. A.) Recueil des actes du comité du salut public, avec la correspondance officielle des représentants en mission et le registre du conseil exécutif

provisoire. VII: [22 septembre-24 octobre 1793]. Pp. 668. Paris: Hachette. 12 f.

Bénet (A.) Inventaire sommaire des archives départementales antérieures à 1790. Calvados: archives civiles; série D. II: Université de Caen (Art. 87–644). Pp. 333. Caen: Delesques. 4to.

Berthault (M.) L'abbaye de Chelles (ordre de Saint-Benoist), diocèse de Paris [657–1790]: Résumés chronologiques. III: [1734–1789]. Pp. 259. Paris: Dupont. 6 f.

Brette (A.) Recueil de documents relatifs à la convocation des états généraux de 1789. I. Pp. cix, 534. Paris: Hachette. 12 f.

Debidour (A.) & Etienne (E.) Les chroniqueurs français au moyen âge: études. Pp. 408. Paris: Lecène & Oudin. 18mo. 5 f.

Desmé de Chavigny (O.) Histoire de Saumur pendant la révolution. Pp. 260. Vannes: Lafolye.

Ducrot (général), La vie militaire du, d'après sa correspondance [1839–1871]. 2 vol. Paris: Plon. 15 f.

Favatier (L.) La vie municipale à Narbonne au dix-septième siècle: une élection en 1667; une fête publique en 1645; les pestes et le bureau de la santé. Pp. lxxi, 198. Narbonne: impr. Caillard.

Feret (P.) La faculté de théologie de Paris et ses docteurs les plus célèbres. Moyen âge. II. Pp. 615. Paris: Picard.

Fournier (M.) Les statuts et privilèges des universités françaises depuis leur fondation jusqu'en 1789. 2e partie: XVIe siècle. IV: L'université de Strasbourg et les académies protestantes françaises. I. Pp. 472. Paris: Larose. 4to. 30 f.

Garnier (J.) Inventaire sommaire des archives départementales antérieures à 1790. Côte-d'Or: archives civiles. Série B. Parlement de Bourgogne (Nos. 12068–12269). Pp. 383. Dijon: impr. Darantière. 4to. 10 f.

Joinville (prince de). Memoirs, tr. by Lady Mary Lloyd. Pp. 340, illustr. London: Heinemann. 15/.

Jousset (abbé). Henri IV et son temps. Pp. 400, illustr. Tours: Mame. 4to. 5·50 f.

Kahn (L.) Histoire de la communauté israélite de Paris: les juifs de Paris au dix-huitième siècle, d'après les archives de la lieutenance générale de police à la Bastille. Paris: Durlacher. 12mo. 3 f.

Lacombe (C. de). Vie de Berryer: Berryer et la monarchie de Juillet. I, II. Paris.

Lenient (C.) La poésie patriotique en France dans les temps modernes. II. Paris: Hachette. 16mo. 3·50 f.

Magen (A.) Jurades de la ville d'Agen [1345–1355], traduit et annoté. I. Pp. 431. Auch: impr. Cocharaux.

Marsy (comte de). Catalogue des manuscrits de la bibliothèque de la ville de Compiègne. Pp. 47. Paris: Plon.

Maulde La Clavière (R. de). Louise de Savoie et François Ier: trente ans de jeunesse [1485–1515]. Paris: Perrin. 8 f.

Mautort (chevalier de). Mémoires [1752–1802] publiés par le baron Tillette de Clermont-Tonnerre. Pp. 512, portr. Paris: Plon.

Mavidal (J.) & Laurent (E.) Archives parlementaires. Recueil complet des débats des chambres françaises de 1787 à 1860. Première série [1787–1799]. XLIV: Assemblée nationale. Paris: Dupont. 20 f.

Orleans, duchess of, mother of the regent, Secret memoirs of the court of Louis XIV and of the regency, extracted from the German correspondence of the. Pp. 372. London: Nichols. 10/6.

Paris, Actes de la commune de, pendant la révolution, publiés et annotés par S. Lacroix. II: Deuxième assemblée des représentants de la commune. Paris. 7·50 m.

——— Documents pour servir à l'histoire des libraires de Paris [1486–1600], publiés par J. Pichon et G. Vicaire, Paris. 10 m.

Petit (E.) Histoire des ducs de Bourgogne de la race capétienne, avec des documents inédits et des pièces justificatives. V. Pp. 514, illustr. Dijon: impr. Darantière. 10 f.

Rémusat (madame de). Memoirs [1802–1808]; tr. by Mrs. C. Hoey & J. Lillie. Pp. 740. London: Low. 7/6.

Saurel (F.) Histoire religieuse du département de l'Hérault pendant la révolution. I. Pp. 334. Paris: Champion. 5 f.

Soyer (J.) Etude sur la communauté des habitants de Blois jusqu'au commencement du seizième siècle. Pp. 145. Paris: Picard. 3 f.

Viollet (P.) Les états de Paris en février 1358. Pp. 36. Paris: Klincksieck. 4to.

B. GERMANY AND AUSTRIA-HUNGARY

Arneth (A., Ritter von). Anton, Ritter von Schmerling: Episoden aus seinem Leben [1835, 1848–1849]. Pp. 343, 2 plates. Leipzig: Freytag. 8 m.

Augsburg.—Die Chroniken der schwäbischen Städte. Augsburg. IV. (Die Chroniken der deutschen Städte vom vierzehnten bis ins sechzehnte Jahrhundert. XXIII.) Pp. lxviii, 546. Leipzig: Hirzel. 16 m.

Bernhardi's (Theodor von), Aus dem Leben. IV: Die ersten Regierungsjahre

König Wilhelms I; Tagebuchblätter aus den Jahren 1860–1893. Pp. 340, portr. Leipzig. Hirzel. 7 m.

Bismarck (Fürst von) Ansprachen [1848–1894.] Herausgegeben von H. von Poschinger. Pp. 358, portr. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt. 7 m.

—— Politische Reden. Historisch-kritische Gesammtausgabe, besorgt von H. Kohl. XII: [1886–1890.] Pp. 697. Stuttgart: Cotta. 8 m.

Brünneck (W. von). Zur Geschichte des Grundeigenthums in Ost- und Westpreussen. II: Die Lehngüter. I: Das Mittelalter. Pp. 123. Berlin: Vahlen. 3 m.

Carl von Oesterreich (Erzherzog). Ausgewählte Schriften. 6 vol. Map. Vienna: Braumüller. 60·90 m.

Cologne.—Kölner Schreinsurkunden des zwölften Jahrhunderts. Quellen zur Rechts- und Wirthschaftsgeschichte der Stadt Köln, herausgegeben von R. Hoeniger. II, 2. (Publikationen der Gesellschaft für rheinische Geschichtskunde. I. II, 2.) Pp. 320. Bonn: Weber. 4to. 22 m.

Du Moulin Eccart (Graf R.) Bayern unter dem Ministerium Montgelas. [1799–1817]. I: [1799–1800]. Pp. 439. Munich: Beck. 8·50 m.

Friedrich's des Grossen, Politische Correspondenz. XXI. Pp. 600. Berlin: Duncker. 15 m.

Garmo (C. de). Herbart and the Herbartians. Pp. 268. London: Heinemann. 5/.

Geiger (L.) Berlin, 1688–1840: Geschichte des geistigen Lebens der preussischen Hauptstadt. II: [1786–1840]. Pp. 651. Berlin: Paetel. 15 m.

Glaser (A.) Geschichte der Juden in Strassburg, von der Zeit Karls des Grossen bis auf die Gegenwart. Pp. 88. Strassburg: Noiriel. 2 m.

Hessisches Urkundenbuch. II: Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Herren von Hanau und der ehemaligen Provinz Hanau von H. Reimer. III: [1350–1375]. (Publikationen aus den königlich preussischen Staatsarchiven. LX.) Pp. 922. Leipzig: Hirzel. 24 m.

Janssen (J.) Geschichte des deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters. VIII: Culturzustände des deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters bis zum Beginn des dreissigjährigen Krieges. 4tes Buch: Volkswirtschaftliche, gesellschaftliche, und religiös-sittliche Zustände; Hexenwesen und Hexenverfolgung. Ergänzt und herausgegeben von L. Pastor. Pp. lv, 719. Freiburg: Herder. 7 m.

Juritsch (G.) Geschichte der Babenberger und ihrer Länder [976–1276]. Pp. 726. Innsbruck: Wagner. 12·80 m.

Keutgen (F.) Untersuchungen über den Ursprung der deutschen Stadtverfassung. Pp. 236. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. 5 m.

Knittel (A.) Beiträge zur Geschichte des deutschen Genossenschaftswesens. Pp. 124, plates. Freiburg: Mohr. 3·60 m.

Leipzig, Urkundenbuch der Stadt. III. Herausgegeben von J. Förstemann. (Codex diplomaticus Saxoniae regiae. 2. Hauptteil. X.) Pp. 422. Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient. 4to. 20 m.

Lindner (T.) Geschichte des deutschen Volkes. 2 vol. Pp. 342, 388. Stuttgart: Cotta. 10 m.

Löher (F. von). Kulturgeschichte der Deutschen im Mittelalter. III: Kaiserzeit. Aus dem Nachlasse herausgegeben. Pp. 383, portr. Munich: Schweitzer. 7·50 m.

Luschin von Ebengreuth (A.) Oesterreichische Reichsgeschichte: Geschichte der Staatsbildung, der Rechtsquellen, und des öffentlichen Rechts. I. Pp. 160. Bamberg: Buchner. 3·20 m.

Mayer (H.) Geschichte der Universität Freiburg in Baden in der ersten Hälfte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts. III: [1830–1852]. Pp. 135. Bonn: Hanstein. 2·50 m.

Nehlsen (R.) Dithmarscher Geschichte nach Quellen und Urkunden. Pp. xlvi, 639. Hamburg: Verlagsanstalt. 5 m.

Orléans (Herzogin Elisabeth Charlotte von). Briefe an ihre frühere Hofmeisterin A. K. von Harling und deren Gemahl. Herausgegeben von E. Bodemann. Pp. xxxii, 234, portr. Hanover: Hahn. 6 m.

Petersdorff (H. von). General Johann Adolph, Freiherr von Thielmann: ein Charakterbild aus der napoleonischen Zeit. Pp. 352, portr. Leipzig: Hirzel. 8 m.

Priebatsch (F.) Politische Correspondenz des Kurfürsten Albrecht Achilles. I: [1470–1474]. Pp. 830. Leipzig: Hirzel. 25 m.

Sybel (H. von). Die Begründung des deutschen Reiches durch Wilhelm I. VI, VII. Pp. 377, 416. Munich: Oldenbourg. Each 7 50 m.

Thudichum (F. von). Geschichte des deutschen Privatrechts. Pp. 474. Stuttgart: Enke. 11 m.

Toeppen (M.) Beiträge zur Geschichte des Weichseldeltas. (Abhandlungen zur Landeskunde der Provinz Westpreussen. VIII.) Pp. 129, map. Danzig: Bertling. 4to. 6 m.

C. GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

Ancient deeds, A descriptive catalogue of, in the public record office. II. Pp. 739. London: Published under the direction of the master of the rolls. 15/.

Biography, Dictionary of national. XLII: *O'Duinn—Owen.* London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 15/.

Bonner (Hypatia B.) Charles Bradlaugh: a record of his life and work. 2 vol. Pp. 850. London: Unwin. 21/.

Bouverie-Pusey (S. E. B.) The past history of Ireland. Pp. 164. London: Unwin. 1/.

Bowes (R.) A catalogue of books printed at, or relating to, the university, town, and county of Cambridge [1521–1893]. Index. London: Macmillan. 7/6.

Canterbury, The registers of the Wallon or strangers' church in, ed. by R. Hovenden. (Publications of the Huguenot Society of London, V.) II. Pp. 305–503. Lymington: Printed for the Society. 4to.

Chalmers (George). Caledonia; or, a historical and topographical account of North Britain from the most ancient to the present times. From the hitherto unpublished manuscripts in the Advocates' library. VII. London: Gardner. 4to. 21/.

Cunningham (W.) & McArthur (Ellen A.) Outlines of English industrial history. Pp. 274. Cambridge: University Press. 4/.

Edward II. Calendar of the close rolls preserved in the public record office [1318–1323]. Pp. 879. London: H. M. Stationery Office. 15/.

Fitzmaurice (lord E.) The life of sir William Petty [1623–1687]. Portr. London: Murray. 16/.

Gasquet (F. A.) The last abbot of Glastonbury and his companions: an historical sketch. Pp. 195. London: Simpkin Marshall. 7/6.

Green (John Richard). A short history of the English people. Illustr. ed. by Mrs. J. R. Green & Miss K. Norgate. IV. Pp. lxxxiii–cx, 1411-1906. London: Macmillan. 12/.

Henry VIII, Letters and papers, foreign and domestic, of the reign of. Arranged and catalogued by J. Gairdner & R. H. Brodie. XIV, 1: 29 December 1538–July 1539]. Pp. li, 611. London: H.M. Stationery Office. 15/.

Hinds (A. B.) The making of the England of Elizabeth. Pp. 152. London: Rivington, Percival, & Co. 4/6.

Hutton (W. H.) William Laud. Pp. 240, portr. London: Methuen. 3/6.

Kenyon (lord), The manuscripts of. Fourteenth report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission. IV. London: H.M. Stationery Office. 2/10.

Melville (A. P.) The last Scots parliament. Pp. 66. Perth: Cowan 1/.

Ministers' accounts, List of original, preserved in the public record office. Part I (Lists and indexes, V.) London: H.M. Stationery Office. 16/.

Newell (E. J.) A history of the Welsh church to the destruction of the monasteries. Pp. 435. London: Stock.

Oliphant (Mrs.) Historical sketches of the reign of queen Anne. Pp. 381, portr. London: Macmillan. 8/6.

Oman (C.) A history of England. London: Arnold. 4/6.

Oxford, The cartulary of the monastery of St. Frideswide at. Ed. by S. R. Wigram. (Oxford Historical Society.) I. Pp. 503, plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Pepys (Samuel). Diary. Ed. by H. B. Wheatley. V: 1 July 1665–30 Sept. 1666. Pp. 451, portraits. London: Bell. 10/6.

Pollock (sir F.) & Maitland (F. W.). The history of English law. 2 vol. Cambridge: University Press. 40/.

Povah (A.) The annals of the parishes of St. Olave, Hart Street, and All Hallows, Staining, in the city of London. London: Blades. 4to. 21/.

Renwick (R.) Abstracts of protocols of the town-clerks of Glasgow. I: 1547–1555. Pp. 130. Glasgow: Carson & Nicol. 4to. 6/.

Salisbury (marquis of), Calendar of the manuscripts of the. V. (Historical Manuscripts Commission.) London: H. M. Stationery Office. 2/6.

Verney (Margaret M.) Memoirs of the Verney family. III: During the commonwealth [1650–1660]. Pp. 493, illustr. London: Longmans.

York, The historians of the church of, and its archbishops. Edited by J. Raine. III. Pp. 443. London: Published under the direction of the master of the rolls. 10/.

Yorkshire lay subsidy, being a ninth collected in 25 Edw. I [1297]; ed. by W. Brown. (Yorkshire Archæological Society. Record series, XVI.) Pp. xxix, 191. Printed for the Society.

——— The certificates of the commissioners appointed to survey the chantries, guilds, hospitals, &c., in the county of York. I. (Publications of the Surtees society, XCI.) Pp. 210. Durham: Andrews. (London: Whittaker. 14/.

D. ITALY

Browning (O.) The age of the condottieri: a short history of medieval Italy [1409 – 1530]. Pp. 275. London: Methuen. 5/.

Cannavale (E.) Lo studio di Napoli nel rinascimento. Pp. 291. Turin. 4to.

Diehl (C.) L'art byzantin dans l'Italie méridionale. Illustr. Paris: Librairie de l'art. 4to. 15 f.

Gregorovius (F.) History of the city of Rome in the middle ages. Transl. from the 4th German ed. by Annie Hamilton. I, II. Pp. 505, 516. London: Bell. Each 6/.

Savini (F.) Il commune Teramano nella sua vita intima e pubblica dai più antichi tempi ai moderni. Pp. 612. Rome: Forzani. 10 l.

Tiraboschi (Girolamo). Lettere al padre Ireneo Affò, a cura di C. Frati. I. Pp. 320. Modena: Vincenzi. 4to. 10 l.

Travali (G.) Documenti su lo sbarco, la cattura, e la morte del re Gioacchino Murat al Pizzo. Palermo: Reber.

E. OTHER COUNTRIES

Bain (R. N.) Gustavus III and his contemporaries [1746–1792]. 2 vol. London: Kegan Paul. 21/.

Barbier (V.) Histoire de l'abbaye de Malonne de l'ordre des chanoines réguliers de S. Augustin. I. Pp. 483. Namur: Delvaux. 4 f.

Bergh (E.) Finland under det första årtiondet of kejsar Alexander III's regering. Pp. 515. Helsingfors. (13·50 m.)

Burke (U. R.) A history of Spain from the earliest times to the death of Ferdinand the Catholic. 2 vol. Pp. 384, 360. London: Longmans. 32/.

Bury Adels Torn. La maison de Croy: étude historique, héraldique, et critique. I. Pp. 243. Brussels: Schepens. 10 f.

Byvanck (W. G. C.) Hoofdstukken onzer geschiedenis: de jeugd van Isaäc da Costa [1798 – 1825]. I. Pp. 260. Leyden.

Candau y Pizarro (F.) Prehistoria de la provincia de Sevilla. Seville: Salas. 4to. 10 pes.

Casier (C.) & Stallaert (C.) Recueil des anciennes coutumes de la Belgique. Coutumes de la ville d'Aerschot, de Neder-Assent, et de Caggevinne. Pp. 232. Brussels: Goemare. 4to.

David (J.) Vaderlandsche historie. 8 vol. Louvain: Van Linthout. 16 f.

Denmark.—Forordninger, Recesser, og andre kongelige Breve Danmarks Lovgivning vedkommende [1558–1660]. Udgivne ved V. A. Secher. IV, 1. Pp. 160. Copenhagen. (3 m.)

Fredericq (P.) Onze historische volksliederen. I. Pp. 119. Ghent: Vuylsteke. 4 f.

Gailliard (E.) De keure van Hazebroeck van 1336. I. Pp. 410. Ghent: Siffer. 10 f.

Goblet d'Alviella (comte E.) Emile de Laveleye, sa vie et son œuvre. Pp. 200. Brussels: Hayez. 16mo. 2·50 f.

Jacobs (J.) An inquiry into the sources of the history of the Jews in Spain. Pp. xlviii, 263. London: Nutt.

Juste (T.) Histoire de Belgique depuis les temps primitifs jusqu'à nos jours. 3 vol. Pp. 352, 380, 438, illustr. Brussels: Bruylant. 60 f.

Knuttel (W. P. C.) De toestand der nederlandsche katholieken ten tijde der republiek. II: De achttiende eeuw. Pp. 317. The Hague: Nijhoff.

Laurent (C.) Recueil des anciennes ordonnances de la Belgique. 2e sér. [1506–1700]. I. Pp. 762. Brussels: Goemaere.

Oliveira Martens (J. P.) Historia de la civilisación ibérica. Pp. lx, 416. Madrid.

Poswick (E.) Histoire des troupes liégeoises pendant le dix-huitième siècle. Pp. 222. Liège: Cormaux. 4to. 20 f.

Reitsma (J.) & Veen (S. D. van). Acta der provinciale en particuliere synoden, gehouden in de Noordelijke Nederlanden gedurende de jaren 1572–1620. III: Zuid-Holland, 1593–1620. Pp. 525. Groningen: Wolters.

Schrevel (C. A. de). Troubles religieux du seizième siècle au quartier de Bruges [1566–1568]. I. Pp. 515. Bruges: De Plancke. 5 f.

Stachelin (R.) Huldreich Zwingli: sein Leben und Wirken nach den Quellen dargestellt. I. Pp. 1–256. Basel: Schwabe. 4·80 m.

Vadianische Briefsammlung, Die, der Stadtbibliothek St. Gallen. II. Herausgegeben von E. Arbenz. (Mitteilungen zur vaterländischen Geschichte. XXV, 2.) Pp. 193–482. St. Gallen: Huber.

Visscher (H.) Guilielmus Amesius, zijn leven en werken. Pp. 227, portr. Haarlem.

Waliszewski (K.) The story of a throne; Catherine II of Russia. Engl. transl. 2 vol. Pp. 530. London: Heinemann. 28/.

Witte (A. de). Histoire monétaire des comtes de Louvain, ducs de Brabant et marquis du saint-empire romain. I. Pp. 214, 25 plates. Antwerp: De Backer. 20 f.

Zabala y Urdaniz (M.) Cuadros de historiografia de España. Pp. 152. Valencia. 4to.

VI. AMERICAN AND COLONIAL HISTORY

Acosta (J. de). Historia natural y moral de las Indias. 2 vol. Pp. 486, 392. Madrid.

Andrews (E. B.) History of the United States. 2 vol. Pp. 390, 341, maps. New York.

Begg (A.) The history of British Columbia from its earliest discovery to the present time. Toronto.

Brooks (N.) Abraham Lincoln and the downfall of American slavery. Pp. 470. London: Putnam. 5/.

Chabaud-Arnault (C.) La marine pendant les guerres d'indépendance de l'Amérique du Sud. Pp. 46. Paris: Baudoin.

Coroleu (J.) América: historia de su colonización, dominación, é independencia. I. Pp. 372. Barcelona. 4to.

Dadelszen (E. J. von). New Zealand official year-book, 1894. Pp. 567. Wellington (N. Z.): Costall. (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode.) 1/.

Ferguson (H.) Essays in American history. Pp. 211. New York: Pott. $1·25.

Lee (F.) General Lee of the Confederate army. Pp. 420. London: Chapman and Hall. 6/.

Maclay (E. S.) A history of the United States navy from 1775 to 1894. II. London: Bliss, Sands, & Foster.

Millares (A.) Historia general de las Islas Canarias. VI, VII. Madrid: Murillo. 4to. Each 3·50 pes.

Pope (J.) Memoirs of sir John Alexander Macdonald, first prime minister of the dominion of Canada. 2 vol. Pp. 710. London: Arnold. 32/.

Prado y Ugarteche (J.) Estado social del Perú durante la dominación española. Pp. 191. Lima: Agois. 2·75 f.

Ropes (J. C.) The story of the civil war in the United States of America [1861–1865]. I: To the opening of the campaigns of 1862. Pp. 270, maps and plans. London: Putnam. 6/.

Speed (T.) The Political Club, Danville, Kentucky [1786–1790]; from the original papers recently found. Pp. 179. Louisville, Kentucky: Morton. fol.

Errata

Vol. ix. page 813, line 12: *for* 'Pembroke' *read* 'Plymouth.'

Vol. x. pages 90–91: *for* 'Rothley in Nottinghamshire; . . . Mansfield . . . Warwickshire; Stoneleigh' *read* 'Rothley in Leicestershire; in Nottinghamshire, . . Mansfield . . ; in Warwickshire, Stoneleigh.'

THE ENGLISH

HISTORICAL REVIEW

NO. XXXIX.—JULY 1895

The Condition of Morals and Religious Belief in the Reign of Edward VI

I.

IN the general absence of contemporary diaries and the extreme scarcity of most of the publications of the few years of the brief reign of Edward VI it is very difficult to determine what was the state of morals, or what was the prevalent form of religious belief amongst the masses of the people, though no such difficulty exists as regards their leaders and others who played a conspicuous part in the changes that were continually going on. The consequence has been that very considerable mistakes have been made as regards both these points, and it is only of late years that the true state of the case has begun to dawn upon writers of history. Till Mr. Froude reached this period of his work it was commonly supposed that the protestant party were pretty well united among themselves in their opposition to the abettors of the old learning, and that as distinguished from catholics they were mostly patterns of a somewhat austere but genuine piety; whilst Archbishop Laurence's 'Bampton Lectures' of 1804 were eagerly accepted, as having distinctly proved that the English church had been modelled much after the Augsburg confession, and that no material changes had been introduced into the English ritual and offices subsequent to the year 1552, when the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI had been published, with the design of superseding the less perfect development of doctrine which had appeared in the earlier Prayer Book of 1549. A little light had indeed been thrown upon the subject by the republication of both these Books of Common Prayer, the contents of which were scarcely known half a century ago even to the better informed

amongst the clergy. Some of the publications of the Parker Society also had opened men's eyes to the fact that the reforming party, on the showing of their own adherents, were very inferior, as regards their morals and general mode of life, to what had been commonly believed, and the 'Zürich Letters' especially had revealed the fact that English reformers had far more sympathy with the Zwinglianism of Switzerland than the Lutheranism of Germany.

The erroneous view of Laurence's 'Bampton Lectures' held its ground for a full generation, no other volume of this series ever having had so extensive a circulation or passed through so many editions during the first quarter of the present century. At a later time additional information caused a reaction in the minds of the better educated of the English clergy, who began to see that the First Book of Edward was in the main much more catholic in tone than the Second. It thus came to be a received opinion amongst a very large section of them that all things were going right as long as the English divines had everything their own way, and that it was not till the interference of Bucer, Martyr, and other foreign reformers was allowed to influence proceedings that sundry further alterations were made in a protestant direction. Yet still the defence of the existing Prayer Book of the church of England was made to rest on the supposed catholic tone of the book of 1552 rather than on the slight changes made in the Elizabethan Prayer Book or the more important additions which were inaugurated at the Hampton Court conference and after the failure of the Savoy conference in 1661.

This view prevails extensively even in the present day, though it has been entirely annihilated by recent discoveries which have been made by a collation of the state papers and scarce printed books of the reign. It can no longer be denied that the changes were brought about by the protector Somerset, himself a rank Calvinist, and that the intention was from the very first to carry things in the protestant direction beyond the point which was reached by the Prayer Book and articles of 1552. The evidence of all this, as well as some account of the deterioration of morals all through the reign, may be seen in various publications which have appeared during the last thirty years. A general view of the nature of the change in religion appeared in this Review in the year 1886, in an article entitled 'The Restoration Settlement.' A more particular account both of the gradual development of Zwinglianism and its change into Calvinism was given in two articles printed in the *Church Quarterly Review* in October 1892 and 1893, where copious extracts from the scarce publications of the period were quoted in evidence of the view advocated.

The general state of morals during the reign was scarcely touched upon in these articles, and in directing our readers'

attention to this subject, as well as to the gradual nature of the proceedings in the changes of doctrine, we shall avoid any allusion to the publications there referred to. There was, however, in the first of these articles, on the 'Preparation for the First Prayer-Book,' an omission of any notice of a very remarkable though very scarce little volume entitled 'The V abominable Blasphemies conteined in the Masse,' published in London by H. Powell, 1548, 16mo. It is evidently one of a series of works of a similar kind which the council secretly encouraged, but were obliged to appear to the outside world to discountenance, as going much too fast for their present purpose. The only copy of this book which I have seen is in the archbishop's library at Lambeth, and is calendared as xxxi. 9, 3 (14). It has no title, but it can easily be identified, as the second leaf, with the signature A_{ii}, is headed with the words 'conteined in the masse.' The importance of this work must plead my excuse for making considerable extracts from it, but its tone and tendency may easily be judged of by its first sentence, which shall be quoted at length.

Here I was minded (good Christian readers) to have made an end of writing against that cursed and abominable sacrifice of the Mass, but being compelled by the obstinate blasphemy of certain papists which everywhere do depredicate and say that we run before the King and his Council (for, good Christian readers, this is their only refuge that they flee to, not having one syllable in the Scriptures to confirm their purpose) I am fain to meddle further in this matter and to shew how they go about in so saying to make the King and his Council partakers of their ungodly blasphemy against God and his Scriptures, which may be proved after this manner. . . .

Afterwards the writer continues—

Now mark ye this argument, mark ye, I say, what followeth of your sayings, if the King and his honourable Council have not yet (as ye most craftily persuade unto the simple and ignorant people, which, if it were not for you, would gladly and joyfully receive the Gospel of the Son of God) disannulled and put down the Mass, that is to say the most abominable and damnable idol that ever Satan with all his craft could invent, then are they by your own confession all ungodly and also partakers of your idolatrous blasphemy, which thing ye shall never be able to avoid. . . . Ye attach yourselves of plain and deadly treason against the King and his honourable Council, which all (thanks be unto the lord, that hath the hearts of all rulers in his hand) be as far in this point from all ungodliness and blasphemy as ye are now from all truth and verity that so stiffly keep up the banner and standard of your master Satan. This, I say, is the very banner and standard of Satan, the devil, which he hath set up to obscure, pervert and utterly banish from the memory and remembrance of all men the death of our Saviour Jesus Christ, blinding all the world with most pestilent error, that is to say with full persuasion that the Mass was a sacrifice and oblation to obtain

remission of sins or a work whereby the priest that offereth Christ and they that are participant of the same do deserve *ex opere operato*, that is to say of the work that is wrought, forgiveness of their sins and heavenly joy not only for them that be in purgatory but also for them that be in hell, briefly for all them that are alive and dead though it be a thousand years ago. Is not this to blaspheme and dishonour Christ, to burn and oppress his cross, to bring his death to perpetual oblivion and forgetfulness, to take away the fruits of his passion, and to enervate and abolish the sacrament of his death? These five abominable blasphemies I will here, with the leave of God, so lively depict and set before the eyes of all Christian readers that the very infants and babes shall clearly see that they which so lewdly affirm that we so run afore the King and his Council intend nothing else but to defame their prince and all them that be about him with papistical heresy, therewith seeking to keep the true subjects of this illustrious realm in perpetual blindness and ignorance.

The rest of the volume from signature A_5 to B_7 is occupied with the five blasphemies, which are as follows:—

1. The Interference with the everlasting priesthood of Christ, the massing priests being substituted in the room of Christ, that is still withholden with death, as suffragans of his everlasting priesthood, which for all them remaineth without end; whereas, according to S. Paul, 'since Christ cannot be letted by death he is that one only priest and hath no need either of suffragans or successors.'
2. It obscures the passion of Christ, who bids us eat and drink, and this is the way to apply the sacrifice of the cross unto us, when we feed upon the body and blood of Christ spiritually either in the holy mysteries or in the hearing and receiving of his word faithfully.
3. It drives away from memory the death of Christ, for what is the Mass but a new and clean contrary Testament?
4. It takes away the fruits of the death of Christ, for who will trust that his sins are forgiven when he seeth every day a new sacrifice afore his eyes? It is to say we are therefore bought and redeemed of Christ because that we should redeem ourselves.
5. The supper of the lord is cancelled.

Look what difference between giving and receiving that the same is betwixt this word sacrament and this word sacrifice. This communion the sacrifice of the Mass hath clean banished away from the congregation, and hath brought in instead thereof a very excommunication. . . . This, I say, is the adulterous Helen with whom all the Papists throughout all the world do commit deadly fornication and adultery. But blessed be that puissant lord of hosts which of his tender love and mercy hath preserved our most sovereign lord and prince Edward the Sixth from the flattering lips of this adulterous harlot, which hath so by the space of these five hundred years and more deceived all nations, alluring them from their true spouse and husband Jesus Christ to all kinds of abomination and filthiness. Oh, how much bound are we all which have any zeal to the gospel of Christ to laud and praise that Almighty and merciful father which hath provided such a noble protector and defender not only of all the king's dominions and realms, but also of all truth and verity, which

at this present time Satan doth not cease with his ministers to expugn and assail on every side, calumniating the true preachers thereof, as though in this matter they should run before the king and his honourable council, surely is nothing else but which to accuse their prince and governor with all his honourable Councillors of plain blasphemy against God and his word, which to do is no less than deadly treason, as I have said before. Beware therefore and cease to bear yourselves in this your abomination by your prince or any of his honorable Council, which all do detest, abhor, and hate all such idolatrous blasphemy, being always ready with all their might and endeavour to seek, set forth and promote the glory of Almighty God, to whom with the son and the holy ghost be praise, glory and honor for ever. So be it.

Finis.

There is no evidence to show who was the author of this little work. We need hardly inform our readers that it was not published *cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum.* But, on the other hand, neither is there any evidence that the council made a scape-goat of the writer or publisher.

We proceed now to give some further evidence of both the points we have undertaken to illustrate, by quotations from some printed volumes of the succeeding reign, which are almost as inaccessible to general readers as that from which we have made so many extracts. And first as regards the general deterioration of morality. It is curious to observe how early this laxity of morals began to set in. Perhaps one of the earliest evidences of it may be seen in the proclamation of 24 April 1548 against such as putting away one wife, married another, or who kept two wives at once. Some taught that this was lawful for the husband, and some went the length of advocating the same licence for the wife, arguing that the prohibition was not of God's law, but only by command of the bishop of Rome. And so the king straitly charged bishops to proceed against all such as should have offended, or should hereafter offend, in this way. All such offenders are to be delated to the archbishops and bishops, and if they should be negligent in enforcing the law and in punishing such evildoers,

then the Justices of peace in every shire shall declare such offenders to the King's highness Council by their letters, that his highness by the advice aforesaid might see a convenient redress made of such misorders and look more straightly upon the Archbishops and Bishops which doth not execute their duties in this behalf according to the trust committed unto them.

The evidence of opponents of protestantism in Mary's reign will not be thought of so much value as many of the numerous testimonies to the same effect which are borne by protestant writers of the period; but it may be taken for what it is worth after making such deductions as the reader may think reasonable on the score

of probable exaggeration or prejudice in writers who are describing the effects of a system to which they were opposed.

This remark applies especially to the first and earliest of the printed volumes we are going to refer to. It is entitled 'The displaying of the Protestantes, and sondry their practises, with a discription of divers their abuses of late frequented. Newly imprinted agayne, and augmented, with a table in the ende of all suche matter as is specially contained within this volume. Made by Myles Huggarde, servant to the Quene's maiestie. Anno 1556. *Cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum.*'[1] We cannot find any evidence of an earlier edition except the statement made by the writer in the dedication that it had been

> before this time imprinted, although not in such perfection as the same is at this present, having called, since the first edition, the aid of my friend, and therefore thought it more mete the dedication unto your majesty.

The date at the end of the prologue to the reader is June 1556, and the only allusion to time in the course of the work is that of the burning of the four Sussex men at Canterbury, which he speaks of as being 'about twelve months past,' which was 12 July 1555. He speaks of one being a Dutchman of Lewes; and it is remarkable that he supplies what Foxe has taken no notice of in his account of Sheterden's examination and martyrdom—how, when he was examined on baptism, he replied that

> it is but an extern sign, and worketh little grace. For, saith he, like as a man doth wash his hands in a basin of water, signifying that the hands are clean, so the child is washed at baptism to accomplish the exterior figure. Then was objected unto him the saying of christ unless a man be borne again with water and the holy ghost he could not be saved. 'Tush,' said he, 'the water profiteth nothing, it is the holy ghost that worketh' (fol. 20).

The chief purpose of the volume is to display the fact that, as the author expresses it in the prologue, 'our late elders and ministers (for so they termed themselves) neither established an uniform religion nor yet persuaded correction of life.' We are not here concerned with the variations of protestants abroad—of which he specifies Lutherans, Zwinglians, anabaptists, Jews, and papists, whose chief captains are Calvin, Peter Martyr, Bullinger, Musculus, and such like—but he notices that Hooper and Cranmer had admitted they had erred greatly in taking Luther's part. And he mentions the fact that about twenty years before a priest had consecrated with ale instead of wine, and, having repented, bore a fagot at St. Paul's Cross; and that a tyler had done penance in the same way for maintaining the opinion that Christ's death only was of benefit to those who died before his incarnation. We do

[1] Brit. Mus. C. 37. b. 45.

not profess to give a complete analysis of the book, but only make such extracts as throw light upon the teaching and morals of the time of Edward VI. Thus, speaking of the marriages of priests, he says (fol. 74)—

The women of these married priests were such, for the most part, that either they were kept of other before, or else as common as the castway; and so bound them to incestuous lechery, which women are led with divers lusts, ever learning and never able to attain unto the truth. Were not the said women ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth, being led with divers lusts, using their bodies with other men as well as with their supposed husbands: yea, and one of them with another's woman, taking it (as it is thought) for a brotherly love, one to help another, after the doctrine of Friar Luther, the first author of their marriage; (*In libro de captivitate Babylonica.*) Is it not seen now by experience that some of their women being divorced, are married again to ruffians, and such other gallants, following the opinion of Sir Jhon Hoper in his book of the 'Ten Commandments'?

As to the mode of celebration of the holy communion in Edward's time (fol. 80), he says that they were constantly changing the position of their table; some turning their faces towards the north, south, or west; some using leavened, some unleavened bread; the changes adopted in the first office for communion and that of the First Prayer Book being compared to the work of a mason first rough-hewing the stones, then polishing them, the authors of the two offices admitting that they were but rough-hewn, 'wherein they said truth, for God knoweth they were but homely stuff. But this book,' meaning their last book of communion (which was the worst of all), 'is wrought to the perfection.' As to the mode of receiving, he says—

Some of the communicants stand, some sit, some kneel, some would hold the cup himself, some would receive it at the minister's hand, some of his next fellow, some would have a short piece of bread, some a thin, some a thick and thin. Some would use the ministration themselves, some were contented to take it in the church, some at their own tables, and after supper, according to the institution. Some would have the wine to be drunk in pewter, some in silver, some in a glass or treue dish. Some would have a table cloth to cover the board, some a towel, and some neither of them both. Thus in sum they used the matter in such sundry forms, that the Total was nought.

Probably there is not elsewhere to be found any so detailed an account of the practice of the time. At fol. 94 the writer says—

Nothing is less used than morning and evening prayer, never was more irreverence in the church, never such disobedience to magistrates, and as for repairing to the church, it is counted a thing of no importance.

With regard to the denial of sacramental grace, his account (fol. 112) is as follows:—

Have they not denied the power of God's word, to work anything to the justifying of man, by the water of baptism? Have they not also denied the most manifest words of God spoken, touching the consecration of his real body in the sacrament of the altar, and say that those words be spoken tropically and figuratively, and that they can work no such effect, as bread to be transubstantiated into his body, although Christ by his Evangelists, Apostles, Prophets, Doctors, Martyrs doth most plainly affirm the same? Have they not also denied the power of God, in the words spoken by the priest at the time of confession, being so plainly commanded by Christ saying, Whose sins you forgive, the same shall be forgiven? Have they not also denied the power of God's word in the rest of the seven sacraments, abolishing five quite out of their company as unworthy thereof, and the other twain remaining as they handled them, scarce worthy the name of a sacrament? And as they have denied the power of godliness in these sacraments: so have they also denied the same in the works of God wrought by his grace in all godly men, to be any means to attain to justification, contrary to the words of S. John. . . .

Here follows an argument against justification by faith alone, quite implying that antinomianism was rampant in England amongst the protestants.

The same view of the great varieties of belief and practice which existed in the preceding reign appears in the work of Bishop Christopherson on 'Rebellion,' published by Cawood, London, 1554. The bishop speaks of Friday being turned into a feast day, and persons invited in order to allure them to heresy, of the carnal liberty which procured divorces and remarriage. He alludes to the destruction of images, the digging up of crosses, the blessed sacrament being trodden under foot and the last communion book teaching that it was only common bread. As to varieties of opinion, some held all things common, some thought all things fatal and that there was no free-will. Some believed God to be the author of sin. Some believed no resurrection, and some that all should be saved; some that Christ took no flesh of the Virgin Mary and was less than the Father, and that there was neither heaven nor hell, that the inward man did not sin, but that a man having the Spirit might lie with another's wife. In fine, there was no heresy that ever was which had not shown its face in England. The colophon bears date 24 July 1554. A copy is in the British Museum, 697. a. 17. All this is attributed to Lutherans, or rather Zwinglians.

Such is the account of an enemy. On the other hand the following extracts from a work published in the first year of the reign tell us what one of their own number thought of his fellows. The copy we take them from is in the Grenville library, 5921. It is entitled 'A faythful admonycion of a certen trewe pastor and prophete, sent unto the germanes at such tyme as certen great princes went about to bring in alienes into germany, and to restore

the papacy, the Kingdom of Antychrist etc. Now translated into Inglyssh for a lyke admonycyon unto all trewe Inglyssh hartes, whereby thei may lerne and knowe how to consyder and receive the procedings of the Inglyssh magistrates and Bisshops, with a preface of M. Philip Melancthon.' As this is a translation from a German book adapted to English circumstances, we are only concerned here with the preface of the translator, who styles himself Eusebius Pamphilus. Who he was we are unable to say.

This preface is to the general effect that God had permitted the death of 'our late Josias, noble King Edward' as a punishment for the sins of the nobles and people who had embraced the Gospel. The editor says—

O Ingland Ingland thy nobles were preached unto and told plainly enough by Gods prophets, that Gods wrath was at hand if they would not redress their enormities, but they could not be heard, yea those to whom they preached made a mock and a Jest at their earnest crying and calling upon them, asking them who made them so mock of Gods counsel. It would never sink into their heads that God would so deal with them as the preachers out of the spirit of God threatened them. They thought peradventure that it was enough for them to pretend Gods true religion how little soever they framed their lives thereafter. (Signat. A_{iii}.)

After continuing his invective for some time he adds—

Thus much be spoken to the nobles for their advertisement, whose insolency and supine dissoluteness without doubt hath been a great cause of this plague that is now come upon us. Notwithstanding I mean not thereby to clear and excuse the inferior and mean sort, as though their part were not therein also. How unthankful have they been also in receiving and how slack in following the earnest advertisements that were daily given them . . . . Let us all, therefore, repent our former negligence. Let us all amend our former faults. And also let us all be true followers of the gospel indeed as we have long been professors thereof in word. And then doubtless God shall cease and withdraw his plague wherewith he had minded to scourge us, he shall drive the papists and the aliens (which they go about to bring in to maintain their kingdom and to make themselves strong against God) out of our country. (Signat. A_{v}.)

After this follows the preface by Melanchthon, but the expressions used are so unlike his writing and so immediately applicable to English affairs of the day that we are half inclined to think that either it was composed by the editor himself or else materially altered to accommodate it to existing circumstances, such as the approaching arrival of Philip of Spain to marry the queen. The following passage is in point:—

First, people are to abstain from intercourse with idolatrous unbelievers, and then to make known their faith to others; for there are many

who pretend to dislike the supremacy of AntiChrist, the bishop of Rome, and yet act in religion as if they had got all from Rome, not caring what villany is practised (as the Spaniards are most vile and beastly people, given to vice and brutishness), and if they should once be suffered to enter they will creep into all the high places and will establish the idol of Rome and the whole cursed papacy again. Already those who have preached true doctrine are imprisoned and deprived. There is no reason because of the sins of professors of the true religion to run to idolatry. These idolaters find fault with our sins, which are incomparably less than the idolatry of the Mass of the Latin service, of the invocation of saints, of the filthy and abominable pretended chastity, that is of the Sodomitical single life of priests, and of such other hypocrisy and superstition as our adversaries go about with fire and fagot, with tooth and nail to maintain and set up for the service of God. For whatever vices rule among the professors of the true religion yet they have not among them murder and blasphemy and idolatry. All other sins may be forgiven, but a fautor of such murderers shall never be forgiven. It is right to resist tyrants who set up idolatry, separate godly men from their lawful wives and bring in strangers to subvert the state of the commonwealth, and such like, for it is easy to see that the Spaniards will subvert all rule, if they are once allowed to enter.

It is needless to say that the colophon, 'Imprinted at Grenewych by Conrade Freeman in the month of May 1554,' is a fiction, the tract being plainly in Zürich type. Melanchthon can hardly have written this preface, which appears to have been penned just before the coming of Philip to England in July 1554. Indeed, it seems to us scarcely probable that there was anybody at that time living who could have used such filthy language except Bale, afterwards bishop of Ossory, who has earned the well-deserved reputation of being the most foul-mouthed of all the protestant reformers.

There is one other publication of the year 1554, which we believe has escaped the notice of all historians. We know no more of its history than what the colophon informs us of, where it is dated thus: 'From Wittonburge by Nicholas Dorcastor An. M. D. L. iiii. the xiiii of May.' Who the refugees were, and how many, and under what circumstances they were tolerated in such a hotbed of Lutheranism as Wittenberg, we do not know. But this little volume, a copy of which exists in the Bodleian Library (Tanner, 76), gives us a very curious and most instructive confession of their faith, addressed to their brethren in England, which represents the matured opinions of the reformed party at this time, very much in the same style as most of the publications of the preceding reign. It is entitled 'The humble and unfained confession of the belefe of certain poor banished men, grounded upon the holy Scriptures of God and upon the Articles of that undefiled and only undoubted true Christian faith which [the

ho]ly Catholic, that is to say universal Church of Christ professeth. ❡ Specially concerning not only the word of God and the ministry of the same, but also the Church and sacraments thereof, which we send most humbly unto the lords of England and all the commons of the same. ❡ To believe with the heart justifieth and to confess with the mouth saveth. Lord, increase our faith.'

The first six leaves of this curious little work are taken up by a prefatory epistle addressed in the singular number by a curate to his late flock, lamenting the passing away of King Edward's days and the present punishment under which the nation is suffering, of which the writer says—

> I certainly believe that our too much slothfulness in prayer and our slothful and seldom coming to the holy supper of the Lord are two of the great causes why the Lord hath thus plagued us.

Nevertheless, he says, he has 'set forth this following confession,' which he doubts not those who read will see

> that all their struggling is to bring thee to their stinking Romish puddles again. Be not abashed therefore with names, titles, dignities, as lord, duke, &c., or bishop, doctor, &c., for except he bring the word of God and Christ's communion, with the maintenance of it, doubt not; by the fruits know him, and give him his name that the Lord giveth him, a blasphemer of the synagogue of Sathanas.

The work itself, commencing with a salutation addressed to their brethren in England, states their confession, which includes Scripture and the three creeds, discarding all traditions. Their definition of the church affirms that, though there are various significations in which the word 'church' is used, yet what they mean is one only apostolic and holy catholic church, which is sanctified, and which exhibits holiness of life, and to this church belong all those who are citizens with the saints, God's elect and chosen, who are the salt of the earth, the light of the world, who do all good works, to whom it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God, whose unrighteousness is forgiven, and whose sins are covered and not imputed to them. This church has the keys, and in this church of the elect the pure word of God is preached, the sacraments administered, and discipline is applied. In it, though some may err, none shall perish. It is invisible, though it may be known by its fruit.

The next part in the 'Confession' refers to the ministry of the word of God. This part is briefly treated, few points being alluded to except that divers ministers are appointed for the purpose of edifying, and that these must preach the atonement and have faithful wives. The next subject which concerns the sacraments is dealt with at greater length. It is opened by a description of the sacraments of the old law, circumcision being spoken of as not

being only a mere sign, but 'a very seal in which the holy Ghost certified their consciences of their portion in the said everlasting life.' In the passover, the other sacrament of the old law,

they, giving faith and credit to the said promise made in the blessed seed, saw the worthiness and merits of Christ's blood, by the comfortable sweetness whereof in the operation of the holy Ghost they were assured of the said life everlasting.

After a few words about the manna in the wilderness, which served the same purpose of certifying, it proceeds to the sacraments of the new law, of which they say—

Moreover the sacraments that are of the Lord's holy institution we do reverently esteem to be no vain or bare signs, neither only evidences of the profession of Christian men, but also certain assured and effectuous testimonies (or rather seals) of the righteous grace and goodwill of God towards us, whereby he, working in us supernaturally and after an invisible manner, doth not only stir up our faith towards him but also establisheth and confirmeth it the more in the assurance of everlasting life. Wherefore like as stedfast faith in the operation of the holy Ghost, doth certify us, even so the Sacraments by proper similitudes being used according to the Lord's institution testify the same. For the holy Ghost, who glorifieth his own ordinances with his blessed presence, and also the word itself, assureth us that nothing, though it be outward and external (appointed and appertaining to the right, whole, and perfect use of God's holy sacraments), is in vain or but a bare sign, forasmuch as when the minister doth execute the Lord's will according to his holy ordinance in the ministration of the visible sacrament by an outward action, the holy Ghost not only certifieth the faithful sicacciners (*sic*) that they are partakers of the things promised, that is to say everlasting life (which life everlasting is even God the Son, whose divine nature is joined with the humanity now sitting in glory), not only, we say, certifieth but also invisibly worketh in them those virtues whereby they be undoubtedly joined unto Christ and one towards another, his mystical members and partakers of eternal life. So that to be partakers of that everlasting life is to be as verily joined unto him and to be a member of his glorious body of his flesh and of his bones as his own divine nature is joined unto his humanity.

The writer goes on to say that as there was a prescribed form under the old law for circumcision and the passover, so under the new there is also for baptism and the supper of the Lord. As regards the latter, the following is a significant commentary upon the alteration of the words used in the First Prayer Book into those of the Second Book. The form of administration is described as being that

where first the minister, taking the bread, giving thanks, and breaking it, ought by the Lord's ensample to deliver it unto other, willing them also to take and eat it in remembrance of the Lord, whose words also he ought to repeat accordingly. And likewise taking the cup to give thanks and to deliver to the communicants, willing them all to drink thereof in remembrance of the Lord.

After this follows a protest against the ceremonies of the mass with this intimation : 'Ye shall see shortly a book when every part of the Mass began.' A special exception is then taken to the use of wafer bread and the denial of the cup to the laity, and the protest ends with the writer's opinion that nothing has caused God's anger so much as 'the most filthy and abominable idolatry and superstition of their mass.' The peroration states that the brethren in exile hold the sacrament in such honour as being

a singular jewel left to the congregation, designed as a special renewing of his covenant and seal of mercy, and should be a provocation to good works to those who duly examine themselves and approach it reverently, and who worthily receiving such notable increase of heavenly comfort and spiritual repast in our consciences are armed afresh for the conflict against the world, the flesh and the devil.

II.

There are three principal sources of information subsequent to the death of Edward VI which throw a little further light upon the belief and practice of the period of his reign. The first is the account given by the persons imprisoned for false doctrine at the commencement of Mary's reign. This exists in a manuscript in the Bodleian Library. Archbishop Laurence printed from this as much as suited his purpose, which seems to have been to show that Calvinism scarcely existed at all in Edward's reign ; but he omitted the greater part of the manuscript, which contains an elaborate argument written by Augustin Bernher, a Swiss attendant upon Hugh Latimer, by which he attempts to prove against the advocates of free will the Calvinistic doctrines of election and reprobation. The second is the account given by Utenhoven, which was published in 1560, of the reception the Dutch and English members of the foreigners' church in London met with at all the Lutheran towns in Norway, Denmark, &c., where they touched. The third is the 'Troubles of Frankfort,' published by one of their own body, William Whittingham, afterwards dean of Durham. We propose to give some account of these sources in as few words as possible.

1. As regards the first, Archbishop Laurence asserts that there is no evidence contained in the volume to show that Cranmer and Ridley were specially addicted to Calvinism. His argument is entirely superfluous, for no one ever accused them of Calvinism ; but the whole of the tract plainly proves that the majority of the prisoners were of this way of thinking, and that those whom they styled free-willers and Pelagians were quite an insignificant number. Also whereas the archbishop of Cashel hazards the assertion that there were few Calvinists, and they of the sublapsarian school, if he had read Bernher's tract, which it did

not suit him to publish, he might have seen that this writer at least stands committed to the supralapsarian view; for he professes to give an answer to the four very pertinent questions put to him by Henry Hart, whom he speaks of as a Pelagian and a free-willer.

The questions are the following:—

1. Whether God would have all men to keep his law or no?

2. The man which gave the talent to his three servants, the one servant hiding his talent in the ground, whether it was his master's will and ordinance that he should hide it; yea or nay?

3. The certain man that had the fig tree, and came three years, one after another, and sought fruit and found none, and yet let it stand one year more to see whether it would bring forth fruit or no, whether that man had ordained that tree to that end that it should bear fruit or no?

4. What is the root of the olive tree of the which the branches were broken off, and what were the branches that for unbelief were broken off, and what were the branches that, contrary to nature, were grafted in? The answer is that

> God of his infinite mercy was determined and purposed before the foundation of the world was laid to take some out of the lost seed of Adam and to regenerate them and make them heirs of his kingdom and vessels of his glory, to set forth in them his profound mercy and goodness, and also that he hath prepared the rest to be vessels of his wrath, in whom he is determined to shew and set forth his righteous judgments and justice, rewarding them according to their deeds with everlasting punishments, whereby he bringeth to pass that the wicked may feel his hatred against sin, and also the godly may the more see the exceeding goodness of their heavenly father towards them.[2]

In the course of his argument Bernher will not allow that it was in the power and liberty of the man who had the one talent not to hide it, but to use it profitably, for fear he should grant free-will to man, as his adversary does, and he asserts that

> it sufficeth the children of God to be assured in their heart by the operation of the holy Ghost that they themselves be chosen to eternal life before the world was made, and in that God doth give them faith and true repentance and all manner of spiritual gifts they praise him for it and confirm their election by it. That is to say, they learn to know and by the operation of the holy Ghost they are assured that by the immutable counsel of God they are chosen to eternal life; as for the reprobate, they will not dispute with God why he did not ordain them also to life, but rather do worship and reverence his divine Majesty and unspeakable power and wisdom, by the which he is able to set forth his own glory and renown even in the very reprobate, which shall be damned for evermore because of their own wickedness, God himself being just and holy in all his works, and not the author or cause of any evil.[3]

[2] Bodleian MS. 1972, fol. 109. [3] *Ibid.* fol. 110.

Afterwards (at fol. 144) Bernher says—

> God would have Adam to fall because he thought it so good. Why he thought it so good is unknown to us. Adam did fall, the providence of God so appointing the same;

and again afterwards (*ibid.*)—

> If you grant an election before the beginning of the world you must needs grant likewise a reprobation, for they be correlatives, so that there could be no election except there be also reprobation.

The prisoners who adopted the Calvinist creed seem to have been much the most numerous; the others, being twelve or fourteen in number, protest against them for their opinions, as well as for their practice of gambling and other amusements, which were thought unlawful, their indulgence in which they considered the result of their doctrine of assurance, which caused 'many to live at free chance careless,' and to neglect prayer except for corporal necessities. The dispute ran so high that after much altercation they refused to communicate with each other at Christmas 1554.

What is most remarkable is that this supralapsarian Calvinist should claim as being on his side 'my dear master Latimer, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Mr. Ridley and Mr. Bradford, Philpott, Careless, and the rest of the saints of God.'

The penultimate document is in favour of the Calvinistic doctrine, addressed from the ministers, seniors, and deacons, evidently a much larger body than the free-willers, to whom it is addressed, and the last is from C. P. to the ministers, thanking them for their letter and book which had been sent him on the subject of predestination. Whether this was Bradford's or Bernher's does not appear. The minority may be best described as Zwinglians, the majority as Calvinists. The free-willers, as they are called, make their appeal to the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI, and the Calvinistic opinions avouched by their opponents certainly go beyond anything that either the Prayer Book or the forty-two articles countenance. But though few at that time would have expressed their faith in the language used by Augustin Bernher, the distinction between the sublapsarian and the supralapsarian view being yet scarcely pronounced, yet the former tenet seems to have been that which was adopted by the greater number of protestants of the time. The controversy between the two parties, who seem by common consent to rest all their arguments on separate texts of Scripture, is extremely instructive as to the uselessness of reference to isolated passages of Holy Scripture with no other clue to their interpretation than the reader's fancy. The texts adduced by either party, or taken by themselves, must have seemed entirely conclusive on the one side for absolute decrees of election and reprobation, and on the other for the existence of free-will, which, it must be admitted,

they did not press unduly, or interpret, as their adversaries imagined, in any Pelagian sense, but only as the foundation of moral responsibility.

Probably the confession of faith made by John Clement, a wheelwright who was in the King's Bench prison, and who, in protest against the various sects of protestants which had sprung up, drew up for himself his confession of faith, indicates the popular form of belief. It seems from Strype's account that 'there were now abundance of sects and dangerous doctrines. Some denied the Godhead of Christ, some his manhood; others denied the doctrine of predestination and free election, the baptism of infants.' Accordingly Clement says, as against those who deny 'the doctrine of God's firm predestination and free election in Jesus Christ, which is the very certainty of our election,' that he firmly believes that he is 'a true, lively member of this blessed church of Christ, which can never wholly err in any necessary point of salvation.' He affirms that good works ought to be done to 'shew obedience to God and the fruits of faith unto the world.' He accepts the last book given to the church by the authority of King Edward VI and the godly articles agreed upon in the convocation house in the last year of his most gracious reign. He further professes that the two sacraments are certain and sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace and God's goodwill towards us, which sacraments have a wholesome effect and operation in such only as do worthily receive the same; that 'Baptism is a sign and seal of our new Birth, whereby the promises of God and our adoption are visibly signed and sealed to us; yea, faith is confirmed and grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God.' Of the supper of the Lord he says that it is a sure seal and a firm testimony of our eternal redemption by Christ's death and blood-shedding, 'insomuch as to such as with true faith and feeling of the mercy of God do rightly and worthily receive the same they do spiritually receive Christ.' And in confirmation of all this he claims the sanction of the names of Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper, Rogers, Saunders, Bradford, and divers other godly preachers. Against the Pelagian sect, which, he says, swarms everywhere, he professes that

> the will and imaginations of man's heart is only to evil and altogether subject to sin and misery, and bond and captive to all manner of wickedness, so that it cannot once think a good thought, much less then do any good deed as of his own work, until such time as the same be regenerate and prevented by the grace of God.

In conclusion he recurs to the subject of predestination and free election, which is the sure certainty of our salvation in Jesus Christ, asserting that of the number of those appointed to be saved 'my firm faith and belief is that I, although unworthy, am one,' so

that 'neither I nor any of these his chosen children shall finally perish or be damned,' and that this is a wholesome and comfortable doctrine, to be received of all Christian men. In support of this theory he refers to Ochino's sermons. The writer follows closely on the lines of the so-called Calvinistic articles, and especially resembles the seventeenth article in his avoiding all notice of reprobation, which he absolutely declines to enter upon, herein differing entirely from the treatises on the subject written by Bradford and Bernher. As being a mere illiterate mechanic, he was quite incapable of inventing these views for himself. He simply reflects the general tone of opinion of the protestants of his time.

2. The second source we have alluded to is the description of the sufferings of the Marian exiles, chiefly Dutch, with some French, English, and Scotch men. This congregation had been formed in July 1550, when Edward VI granted them a patent to assemble under their superintendents, John Alasco and Peter Deloenus, apparently intending this church to be a model on which the church of England was to be reformed. Alasco, with about 175 others, set sail from Gravesend, 17 Sept. 1553, in two vessels. In the larger was Alasco himself, with Micronius and Utenhoven, who wrote the account which we now abridge. They were driven by stress of weather to the coast of Norway, from whence they managed to get, partly overland, partly by boat, to Elsinore. But the king of Denmark, who was a bigoted Lutheran, refused to allow them shelter in his dominions, alleging that they were of the sect of sacramentarians, whom Luther abhorred, though the exiles persisted that after all there was no great difference between their opinions and those of the Lutheran party, and they were willing to discuss the differences according to Scripture. They, however, put out a form of faith which materially differed from that of the Augsburg confession. In vain did they plead that they had themselves been tolerant of Lutherans, as even their friends at Zürich had admitted to communion the Swedish ministers who had quitted their country because of the *Interim*. The plea urged against them was their contemptuous mode of administering the Lord's supper and the many divisions that existed among them. Wherever they went they met with the same treatment, the Lutheran authorities urging that they were only following out Luther's views, the chief pastor at Bremen, Jacob Probst, quoting Luther's own words—*Beatus vir qui non abiit in Concilio Sacramentariorum et in via Zuinglianorum non stetit et in cathedra Tigurinorum non sedit.* After many refusals of settlement the whole party of the larger ship arrived at Emden, Lübeck, and Wismar. Those in the smaller vessel reached Copenhagen on 3 Nov., where they were evidently taken for anabap-

tists, but where they remained unmolested till the magistrates had orders from the king to get rid of them unless they would subscribe to the king's confession of faith. This they refused to do, and departed for Rostock. Here David Whitehead, who was afterwards pastor at Frankfort, and had the first offer of the archbishopric of Canterbury from Elizabeth, was their spokesman; but he failed to satisfy the Lutherans, and so in January 1554 they were obliged to depart and make their way to Wismar. Here Micronius was their spokesman; but he too failed to convince the authorities that they were not dangerous sacramentarians, who would pay no heed to magistrates; and on 22 Feb. they were forced to migrate to Lübeck. The fear was that some of them were perhaps anabaptists, and therefore Micronius gave a written confession of their faith, which is as follows:—

Baptism is a seal of divine grace towards all those who, according to the testimony of the gospel, have communion with God the Father and the Son and the holy Spirit. The ministration of baptism ought to be done in the church, without any of those superstitions of the Papists which obscure its mystery. We therefore condemn all those things in its administration which have been invented by men and obscure its dignity. We allow that the baptism of children has place in the church of Christ. For since Infants, according to the testimony of the Gospel, have communion with God the Son and the holy Ghost, and are already members of the church which Christ cleanses with the washing of water by the word, it is impossible to deny them the right of baptism, unless at the same time it is denied that they are members of the church and have a saving communion with God. Meanwhile we strongly repudiate that preposterous reliance on infant baptism which is the faith of so many at the present time.

This confession, the petitioner says, 'shews how far we are from the opinions of the anabaptists.' There can, therefore, be no doubt that Micronius and his party expressed the highest view of baptism that they could; and we ask any candid reader whether more can be made of it than this, that it sets a visible seal to a grace which has been conferred independently of and antecedent to the sacrament. The same separation of grace from the administration of the other sacrament is expressed in exactly similar language, the only difference being that, whereas baptism is styled *signaculum*, the Lord's supper is designated as *obsignaculum*. The latter is not a classical word, and we know not how to render it, unless we adopt the expression for the two respective words of seal and counter-seal, though it is difficult to perceive any distinction of meaning in the present case.

Upon their arrival at Lübeck they found several of their companions, who, after being driven away from Copenhagen, had arrived at Lübeck, 19 Dec. 1553. Here they had been allowed to remain till 3 Jan. 1554, when a complaint was lodged against them

that they had spoken disparagingly of the sacrament. But upon their further remonstrance, and chiefly on account of the severity of the weather, they were still permitted to stay till the end of February. On the 26th of this month Micronius, who was at the head of the newly arrived party, held a controversy with certain Lutheran pastors. But all endeavours were in vain. They were driven from Lübeck and had to take refuge at Hamburg, where several others of the Dutch congregation had collected in the preceding October. Here, on 3 March, he disputed with the celebrated Lutheran Westphal, who seems to have implied that no departure from the Augsburg confession could be allowed, and represented that the Zwinglian views had been entirely disposed of at the Marburg conference in 1529. Micronius, however, on the contrary, was of opinion that the Zwinglians had the advantage in that controversy, the truth being that both parties had shaken hands and agreed to differ as to the matter of the real presence. On the following day, 4 March, when the colloquy was renewed, Westphal turned to a Scotchman named Simpson and asked him what he thought about the sacraments, to which he replied that he was of the same opinion as Micronius, and that theirs was the same doctrine that was established in the reign of Edward VI in England.

On the next day they were summoned before the magistrates, who accused them of being anabaptists and of belonging to the Münster sect. They, however, presented their petition with their confession of faith, but all to no purpose. They were driven away from Hamburg, and they at last settled at Emden. Alasco remained there a year, and thence migrated to Frankfort, and Micronius superintended a congregation at Norda. In 1556 Alasco returned to Poland. The whole history shows that these exiles believed themselves to be in conformity with the Zwinglian doctrine as preached at Zürich, as well as the well-understood meaning of the Second Book of Edward VI, and as such were rejected at every place where they requested shelter in which the Lutheran doctrine was established. They were treated everywhere by the Lutherans as what the Marian sufferers were almost always designated by them, as the devil's martyrs. They were not condemned for any pronounced Calvinism, but for the special denial of the Lutheran doctrine of the real presence in concomitance with the bread and the wine in the sacrament of the Lord's supper.

The opinions of these exiles would, of course, be of little importance if it were not that they so materially contributed towards the formation of the religious views of the protestant portion of the nation during the reign of Edward VI. Alasco had been converted probably by Zwingli himself at Zürich about the year 1530, though for many years afterwards he retained his

benefices in the Roman church, and when he came to England it is plain that he was mainly instrumental in drawing off Archbishop Cranmer from his Lutheran views to the anti-sacramental opinions he afterwards advocated. He had, when it suited his purpose, endeavoured to represent the difference between his own and Luther's views as of small importance, and after the death of Luther in 1546 he had hoped that a nearer approach to unity amongst protestants of the German and Swiss schools might have been effected. And it was specially with this view that Cranmer had summoned Alasco to England. But after Bucer's death on 28 Feb. 1551 the last faint hopes of any such amalgamation had died away, and Peter Martyr and Alasco carried everything before them.

Cranmer's change of opinion may be gathered from the following short extracts:—

1 Aug. 1548. 'All our countrymen . . . entertain in all respects like opinions with you . . . I except the Archbishop of Canterbury . . . he conducts himself in such a way . . . as that the people do not think much of him, and the nobility regard him as lukewarm.'

28 Sept. 1548. 'Latimer has come over to our opinion respecting the true doctrine of the Eucharist, together with the Archbishop of Canterbury and the other bishops who heretofore seemed to be Lutherans.'

31 Dec. 1548. 'The Archbishop of Canterbury, contrary to general expectation, most openly, firmly, and learnedly maintained your opinion upon this subject. . . . I perceive that it is all over with Lutheranism now those that were considered its principal and almost only supporters have come over to our side.'

All this was written to Bullinger by Bartholomew Traheron.

The next extract is from John ab Ulmis, writing from Oxford to the same, 27 Nov. 1548.

Even that Thomas Cranmer himself, about whom I wrote to you when I was in London, by the goodness of God and the instrumentality of that most upright and judicious man master John Alasco is in a great measure recovered from his dangerous lethargy.

And again, 2 March 1549—

The Archbishop of Canterbury . . . has, contrary to the general expectation, delivered his opinion on the subject correctly, orderly, and clearly, and by the weight of his character and the dignity of his language and sentiments easily drew over all his hearers to our way of thinking—

i.e. the views advocated by Martyr, following in the steps of Zwingli. These extracts show the opinion of a foreigner resident in England, who appears, from his letters, to have been cognisant of all that was going on in the changes of religion and worship.

But we have also distinct evidence of Alasco's influence over Cranmer in other letters which have been printed in Gorham's

'Reformation Gleanings.' Thus Alasco, writing to Bullinger, 10 April 1551, says—

> Not long ago Dr Martin Bucer departed this life. The Archbishop of Canterbury consulted me on inviting to this country several learned men. I therefore proposed Musculus, your Bibliander, and Castalio; he suggested also Brentius, but when I mentioned that he did not agree with us on the Sacramentarian matter, he replied that he had already been so informed. I could strongly desire, holy man, that we had here some of your ministers. I already number Musculus among yours, and I knew some time since, that Bibliander is your co-pastor; already the Archbishop of Canterbury has instructed John Hales to provide for the journey of Musculus and Bibliander, if they be disposed to come. If you think it possible to persuade Castalio to undertake a journey hither, I request you to ascertain and inform me of his wishes.

From all this it is abundantly plain that Martyr and Alasco were carrying all before them, and that we are far more indebted to them than to Ridley and Cranmer for the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI and the forty-two articles which quickly followed it. There was evidently a lingering hope in Cranmer's mind that, now that Bucer, the sole remaining Lutheran in England after the German reformer's death, had followed him to the grave, some compromise might yet be made with his adherents, some of whom were fast developing into Zwinglianism. But it did not suit Alasco's purpose that Brentz should be invited to take part in the changes going on, and so the Lutheran reformer remained at his post till his death, his last will condemning all heretics, especially the Zwinglians, whom he does not hesitate to speak of as liars. He made his confession at his death, expressing his agreement with Luther's doctrine.

This was the state into which affairs had drifted in the year 1551. There had been a systematic attempt from the first to get rid of catholic doctrine, and to reform the church after the model of foreign protestantism. It was not, as has been erroneously supposed, that the English reformers were becoming gradually enlightened, and so slowly adopted changes as they from time to time approved themselves to their better judgment. On the contrary, every change was deliberately made with a view to a subsequent alteration; and a Third Prayer Book would soon have supplanted the Second, just as the Second had been designed to supersede the First. The pretence of the compilers of the Second, that it was only an improved edition of the First, must be seen to be mere hypocrisy when the two are compared together in regard to the doctrine of sacramental grace. If the two books do not seem to any one to proclaim this on the face of things, how is it possible to resist the evidence afforded by the correspondence of the period and the history of the Marian exiles? Is it not plain that the denial of the

real presence is as clear in the Second as its assertion is in the First? That it was so to Lawrence Humphrey and Thomas Sampson in July 1566 is plain from their complaint alleged in a letter to Bullinger, when they averred that

> the Article composed in the time of Edward the Sixth respecting the spiritual eating, which expressly oppugned and took away the Real Presence in the Eucharist and contained a most clear explanation of the truth, is now set forth among us mutilated and imperfect.[4]

This, of course, refers to the reintroduction, in 1559, of the words used in the First Prayer Book of 1549—'The body [or blood] of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.'

And now let us briefly summarise the evidence of the intentions and purpose of the reformers of the reign of Edward VI. If we bear in mind the absolute necessity there was for caution in the mode of proceeding, and also the known opinions of Cranmer expressed during the reign of Henry VIII as regards confirmation and holy orders, there will seem nothing unreasonable in the view which we believe to be the only true account of the changes in religion successively adopted in the reign of his successor, and that account is as follows: There was, from the moment of Henry's death, a systematic attempt made by the men of the new learning, headed at first by Somerset and afterwards by Northumberland, gradually to get rid of catholic doctrine. In furtherance of this project, which was never lost sight of during the whole of Edward's reign, they first put out the order of communion, which was partly in English, partly in Latin; they then proceeded to the First Prayer Book, which came out little more than a year afterwards, and then, whilst pretending that the First Prayer Book of 1549 had been drawn up with the assistance of the Holy Ghost, they hypocritically destroyed the doctrine of the Eucharist, and pared down other sacramental doctrines to the lowest point they could venture. The next step was the new ordinal of April 1550, and then they endeavoured to impose upon the clergy the forty-two articles, with the view of paving the way for a Third Prayer Book, which would go still further in denying sacramental grace and assimilating the church of England to the platform of Zürich and Geneva. The successive publication of the new ordinal between the times of the issue of the two Prayer Books and the improved edition of it which appeared as part of the Prayer Book of 1552 points in the same direction. In the earlier ordinal, though much of the ceremonial was dropped, there were still retained the use of the vestments; the cope, the tunicle, the surplice and the alb, and the pastoral staff being mentioned by name. All these were omitted from the second ordinal of 1552,

[4] *Zürich Letters* (1st ser.), lxxi. p. 165

because these offices were intended to be performed without any special dress, the careful exclusion of any such mention being an accommodation to the scruples of such men as Hooper.

The matter scarcely needs the additional evidence afforded by the fact that Cranmer had ordered Dr. Taylor, of Hadley, a mere priest, to ordain Robert Drake as deacon in the year 1548, and afterwards admitted him to the order of priesthood, according to some form resembling the ordinal of the following year, which was not yet authorised or perhaps even composed. It was not proposed in the lords till 22 Jan. 1550, and did not come into operation till the following April. The story is not told by an enemy, but by Foxe (vol. viii. p. 107), and plainly proves the indifference both to the law of the land and the customs of the church which characterised that unhappy period.

The men who succeeded in Elizabeth's reign to the place of Edward's bishops were of the same school. They neither valued the apostolical succession which they possessed nor believed in the sacraments they administered. What wonder is it that when Elizabeth had occupied the throne for nearly thirty years no attempt was made to answer Cawdrey's allegation [5] that the bishops had all that time for the most part neglected to administer the rite of confirmation? They had been but faithful to the traditions of the Zwinglian party, who had taught them that orders were a state of life allowed in Holy Scripture, and that confirmation had grown of corrupt following of the apostles.

3. The third source of information we have alluded to is the history of the Frankfort and Genevan exiles as detailed in Whittingham's 'Brief Discourse of the Troubles begun at Frankfort in Germany, A.D. 1554, about the book of Common Prayer and Ceremonies, and continued by the Englishmen there to the end of Q. Mary's reign.' This was first published in 1575, and though twice reprinted, once in the second volume of the 'Phenix' in 1708 and again in a separate volume in 1846, is not very commonly met with. It gives an account of the quarrels which originated in the dislike of some of their body of the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI, which the most influential of the party wished to have in use in their congregation, though by common consent of all the reformers the litany and surplice were to be discontinued, together with other ceremonies that might seem strange to the French reformed communion which had been allowed by the magistrates. Several other ceremonial acts as regards the ministration of the sacraments were omitted as superstitious. Both of these parties, therefore, if they had been at home, would have been in favour of that further revision of the Prayer Book which Cranmer had taken in hand. Accordingly on

[5] Strype's *Aylmer*, p. 90.

2 Aug. 1554 they wrote off to their fellow-countrymen at Strassburg, Zürich, Wesel, Emden, &c., their ideas about discipline, in order to establish some unity amongst the Englishmen dispersed in those towns, whom they accordingly desired to come and settle at Frankfort. But there were already divisions at Frankfort, tidings of which had spread abroad, and the other exiles would not unite unless they would promise some substantial agreement with Edward's Second Book. But Knox and Lever had already been elected superintendents, and there was no chance of Knox consenting to anything in that Prayer Book which could not be proved from Scripture. Accordingly Knox and Whittingham wrote to Calvin, describing the points they objected to, and from their mode of expression it is plain that they had no idea that there was any consecration of the elements intended, but only a prayer like that which precedes it, 'in which are contained the words of institution;' but they distinctly object to the 'Gloria in Excelsis' as being used by the papists. At Calvin's suggestion a sort of compromise was adopted, which lasted from 6 Feb. 1555 till 13 March of the same year. This letter of Calvin's is the celebrated one in which he uses the expression *tolerabiles ineptiae* of parts of the contents of the Prayer Book. The patched up concord was disturbed by the arrival of Dr. Cox, who in the reign of Elizabeth was promoted to the bishopric of Ely. Cox soon got his own way, and managed to drive away Knox and Whittingham to Geneva. He wrote to Calvin explaining how the magistrates had given them leave to use the English Prayer Book, of which they had, however, given up confirmation, saints' days, kneeling at communion, surplices, crosses, and other like things, for fear of offending the weak brethren. The upshot of the matter was that the congregation was split up, some retiring to Geneva, some to Basle, whilst Cox, Whitehead, and others remained at Frankfort, using the English Prayer Book but omitting the services and ceremonies mentioned above. But the retirement of those who were dissatisfied did not put an end to their differences, which lasted all the time till the accession of Elizabeth. In the discussion of these troubles occurs one of the earliest assertions about the Third Prayer Book, the statement being (p. 82, ed. 1708)

> that Cranmer, Bishop of Canterbury, had drawn up a Book of Prayer an hundred times more perfect than this we now have, yet the same could not take place, for that he was matched with such a wicked clergy and convocation, with other enemies.

We need not enter into the details of the quarrels between the elders and ministers and the congregation. It seems as if they could not agree upon any matters of discipline, and as if they were obliged to appoint as deacons men possessed of private means, for fear they should embezzle the alms which it was their business to

collect. The factions seem to have numbered about thirty-six or thirty-eight on one side and fourteen or fifteen on the other. The dispute lasted from 13 Jan. 1557 till 30 March, when the new book of discipline was subscribed by forty-two out of the whole congregation, which were in all sixty-two. Horne and Chambers seem to have been the principal persons in the minority, who found fault with the new discipline; Whitehead the chief of the majority, who were for imposing it. After this Horne and Chambers appear to have left Frankfort and joined the preceding seceders at Geneva in 1558, soon after which tidings reached them of the accession of Elizabeth, when it was thought best at Geneva to close up all differences, and accordingly Kethe was sent with a letter, dated 15 Dec. 1558, to Aarau, Basle, Strassburg, Worms, Frankfort, and other places where there were any English protestants assembled, exhorting them to forget all past grievances and join together, lest the papists should find occasion against them because of their dissensions. This was signed by the well-known names of Goodman, Coverdale, Knox, Gilby, and Whittingham amongst others. The answer to the letter from Frankfort was signed by Pilkington, Nowell, and others, expressing their hope that all would agree in whatever should now be arranged by authority in England and by consent of parliament, 'being not of themselves wicked.' The answer from Aarau, which was nearly to the same effect, is signed by Thomas Lever and three others, and dated 16 Jan. 1559.

The quarrels of the exiles as detailed by one who professes to be an impartial judge would be of small importance but for the distinct revelation of the fact of the existence of two principal factions amongst them, one of which was for doing away with the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI, the other being content to adopt it, with the omission of certain provisions which they disliked, amongst which were the kneeling position at the reception of the Lord's supper and the existence of an office for confirmation, both of which were supposed to be relics of popery. The latter party were Zwinglians in reality, but they were usually designated as Pelagians and free-willers by the others, who were more or less advanced Calvinists.

At the risk of being charged with enlarging upon evidence of what has been abundantly proved already, we venture upon an extract from a very scarce tract which is amongst the last of the publications of the reign of Edward VI. It is a translation by T. C. of a work written in German by Micronius, and addressed by him to the faithful congregation of the Dutch church at London. The only copy we have seen is that in the British Museum, with the press-mark '4326. a.,' entitled 'A short and faythful | Instruction, gathered out of holy Scri|pture, composed in Questions and An|sweres, for

the edifyeing and comfort | of the symple Christianes, whych | intende worthely to receyve | the holy Supper of the | Lorde.' To the first question, 'Whereby knowest thou, that thou arte a Christian?' the answer is, 'Bycause the holy ghost by the witnesse of fayth certifieth me in myne herte and sealeth my conscience, that I am the chylde of God alonly through the merite of Jesus Christe.' To the question, 'What are the Sacramentes?' the answer is, 'They are holy exercises, seales and effectual tokens of remembrance, ordeyned of the Lorde himselfe for the comforte of his congregacion.' Again, to 'What is Baptyme?' we have, 'It is an holy ordinaunce of Christ in the recept wherof all the membres of hys congregation (in which yonge children are conteyned also) are baptysed with water in the name of the father, and of the Sonne, and of the holy Ghost.' We have only space for one of the answers to the questions on the other sacrament, viz. 'What profyt and comforte fyndest thou in the due and worthye recepte therof?'

Answere, Truely, in the ryght ministracion therof, it is lyuely and effectually set out to me myserable synner as it were before myne eyes, beaten into my remembraunce, yea wytnessed and sealed to my feble conscience through the holy Ghost, that Christ hath once for al upon the crosse made an euerlastyng full and parfyte oblacion and sacrifice for my synnes, and that I also beleuynge in hym haue thorough hys death and oblacion once made forgyvenes of my synnes wyth comfort and full truste of euerlastynge lyfe as verely, truly and certeinlye as I at hys table eate of the bread broken and drinke of the cuppe of the Lorde, whyche (after the use of holy scripture and maner of Sacramentes) he calleth his body and bloude.

This little work was reproduced exactly in sixteen pages of one of the Camden Society's publications in 1884.[6] If any one should be inclined to wonder at the extraordinary unanimity of the reformers of Edward's reign in their endeavour to detach the grace of God from the sacramental signs, or to disparage the sacraments, we would, in explanation of this point, refer to what we believe was the original source of it all, viz. the publication, in the year 1527, of the 'Farrago annotationum in Genesim ex ore Huldrychi Zuinglii per Leonem Judae et Casparem Megandrum exceptarum. Tiguri ex aedibus Christophori Froschover Anno M.D. XXVII. Mense Martio.'[7] The whole passage from p. 173 to p. 178 is well worth reading, and is most instructive in this relation. We have only space for one short but pregnant extract, from p. 176.

Satis de signis superius loquuti, hic breviter dicimus, Signa quaedam esse miracula, quae fidelium non mentes, sed carnis imbecillitatem nonnihil firmant; infideles excaecant, et eis in testimonium damnationis fiunt. Signa vero pacti aut symbola (quae alii signa sacramentalia vocant), ut est in veteri lege Circumcisio, et agni paschalis manducatio, in nova, baptismus et Eucharistia, fidem interiorem nec adjuvant, nec firmant (ut

[6] *Troubles connected with the Prayer Book of* 1549, edited by the Rev. N. Pocock, pref. pp. xxxi–xlvi.

[7] Brit. Mus. 690. a. 3.

quidam absque verbo Dei docent) sed admonent hominem officii: et sunt testimonia damnationis his, qui non servant quae per symbola significantur.

It has always been asserted that we are indebted for the Second Prayer Book and the forty-two articles to Cranmer and Ridley, but no evidence is ever produced to show that Ridley's influence was anything more than indirect, whereas all the evidence points to Alasco and Peter Martyr as their compilers or as assistants to Cranmer in compiling them. And it has been urged in favour of their Lutheran origin that the baptismal office is very like Hermann's, and that many of the earlier articles are expressed exactly in the same form as those of the Augustan confession. There is some force in the argument, as it must be admitted that the wording of the articles is more in accordance with the Augustan than with any of the Helvetic confessions. Yet we should remember that the confession of Augsburg was the earliest and far the most celebrated of all the confessions of the sixteenth century, and that even Martyr was quite willing to adopt it if he might be allowed to take it in his own sense, although he was almost as bitterly opposed to Lutheranism as Luther, and after his death Westphal, was to the Zwinglians and Calvinists. Thus in his address to the governors at Strassburg he says, 'I willingly embrace and confess the confession made at Augusta,' though he had refused to subscribe to the agreement made between Martin Bucer and Luther and his fellow-ministers, because he would not grant that they that are without faith in receiving the sacrament receive the body of Christ,[8] alleging that Bucer himself had taught otherwise at Cambridge. And yet in his epistle to the English he inveighs most strongly against the Lutherans at the commencement of the reign of Elizabeth. For it appears that, though the current of religious belief had set very strongly in towards denying the grace of either sacrament, there were still some who, though opposed to all Roman doctrine, yet adhered to the Lutheran teaching of grace being conferred in both the sacraments. Certain persons who had conceived a dislike of Lutheranism applied to Peter Martyr at Strassburg for advice as to whether it was lawful for them to have their children baptised by one who held to Lutheran doctrine, and Martyr replied that though baptism by a Lutheran was valid, and was on no account to be repeated, yet they ought not to allow a child to be baptised by a Lutheran, because baptism was a seal of faith, and

the faith of the Lutherans and ours are so different that they even detest our faith, and the controversy between us is not about a small matter, but about a principal point of faith. The Lutherans would not allow their children to be baptised by us, so neither should we allow ours to be baptised by them.

[8] *Common Places*, part ii. p. 136.

In explaining the difference between the Lutherans and himself he says—

They attribute unto the sacraments a great deal more than is requisite, and tie the grace of God unto baptism. There is none agreement between them and us in any of both sacraments. Infants, if they die without baptism, are in no danger, as neither grace nor predestination must be tied to outward things and sacraments. Furthermore, it is better that the discord between us and the Lutherans should be increased than that we should be in danger of ceasing to defend that truth about the Sacrament which has hitherto been constantly held.

In further evidence of the connexion that exists between the expressions of the articles and the opinions of Martyr it seems worth while to exhibit the following comparison of the ninth article with certain phraseology used by Martyr in a letter to an unknown friend in England, written soon after the accession of Elizabeth to the throne:—

But to declare in few words, this is my opinion, that even as by the holy words either heard or read our faith is stirred up, waxeth fervent, and is increased, so doth it also happen while we receive the sacraments which be the words of God, but yet visible words, that our faith is made more firm and increaseth.[9]

Surely these words exactly explain the meaning and intention of the clause in the twenty-seventh article, that 'the promises of forgiveness of sin and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the holy Ghost are visibly signed and sealed, faith is confirmed, and grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God.'

Whatever may be said of some of the other articles, there is no trace in the sacramental portion of them of their having been derived from the Augsburg confession, which is so definite in Articles IX. and X.

In baptismo docent quod sit necessarium ad salutem quodque per baptismum offeratur Dei gratia et quod pueri sint baptizandi qui per baptismum oblati Deo, recipiantur in gratiam Dei.

De coena Domini docent quod corpus et sanguis Christi vere adsint et distribuantur vescentibus in coena Domini et improbant secus docentes.

If there were any possibility of evading the plain meaning of these words, the strong language used by Melanchthon in his 'Apologia Confessionis Augustanae' cuts away the ground entirely.

NICHOLAS POCOCK.

[9] *Epistles*, p. 127.

The Constable Lesdiguières

MORTUUS est in senectute bonâ, plenus dierum et divitiis et gloriâ. The Jacobin who preached Lesdiguières' funeral sermon was happy in his text. Few indeed were the soldiers who took horse after the massacre of Vassi, and fought a hard campaign in the heart of the Thirty Years' War. Lesdiguières could reckon eighty-three years of life, and sixty-four of almost continuous fighting. His life and his luck alike seemed charmed. Born to poverty he died a millionaire; the intended advocate of Dauphiné was the last on the roll of the Constables of France. Even in his biographers is he fortunate. The Secretary Videl wrote his master's life from fifteen years of close association, with his voluminous correspondence at his hand, while Dauphiné was still echoing every tradition of its hero. MM. Douglas and Roman have ransacked France to accumulate materials for a more scientific biography.[1] To these M. Dufayard's [2] industry has largely added from the archives of Grenoble and Turin, while his literary skill has moulded them into a definitive life of him whom Voltaire christened 'l'heureux Lesdiguières.'

Prodigies and prophecies cling to the cradle of the young François de Bonne; yet scarcely could a Cornelius Agrippa or a Nostradamus have correctly cast the horoscope of the child. His father and forefathers were petty Dauphinois gentry, following the profession of notary in the district of Champsaur, differing rather in birth and pride than in wealth and manners from the peasant farmers of the countryside. François when five years old lost his father, and the boy, complained these peasants to his mother, was soon the nuisance of the parish, dividing their children into bands, and training them in mimic war. His youth and entrance into life were characteristic of his class. Sent to the university of Avignon, where lectures were already disorganised by seismic symptoms of the great upheaval, the undergraduate preferred the garrison drums to the college bell, and became with his ribald comrades the terror of the pavement, forming intimate acquaintance, if not friendship, with the pontifical

[1] *Actes et Correspondance du Connétable de Lesdiguières*, par MM. Douglas et Roman. 3 vols. 1878–89.

[2] *Le Connétable de Lesdiguières*, par C. Dufayard. Paris, 1892.

police. Hence he passed on to Paris, to study law at the college of Navarre. Term and vacation were equally intolerable. Richer relations turned the cold shoulder to their ill-dressed cousin. Neighbours smiled and footmen laughed at the disagreeables which to the young or the sensitive are disasters. Law was thrown to the winds, and the boy enlisted, joining before long the *compagnie d'ordonnance* of Gordes, lieutenant-general in Dauphiné. Here, like many young nobles, he served as a private of light horse, eking out his pay by opportunities of pillage. In helmet and breastplate, with musket in hand, sword at side, and pistol in the saddle-bow, he no longer cut the sorry figure of college days. He was well-knit and muscular, extraordinarily active, with flashing eyes, and the air of a great gentleman. The best traditions of the French army were maintained by Gordes, himself a pupil of Bayard, and Bonne attracted his commander's notice. With the outbreak of the wars of religion the market value of a good trooper rose rapidly. Huguenot churches and nobles busily enrolled soldiers and commissioned officers. Gentlemen, whom the cessation of the Spanish war had left to starve, now found a competence if not a fortune. Apart from religious proclivity, higher pay and hatred for the Lorrainer, to whom the disastrous peace was attributed, attracted them to the party of Reform. Even while at Avignon, Lesdiguières[3] seems to have become a convert. But he would not sacrifice career to conviction; the sight of fellow students haled in their shirts to the papal prisons served as a deterrent from profession. Now, however, after some hesitation he left the royal service to join the partisan chief Furmeyer.

Reform in its south-eastern outpost had a peculiar character. Its hold upon the country people was stronger than elsewhere. In most villages there was a small reformed congregation, in many cases whole valleys declared themselves. Nobles and towns were alike divided, the balance of numbers and importance being however in favour of catholicism. Yet the Huguenots were the more pushing party, and seemed likely at first to carry the province with them. The war was here even unusually cruel. The natives of the uplands were fierce, the lesser gentry more numerous and less cultivated than in the northern or central provinces. The small noble or the adventurous *roturier* treated the rising as a speculation, levied the local vagabonds and the floating scum of French, Swiss, or Rhenish mercenaries, and fought for plunder. There was little concentration and therefore little discipline. Geographical features, the mountain ranges, and the torrents cutting the country into strips, determined the character of the operations. It was a war of small castles against small towns, of ambush, camisade, and escalade. In the country,

[3] This name, by which François de Bonne is usually known, was derived from the estate Diguières erected into a duchy-peerage by an ordinance of 1611, verified by Parliament in 1612.

peasants were burnt out of their villages, in the towns the weaker party was expelled or massacred, priest-hunting and cattle-lifting became an art. The early Huguenot leaders, Adretz, Mouvans, and Furmeyer, set an atrocious example, only to be palliated by the crimes of their opponents. Yet success required high military gifts, personal courage, endurance, ingenuity, and above all rapidity, the 'assaut de lévrier, défense de sanglier, et fuite de loup' once dear to Bayard, himself a Dauphinois. In such a school Lesdiguières was the aptest pupil; he absorbed its vices with his virtues; in the last campaign of his life his brutality to the Genoese peasantry cost him dear. Yet this training was tempered by good nature, perhaps by religious indifference, above all by his belief in regular pay and discipline.

In Dauphiné the first three wars of religion were practically one, for neither party deemed it prudent to disarm. In 1568–9, Lesdiguières acquired a wider military experience. He served under Montbrun in Acier's hazardous march across France to join Condé's army. Thus it was that the young Dauphinois officer fought both at Jarnac and Moncontour, and that he first formed the friendship of Henry of Navarre, who early recognised his gifts. Adretz meanwhile had seceded to the Catholics, Furmeyer was killed, the campaign in central France removed many a possible rival; the fittest only survived, for out of 12,000 men who marched from Dauphiné only a twelfth returned. With the peace of Saint-Germain, Dauphiné at last took breath, and Lesdiguières was already a military personage, and a man of substance. The wealth was not all well earned. He loved his mother and he married a rich wife to give her comfort. He loved himself, and he pillaged and secularised to adorn and enlarge the poor manor of his heritage.

It is well known that the fatal character of the massacre of St. Bartholomew was due to the craving of the Huguenot nobility to return to Paris. The more provincial the noble, the more irresistible the temptation. The pauper undergraduate of the college of Navarre could now exhaust the pleasures of the capital, as a man of light and leading, as a friend of the bridegroom, in whose honour all Huguenot gentility had met. Lesdiguières, however, with the *flair* of the hunter and the hunted sniffed blood. An accidental meeting with his old tutor is said to have revealed the coming tragedy. He left Paris suddenly on the pretext of his wife's ill health. That the excuse was accepted proves how little Lesdiguières was known; domestic anxiety was not his foible. The tale is characteristic. The 'renard Dauphinois' exposed his life in action, but he never risked a *guet-à-pens* without precaution and a loaded pistol. The more intense effects of St. Bartholomew were not felt in Dauphiné. Gordes to the best of his ability prevented massacre, while the Dauphinois, 'plus consciencieux et plus gens de bien'

than other Frenchmen, were less ready to take arms against the crown. Many Huguenots fled to Geneva, many 'to save the body lost the soul.' Lesdiguières did neither. It is a proof of his growing importance that his old commander did his utmost to win him, now employing theological arguments, now dwelling on the duty of obedience. The quondam light-horseman replied that he knew the duty of a subject towards his king, and of a Christian towards his God, that they seemed hard to reconcile, and that reflexion needed time. This reply became with him a formula; reflexion needed exactly half a century.

In the wars of religion, as in all great revolutionary movements, the leading actors are interesting because they are exceptional, or because they are typical. To the former class belong Coligny, Henry of Guise, La Noue; to the latter, Navarre, Monluc, Lesdiguières. The Dauphinois was pre-eminently a type of his class, his province, his party, and his nation. This is nowhere more clearly recognised than in what may be termed in more than one sense 'the mean period,' which lies between the great massacre and the Catholic League. Side issues and personal ambitions everywhere distorted the professed objects of the strife. Members of each party intrigued with their opponents or with foreign powers against the crown or without its sanction. The conflict became rather social or political than religious. Party chiefs at one moment prepared to throw their forces upon the border lands of France, at another invited foreign princes to intervene in the religious struggle. It was Lesdiguières' good fortune to survive his friends, his rivals, and his enemies. Shortly after the resumption of hostilities Montbrun was taken and beheaded. Lesdiguières rose upon his fall. Merciless as his soldiers were, they were at least under discipline, and his highly drilled force gave him the advantage over other Huguenot chiefs. He was at once marked out by popular feeling as Montbrun's successor. But a dozen nobles of better birth or higher standing pressed their claims; they scorned to serve the adventurous cadet of La Bonne. Lesdiguières developed his powers of intrigue, applying the system familiar in his later years. He modestly professed his own unworthiness; he dwelt on the services of impossible candidates; he pressed upon Navarre, Condé, and Damville, relations of their own, unlikely to accept the post; he left meanwhile no stone unturned to further his own cause. His reward was a temporary commission from the princes to levy troops and taxes in the name of the churches of the province, to appoint officers, to fortify and garrison, to dispose in fact of all the resources of Dauphiné with the aid of a provincial council. He was now the first man in his party, in one of its most important provinces. The rival nobles, however, formed a party called the *Désunis*; they sulked in their castles, or engaged in open hostilities against their chief, they joined their catholic foes,

they pressed for peace when Lesdiguières proved the necessity of war, they even attempted assassination. Had the catholics at this period been in earnest, the Huguenot cause could hardly have survived. The social war which broke out in Dauphiné was perhaps Lesdiguières' salvation. The exactions and brutalities of the nobles and the soldiery had become intolerable to the poorer classes of both faiths. Peasants and artisans, catholic and protestant, combined in armed bands, and blowing upon horns after the fashion of the Swiss, they fell upon the troops, burnt castles, and massacred their occupants. They doubtless received encouragement from higher quarters. Henry of Guise, looking to the democracy for support against the crown, is said to have stimulated the Jacquerie, while the Huguenot chief was accused of acting in concert with the peasants. Nobles, however, and town governments alike had always feared to arm the masses, and few leaders of either religion were bold enough to appeal to Acheron. If the peasants were Lesdiguières' allies, he could not save them from being cut to pieces by Mandelot and by Guise's more conservative brother Mayenne.

For Dauphiné the petty peaces of this period had little meaning. Peace, as war, was made to enrich the princes, and Dauphiné lay outside the immediate area of court intrigue. Lesdiguières had as yet no assured position, his interest lay in the continuance of war, and he urged upon his party, perhaps with truth, that peace implied annihilation. The court believed that the submission of Dauphiné depended upon the Huguenot leader, and that his religion was but pocket deep. The queen-mother journeyed in person to Grenoble to convert or to corrupt the dangerous mountaineer. Lesdiguières, however, was a master of excuse; he never ventured to subject himself to Catherine's powers of persuasion. He unswervingly insisted, from a distance, on the guarantees which were ultimately to be accorded by the edict of Nantes. The court finding him impracticable resolved to crush him, and Mayenne was despatched to Dauphiné with an overwhelming force. In the preceding struggle Lesdiguières had not met with unvarying success. The catholicism of the towns had baffled him. At Embrun his emissary who attempted to beguile a sentinel was arrested and quartered. His partisans at Grenoble were massacred in their houses. The disreputable consuls of Briançon, who would conceal their peculations by betraying the town, were detected, and their severed heads grinned a ghastly welcome from the ramparts. The catholic peasants of the Alpine valleys were learning to barricade their passes as the heretic scourge approached. Mayenne's operations determined the campaign. The Huguenot chief had not yet met so scientific a soldier, nor so regular a force. His strongest fortress, La Mure, was after desperate resistance taken in his teeth. The Désunis had joined the enemy; the peasant revolt was stamped

out. The Huguenots weary of the struggle cried, 'Sooner persecution than continual war.' Lesdiguières in despair turned to the dangerous resource of foreign aid. He who was to be the bulwark of the eastern frontier inaugurated his foreign policy by action little short of treason. Earlier intrigues with Savoy on the subject of Saluzzo had at least been questionable; he now implored Charles Emmanuel to intervene against Mayenne. The duke had a perfect knowledge of the political barometer, and refused to stir. Lesdiguières was fairly beaten; there was an end, to all appearance, of the abnormal importance of the impudent Dauphinois adventurer.

Future events were to prove that Mayenne with all adventitious advantages and considerable talents was a lesser man than his beaten and humbled opponent. In France an unimpaired physique was an incomparable advantage. Lesdiguières was no saint, and he lived in an age of sinners. Henry of Navarre and Henry of Guise rarely relaxed their intellectual vigour, but Lesdiguières was perhaps the one leader since Coligny's death and La Noue's misfortunes who was never physically slack. He utilised peace as he had exploited war. Beaten on the question of submission in his own assembly, he yet secured the command of the places of security. Deserted by Navarre, his agent Calignon extorted from his leader's petulant or politic indolence the confirmation of his command in Dauphiné. The Désunis were forced to recognise his title. Making a journey to Guyenne he improved his personal friendship with Navarre. Gascon and Dauphinois agreed that peace could not be permanent. While Guise was manipulating local disaffection in the four corners of France, Lesdiguières was drilling in Dauphiné his 400 gentlemen and 4,000 harquebusiers.

The formation of the great catholic league raked up in Dauphiné, as elsewhere, the embers of civil war, and before long the flames burnt fiercely. The larger towns and the catholic valleys eagerly affiliated themselves to the league. The house of Guise had no slight influence in the province. The lower classes remembered the duke's sympathy in the social war, whereas Mayenne had nursed the favour of citizens and nobles. Until now the catholics had never been adequately organised, had never utilised their numerical superiority; on the other hand the breaches which had divided the Huguenot nobles were closed, they no longer fought for place or plunder, but for life or home. In Lesdiguières were at length concentrated the whole resources of his party, and never were his talents more conspicuous. His marvellous rapidity multiplied his forces; his light guns, carried sometimes on the shoulders of his men, commanded positions inaccessible to siege artillery. He possessed the strategic instinct of his master, Henry of Navarre. Scanty as his forces were, he clogged the vital arteries of the two

chief catholic towns, Gap and Grenoble. The rapidity of his raids terrorised the capital. As at Paris, the clergy were armed and drilled, chains were hung across the streets, the sessions of parliament were suspended. The growing importance of the war in Dauphiné was recognised at headquarters. Mayenne moved in person on the province, the governors of Lyons and Provence were ordered to co-operate, while La Valette was commissioned to reduce Dauphiné to submission. Once more, however, the political divisions of the stronger religious party saved the existence of the weaker. The interests of royalists and leaguers were far asunder. Among the local nobility a party of *politiques* was already forming, opposed to the extremists of the towns. The league was directed against both Huguenots and *Mignons*, and La Valette was the brother of the royal favourite Epernon. Thus, though the royal troops acted in nominal concert with the leaguers, a secret compromise with the Huguenots was effected on the basis of religious toleration, and upon the murder of Guise, La Valette's successor, the Corsican Ornano, publicly negotiated an arrangement with Lesdiguières in the teeth of catholic opposition. The news of the king's assassination was received with frenzied joy in the Dauphinois capital; Grenoble had its 'Day of Barricades,' and Ornano with his Corsicans was expelled. The result was an offensive and defensive alliance between royalist and Huguenot for the recognition of Navarre, and this was cemented by the fall of Gap. The war was changing its character, massacre and expulsion were out of date. The town retained its catholic garrison, its catholic worship, its catholic municipality. Submission to the crown was the one condition.

Henceforth the peril to the French frontier provinces came from without, rather than from within. The danger was not disintegration, but dismemberment. This was peculiarly the case in Dauphiné, which is, or was, only accidentally a part of France. Close geographical and commercial relations bound the Dauphinois to the Savoyards on their north, and the Provençals on their south. Even the Alps were a less effective frontier than the Rhône, for the great route of Mont Genèvre united Dauphiné to Piedmont. Reform had spread rapidly from Geneva through the three sub-Alpine provinces, each of which had long contained its Vaudois element, and this had formed yet another bond of sympathy. It was a common accusation that the Huguenots intended the substitution of a Swiss cantonal system for the monarchy. In the south-eastern provinces this charge was not wholly groundless. Huguenot enthusiasts had dreamed of the revival of an Allobrogian nation, comprising all the Savoyards, Dauphinois, and Provençals, with Geneva for their capital. With the disputed succession to the crown dismemberment passed out of dreamland into the sphere of overwakeful politics. The danger now consisted in the combination of

leaguer disloyalty with foreign ambition. The weakness of France was the opportunity of Savoy. For a decadent monarchy the new duke, Charles Emmanuel, was a dangerous neighbour. None could so obstinately play a losing game, none so skilfully utilise success. His culture, greater than is the common lot of rulers, he applied to diplomacy and war. His troops, ill-clothed, ill-shod, ill-fed, blindly followed the general who when unhorsed would lead them pike in hand. The Savoyard envoys were as devoted and as well drilled as the regiments. Nobles and peasantry vied in loyalty. French sympathies in Savoy were infinitesimal as compared with Savoyard sympathies in France. It is Lesdiguières' real claim to greatness that with paltry resources he baffled so remarkable a foe, converting finally his skill and his ambition to the defence of France and the detriment of Spain. From 1588 the relations of Lesdiguières with Charles Emmanuel, either as friend or foe, are closer than with any other living man.

The duke of Savoy sat upon the Alps as upon a rail, and circumstances decided the side of his descent. Abandoning awhile Italian ambitions, he transferred the centre of his activity from Turin to Chambéry. Geneva was saved by Lesdiguières' watchfulness, but the duke swore 'to burn his boots rather than not take the town.' Every French party was essayed in turn; he tried to win Lesdiguières and Montmorency against the crown, he offered to defend Saluzzo against the Dauphinois and La Valette. His marriage with a Spanish infanta yet further determined his policy, the revival of a Burgundian kingdom, a buffer state stretching from the Mediterranean to the Jura. The duke eagerly welcomed the French catholic league; to the Guises his price was the district between the Alps and the Rhône; to the king he represented that Lesdiguières' propagandism was dangerous to all Italy; let him block his path by the occupation of the Italian nursery of heresy, Saluzzo. In 1588, rightly believing the monarchy to be powerless, he annexed this marquisate, the last shred of French territory over Alps, and once more turned upon Geneva. The murder of Henry III opened wider prospects. As grandson of Francis I he claimed the succession to the throne, but at all events he would annex Provence and Dauphiné. He pressed his project of a kingdom of the Alps upon the parliament of Grenoble.

La nature a fait des Dauphinois et des Savoyens un seul et même peuple. Quand vous leur aurez donné un même maître, ils seront encore ces indomptables Allobroges qui furent la gloire des Celtes, la terreur de Rome. Renouez la chaîne des temps, rattachez-vous à l'ancienne dynastie de vos rois.

Receiving in Dauphiné a temporary rebuff, the duke was rapturously received by the populace and parliament of Provence. He entered Aix amid cries of *Vive Savoye! Vive la Messe!* Before

long Grenoble was calling for his protection. Lesdiguières realised that the reduction of the Dauphinois capital was essential to the integrity of France. Ornano was a prisoner, and he was left to his own resources. With forces not exceeding 1,500 men the remaining leaguer strongholds in upper Dauphiné, Briançon, Exilles, and Barcelonnetta were reduced, the Savoyards driven back, the Alpine passes blocked. He then closed upon Grenoble. With his usual confidence he begged the king for the governorship of the town. *Cap de Diou, sire,* laughed Biron, *donnez-lui le gouvernement de Lyon et de Paris s'il les peut prendre.* Grenoble he did take by famine and by battery. But it was not enough to take the town, he must make it French and loyal. The past was forgiven; the leaguer parliament was retained intact, the dissident members rejoined the body. Huguenot worship was confined to a suburb. Lesdiguières gained the affections of the townspeople; he personally begged the friendship of his most active enemy, the archbishop of Embrun. For Lesdiguières his exploits in the Huguenot cause were over; henceforth he fought for Dauphiné and France against the foreigner, or for the crown against its rebels. He was no longer a partisan leader who must live by war, but a royal representative whose interest at home was peace.

From 1590 to 1598, while the king was stamping out or buying out the league, and driving the Spaniards from French soil, Lesdiguières was combating the duke of Savoy and his papal and Spanish auxiliaries. His military experience was enlarged, his forces more considerable, and he won his great victory of Pontcharra over 15,000 men of the three allied powers. The civil wars had developed an excellent infantry, and nowhere was it better than in Dauphiné; it met, ever on unequal terms, the veteran Spanish foot and the admirably trained Savoyards. The aims of Charles Emmanuel were always the same, to annex Dauphiné from Savoy and the Mont Genèvre, and Provence from the Argentière pass or the Var. Lesdiguières realised that defensive warfare is a losing game, that the war was fed from Piedmont, and in Piedmont must be decided, that the Alps could only be effectually blocked by occupation of the eastern slopes. Thus, while the Savoyard pushed towards Grenoble and Aix, Lesdiguières' light horse rode wellnigh to Turin, and Cavour and Briquéras far within Piedmontese territory were strongly garrisoned. It was in the main a war of sieges, for the small forts and villages commanded mountain passes, and it was unsafe to leave them in the rear. The results were singularly even. If Lesdiguières failed to rescue his garrisons at Cavour and Briquéras, he recovered his stronghold at Exilles, beat the Spaniards descending the Doria valley at Salbertran, and relieved Grenoble by the brilliant capture of Barraux. The duke's success depended upon the divisions of France and the attacks of Spain, and if he

could be held in check until civil war had worn itself out, the drawn game was the battle won.

The convention of Paris between France and Savoy was, like the treaty of Vervins itself, no peace, but a truce for taking breath. The chief point at issue, the retention of Saluzzo, was referred to arbitration. Charles Emmanuel, however, could no longer rely on Spain; Philip II bequeathed nothing to the duchess his daughter but an image and a crucifix. Yet the duke could not reconcile himself to the condition of French alliance, the cession of Saluzzo. While he retained the one *place d'armes* of France in Italy, it was vain to tempt Henry with Naples or the Milanese. The duke hoped against hope for the renewal of civil war. His envoy reported encouraging symptoms of catholic discontent, but his unfailing theme was the ambition of Lesdiguières, who would now absorb Savoy by gathering in his hands the south-eastern provinces, now conquer Saluzzo for his son-in law. Lesdiguières was in fact the real opponent, and Savoyard fears magnified his influence. Thus Charles Emmanuel insisted on Lesdiguières' absence when he practised in person the persuasion of his silver tongue upon the king. Henry, however, was primed against concession. 'These guns are to take Montmélian, he said, as he did the honours of the arsenal; 'and this my most faithful servant,' as he introduced Lesdiguières.

The duke returned with the clear alternative of the cession of Saluzzo or the right bank of the Rhône. He had sown his bribes broadcast, but thought neither time nor money wasted. He had studied the temper of religious parties, had deepened the discontent of Bouillon and Epernon, and dangled before Biron's eyes the dismemberment of France and a Burgundian kingdom. When his ambassador counted up the cost, the duke replied that he had come to sow and not to reap; when twitted with bringing nothing home but Parisian mud, he rejoined that the traces of his visit would long outlast the mud upon his mantle. But Lesdiguières was always in his path, brushing aside the representations, timid or corrupt, of the dangers of a foreign war. It was Lesdiguières who brought the king to Grenoble, who had armed Dauphiné to the teeth, and to whom the rich results of the campaign were really due. The actual operations did the Savoyards no little credit. Bourg and Chambéry fell indeed without serious resistance; yet it took the whole French army to conquer Savoy, which in the past and future was occupied at pleasure. But the French commanders were divided, and when in the latter and more difficult stage the sole command was conferred upon Lesdiguières the nobles served under him with extreme reluctance, the musketeers of the guard mutinied, and even Sully, who afterwards gave his loyal co-operation, grumbled at being forced to take his orders. Victory was indeed mainly won by the French artillery, by the science and the

siege-train of the grand-master, and the ingenuity and mountain batteries of Lesdiguières. While the greater nobles danced and flirted at Chambéry or Grenoble, the two artillerists cleared the Alpine slopes from Mont Cenis westwards, and following the Isère, contrary to all belief, won Montmélian, Savoy's last stronghold, just before winter fell. Charles Emmanuel stormed over the Little St. Bernard, and fought Lesdiguières with varying success amid the snows, but January brought the peace of Lyons. Bresse, Bugey, Valromey, and the Pays de Gex were rich compensations for Saluzzo. France gained a fertile province stretching far within her natural frontier; the fat capons of La Bresse were henceforth the choicest dainty of the Halles; the church of Brou, the most legitimate offspring of the union of Gothic and Renaissance art, the sepulchre of Savoyard dukes, now lay without the duchy; the very tomb of Margot, the relentless foe of France, was to become a French public monument.

The gain of France was not, however, universally recognised. The decadence of Spain was not yet foreseen, and the closure of the Alps left her to work her will on Italy. Henry had long been fostering an Italian opposition. Venice was the first power to recognise his accession; the rulers of Tuscany and Mantua turned towards France; the pope had rejoiced at Lesdiguières' victories, although his harquebusiers ate meat on fast days. These allies seemed now abandoned. The duke of Savoy was still regarded as a Spanish agent. Lesdiguières had long protested against playing the game of Spain, against the cession of Saluzzo, the surrender of French claims, the betrayal of Italy. 'Henry,' he exclaimed, 'had made peace like a huckster, and the duke of Savoy like a king.' After the signature he besought his master on his knees that he would not so dishonourably desert the states of Italy. The 'Première Savoisienne,' a pamphlet which he unquestionably inspired, cried shame upon the great kingdom which abandoned to a wretched kinglet of the Alps her arsenal and stronghold in Italy; was it not enough to have borne this mark upon her brow for twelve long years? France's true frontier was the Alpine chain, and this it was the king's duty to secure. Lesdiguières' protests were ascribed to interested motives; his fortunes depended upon war; he hoped to add to Dauphiné such territories as were torn from Savoy; he aspired to rule Saluzzo, and thus hold the key of Italy. M. Dufayard admits that self-advancement was always among his hero's motives, yet statesmen and patriots, Ossat and Du Plessis Mornay, concurred in condemning the peace of Lyons. How, it was asked, could the king trust a prince whose faithlessness was his heritage? Charles Emmanuel himself had vowed that he would never respect this treaty made without his knowledge and against his will. The peace found full favour alone with the overburdened natives of

Dauphiné, and with the Savoyard peasants rid at last of the false Dauphinois, the glutton fox who ate their chickens and their cheese.

The importance of Lesdiguières' further career is threefold. He is the autocratic administrator who wins the title of the Roi-Dauphin; he is the mediator between monarchy and freedom, between nationality and religion; and finally he is the propagandist of French influence in Italy. From 1601 until 1610 Lesdiguières was the sentinel of the Alps, and his vigilance insured the comparative repose of south-eastern France. Charles Emmanuel had never despaired of the dismemberment of France; he played no secondary part in the plots of Biron and Bouillon. The monarchy and Lesdiguières had no more irreconcilable enemy than the ex-leaguer governor of Grenoble, Albigny, upon whom the government of Savoy was ostentatiously conferred. Lesdiguières purposely exaggerated the danger as a corrective against a relapse of listlessness. He pressed for reinforcements, for more artillery, reported the massing of Savoyard troops, the march of Spanish regiments, the construction of pontoons. Well might Henry write when he applied for furlough, *Revenez bien vite en Dauphiné, car je suis en repos quand vous êtes dans ces quartiers-là, et je suis toujours en inquiétude quand vous êtes absent.* The Dauphinois was now a personage in Europe. Elizabeth held him in high esteem. The princes of Brandenburg, Hesse, and Baden begged his friendship. Maurice of Nassau would fain serve at his side. His intercourse with Swiss and Italian states was close and constant; his activity extended from the Var to the Valtellina, from Vaud to Geneva. His estate at Coppet gave him a *pied-à-terre* in the Vatican of reform. Geneva had good reason to be grateful. He thwarted Spanish intrigues at Bern, he notified every movement of troops in Savoy. Before Albigny's celebrated escalade Lesdiguières' spies had described Semori's ladders, fitting one within the other, painted black, furnished with rollers, and tipped with cloth, that they might glide noiselessly along the walls. Sensitive and jealous of independence as the republic was, she bowed to the *pis-aller* of French protection. Further to the east Lesdiguières was already watching the Valtellina. Fuentes, governor of Milan, had built a fort upon the Adda to command the Splügen and Maloja; Spanish influence was spreading among the catholic population of the great German-Italian artery. At once Dauphinois agents were examining the strategic capabilities and the political peculiarities of the valley; their master was urging the Grisons to religious concessions to their catholic Italian subjects, to the union of political parties in the face of Spanish aggression.

In Italy, meanwhile, there were symptoms of a momentous change, the latter end of which was Solferino. Charles Emmanuel had hoped to wed his son to Philip III's heiress; the birth of an

heir disturbed his calculations. He wished at first to be rid of both France and Spain, to form a confederacy with the pope, Tuscany, and Venice under the protection of the emperor, England, and the Swiss. When Henry IV made advances he wrote to his son that he would never admit the traditional enemy to the heart of Piedmont, he could never trust a nation so fickle as the French. He soon realised, however, like more than one of his successors, that the lords of Lombardy could only be beaten by French aid. Fuentes alarmed him by the annexation of Finale, and by continued aggression in the Valtellina. Charles Emmanuel prepared to enter the great European combination against the Habsburgs, and nowhere found such warm support as with his most formidable enemy. With real diplomatic insight, Lesdiguières appreciated the full importance of this new opening. His king suggested that the aid granted to Savoy might be secret; Sully urged that Henry's strength should be thrown upon the Rhine. Lesdiguières would have no half measures; he insisted on vigorous action upon the Po as upon the Rhine. With councillor Bullion he signed the defensive and offensive alliance in a personal interview with Charles Emmanuel at Brusol. At the last moment Henry hesitated under pressure from the pope; Lesdiguières assured him that it was too late, his troops were at the foot of the Alps. On 19 May the army of Italy would have crossed the frontier, on the 15th the king was struck down by Ravaillac. His presage that the old Huguenot would outlive him was fulfilled.

We cannot here follow closely the shifting relations of the queen-regent and of Luynes towards Savoy. The former, notwithstanding her early protestations, was soon dazzled by the proposals for the Spanish marriages. Upon Lesdiguières devolved the hateful duty of personally informing Charles Emmanuel that the treaty of Brusol was broken. In vain the betrayed ally shrieked and wept and tore his beard, crying shame upon 'this miracle of treachery.' Equally in vain he tempted the marshal's loyalty by offering the chieftainship of a rebellious party, which should include Guise, Joyeuse, Nemours, and Epernon. Yet Lesdiguières' face was always turned towards Italy. He was intent by one means or other to force his court into an Italian war of which he should be the hero. Hence his apparent inconsistency when the death of Francesco Gonzaga left in dispute the inheritance of Montferrat, the prelude of the later war of Mantuan succession. With his encouragement Charles Emmanuel overran the marquisate, claiming it as a female fief for his granddaughter, Francesco's only child. Finding, however, that public feeling ran high against the duke, Lesdiguières besought his court to take immediate action against Savoy, and France clumsily combined with Spain in driving Charles Emmanuel from his conquest. The treaty of Asti which closed this

war was soon infringed by the shameless attack of Don Pedro de Toledo upon Piedmont. In a moment Lesdiguières was at Turin. The time was come, he cried, to pacify Italy and have done with Spain. Disavowed by his court he rejoined that his honour and his country's interest pledged him to the defence of Piedmont. While at Grenoble in the assembled parliament, the *greffier* read aloud the royal ordinance forbidding the army of the Alps to march, the drums were beating in the streets, and from the palace windows could be seen Lesdiguières' veterans defiling towards the bridges of the Isère. A more extraordinary example of the disjointed condition of France could scarcely be found. Seven thousand foot and five hundred horse followed a peer and marshal of France across the Alps to attack the king's ally. Nor is it less characteristic that, before the campaign on the Tanaro was closed, the general, publicly disavowed, was receiving private congratulatory letters from the new minister of foreign affairs. It was Richelieu's initiation in Italian politics. The schemes, however, of both minister and marshal were momentarily arrested by Concini's murder and the queen's disgrace. Louis XIII's favourite Luynes has been regarded as Richelieu's forerunner, as suggesting the political programme which the cardinal executed. This much is true that, with Concini's fall, France breathed a fresher air, and her renewed vigour was manifested in the revival of Italian interests. Lesdiguières was sent back to win his brilliant victory of Felizzano, and in six weeks to take five towns and kill or capture 6,000 Spaniards.

Luynes himself drifted in October 1617 into peace with Spain. Spanish aggression in Italy, however, depended little on Madrid. Toledo, Bedmar, and Osuna fought, robbed, and plotted on their own account, while Philip prayed and Lerma drafted treaties. Lesdiguières soon found his opportunity. In the early days of Spanish power Italians had looked to a Spanish governor for liberation, tempting Pescara with the crown of Italy or Naples. The melodrama was now revived. Osuna, viceroy of Naples, was the typical prancing proconsul of his day. He had defied Jesuits and Inquisition. With his colours flying from Spanish ships he had waged private war against Venice. To him had been attributed, rightly or wrongly, the mysterious plot to overthrow the republic. He had seen Don Pedro and Bedmar at length disgraced; he feared his own recall. The Neapolitan squadron was at his disposal; his mercenaries looked only to himself; he won the populace by rough treatment of the nobles, by promises to suppress the hated Alcabala. It was easy to enlist Lesdiguières and Charles Emmanuel in an impudent design upon the throne of Naples. Venice was vainly tempted by the traditional bait, the cession of Apulian towns. To no purpose Lesdiguières entreated, and the duke of Savoy stormed;

he would turn monk, he cried, if Venice let slip so fine a chance. The Lombard towns, wrote the marshal to his court, were ripe for revolt; all Italy would answer the call of France. A Franco-Savoyard corps was ready to embark the very moment that the viceroy should take the leap. But each feared the other, and there was a race in treachery. Luynes disavowed his promises. Osuna betrayed the marshal and the duke. The Savoyard envoy and Prince Philibert betrayed the viceroy. The fire-eating Osuna surrendered without stroke or shot to the cardinal Borgia. Naples learnt once more that Spain, if slack, was strong, and Italy that salvation came not from the south.

By Lesdiguières these years had not been wasted. He strove to commit his court to Savoyard interests by the marriage of the king's sister with the prince of Piedmont. He raised the cry of the natural union of France and Savoy—*germains par la ressemblance de leur complexion et la conformité de leur fortune.* Historians, diplomatists, patriots caught up the chorus. The court was plied with the ponderous erudition of Guillet, the persuasive eloquence of Sales. In vain ministers protested that France was taking a serpent to her bosom; vainly Christine implored that she might wed a king. Lesdiguières conquered, consoling the princess by her royal reception at Grenoble. The rejoicings of France and Savoy echoed throughout Italy; the marriage was held to be the beginning of the end of Spanish sway. Action was indeed delayed by the outbreak of religious war. But if Lesdiguières served the crown against his co-religionists, like Coligny he ceaselessly urged the king to turn catholic and Huguenot swords against the national enemy.

Great as was Lesdiguières' activity in Italy, this had been by no means the only vent for his indomitable energy; since 1598 his career was closely intertwined with the tangled skein of party politics. His independent position in Dauphiné laid him open at once to temptation and suspicion. The former he could resist, for he was passionately devoted to the unity of France and the person of his king. Suspicion was harder to set aside. Even Sully, partly from personal jealousy, partly from ministerial fear of provincial autonomy, communicated his disquietude to the king. Henry looked askance at his over-mighty subject with his companies of guards, whose strong places commanded Dauphiné, whose arsenal at Vizille could arm 10,000 foot and 3,000 horse, whose alliances extended to Savoy, Switzerland, and Germany, and whose influence among Huguenots was all-pervading. *Que diriez-vous,* he once said, *de monsieur de Lesdiguières qui se veut faire dauphin?* Yet facts were stubborn. Royal commissions reported that the lieutenant-governor was scrupulously loyal. His prompt obedience to the king's orders against his co-religionists in Orange forced even

Sully to retract. Henry showed his penetration when with some presage of his fate he commended his child to the great Dauphinois.

After Henry's death it became increasingly difficult to reconcile loyalty with religion. The Huguenots would utilise the weakness of the government to extort concessions, while the crown would minimise or invalidate the privileges of the edict of Nantes. Within the Huguenot party divisions of long standing were accentuated, aristocratic and democratic sections watched each other, the nobles resenting the political ambitions of the ministers, the latter suspecting the princes' devotion and resisting their supremacy. France was a prey to an oligarchy of blood-royal or adventure, and every faction-chief bid high for the support of a religious party which in spite of its divisions retained a military and political organisation. Lesdiguières' duties fortunately removed him from court intrigues ; he had moreover, with all the great nobles, causes of dispute ; for the dead king alone had he any personal affection. Within Dauphiné he balanced the clerical party in the Huguenot synod by giving increased influence to the nobles. His autocratic disposition disliked the ministers' political pretensions, while he had reasons, not of the purest, for resenting their pastoral interference. In the party generally he was regarded as a Huguenot d'État. Upon the assembly of Saumur he urged the necessity of scrupulous obedience to the crown, yet he frankly reproached the regent with her breach of faith, imploring her to be honest and generous towards the Huguenots. He acted usually with Sully, but always with Du Plessis Mornay, and formed with the latter and with Rohan in 1612 a close union which caused much disquietude to the crown. Lesdiguières' breach with his party may be said to date from the assembly of 1615. After the fiasco of the last estates-general of old France, Condé had broken into open revolt, and the court had selected Grenoble as the seat of the Huguenot assembly, that it might be removed from Condé's influence and be subject to Lesdiguières' control. No one detested Concini and the Spanish alliance more keenly than the Dauphinois. Yet he warned the assembly that if it left Grenoble and held out its hand to Condé, a *feu de paille* might blaze into a dangerous civil war, and by its own act the great edict be torn in shreds. The extremists, however, had their way. The assembly moved to Nîmes and thence to Rochelle. To the last it implored Lesdiguières not to desert the churches, with whom he would always find the rank and the honour that were his due. He replied that the churches must return to their duty, and that then he would never separate his cause from theirs. The rebellion was after all a *feu de paille*, yet it had estranged Lesdiguières from his party, and had caused the determination of the young Richelieu to have done with the political pretensions of the Huguenots.

Against Mary and Concini the Huguenots may be regarded as

having taken the offensive. Luynes, more audacious, and more subject to Jesuit influences, put them on their defence. The king's action in personally reinstating catholicism in Béarn, and in reducing his father's kingdom to the position of a French province, was a direct provocation to civil war. As the Huguenots had utilised the revolt of Condé against the queen, so now they supported the queen and Epernon against Luynes. At the assembly of Rochelle the scabbard was thrown aside; the leaders of the party could no longer compromise. Rohan had rated the mutinous democracy for its disobedience, but refused to desert their cause. Lesdiguières placed his sword at the service of the crown, but before marching he ostentatiously communicated at Charenton on Easter day, and swore to the consistory to live and die in the reformed faith. With pathetic hopefulness the Huguenots in their paper constitution nominated their old chief to the command of Dauphiné, Provence, and Burgundy, but with politic foresight they associated with him another Huguenot of historic name, Montbrun.

Of this disastrous war the hero was not Lesdiguières, but Rohan. The *renard Dauphinois* cheated indeed Du Plessis Mornay out of the possession of Saumur, he planted the batteries against the walls of Saint-Jean d'Angeli, hallowed in Huguenot story. Yet he was well-nigh a prisoner in the catholic camp, and the king's personal kindness alone kept him from desertion. Even Louis, however, hesitated to entrust to him the siege of Rochelle. Before the ramparts of Montauban Lesdiguières ate his heart out in naction. While the Huguenot chiefs displayed all their old resource and resolution, the greatest captain of France was reduced to the criticism of the tiro Luynes and the foolhardy young Mayenne. The catholic generals assured the king, now that the marshal-general was in his dotage, now that he was in treasonable communication with the enemy. At length the Huguenots of Dauphine declared for the rebellion. Lesdiguières, despatched to his own province, was once more himself. By rapid and resolute movements, by dexterous diplomacy and well-timed liberality, he conquered or conciliated his opponents; he prepared with Guise and Montmorency to encircle and crush Rohan in the narrowing limits of his power. At this moment Luynes died and peace became possible. Negotiations were entrusted to Lesdiguières and Rohan. Personal sympathies and mutual esteem made them the easier. If the peace of Montpellier, the prelude of foreign war, was yet for six months delayed, the blame was due to neither.

Posterity will always differ in its estimate of the conduct of these two great men in the war which was, and which both felt to be, a momentous crisis for France. Both monarchy and Huguenots were in the wrong; which of two false tracks was an honest man to choose? Was national union or independence of thought the

greater aim? Was the centralisation of power too dearly bought by the sacrifice of provincial liberties? Of each the panegyrist might reasonably write, *Il a toujours cherché l'honneur dans le devoir;* and of each the detractor might naturally reply—

> His honour rooted in dishonour stood,
> And faith unfaithful kept him falsely true.

Meanwhile Lesdiguières had taken the fatal leap. It is easy to justify his policy, it is difficult to pardon his perversion. In every historic somersault, be it political or religious, analysis of motives must needs be arbitrary. Lesdiguières had a passion for the unity of France; it may have been impossible to maintain this from within his party. Yet unquestionably there were less creditable causes. Lesdiguières had married not for love but comfort. His bride was rich, but dull and shy. Far different was Marie Vignon, the wife of a Lyonese silk merchant. When the Huguenot chief became a widower he took his mistress to his home. But she was not content with her anomalous position. Her husband was assassinated by the Savoyard agent Allard, and it is impossible to exonerate Lesdiguières. His church indignantly refused to celebrate a marriage. Prayers were put up for his repentance, deputations besought him to purge his household of the unclean thing. The catholics had no such scruples; the union was blessed by the archbishop of Embrun. Marie Vignon never forgave the ministers; she lavished all her fascination to convert her elderly adorer to the church which unceasingly caressed her. To Gregory XV she expressed her heartfelt joy on seeing *ses espérances heureusement terminées, ses souhaits accomplis et ses soins récompensés.*

Apart from love, ambition had been Lesdiguières' pole-star. Even in 1612 he had been suspected of serving the interests of his party for a duchy-peerage. In 1621 the court had tried to discredit him with the Huguenots by bribing him to catholicism with the sword of constable, which it never intended to confer. Luynes having once committed him induced him to refuse the honour, to propose, indeed, that it should be conferred upon himself. Henceforth every one knew Lesdiguières' price. The paschal communion at Charenton was the farce which preceded the comedy. Upon Luynes' death the supreme honour could no longer be denied without risking the royal power in the south-eastern provinces. To a great soldier the bribe was also great. The bargain was quickly struck. On 23 July, 1622, Lesdiguières made his solemn abjuration at Grenoble, and received in return the constable's sword. All France and all Europe congratulated the old soldier on the honour which his military talents well deserved. Rohan, however, nobly spoke his mind: *J'ay aussy appris, monsieur, que le Roy vous avoit honoré de la charge de Conestable de France, dont je vous félicite;*

bien fasché néanmoins que vos longs et grands services ne vous l'ayent peu acquérir sans géhenner votre conscience. The conversion was not one of which the catholic church can boast. The instruments were corruption and the condonation of adultery and murder.

It is to Lesdiguières' credit that with his conversion he did not abandon his conciliatory policy. He was, if possible, the more considerate to the Huguenots, retaining his old captains, continuing his annual gifts to the Grenoble pastors, protecting the Dauphinois churches, and saving the Vaudois from Savoyard persecutions. *Questa manifattura,* wrote the nuncio of the negotiations of Montpellier, *è stata del contestabile il quale è peggiore Ugonotto che quando ne portava il nome.* In 1626 his entreaties to the king to spare Rochelle provoked Richelieu's accusation that *le bonhomme peu zélé & Catholique de légère teinture* had purposely misconducted the war in Italy to force the king to treat with his subjects. Lesdiguières' catholicism was indeed little deeper than his Calvinism. The very tales of his deathbed illustrate the sceptical irony with which his new religion was regarded by the late Huguenot d'État. Whether or not his conversion was a crime, it was undoubtedly an error. An octogenarian does not lightly belie the principles of his life. From the moment of the change the constable's fortunes seem to fade. It was as a catholic that he fought his disastrous campaign against Genoa. His catholicism caused the first breach of the peace of religion in his province. His last months were occupied in combating his subordinates, in extinguishing the flame that had spread from Rochelle and leapt the Rhône. He corrupted rather than conquered his Huguenot opponents, teaching to Brison and to Gouvernet the lesson which he had learnt himself.

Yet outwardly Lesdiguières' conversion was the climax of his fortunes, and the peace of Montpellier the triumph of his policy. He was now constable of France, an important factor in the council, the natural leader of French armies. Meanwhile the two lines of Habsburg, acting in close concert, had crushed the Grisons. Under the compromise of 1623 papal troops had occupied the Valtellina fortresses. Urban VIII extended the term of occupation from three months to eighteen; his object was merely to shield the Spaniards from attack. With Richelieu as first minister and Lesdiguières as constable, France was less long-suffering. Yet she would not commit herself to war with Spain. While Cœuvres acted in the Valtellina, while employment was found for the Austrian Habsburgs in the Palatinate and Flanders, Lesdiguières and Charles Emmanuel combined in their long-designed attack on Genoa. This republic, nominally independent, was the bank of Spain, and her watergate to Italy. No partition treaty between France and Savoy was absolutely determined, but it was understood that France should annex

Genoa and the eastern Riviera, and Charles Emmanuel the Milanese.[4] It is noticeable that Lesdiguières' chief interest lay in Italy and the seaboard; he would surrender Bresse if the western Riviera were also conceded to France. But to this proposal, as to the annexation of Montferrat by Piedmont, Louis XIII was fundamentally opposed.

The old constable crossed the Alps in January of 1625. For the first time he commanded a large national force, comprising picked regiments from all France. He was promised the co-operation of the fleets of the duke of Guise and Maurice of Nassau. Yet this was the least fortunate of all Lesdiguières' campaigns. From the first the dual control caused disagreement. The constable would have made Savona the base of operations and here awaited the Dutch-Provençal fleet; Charles Emmanuel insisted on a direct attack on Genoa, and Lesdiguières' commission compelled him to acquiesce. Moving on parallel lines the duke ascended the Stura valley, while Lesdiguières followed the more ordinary route along the Lemmo, utilised by the modern railway from Alessandria to Genoa. Charles Emmanuel stormed Rossiglione, and nothing but the difficulties of the Col di Mazone lay between him and Voltri. The peasants of the southern slopes fled into the capital, the Genoese merchants despatched their valuables to Leghorn. Meanwhile the bulk of the Genoese forces were concentrated in advance of the more practicable Bocchetta pass, and Lesdiguières was checked by the lines of Gavi. This position Charles Emmanuel turned, and routing the main Genoese army at Voltaggio in its rear he climbed the Bocchetta, and saw the Riviera at his feet. Genoa was within a few hours' march; its fall seemed certain. The constable however, experienced in mountain warfare, refused to leave an untaken position in his rear, and the capture of Gavi cost a fortnight. Again the duke insisted on advance. Again Lesdiguières refused. The allies, he urged, had neither transport nor supplies, no reinforcements were at hand, the Dutch and Provençal squadrons had not left their ports, the Apennines once crossed a Spanish advance from the Milanese would cut off retreat, the troops would lie starving round the walls of Genoa subject to attack from Sicily and Naples. The delay was fatal. News arrived that the Huguenots were in arms at Rochelle, that the Dutch fleet was detained to fight them. The Austrians overrunning the Valtellina set the Spaniards free to act upon the flank of the allies. Spanish troops and Spanish gold were pouring into Genoa; enthusiasm had replaced despair. The allies' retreat was one long disaster. The peasants, brutally ill-used by the French soldiery, fell upon the stragglers,

[4] This partition scheme of the Roy-dauphin curiously resembles the abortive treaty of 1446, by which the last independent dauphin—afterwards Louis XI—agreed to partition Lombardy with Savoy. To France was assigned Genoa with its Riviera, as far as Lucca and the territory south of the Po, to Savoy the district north of the Po and west of the Adda.

hamstrung the teams, and looted the baggage-trains. Desertion and disease decimated the ranks. Large garrisons were foolishly left along the route with no option but surrender. The Franco-Savoyard divisions, with an overwhelming Spanish force upon their heels, was ignominiously driven within the walls of Asti. Piedmont was only saved by Feria's delay. The duke and constable recovering confidence, and learning the lesson of concord, made a forward movement, and holding both banks of the Po at Verrua and Crescentino checked the Spanish advance on Asti or Vercelli. Here their shattered regiments redeemed their reputation, and before winter fell were rescued by French reinforcements. Once more Lesdiguières raised the cry of the conquest of the Milanese. It was but a hollow echo. His marvellous vitality had at length been sapped by fever; the conduct of the retreat, even the defence of Verrua, he had been forced to leave to others. The French government had no taste for another fall with Spain. On Christmas-eve the constable bade farewell to his old ally and enemy, promising to return in spring. But he was never again to cross the Alps. The treaty of Monçon destroyed Lesdiguières' hopes. Charles Emmanuel, cursing once more the prodigious treachery of France, turned his restless energy to the formation of a national Italian league. The last service which he imposed upon his friend was the disbandment of the French regiments for which Italy had no further use.

If France, indeed, had any genuine interest in Italy, Lesdiguières was right and Richelieu was wrong. The statesman missed the supreme moment which the soldier would have seized. The paltry particularism, the mountaineer's short-sighted greed of the house of Savoy, are the commonplace of French historians. But Charles Emmanuel was, until the present century, the one sovereign of his race who was rather Italian than Savoyard. Shrewd and unscrupulous as the third ruler of his name, he had the soaring imagination, the speculative spirit, the lack of which in his descendant was the despair of Argenson. He was by nature gifted for the *rôle* which painful practice has taught the later members of his house to play. By tongue and pen he strove to revive the sentiment of Italian nationality, while round his uplifted sword might well have rallied the broken remnants of Italian valour. This Lesdiguières alone had recognised. Franco-Savoyard treaties have ever been writ in sand; Lesdiguières would have carved their clauses on Alps and Apennines. Richelieu's Italian policy has been constantly belauded, yet by him the hold of Spain on Italy was not a whit relaxed, while Savoy, the single strong native power, was wellnigh annihilated. The cardinal did but tread on the heels of Spain, the constable would have struck fiercely at Milan and Naples, the two eyes of the Spanish giant.

Notwithstanding the failures of his last campaign Lesdiguières' military gifts are beyond all doubt. He was eminently a scientific soldier, trusting nothing to chance. He never fought without careful survey of the ground, without full consultation with his officers. Before a campaign opened stores were collected, magazines established, the medical service organised, contracts for baking signed. The service of spies was reduced to a system, his horse scientifically trained in outpost and reconnoitring duties. The pioneer and engineer departments formed an integral part of the military organism. Lesdiguières with La Noue believed that success depended not on numbers, but on selection of men and officers and on drill. Among his most trusted lieutenants were found the proudest nobles of Dauphiné, side by side with adventurers, with sons of peasants and small tradesmen risen from the ranks, and this in an age when Sully was thought courageous for bestowing commissions upon *roturiers*. The artillery and cavalry arms were almost revolutionised. Mule batteries of light bronze guns were substituted for the heavy artillery of the day. The proportion of light horse and mounted harquebusiers in the regular cavalry was largely increased. The campaign once opened, Lesdiguières delivered his blows with extraordinary rapidity; he was versatile in expedients, modifying his plans with a minimum of confusion, appreciating in a moment his enemies' mistakes, varying his tactics to meet national or personal characteristics. Above all, though freely exposing his life in action, and sharing with his privates every hardship of mountain warfare, he had none of the false sense of honour or the foolhardiness of his contemporaries. He thought it no shame to decline a combat, to retreat before superior force; he would never have lost a Jarnac or a Moncontour. If La Noue earned the title of the Bayard of the civil wars, Lesdiguières may well be called their Duguesclin.

The administration of Lesdiguières in Dauphiné well illustrates the absolute power of a French provincial ruler. The independence of these great officials had grown beyond all bounds during the civil wars; they were forming a new stratum of feudalism closely resembling that which was the original foundation of French nobility. Large landed estates within the province increased their official importance, and they strained every nerve to establish the hereditary principle. A proposal was actually made to Henry IV that the governorships should be hereditary fiefs held on military tenure. This absolutism Lesdiguières in his distant government carried to its extreme. Even the king would complain of his system and his manners, reproaching him *d'user d'autorité absolue, et de parler toujours en grondant comme les vieillards.* The Dauphinois had, indeed, little of the Gascon's geniality and tact. He possessed, however, the talent for detail, the mark of a

magnificent physique; to him his master's fits of indolence were unknown. What Sully was attempting to do for France, Lesdiguières performed for Dauphiné; for the feverish exhaustion from which factions were still suffering even his high-handed despotism was a wholesome tonic. In him every provincial institution found its master. He held the estates and fixed the contributions. The Dauphinois law court, the parliament of Grenoble, had led to the last the catholic extremists. It was now bent to Lesdiguières' will, holding its sessions only when he was present. If he enforced impartiality where he was indifferent, scant justice could be obtained against himself or his officials. All symptoms of urban independence, which both in the Huguenot party and the league had threatened the unity of the state, were rigorously suppressed. The town consuls were elected only with his consent; his *surveillance* extended even to the parish councils. While forcing the peasants of the Champsaur to buy their wine from his estates, he forbade the consuls of Grenoble to grant differential duties to the Graisivaudan vineyards. In spite of the resistance of the local capitalists he created a bank of Grenoble; he knew, he said, their interests better than themselves. More popular was the magnificent embankment of the Isère and the Drac, the building of bridges and quays, the erection of fountains, the widening of streets and squares. The town became not only a stately capital, but a first-class fortress. Throughout the province labourers were busy on roads and bridges, communication with Italy was improved, the fairs of Briançon stimulated, village shooting clubs encouraged, and police organised. This was not without its cost, for improvements are often dearly bought. The province, moreover, groaned under the standing army which was the open secret of Lesdiguières' power. He attempted, indeed, to protect peasants from soldiers, and soldiers from officers. But even when the troops did not plunder the country-side they lived on it, while the towns were forced to exempt the officers from the *taille* and municipal imposts. If at the constable's table guests found always mutton and mushrooms, his harquebusiers also fared daintily at the villagers' expense. Each private had his bed with pillows, counterpane, and two clean sheets a fortnight; his table must have a snowy cloth with two and a half pounds of bread and a jug of wine thereon.

Lesdiguières was greatly feared, yet he was not quite unpopular nor unkindly. Richelieu once termed him an *abîme de bonté*. He felt strongly for widows, orphans, and broken-down soldiers. In his own palace he presided over a charity organisation society, the outcome of which was a definite poor-rate. Popularity is gained either by the geniality of the indolent or by the industry of the importunate. It was a far cry to Paris, yet every Dauphinois who wished a job perpetrated found that his representative rarely refused

and never forgot a commission. The magnates nicknamed Lesdiguières the *avocat*, yet they realised that his sentiments were aristocratic. He hotly supported the gentry in the burning question of the *taille*, insisting that it was personal and not real, attached not to land as such, but to land owned by *roturiers*. He defended the nobles' interests and arbitrated in their quarrels. If a nobleman loved a lady or her dower, Lesdiguières arranged the match. Above all he loyally carried out the prohibition of duelling, which, if contemporaries may be believed, had caused more loss of noble blood than civil war or religious massacre. Men grumbled but were grateful. Voluntary duellists form a small proportion of their class. Those who have contributed to anarchy often welcome its suppression.

For the execution of the provisions of Nantes Lesdiguières' comparative indifference, his absence of religious zeal, pre-eminently fitted him. His industry and love of detail enabled him to discuss and decide those apparently trifling questions upon which religious peace depends. He gave a proportionate representation to the Huguenots in the town councils, and fixed their share of taxation. He divided the cemeteries, gave the use of the bells to each congregation alternately, and insisted on the common use of hospitals. In education the passions of the time justified a rigid secularism, worthy of Paul Bert; in the public schools it was forbidden to touch upon religious instruction. In every town where catholic worship had been suppressed Lesdiguières restored it. When asked if he would reinstate it at Die and Montélimar, where his own harquebusiers had expelled the priests, '*Oui*,' he replied, '*et je l'y ferai plutôt entrer à coups de canon*.' On the other hand he provided that temples should be built wherever they were authorised by the Edict. In some cases he permitted prayer without preaching, in others prohibited psalm-singing in the street; in others the temples must have no windows towards the road. Butchers were ordered not to hang out their meat on authorised fast days. Many ordinances show a puritanical character. Blasphemy and games of dice, cards or ninepins were forbidden in the neighbourhood of churches and chapels, taverns were closed during service. Public balls were prohibited, and at private dances decency and modesty were required from those who indulged in such profane amusements. Questions more difficult and important were the return of exiles, the restoration of their property, the recrudescence of religious hate, as when the catholic and Huguenot nobles of Montélimar interchanged a series of challenges which might readily have ended in civil war. The chief stumbling-block was however the restoration of secularised church property. This had frequently changed hands, was the subject of mortgage, dower, or settlement. A convent had become an arsenal which could not be spared. A large proportion had fallen

into the hands of influential nobles, and especially of the lieutenant-governor himself. In such cases the church obtained but scant restitution. Lesdiguières could reconcile party with party, but not his profits with his principles. Yet, all deductions made, his work was great; in a province where religious war had been most cruel, religious parties most evenly divided, there was no fresh outbreak until Lesdiguières by his conversion drove the Huguenots to despair. A quarter of a century of peace was no small tribute to the administration of one who had lived and thriven on war.

Lesdiguières rose from rags to purple and fine linen. He amassed an enormous fortune by the worst of means. His possessions spread from his native village over the whole district of Champsaur to every part of Dauphiné, to all quarters of France. Even in Switzerland Coppet received its first title to distinction from Lesdiguières' possession. During the wars the value of land had rapidly depreciated, and the speculator had every opportunity. Many of Lesdiguières' estates were however robbed from the church, confiscated from enemies, bought from the state at his own price, acquired or retained by scandalous terrorism over the law courts. The purchase-money was obtained by the pillage or ransom of catholic populations, the loot of Savoyard villages or towns. On the mere rumour of the Huguenots' advance the merchants of North Italy hid their wares. Friends fared little better; requisition was as ruinous as plunder. Traditions long survived that the women of Champsaur lost their hair in carrying stones upon their heads for the château of Vizille, that the peasants who resisted the lord's commands were told that they must come or burn. From the state Lesdiguières was an indefatigable beggar. His letters complain ceaselessly of his 'honest poverty,' and crave tolls and salt monopolies, judicial fines, and charges on the *taille*. Theft was not neglected. The great official appropriated a sum transmitted from Languedoc to Geneva to be invested for the augmentation of pastors' stipends. We must admit with his biographer that our hero *ne ressemblait que trop à ces hommes de proie de toute taille et de toute origine, pour qui la concussion était une habitude et le vol une tradition.*

If Lesdiguières made his money like a thief, he spent it like a king. Vizille was his Fontainebleau, with its huge park, its dragon fountains, its long gallery painted with the victories of its master and his king, and above the door the great bas-relief of Lesdiguières on horseback. His Louvre was the palace of the treasury at Grenoble. Here his visitors admired the orangeries, the botanical rarities, the gardens peopled with statues, the coverlets of cloth of gold, the mirrored chamber. Upon his cannon were cast his arms together with the king's; he coined money, which was the very symbol of royal power. Though not, as Monluc and La Noue, himself a writer, Lesdiguières appreciated letters, stocking his library as

carefully as his arsenal. He read the classical historians, giving the preference to Plutarch; Thou and Aubigné were among his correspondents. *Que ne dois-je pas à ma mère?* he would often say, *à ma mère qui m'a si bien fait élever?* Vizille, moreover, not only contained a fine collection of pictures, but became a school of artistic industries to which the sculptors Jean and Jacob Richier have given abiding fame. Here Lesdiguières lived among his people in the grand manner. His long grave face, his bright eyes, his broad brow with its deep furrow, the short hair and pointed beard, the upright figure which age never bent, harmonised well with *cette maison de paix, d'honneur et de courtoisie.* For the constable's end the hardships of the Grenoble campaign were probably responsible. His splendid constitution repeatedly threw off the fever, but at length on 28 Sept. 1626 he died.

Born the son of a petty Dauphinois notary, Lesdiguières had lived to play *le roy-dauphin.* As his career widened his capacities had developed. The soldier of fortune became the statesman, serving the interests of his country as skilfully as he had served those of his party and his own. If posthumous fame be added to wealth and dignity, he was, perhaps, the greatest adventurer in an age of rapid fortunes—a beggar mounted, it may be, but one whose incomparable seat deserved the mount.

E. Armstrong.

Cromwell's Major-Generals

AMONG the experiments of the Commonwealth and Protectorate the rule of the major-generals in 1655–7 possesses a threefold interest and importance. First, it throws much light on Cromwell's general methods, both of regular government and of meeting emergencies. Secondly, though an exceptional and temporary expedient, it teaches us something about the working of normal and permanent local institutions in England during the Commonwealth. Thirdly, it illustrates vividly that conflict between parliamentary and extra-parliamentary government which was so prominent a feature of the period, and which, in popular estimation, is its leading feature.

In considering the pretexts for instituting the major-generals it is necessary to recall the state of public affairs in the early part of 1655. On 19 Jan. 1654–5 Cromwell dissolved the first Protectorate parliament, because it persisted in regarding itself as a constituent assembly, with a right to amend the Instrument of Government of December 1653, while the Lord Protector maintained that such a claim was barred by the Instrument itself, to which parliament was subordinate. Between January 1654–5 and September 1656 no parliament was called together, and England was ruled strictly in accordance with the Instrument of Government as it stood. This interval was a time of serious unrest, which made itself felt both in constitutional opposition and armed insurrection. The constitutional opposition turned on the legality of such extra-parliamentary taxation, as, by the Instrument, the Lord Protector was entitled to impose;[1] and it gathered chiefly round what students of the time know as 'Cony's case,' which ended in a victory for Cromwell. The armed insurrection was more formidable. It was not the orthodox republican, such as Ludlow, whom Cromwell had most to fear. The government was attacked on two sides by forces ready to meet sword with sword. On the one hand were the fanatical republicans, or Levellers, led by such men as Wildman and Sexby, who hated Cromwell for his exalted position

[1] *E.g.*, in accordance with the 27th clause of the Instrument, the Protector and council on 8 Feb. 1654–5 fixed the assessment for the army and navy at 60,000*l.* per month, to be continued until 24 June.

and conservative ways; on the other were the royalists, ever on the watch, keeping their champion in readiness on the nearest continental shores. These two forces, so dissimilar in antecedents and principles, were ready to combine against the king-like 'usurper.' In his speech before the dissolution in January 1654–5 Cromwell asserted that the government had in their hands a treasonable correspondence between the Cavaliers and the Levellers. At the same time he referred ominously to the rapid generation of discontent, which he attributed to the malign influence of the parliament. While parliament was weakening authority by fruitless debates the Cavaliers had been collecting arms, and Charles Stewart had been issuing military commissions and giving the command of castles to his followers.[2] The widespread unrest had more than one centre. Early in February 1654–5 Wildman was arrested by Major Butler near Marlborough in the act of dictating an insurrectionary manifesto, and imprisoned in Chepstow Castle. In March a threatening royalist outbreak in Yorkshire under Sir Henry Slingsby and Sir Richard Mauleverer was suppressed, and the two chief insurgents were arrested. Above all, on 11 March 1655, 200 Cavaliers under Wagstaff and Penruddocke entered Salisbury during the assizes, and seized the judges in their beds. They hoped to rouse the inhabitants, but being disappointed they moved from Salisbury to South Molton, in Devonshire, where they were overtaken and defeated by the government forces under Crook.[3]

Cromwell's government being thus surrounded by dangers, it was hampered by two weaknesses, one civil and the other military. The civil weakness was in local administration. Local government was mainly exercised by two bodies, viz. the justices of assize and the justices of the peace. In the seventeenth century the justices of assize performed administrative acts and exercised a general administrative oversight in a way which has become entirely obsolete. The circuit system was disorganised by the outbreak of the civil war, and between 1642 and 1646 it was suspended altogether. Although the circuits were resumed and continued after the close of the war, it was not till the beginning of

[2] Carlyle's *Cromwell*, speech v.

[3] In the course of the spring and summer, before the major-generals were all appointed and settled in their districts, many arrests of individual royalists, and of persons to whom the most shadowy suspicion of royalist tendencies might be supposed to cling, were made. One interesting instance is the arrest of the much-enduring Sir Ralph Verney in his house at Claydon, on 13 June 1655, and his detention in London. Sir Ralph's letters describing the circumstances are among the Verney MSS. and have been kindly brought to my notice by Mr. S. R. Gardiner.

For the details of the insurrection see Godwin's *English Commonwealth*, vol. iv. chap. xii. The evidence as to its extent and importance has been examined by Messrs. Palgrave and C. H. Firth in the *Quarterly Review* for April 1886, and in the English Historical Review, 1888 and 1889.

the Commonwealth that the judicial system entered on a new lease of life and vigour. The justices of the peace, deprived of the indispensable supervision of the circuits, and convulsed by the troubles of the time, had become to a large extent useless during and immediately after the civil war. The county magistracy was reformed by a new commission of the peace in 1651, but it was affected by a weakness which no mere legislation could cure. The government had no real hold on the landed gentry, from whose ranks the justices were taken. The county magistracy could not be restored to its old strength until the supreme government could found itself on the affections of the country population. The imperfection of local administration was brought into prominence by the Puritan standard of manners to which the government desired the behaviour of the people to be conformed. Such puritanism was as little rooted in the average English heart as republicanism; and Cromwell might well call out for new agents of his will.

From a military point of view, too, the Commonwealth was at first weakened by the inadequacy of the local militia. The reconstruction of this was accordingly undertaken early, and was completed in the beginning of 1651. In quiet times such a force might have been adequate to the maintenance of local order; but when, as in 1655, the very existence of the government was threatened on all sides, and armed conspiracy was at work everywhere, it was necessary to have an omnipresent and always ready military force, including cavalry. The regular standing army had its hands full, and unless a standing local force of horse and foot could be provided, the country districts would fall into dangerous anarchy.

I.

Although the weakness of the government was chiefly felt at a distance from the metropolis, Cromwell's attention was called first to the condition of London, where the need of efficient and permanent defence was obvious. On 15 Feb. 1655—*i.e.* not much more than a fortnight after the dissolution, and about a month before the outrage at Salisbury—the Protector issued a commission to the lord mayor and the recorder of London, to the sheriffs and a large number of the aldermen (one of whom was Major-General Philip Skippon), to Colonel John Barkstead, lieutenant of the Tower, and to twenty-three other military officers and gentlemen, to be militia commissioners for the city of London.[4] He alleged that the enemies of the public peace were still restless and active, and that a great part of the army would therefore be needed at a distance. In order

[4] *Cal. State Papers* (Dom.), 1655, pp. 43-4. Cf. *Mercurius Politicus*, No. 245.

that the capital might not be left undefended, the commissioners were ordered to raise an armed force, to be commanded by officers chosen on consultation with the Lord Protector. The duties of the force to be thus raised were carefully prescribed. It was (1) to suppress all rebellions, insurrections, tumults, and unlawful assemblies; (2) to seize, disarm, and slay all who levied forces against the government; (3) to disarm all persons known to be Roman catholics, as well as all who were reputed dangerous or seditious, and to give their arms to the well-affected. Such a commission, considered as a piece of administrative machinery, was no novelty. By the act of 1650, in which the militia of the Commonwealth had its origin, commissions, similar to this one, were substituted in counties for the lords-lieutenant; and on them were imposed similar administrative responsibilities.

The London commissioners quickly resolved to raise three regiments of foot.[5] On 9 March the Protector ordered them to raise and arm a force of horse under Skippon's command and that of officers appointed by him, to obey the same orders as those given to the foot. This was the month of the Salisbury plot and other revolutionary explosions in various parts of England, and Cromwell and the council rapidly resolved to extend their plan of defence from London to the counties, and to make the new militia something like a national force. The method adopted in the capital was closely followed. Commissioners were appointed and instructed in a large number of the counties and in several of the principal towns. In the counties these commissioners were the leading men, civil and military, of the district, often including the high sheriff and generally including justices of the peace. In the towns the mayors and many of the aldermen seem to have been generally included. By the middle of March twenty-two commissions were issued, viz. for Dorset, Cheshire, Chester, Durham, Staffordshire, Suffolk, Essex, the three ridings of Yorkshire, Northamptonshire and Rutland, Cambridgeshire, the Isle of Ely, Hertfordshire, Lancashir , Leicestershire, Monmouthshire, South Wales, the city of York, Bristol, and Huntingdonshire. The numbers on the commissions were on the whole, but not invariably, proportioned to the size and population of the districts, and ranged from nine for Chester to twenty-three for South Wales, twenty-four for Lancashire and for Suffolk, and twenty-six for Northants and Rutland.[6]

As a specimen we may take the Dorset commission and instructions, which were issued on 14 March. The commissioners were to be militia commissioners, and were appointed because 'the enemies are raising new troubles and now robbing and plundering the people.' They were to inquire into conspiracies and secret meetings (the

[5] *Cal. S. P.* (Dom.), 1654–5, p. 72. [6] *Ibid.* pp. 78–9.

justices of the peace on the commissions being ordered to take information on oath of what had been spoken, done, written, printed, or published against the peace); to disarm and seize the horses of papists, royalists, and other rebellious persons; to exercise a careful espionage on strangers; and to confiscate all stray arms and ammunition to the use of the state. They were to require the co-operation of the sheriff and the ordinary civil magistracy, and to correspond with the 'commanders of the forces,' who should aid them on application. They were to raise a military force, commissions for field officers being sent to them for the purpose, and the said officers being ordered to appoint subordinates on the approval of the militia commissioners. The force was to be supported by a tax imposed on the 'malignant' and disaffected; it was to be carefully trained and mustered, and to act with great stringency in the suppression of rebellion.[7]

When these instructions are compared with the brief and bald London commission, they show how much, under the stress of events, the design had been developed and defined. The espionage of doubtful persons and strangers is made more constant and formidable; the clauses bearing on disarmament and the use of arms are of greater stringency; the interference with individual liberty is serious throughout. Above all, the combination of civil and military duty and responsibility is made more prominent and carried out more completely. Not only is there the same blending of soldiers and civilians in the Dorset commission as in the London one, not only is there the same military sanction attached to civil duties, but there is express provision for the co-operation of the sheriff and magistrates with the militia commissioners. Above all, the prominence given to the justices of the peace in this commission and in other ones, and their deliberate inclusion in the scheme, deserve the most careful notice.[8]

Thus, then, before the end of March 1655, a vigorous militia, or at least the new machinery for providing it, was in full operation in England and part of Wales. In each district, whether a county or a town, or more than one county, there was a group of commissioners, distinct from the commission of the peace, consisting for the most part of county gentlemen or municipal officers (according as the district was rural or urban), with a few military officers interspersed. Primarily the commission was a police force, with large powers of inquisition, disarming, and punishment. Secondarily it was the provider and organiser of a military force

[7] The full instructions thus summarised are in *Cal. S. P.* (Dom.), 1654–5, pp. 77–8.

[8] In the *Cal. S. P.* (Dom.), under date 24 March 1655, there is a series of instructions to justices of the peace, which show how desirous Cromwell and the council were to put life into the county magistracy, and to associate it with the utmost activity of local government.

or new militia, which it was to use partly to defend the district against insurrectionary violence, partly for the performance of its own direct executive duties.

II.

The commissioners having been chosen, the next business was to provide officers for the militia; and that business was begun by one noteworthy transaction. Cromwell's brother-in-law, John Desborough, was one of the Protector's most trusty servants. In the crisis of the Salisbury plot, when it was not unreasonable to fear that the flame of rebellion might spread over the whole south-west, Cromwell turned to Major-General Desborough. On 12 March, two days before the commissioners for Dorset were appointed, and before any steps had been taken towards organising the militia in those parts, Desborough was commissioned to take his regiment of regulars into 'the west,' and to collect under his command all the horse and foot in 'the western countries,' especially the forces of Colonel James Berry. The duties imposed on these regulars were essentially similar to those afterwards imposed on the new militia. In the first place the troops were to suppress the rising; secondly, they were, in co-operation with the justices of the peace, mayors, bailiffs, and other civil officials, to arrest all dangerous persons, disarm them, and confiscate their horses to the use of the state.[9]

Thus empowered, Desborough was styled 'major-general of the west,' and we must suppose him entering promptly on his duties, and making a vigorous inquiry into the condition of a wide district stretching westward and north-westward from Wiltshire. While thus engaged he must soon have come into contact with the militia commission for Dorset, which was formed on 14 March. As, in the formation of the new militia commissions, no south-western county or district besides Dorset is mentioned, it seems evident that Desborough, as 'major-general of the west,' with the regulars under his command and the civil authorities well drilled into co-operation with him, was all-sufficient for a long time after his appointment, and it is more than probable that the Dorset commission, with the militia raised by it, was in more or less close connexion with, or subordination to, the major-general of the district.

As to what happened in the counties between the end of March and the end of May 1655 there is hardly any evidence, but the commissioners must have been hard at work raising troops, rousing justices and sheriffs, and appointing officers. In the end of May the process of fusion between Desborough and the militia commissioners of Dorset, as well as the peace-preserving authorities of the south-west which we have supposed to be going on, was acknow-

[9] Thurloe, iii. 221–2.

ledged and confirmed. On 28 May a second commission was sent to Desborough, 'to be major-general of all the militia forces raised and to be raised within the counties of Cornwall, Devon, Somerset, Dorset, Wilts, and Gloucester.'[10]

This second commission to Desborough is to be regarded as the precise beginning of the institution of the major-generals, properly so called. The wording of it shows that, with or without formal commissions, the counties named had been organising a militia; that the original commission to Dorset had merged in the new one; and that Cromwell had discovered that an officer of the regular army would make an excellent major-general of a new militia district. The Protector's aim was to make the combination of civil and military authority practically effective, and to prevent friction or waste of energy between commissioners and officers.[11] In the south-west the aim was easily attained: a regular officer of high rank and great experience had been ordered into a wide district; he proved himself there an excellent rallying-point and head of all the forces that made for order; nothing better could be done, therefore, than to group the militias of several contiguous counties under his command, leaving it to him, with the force of his character and the *prestige* of his position, to co-operate with the commissioners and insist on the execution of their many-sided work. What had proved so easily possible with Desborough and the south-west might prove equally so in other districts; there might be the same grouping of counties, the same co-operation with commissioners, the same vigorous headship of the new forces by trained officers. That was what actually happened in the summer and autumn of 1655, and that *was* the institution of the major-generals.

By the middle of June Desborough was in the midst of his labours, working from a centre at Exeter; and about the same time Colonel James Berry was similarly engaged at Lincoln, and Major Hezekiah Haynes at Bury St. Edmunds.[12] The scheme was extensively developed in August and September. By 2 Aug. it had been decided that there were to be twelve militia troops in the counties making up Desborough's district;[13] and by the 10th of the same month so many more officers had been appointed in the same way, each bearing the title 'major-general of the militia,'[14] that it was necessary for the Lord Protector and the council to frame general

[10] Thurloe, iii. 486.

[11] One great advantage of the plan was the grouping together of such districts as Devon and Cornwall, which had exhibited so much separatist feeling during the civil war.

[12] Thurloe, iii. 556-7.

[13] *Cal. S. P.* (Dom.), 1655, p. 267.

[14] On 9 Aug. most of the major-generals were definitely appointed to their respective districts (*Cal. S. P.* (Dom.), 1655, p. 275). On 11 Oct. some alteration of one or two of the districts took place; and on 19 Oct. two of the major-

instructions for them.[15] In the course of the month various instructions were issued.[16] On 21 Sept. a general commission was issued to the major-generals.[17] It began by referring to the rebellion of the spring as having been stirred up by 'the old malignant and popish enemies,' who, though suppressed by God's mercy, were still stirring up troubles. On account of the ever-present danger a well-affected militia of horse had been raised.

> As they need a commander to discipline and conduct them, we appoint you major-general and commander-in-chief in counties, with full powers to keep the said militia in good discipline, conduct them to fight against all enemies . . . . We give you power, in case of invasion or rebellion, to raise the inhabitants of the said counties, and to exercise, arm, muster, and conduct them to the places where we shall direct you in case of rebellion.

The major-generals were then authorised to appoint deputies, if necessary ; and they were promised the assistance of the justices of the peace and other civil officials. To this circular commission the instructions prepared in the preceding month were annexed.

So much for the military side of the institution. At the same time nine orders for securing the peace of the Commonwealth were issued, to the following effect, viz. :—

(1) All persons engaged in rebellion since the beginning of the Protectorate were to be imprisoned or banished, and their estates sequestered towards payment of the forces newly raised, one-third being allowed to their wives and children.

(2) All adhering to the late king or Charles Stewart, his son, were to be imprisoned or transported.

generals were authorised to act through deputies with full powers. In the end of October and beginning of November two more major-generals were ap ointed, bringing up the total number (excluding deputies) to 12. (See *Cal. S. P.* (Dom.), under dates; *Public Intelligencer*, 29 Oct. ; *Parliamentary History*, xx. 334; Thurloe, iv. 117.) The list, as it finally stood, was as follows :—

Kent and Surrey . . . . Col. Kelsey.
Sussex, Hants, Berks . . . Col. Goffe.
Gloucester, Wilts, Dorset, Somerset, Devon, Cornwall ('the west') } Major-General Desborough.
Oxford, Bucks, Herts, Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, Cambs } Lord-Deputy Fleetwood (with Major Hezekiah Haynes as deputy).
London . . . . Major-General Skippon.
Westminster and Middlesex . . Col. Barkstead.
Lincoln, Notts, Derby, Warwick, Leicester } Commissary-Gen. Whalley.
Northants, Beds, Rutland, Hunts . Major Butler.
Herefordshire, Salop, N. Wales . Col. Berry.
Cheshire, Lancashire, Staffordshire Col. Worsley.
Yorkshire, Durham, Cumberland, Westmoreland, Northumberland } Lambert (with R. Lilburne and Charles Howard as deputies).
Monmouthshire and S. Wales . . Col. Rowland Dawkins.

In July 1656 Worsley died, and was replaced by Tobias Bridges.

[15] *Cal. S. P.* (Dom.), 1655, p. 278. [16] *Ibid.* p. 296. [17] *Ibid.* p. 344.

(3) A tax of 10 per cent. on all with 100*l*. a year from lands, and 10*l*. a year on all with 1,500*l*. personalty, was to be levied on the estates of all sequestered for delinquency, or who had fought against parliament. Sequestration was to be the penalty for non-payment, which penalty might be discharged by giving good security, or otherwise assuring it by a rent charge, &c.

(4) Those living loosely and unable to give a good account of themselves were to be transported.

(5) From 1 Nov. 1655 none of 'the party' (*i.e.* the disaffected or royalists) were to keep in their houses chaplains, schoolmasters, ejected ministers, or fellows of colleges, nor have their children taught by such, on pain of double taxation.

(6) No ejected ministers or schoolmasters were, after 1 Nov. 1655, to return to the exercise of their functions, under penalties, unless they obtained the approval of the commissions for public preachers.

(7) None were to keep arms without licence.

(8) None banished were to return without licence.

(9) A competent number of commissioners were to execute these orders in each county.[18]

Of these instructions the third is at this stage worthy of special attention. The financing of the major-generals was an essential part of the institution, and was, perhaps, that part of it of which Cromwell was proudest. The military aspect of the institution was the one on which it was most politic to dwell. The nation might resent an extension or intensifying of the police system or local executive; it was less likely to resent protection against domestic enemies and widespread rebellion; and, if by any cleverness the bulk of the nation could be relieved from contributing towards the cost of the militia, there might be no general resentment at all. Therefore, as the Protector afterwards said,

> where that insurrection was, and we saw it in all the roots and grounds of it, we did find out a little poor invention. . . . I say there was a little thing invented, which was the erecting of your major-generals. . . . We did find—I mean myself and the council did—that, if there were need to have greater forces to carry on this work, it was a most righteous thing to put the charge upon that party which was the cause of it. . . . When we saw what game they [the royalists] were upon . . . we did think it our duty to make that class of persons, who as evidently as anything in the world were in the combination of the insurrectionists, bear their share of the charge.[19]

In short, the new militia was to be paid for out of taxation levied, not on the nation generally, but on royalists only; and thus arose the ten per cent. tax, the decimation mentioned in the third instruction of 21 Sept. We shall hear a good deal more about it presently,

[18] *Cal. S. P.* (Dom.), 1655, pp. 346–7.

[19] From Cromwell's speech at the opening of the second Protectorate parliament, 17 Sept. 1656. See Carlyle's *Cromwell*.

and see how the collecting of it became one of the primary as well as the most troublesome duties of the major-generals themselves.

In October the council was busy; additional instructions were prepared, discussed, and despatched; the connexion with the general police system was brought into prominence; the districts of several of the major-generals were defined and settled, and at last everything was ready for the complete publication and final launching of the scheme.[20] On 31 Oct. an official declaration was made by the Protector in council, which is to be regarded as the publication and also as the practical inauguration of the institution. It purported to show "the reasons of the government's proceedings for securing the peace of the Commonwealth on the occasion of the late insurrection;'[21] and it dealt with the major-generals as the chiefs of a new military force, provided for by the taxation of disaffected royalists. Its substance is as follows:—

(1) Providence having, by the issue of the civil wars, declared against the royalist party, the victors signalised their triumph by extremely mild measures towards the vanquished, *e.g.* the Act of Oblivion. That leniency gave the government courage to act promptly and decidedly in the crisis.

> We do acknowledge, unless the carriage towards them had been such as is before expressed, we could not, with comfort and satisfaction to ourselves, have used the courses we now see we are obliged to take against the persons and estates of that party for securing the lives, liberties, peace, and comfort of all the well-affected.[22]

(2) But all such pardons and leniency were conditional upon good behaviour for the future; and the royalists having failed in such behaviour the government was no longer bound to be lenient.

> We do not now only find ourselves satisfied but obliged in duty . . . to proceed upon other grounds than formerly. . . . It will not be denied that as well the articles of war as the favour and grace granted by the Act of Oblivion contained in them a reciprocation. . . . If the state do not attain their end, neither ought the other to accomplish theirs. In such acts . . . either both are bound or both are at liberty. . . . [The supreme magistrate] may proceed with greater severity, inasmuch as he hath used the last means to reclaim them without fruit, and knows by experience that nothing but the sword will restrain them from blood and violence.[23]

(3) They had, therefore, (*a*) made various arrests; (*b*) taxed the royalists especially, in order to put down violence planned and carried out by them.

> It will not be thought strange . . . that we have laid a burden upon some of their estates beyond what is imposed upon the rest of the nation towards the defraying of the charge which they are the occasion of.[24]

[20] *Cal. State Papers* (Dom.), 1656, pp. 370–405.

[21] *Parliamentary History*, xx. 434–60; *Cal. State Papers* (Dom.), 1655, pp. 405–11.

[22] *Parliamentary History*, xx. 438.

[23] *Ibid.* xx. 438–40.

[24] *Ibid.* p. 241.

(4) Details were given of the royalist plot culminating in a correspondence with Charles Stewart in the summer of 1654, which was to bring about general insurrection and open war.

(5) The royalists (in alliance with some of the Levellers) being thus formidable, additional forces must be raised to deal with their designs. Therefore 'a new and standing militia of horse' has been raised in every county, the expense being defrayed by the rebels.

It is plain to every one that is not blinded with prejudice that these men . . . will leave no stone unturned to render vain and fruitless all that blood which hath been spilt to restore our liberties, and the hopes we have conceived of seeing this poor nation settled and reformed from that spirit of profaneness which these men do keep up and countenance . . . and therefore we thus argued that . . . the peace and common concernments of this Commonwealth must be otherwise secured and provided for than at present they were; that this was not to be done without raising additional forces; that the charge of those forces ought not to be put upon the good people . . . but upon those who have been, and are the occasion of all our danger.[25]

(6) It is equitable to impose the tax on the *whole* of the royalist party, because the insurrection evidently involved the whole party by implication.

We do appeal to all indifferent men . . . whether the party were not generally involved in this business, and in reason to be charged with it. . . . It is certain here was the cause and quarrel of the pretended king once more brought upon the stage by his followers. . . . He was ready to embark for England upon the first notice of success, which no man will believe he would have put himself upon, in the eye and face of the world, if those who showed themselves in arms were to have no other seconds than what appeared; nor will it be imagined that those of his party who came over hither upon that errand . . . would have run so great hazard upon so weak grounds. . . . Great sums of money were collected and sent over to the pretended king, and furnished also for this design, which we cannot think came out of a few hands. . . . The time when this attempt was made is likewise observable; it was when nothing but a well-formed power could hope to put us into disorder. . . . These things alone are enough to satisfy that these troubles were the fruit of great deliberation and consent.[26]

(7) The difficulty and danger, then, being so serious, the hands of the supreme magistrate must not be tied by ordinary rules.

It is evident that in this Declaration the institution is regarded as purely military; there is no mention of the functions of the new force in detail; nor could we gather from it that it was designed to meet in any way the exigencies of provincial government.

[25] *Parliamentary History*, xx. 455. Cf. to the same effect Thurloe's memorandum on the reasons for erecting a new standing militia in all the counties in England (Thurloe, iv. 132–3).

[26] *Parliamentary History*, xx. 456–7.

III.

For the full recognition and explanation of the executive functions of the major-generals we must turn to twenty-one Instructions which were issued to them at a somewhat later date, and then published in the newspapers. Taken together with the Declaration they represent the full idea of the institution as it left Cromwell's brain, while in themselves they are the completion of the partial instructions issued from time to time by the council during the summer and early autumn.[27] In these Instructions the military aspect of the institution is made almost entirely subordinate to the administrative; in the course of the twenty-one clauses the major-generals are ordered to act practically as a police, with a military force to assist them, if necessary. The document, in fact, indicates a scheme of local government conformed to a puritan standard of public morals. No very special or temporary danger to the state was assumed to exist; it was only assumed that plenty of the influences which make for bad or loose government are abroad and active in England and Wales. In particular it was assumed that there had hitherto been too great carelessness as to the loyalty of large households in country districts, and also that the land swarmed with vagrants, native and foreign, whose movements, so long as they were unaccounted for, were a source of risk to the public peace.

The major-generals, then, having been fairly installed and instructed by the beginning of November 1655, it is necessary to consider how they actually did their work—how their actions corresponded with their instructions. The best evidence as to their actual achievements is to be found in their frequent despatches. It will be convenient to analyse the instructions and the correspondence together, in order that conception and reality, design and accomplishment, may be presented side by side.

Thus treated the subject may be arranged under six heads—(1) taxation, (2) general conservation of the peace, (3) religion and morals, (4) poor law, (5) registration, (6) licensing. Before these are dealt with in order a word must be said as to the evidence afforded by the correspondence as to co-operation between the major-generals and the militia commissioners on the one hand and the local magistracy on the other.

The relations between the major-generals and the militia commissioners were naturally a matter of primary importance. In a sense the former were subordinate to the latter, inasmuch as the militia was raised by the commissioners, and its officers were at least partly appointed by them. In another sense, however, the commissioners were subordinate to the major-generals, inasmuch as the

[27] *Parliamentary History*, xx. 461–7; *Public Intelligencer*, 17 and 31 Dec. 1655; *Mercurius Politicus*, 20–27 Dec. 1655, No. 289, and 5 Jan. 1655–6.

latter were entrusted with large and independent powers, both civil and military. There was thus not only the possibility of dispute as to co-ordination or subordination, but also the absolute necessity of frequent conference, especially at the outset. On the whole the two bodies seem to have worked well together, without friction. Sometimes the commissioners are expressly praised for their behaviour,[28] and frequently they themselves write expressing their willingness to act.[29] As to their constitutional position there seem to have been few difficulties, though they occasionally complain, or the major-generals complain for them, that they are not in possession of sufficiently explicit instructions.[30] Their success probably depended on their frank and hearty co-operation with the major-generals, both in the taxation of royalists and in the invigoration of local government, predisposed as they were to such co-operation by possessing a moral standard in common with their military coadjutors and heads.

It was different as to the permanent local magistracy, with whom the major-generals and the commissioners found themselves in contact, and with whom they were instructed to co-operate. The difficulties here were of a more serious nature, owing to the disaffection or apathy of the gentry, which has been already referred to. The correspondence gives ample evidence of the embarrassment to the major-generals caused by the unsympathetic or obstructive behaviour of the local executives. As early as June 1655, before Berry had been moved from the east of England to his proper sphere in the west midlands and North Wales, he wrote from Lincoln to Cromwell, 'Our magistrates are idle, and the people all asleep.'[31] The chief difficulties continued to be felt in towns, with the corporations. In November 1655 Whalley reports a controversy about precedence at Leicester, and asks for a decision from headquarters.[32] In the same month Haynes writes of his difficulties with 'malignants' at Cambridge, Norwich, and Colchester;[33] and he warns the council of state that 'if corporations be not soon considered the work now upon the wheel will certainly receive a stand.' In January 1655–6 the malignants in the Bristol corporation were giving trouble. Desborough accordingly

[28] Thurloe, iv., M.-G. Butler to Thurloe, p. 218; Worsley to Thurloe, p. 224; Kelsey to Thurloe, pp. 224–5; Haynes to Thurloe, pp. 227–8; do. p. 257.

[29] *E.g.* commissioners for Norfolk to Protector, Thurloe, iv. 171; do. from those under Haynes, *ibid.* p. 225, &c. &c.

[30] Butler to Thurloe, Thurloe, iv. 179; Goffe to Thurloe, *ibid.* p. 190; Berry to Thurloe, *ibid.* p. 211; commissioners for Lincoln to Thurloe, *ibid.* p. 212; do. *ibid.* p. 238; Goffe to Thurloe, *ibid.* p. 238–9, &c.

[31] Thurloe, iii. 590.

[32] Whalley to Thurloe, Thurloe, iv. 240–1.

[33] Thurloe, iv. 257. Colchester was especially troublesome, on account of the traditions of 1648 and the second civil war. On 19 Dec. 1655 the government took the strong step of having the corporation elected in the presence of the major-general (*ibid.* pp. 330–1).

wrote to Cromwell, reporting that he had gone to the mayor and requested him to deal with such persons, informing him that, if he failed to do so, he himself would be obliged to purge the corporation.[34]

In the counties the major-generals soon found that they could not do their work efficiently unless they themselves were made justices of the peace. On 14 Nov. 1655 Whalley complained that he was forced to take more upon him than his instructions warranted by the fact that he was not on the commission of the peace.[35] Ten days later he wrote to the same effect more urgently still.[36] In Berry's district the difficulty was met by the enrolment of the militia commissioners on the commissions of the peace.[37] In some cases there was a scarcity of justices;[38] sometimes they fell into a general condemnation which included a whole host of local officials.[39]

(1) *Taxation.*—The financial duties of the major-generals, which do not appear at all in the Instructions, make a very great show in the correspondence. An income tax of ten per cent. was imposed on all royalists possessing estates in land of the value of 100*l*. a year or upwards, or personal property amounting to 1,500*l*.;[40] and on the major-generals lay, first, the inquisitory duty of determining who in their respective districts were royalists within the prescribed limits of means; secondly, the duty of collecting the tax from them; thirdly, the duty of paying the militia out of the proceeds. They entered on this part of their work at an early stage—as soon, indeed, as they had had the essential preliminary interviews with the commissioners—and it was their chief and apparently most difficult duty during the winter and spring of 1655–6.[41]

As regards the determination of liability and the collection of the tax, there were not a few difficulties. The general method was to require a declaration on oath from each reputed royalist as to the amount of his estate, and then to make a list of persons liable in each county. One difficulty at the outset was the number of claims to exemption. In these cases it was the practice of the major-generals to appeal to the Protector and the council of state; as a rule they were directed to adhere firmly to their instructions, but in certain cases the pleas were allowed. Another difficulty arose out of the defalcation claims made by many persons to a deduction of their debts and burdens from the estimate of their total property. The first mention of this matter came from the Lincolnshire commissioners in Whalley's district, on 17 Nov. 1655.[42] In this

[34] Thurloe, iv. 396. [35] *Ibid.* p. 197. [36] *Ibid.* pp. 240–1.
[37] Berry to Thurloe, Thurloe, iv. 316. [38] *Ibid.* p. 353.
[39] *Ibid.* Berry to Thurloe, pp. 393–4. [40] *Ibid.* pp. 208, 216, 218; Godwin; iv. 230.
[41] As early as 20 Nov. Kelsey wrote to Thurloe of 'this uncouth employment' (Thurloe, iv. 224–5). [42] Thurloe, iv. 212.

case Whalley made the allowances on his own responsibility, but asked for confirmation and advice from headquarters. A prompt reply came from Whitehall on 20 Nov. 'His highness and the council,' the message ran, 'do not think fit to allow defalcations for debts.'[43] Whalley's leniency can hardly have arisen from firm conviction, for immediately on receipt of the council's order he wrote from Leicester to Thurloe—

> I am exceeding glad you sent me his highness and the council's orders not to allow of debts and incumbrances on delinquents' estates. It will very much shorten our work. And certainly had not such an order been made the tax would come to little.[44]

Another difficulty was connected with property belonging to one owner, but situated in different counties or in the districts of more than one major-general. It often happened that a man had, say, 50*l.* a year from land in one county and 50*l.* in another; and yet, according to the letter of the instructions, he would escape 'decimation' owing to his not having 100*l.* in one county. It was decided that, in such cases, the tax should either be laid in each county in proportion to the amount of land held there, or nominally charged on the county in which the landowner resided.

Another point was the date at which the valuation of property was to be made. A valuation had been made on 1 Nov. 1653; and the commissioners were instructed to use it as the basis of assessment.[45] But the difficulty was that since that date much land had passed out of the hands of the proprietors, and they very naturally objected to being taxed on land which they possessed no longer. The Lincoln commissioners, having stated the difficulty, were ordered to assess the tax on the valuation of 1 Nov. 1653, though in some cases an option seems to have been left to the unhappy royalists.[46] The injustice of the government's decision caused heart-burnings in Whalley's district,[47] but apparently the government stood firm.

Another difficulty sometimes arose when the same person possessed real and personal property, each being liable to the tax. For example, the Lincoln commissioners, whose lot it was to discover so many snakes in the grass, raised the difficulty in this form: If one taxed has 1,500*l.* personal estate and less than 100*l.* a year in land, is the 1,500*l.* to be charged with 100*l.*, or is 10*l.* to be charged on the land?[48] Desborough solved the difficulty in such cases in Bristol by taxing all capital of 1,500*l.* and all income of 100*l.* a year, without caring what were the proportions of realty and per-

[43] *Cal. State Papers* (Dom.), 1655–6, p. 29.
[44] Thurloe, iv. 240–1. Cf. Worsley from Cheshire, *ibid.* p. 251.
[45] *Ibid.* p. 238.
[46] Berry to Hanmer, Thurloe, iv. 294.
[47] Thurloe, iv. 411–2.
[48] *Ibid.* p. 238.

sonalty in the estate. He asked for a confirmation from headquarters, but, as no formal one is recorded, we may assume that his practice was approved.[49] Where leases for lives had been granted it was difficult to decide whether the land tax was to be laid on the reserved rent or on the value of 'the living.'[50] How this problem was solved we do not learn.

Another difficulty stated, but not solved, was in relation to estates forfeited for treason, and repurchased by trustees on behalf of 'delinquents.'[51]

The assessment of the tax was facilitated by getting lists of those who had compounded at Goldsmiths' Hall, *i.e.* those 'delinquents' whose estates had been sequestrated and were managed by the Committee for Compounding in permanent session at Goldsmiths' Hall.[52]

As time went on, and the necessities of the new militia revealed themselves more and more clearly, the commissioners and the major-generals began to feel that the proceeds of the tax were not likely to be sufficient, and that the exemption from taxation was placed too high. To this effect Berry and the commissioners for his district wrote at an early stage.[53] Kelsey, writing from Maidstone, proposed that all persons having an income of 50*l.* should be taxed;[54] while the Northamptonshire commissioners, writing a few days later, suggested that those with 20*l.* per annum real or 300*l.* personal estate should be taxed,[55] on the ground that such persons were as dangerous as those of higher quality. This was an extreme proposal. On 12 Dec. 1655 Whalley wrote to Thurloe, mentioning a more moderate one of Lilburne's, viz. that 40*l.* real and 500*l.* personal should be the limits, and adding that he disapproved of it on the ground that it would alienate and irritate the royalists, without producing any return worth the cost.[56] Nevertheless Worsley made almost the same proposal;[57] and it was frequently made afterwards.[58] Desborough wrote from Exeter on 12 Jan. 1665–6 that the persons who might be irritated by the taxation of the smaller incomes were not worth conciliating.[59] Further experience led Worsley to sink to a 40*l.* limit;[60] and he reported that the commissioners of his district were unanimous in thinking that 50*l.* real and 500*l.* personal were the proper limits. The government in London, however, probably realising that the decimation as it stood was severe enough, gave

[49] Thurloe, iv. 359–60. See *ibid.* pp. 336–7. [50] *Ibid.* p. 278. [51] *Ibid.* p. 541.

[52] *Ibid.* pp. 156, 185, 207–8, 212. The committee was started as a joint parliamentary and civic body to plan taxation in Sept. 1643. After Feb. 1653–4 its sole function was to manage sequestrated estates. See Calendar of the Committee for Compounding, 1643–1660.

[53] Thurloe, iv. 215–6. [54] *Ibid.* pp. 224–5. [55] *Ibid.* pp. 235, 320.

[56] *Ibid.* p. 308. [57] 50*l.* real and 500*l.* personal (*ibid.* pp. 340–1).

[58] *E.g.* by Desborough (*ibid.* p. 391). [59] *Ibid.* p. 413. [60] *Ibid.* pp. 449–50.

no heed to these representations; and accordingly, as the winter of 1655–6 grew into the spring, the commissioners and the major-generals came face to face with a shortcoming of funds, and were obliged to report to the Lord Protector that if more money was not forthcoming the numbers of the militia must be reduced.

Thus the third financial duty imposed on the major-generals—namely, the payment of the new militia—came to be no light one. Some districts—*e.g.* Wales and Norfolk—proved very scarce in royalists who could be fleeced for the benefit of needy soldiers.[61] Districts varied much in productiveness: *e.g.* Lincolnshire was expected to yield at the rate of above 3,000*l.* a year; from Staffordshire 1,300*l.* or 1,400*l.* was expected; while Lancashire was not expected to yield more than 1,100*l.*[62] Soon after the beginning of the new year (1656) the question of payment began to become pressing. On 11 Jan. Whalley wrote from Lincoln that more than six months had elapsed since the troops in his district enlisted, and he asked for a warrant to pay them out of the proceeds of the tax.[63] On 25 Jan. Desborough wrote to the same effect;[64] but the government would not speak. On the 28th he wrote from Truro that in order to pay the troops he had to go beyond his commission, which he greatly regretted.[65] On 2 Feb. Goffe reported from Winchester that the decimation of his district would certainly not suffice to pay its troops. Sussex, he expected, would yield 1,500*l.*; Hampshire, 1,000*l.*; Berks, 1,000*l.* 'For the two first counties,' he went on, 'this is just half as much as will pay the troops. Indeed, in the other it may come near the money appointed to pay that troop; but then there will be nothing left to discharge the officers belonging to the commissioners of the three counties (which, as his highness' letter seemeth to imply, we are also to satisfy out of this money, though we are not directed by what rule we shall proceed in paying them).' The major-general then made a suggestion. 'I take the humble boldness to offer,' he wrote, 'that all the money raised upon this account may be brought to the common treasury, and that we may all be paid alike out of the said treasury; or else I fear those associations that raise least money will have such a pitiful militia that the major-generals will have little honour or comfort in commanding them.'[66] On 7 Feb. Butler wrote from Northampton that 1,080*l.* over and above the proceeds of the decimation were needed to pay the troops.[67] On 11 Feb. Goffe wrote with much seriousness, conveying to the council a message from one of his subordinates: 'Captain Dunch bids me tell you, if you do not help us, he must be forced to mutiny.'[68]

[61] Thurloe, iv. 287. Cf. pp. 170–1.
[62] *Ibid.* pp. 337, 340–1, 427, 434–6.
[63] *Ibid.* pp. 411–2.
[64] *Ibid.* p. 462.
[65] 'It's unpleasant to me to act without rule' (*ibid.* p. 472).
[66] *Ibid.* pp. 497–8.
[67] *Ibid.* p. 511.
[68] *Ibid.* pp. 525–6.

What was to be done? For weeks the stream of grumbling had found its way to Whitehall; but the government had made up its mind that the *maximum* of practicable taxation was reached. Yet in all quarters of the land the balance-sheet showed an ugly deficit. On 29 Jan. Cromwell had authorised the major-generals to give to their soldiers and officers, out of money already levied, six months' pay, or as much thereof as the money received within their districts (over and above the necessary charge incident to the service) should amount to, the whole receipts being applied in equal proportion to the whole militia forces.[69] This did not advance matters very far. At last the council of state began to bestir itself. A committee was formed to consider the affairs of the major-generals; and, on its report, the council, on 27 Feb., advised the Protector to reduce the militia of Oxfordshire, Bucks, Herts, Berks, Southampton, Sussex, Kent, Cambs, Suffolk, Norfolk, and Rutland from 100 to 80 in each troop, and to pay them up to the date of reduction.[70] On 11 April the government announced their intention to reduce all the militia troops to the same extent,[71] and on the same day the council issued to the major-generals the tardy authorisation to pay the militia out of the extraordinary tax.[72] An estimate was also made of the total cost of the reduced force for a year from 24 June 1656; the salaries of the eleven major-generals were fixed, and the major-generals themselves reappointed. The total estimate was 80,067*l.* 12*s.* 4*d.* The soldiers disbanded were to be paid only up to 24 June.[73]

The whole management was made more systematic; *e.g.* the council appointed what it called an army committee to consider fit rules for the major-generals, to return a yearly account of moneys and charges in their associations, and to issue the moneys by warrants from the said committee for paying the officers and soldiers of the new militia troops. On the army committee was henceforward to devolve the responsibility of both collecting and disbursing the tax, a responsibility which had hitherto lain on the major-generals, the major-generals now, together with officials called receivers-general and county treasurers, acting as agents of the committee.[74] The major-generals were to give in to the army committee perfect lists of all persons charged with yearly or gross payments, signed by themselves and three commissioners, with duplicates to the receivers-general. They were also to cause the county treasurers to send in accounts of their receipts within ten days from 25 Dec. and 24 June annually, noting any additions or alterations. They were also to return the addresses of the county treasurers, and cause the muster rolls to be sent to the commissary-

[69] *Cal. State Papers* (Dom.), 1655–6, p. 140. [70] *Ibid.* p. 200.

[71] The actual order was despatched on 15 April (*ibid.* p. 27).

[72] *Ibid.* pp. 262–3. [73] *Ibid.* [74] *Ibid.* pp. 367–8, 12

general of musters, with duplicates to the army committee, the commissary-general to obey the directions of the army committee. As for the county treasurers, they were to deliver up to the army committee a perfect account of all sums raised and spent in the half-year ended 21 Dec. 1655, which account the committee were to pass, or, if not satisfied with it, to refer to the council of state. In short, the government seem to have come to the conclusion that the collection of the 'decimation' and its payment to the troops had not been a great success as conducted by the major-generals, and that these things would be better managed from Whitehall.

(2) *General Conservation of the Peace.*—The major-generals were instructed to suppress insurrections and unlawful assemblies, and to repel invasions.[75] They were to see that all papists, rebels, and dangerous persons were disarmed, and their arms confiscated.[76] They were to provide police protection for the highways and roads, especially near London, and to insist on the prosecution of robbers, highwaymen, &c., and the punishment of their abettors. (In this work the major-generals were to co-operate with the sheriffs; every one discovering or apprehending a malefactor of the aforesaid sort was to be paid a reward not exceeding 10*l.*, by the sheriff, who was to be recouped by the state.[77]) They were to watch the behaviour of disaffected persons, and that of their subordinate officers.[78] When any one prosecuted an undiscovered murderer or other gross offender against the peace he might apply to the major-general or his deputy; and he, knowing what the business was, might 'as well by summoning all persons who lived dissolutely or without a calling, or at a higher rate having no visible estate answering thereunto . . . if he should see cause, as by the diligence of all civil officers or persons under his command, according to their respective duties in apprehending all suspected persons who passed through or lay lurking within any place under his charge, to endeavour the finding out and apprehending the offenders,' for which purpose he might give notice to and get the help of the major-generals of neighbouring associations.[79]

In the correspondence there is no great bulk of evidence bearing on this head, but what there is unmistakably indicates both vigour and success. The absence of armed rebellion deprived the major-generals of any pretext for repelling invasion by military force; but in the department of police they had much work to do, and they evidently did it. They entered at once into hearty co-operation with the justices of the peace, and into as hearty co-operation with municipal magistrates as those functionaries

[75] Instruction 1, *Parl. Hist.* xx. 461–7.
[76] Inst. 2, *ibid.*
[77] Inst. 3 and 16, *ibid.*
[78] Inst. 4, *ibid.*
[79] Inst. 15, *ibid.*

would allow. Haynes began to search for arms in Suffolk as early as 22 June 1655.[80] We have seen how early and how fully Berry realised his general responsibility in Lincolnshire. The work of disarming seems to have proceeded briskly in many districts.[81] With papists there was sharp practice. On one occasion, for example, Butler relates how, as he was riding through the forest of Rockingham, he overtook a wayfarer who proved to be a Roman catholic priest 'without any certain habitation.' Being thus doubly an offender, he was put into custody; and a copy of his examination, along with a catechism found upon him, was forwarded to Whitehall, the major-general retaining the *Agnus Dei* and rosary of the priest, along with 'a medal of the Virgin Mary, or crucifix, and some other books.'[82] There was much energy in arresting and imprisoning all persons who appeared to be dangerous, or who, on examination, could give no satisfactory account of themselves. So many of such persons were deprived of liberty that there were some complaints of want of room for prisoners.[83] On 5 Jan. 1655–6 Berry wrote to Thurloe a letter about the state of things in Shropshire, showing how completely the preservation of the peace in that county came within the purview of the major-general;[84] and in a later letter he complains bitterly of over-work in quarter sessions, alleging that he is losing his military character altogether and becoming a mere toiling magistrate.[85] On 29 Jan. Whalley complained of over-work in the same department. 'I wish,' he wrote, 'there had been more major-generals. Our presence, I find, is desired in all places, and gives life to all proceedings; . . . if the Lord gives abilities to your major-generals . . . it's the best way that ever as yet was devised for the peace and safety of the nation. You cannot imagine what an awe it hath struck into the spirits of wicked men.'[86] On 9 Feb. 1655–6 Berry wrote from Monmouth, 'I am much troubled with these market towns everywhere; vices abounding and magistrates fast asleep.'[87]

Quakers were regarded as being almost as dangerous to the public peace as Roman catholics, and were treated with almost equal severity.[88] It was alleged that they 'troubled the markets,' and otherwise interfered with public peace and comfort. In their early days they were active peripatetic religionists, entering freely into places

[80] Thurloe, iii. 574.

[81] Correspondence throughout, and especially Thurloe, iv. 379, 'Instructions by the major-general of Bristol.'

[82] Thurloe, iv. 274.

[83] Worsley to Thurloe, Thurloe, iv. 333–4.

[84] *Ibid.* pp. 393–4.

[85] 'I am now at last become civil' (*ibid.* p. 413).

[86] *Ibid.* p. 434. As to Whalley and his success cf. *Mercurius Politicus*, No. 294, 24–31 Jan., and *Political Intelligencer*, No. 18, 28 Jan.–4 Feb. 1655–6.

[87] *Ibid.* pp. 545–6.

[88] Worsley to Thurloe, Thurloe, iv. 315, *ibid.* 333–4, *ibid.* 613, &c.

of public resort, whether churches or market-places, and calling out for the instant reform of what they deemed abuses. Once there was hope of striking at the arch-quaker, George Fox, himself. 'I have some thoughts to lay Foxe and his companions by the heels, if I see a good opportunity.' [89] On one occasion Butler forwarded a list of the persons committed to gaol by him, with specimens of the offences thus punished.[90] The system of espionage was brought to a high point of perfection. On 21 March the major-general [91] wrote from Stafford, 'We have things in that posture already that there is hardly a meeting of three cavaliers together on any account but I am suddenly acquainted with it.' [92] On 5 July 1656 Haynes proposed to accompany the judges on circuit, with a view to the more thorough preservation of order.[93] On 21 April 1656 Whalley had reported thus triumphantly of part of his district: 'This I may truly say: you may ride over all Nottinghamshire and not see a beggar or a wandering rogue,' though he was obliged to add, 'I hope suddenly to have it so in all the counties under my charge if it be not already; but I much fear it.' [94]

(3) *Religion and Morals.*—During a prevalence of puritan thought and feeling it is difficult to distinguish efforts to preserve public peace from efforts to purify public morals; and it is still more difficult to distinguish the latter from efforts in behalf of religion. The major-generals were instructed to prevent horse-racing, cock-fighting, bear-baiting, and the performance of stage plays within their districts, because of the danger of general evil and wickedness, as well as of hatching treason and rebellion.[95] They were to report upon the character of teachers and preachers, and to secure the execution of the ordinance for the ejection of insufficient ministers and schoolmasters.[96] By their behaviour they were to promote godliness and virtue, and to co-operate with justices of the peace, ministers, and officers intrusted with the care of such things to secure the execution of the laws against drunkenness, blasphemy, swearing, plays, profaning the Lord's day, &c.[97] They were to seek out and suppress all gaming-houses and houses of ill fame in London and Westminster.[98]

The correspondence shows no lack of stringency in compliance with these instructions. There is some evidence that efforts were made to distinguish what was immoral from what was inexpedient. Thus in March 1656 the spring races at Lincoln fell due, and the earl of Exeter asked Major-General Whalley whether Lady Grant-

[89] Goffe to Thurloe, 10 Jan. 1655–6. Thurloe, iv. 408–9

[90] Thurloe, iv. 632–3.

[91] Called 'Goffe' in Thurloe, but this must be an error.

[92] Thurloe, iv. 639. [93] *Ibid.* v. 1187–8. [94] *Ibid.* iv. 718–9.

[95] Inst. 4, *Parl. Hist.* xx. 461–7.

[96] Inst. 7. Cf. No. 5 of the Instructions of 21 Sept.

[97] Inst. 6. [98] Inst. 19.

ham's cup might be run for. Whalley gave permission; and he reported to Cromwell, 'I assured him it was not your highness's intention in the suppressing of horse races to abridge gentlemen of their sport, but to prevent the great confluences of irreconcilable enemies.[99] Against wickedness, profaneness, &c., the major-generals worked steadily. Against swearing they were especially severe. Butler fined a certain Mr. Barton 6*l.* for saying 'God damn me,' and protested that it should have been 10*l.* if the culprit's horse would have fetched as much.[100] Attempts were made to prevent the profanation of Sunday by preventing markets from being held on Saturday or Monday.[101] In some places 'base books' were suppressed; and a raid was made against illegal marriages.[102]

The most direct efforts in behalf of religion were those to carry out the ordinance for the ejection of insufficient ministers and schoolmasters, and generally to regulate churches and schools. The demand for 'ejectors' is heard very early in the correspondence; and, along with complaints of their inefficiency, is repeated again and again throughout its course. Ejection was not always for scandalous living only. Kelsey on one occasion reported that the whole garrison of Rochester was perverted and injured by the heresies of a certain minister named Coppin. The major-general had arrested and imprisoned him, and proposed that he should be transported.[103] On 28 Feb. 1656 Berry sent in a bad report of the spiritual condition of Breconshire. The county, he wrote, was getting heathen from the want of able preachers and the slowness in filling up vacancies.[104] On 23 April Haynes proposed a conference in his district with disaffected ministers and those tinged with anabaptist or fifth-monarchy views.[105]

On the whole there are indications that this part of the major-generals' duties was not only diligently but sometimes severely and irritatingly carried out.[106] Sometimes the council of state had to exercise its right of supervision and revision. Thus on 12 March 1656, on the petition of the parishioners of Radwinter, in Essex, Haynes was ordered to show cause why the clergyman, one Reynolds, had been made to stop preaching, and to suspend the restraint if it should be found desirable.[107]

(4) *Poor Law.*—The major-generals were instructed to see that unemployed persons were either made to work or sent out of the Commonwealth; to consider the case of the poor, and to report upon it to the Lord Protector and his council; meanwhile they were to insist upon the execution of the laws bearing on such cases.[108]

[99] Thurloe, iv. 607.
[100] *Ibid.* pp. 632–3.
[101] *Ibid.* pp. 277–8; *ibid.* v. 296.
[102] *Ibid.* iv. 523.
[103] *Ibid.* p. 486.
[104] *Ibid.* p. 565.
[105] *Ibid.* p. 727.
[106] See the case of Mossom, the schoolmaster at Richmond, *Cal. State Papers* (Dom.), 1655–6, Jan. 24.
[107] *Ibid.* 12 March.
[108] Inst. 5; *Parl. Hist.* xx. 461–7.

On this head the correspondence yields very little evidence, and such as there is seems to justify the belief that the penal aspects of the poor law were those most insisted on by the major-generals.

(5) *Registration.*—The major-generals were instructed that every householder in their respective districts must give security by his bond that his servants should keep the peace of the Commonwealth while in his service, during which time he must be ready to appear before the major-general or his deputy or agent, whensoever and wheresoever and as often as he should appoint, on notice left at his house. Also every major-general and every deputy was to keep a list of all persons in his district giving such security; and from time to time to return it, with information as to the quality and place of abode of each householder, to be entered in a central register. For the purpose of this register a registry office was to be set up in London, in which such lists were to be entered alphabetically.[109] When a householder, who had given security, appeared at the office, the registrar was to take his name and that of the place whence he came, as well as his temporary address in London or Westminster. Every time he changed his lodgings he was to furnish his new address to the office. When he intended to remove to the country the registrar was to inform the major-general of the district into which he proposed to go of (*a*) his name, (*b*) the place of his former abode, (*c*) how long he had been in London, (*d*) to what place he had gone from London. In case the registrar should find, when he received the name of such a householder, that the name did not appear in the district list furnished by the major-general, the registrar was to inform the secretary of state of the name and lodging of such a householder.[110]

Besides the bond for the household entered into by its head there was a *personal* bond bearing on four classes of persons, viz. (1) those who had borne arms against the Commonwealth; (2) those who lived dissolutely; (3) those without a calling; (4) those apparently living beyond their means. Every member of those four classes was to give bond with two sureties, with condition that if 'the above bounden A. B.' should (1) henceforth live peaceably, &c., (2) reveal to the authorities any knowledge of plots against the government, (3) be ready to appear before the major-general whenever called upon, (4) formally notify any change of address, (5) on going to London comply with rules for registration there, (6) refrain from ever using a false name, the obligation should be void.[111]

[109] The London registry office, known as 'the major-generals' office,' was opened in Fleet Street, at the 'Cock,' over against Black Horse Alley (*Parl. Hist.* xx. p. 468). Under the chief registry there were to be several subordinate offices in London and Westminster.

[110] Inst. 8, 9, 10; *Parl. Hist.* xx. 461–7.

[111] This form of 'bond to be entered into before the major-generals' will be found in *Mercurius Politicus*, 13 Dec. 1655, No. 288.

Further, every one, whether a foreigner or not, landing in England after 1 Dec. 1655, was, within twenty-four hours after landing, (*a*) to appear before an agent of the major-general of the district in which he landed; (*b*) to tell the name of the place from which he came, and that to which he was going, the said places to be entered in a book; (*c*) to engage that, on going to London or Westminster, he would make himself fully known to the registrar. If the immigrant had been a rebel he must give notice of every change of lodging. If he gave a false name or acted otherwise fraudulently, he was to be imprisoned during the pleasure of the Lord Protector or the council of state. The agents of the ports were from time to time to send lists of immigrants to the registrar in London, with an account of their personal appearance; and, if the immigrants were not bound for London, the same information was to be forwarded to the major-generals of the districts to which they were bound.

As often as any inhabitant of London or Westminster who had given security intended to change his residence he was in person to give notice of such intention to the registrar or his deputy, who was thereupon to enter his name, together with the names of his former and his intended residences, and by the next post to signify the same to the major-general in whose district the place lay whither the said person intended to remove.[112]

Cromwell's scheme thus included a double system of security for the sake of the public peace, viz. (1) an assurance to be given by every householder; (2) a bond to be entered into by royalists, as well as dissolute, idle, and extravagant persons, both parts of the system being worked in connexion with a central registration office in London, and with the constant co-operation of the major-generals. A moment's reflexion on the total effect of the instructions is enough to show how great, both in extension and intension, were the powers conferred on the major-generals under this head. The correspondence gives evidence both of their activity and of some of the difficulties with which they had to deal. We hear little indeed of the mere registration business—of the central office in London or any of its subordinates. But 'taking security' by means of bonds gave much work and trouble.[113]

Sir Ralph Verney, for example, was from home when the Bucks gentry were summoned by the commissioners and major-general. On 10 Nov. 1655 Sir Roger Burgoyne wrote to him, 'The Grand Commissioner' (it is to be presumed he means Haynes, Fleetwood's deputy) 'is come into these parts, and has convented before him the

[112] Inst. 11, 12, 13; *Parl. Hist.* xx. See also *Cal. State Papers* (Dom.), 26 Dec. 1655.

[113] Thurloe, iv. 156, 184–5, 190, 208, 234, 293–4, 322, 340–1, 411–2, 485–6, 495, 745.

principall gentry of our county that have been either sequestred or sequestrable, though they escaped the hands of the Committee.' Dr. Denton, the physician, Sir Ralph's uncle and faithful friend, warned him to delay his return as long as he could, that he might, if possible, be overlooked. Sir Ralph's difficulty was in ascertaining wherein consisted the offence which had led to his arrest in June. He was, however, set at liberty in October, on giving security for good behaviour. In March 1656, to save himself from the clutches of Major-General Fleetwood, he prepared a petition to the Protector, asking to be excused the decimation, on the ground that he had never been a delinquent. The Protector, however, referred him back to the major-general, and the decimation was confirmed, though apparently some alternative was offered, which Sir Ralph's scrupulous sense of honour forbade him to accept.[114]

One difficulty was raised more than once by Major-General Goffe. Security, he wrote, could not well be taken; the machinery for registration must be ready and in working order first;[115] besides, he considered that it would be a milder measure to postpone taking security to taxation. Kelsey was puzzled as to the precise definition of the classes for whom security was to be required, and he also complained of the want of prison accommodation for those who failed to give it.[116] On 14 Dec. 1655 Berry wrote from Wrexham to say that a local Welsh register was much wanted.[117] On 17 Dec. Worsley sent a request for more printed bonds, according to private instructions.

A certain Thomas Dunn was appointed registrar of the city of London at Christmas 1655.[118]

(6) *Licensing.*—The major-generals were instructed to suppress all *solitary* alehouses. They were to prevent all persons from posting without special warrant, and to allow no horses to be 'laid' to convey passengers without notice of place and persons being first given to the nearest justice of the peace. Whatever inn, alehouse, or tavern allowed horses to be so laid, and found out what had been done only after the horses had been used, was to forfeit its licence, which could not be granted again. All alehouses were to be carefully regulated both as to numbers and character.[119]

Under this head the major-generals seem to have done their work briskly. There was a good deal to be done. By Tudor legislation the licensing of public-houses was put into the hands of the justices of the peace; and they showed themselves more careful for the relief of thirst than for the prevention of drunkenness. There were also many unlicensed houses. The constables of Coventry, for example, reported that there were fifty unlicensed alehouses in

[114] *Memoirs of the Verney Family*, iii., chapters vii. and viii.
[115] Thurloe, iv. 190, 208. [116] *Ibid.* p. 234. [117] *Ibid.* p. 316.
[118] *Cal. State Papers* (Dom.), 26 Dec. [119] Inst. 17, 18, 21.

the town. Whalley wrote from Coventry on 1 Dec. 1655 that both there and in Lincoln, owing to the want of co-operation on the part of the civic magistrates, alehouses were no sooner put down than they were set up again.[120] On 11 Jan. 1655–6 Whalley wrote that the alehouses in Lincoln were incredibly numerous.[121] About the same time the stimulating effects of the new *régime* began to be felt in Shropshire, where the justices, 'considering that the end of the law in licensing inns was not to set up houses to tipple in, but to make entertainment for strangers and travellers,' roused themselves to put the licensing regulations in force.[122] To take another instance, on 24 Jan. 1655–6 Worsley wrote that he was doing his best in Lancashire, but that it was very difficult to carry out the work of suppression without seriously weakening the revenue. He intended to put down, if he could, two hundred alehouses in the hundred of Blackburn alone.[123] By-and-by a note of progress is heard from Lincoln, whence, on 26 Jan. 1655–6, the report comes, 'The business (blessed be God) that our major-generals and we are entrusted with goes on very well; . . . we have suppressed forty, fifty, and sixty alehouses in some corporations.'[124] Under the same impulse the justices of Warwickshire directed the high constables of the hundreds to suppress a third of the inns and alehouses within their districts.[125] On 9 Feb. Worsley wrote to Thurloe from Chester that he was putting down all alehouses which belonged to one or more of the five following classes: (1) those hostile to the government; (2) those whose owners had other means of livelihood; (3) such as were in 'big and dark corners' (blind alehouses); (4) those of bad repute and disorderly; (5) those suspected to be houses of ill-fame.[126]

Besides the foregoing six departments of work imposed on the major-generals by their instructions there is evidence to show that they discharged an additional function—namely, an oversight of various matters of local administration. This must have had important practical results. For example, they were entrusted with the regulation of weights and measures in many places.[127] Again, we find Major-General Whalley writing from Nottingham on 9 April

[120] Thurloe, iv. 272–3. [121] *Ibid.* pp. 411–2. Cf. p. 434.

[122] *Public Intelligencer*, 14–21 Jan. 1655–6, No. 16.

[123] Thurloe, iv. 449–50. Cf. Worsley to Thurloe, *ibid.* p. 473.

[124] *Public Intelligencer*, No. 18, 28 Jan.–4 Feb. 1655–6.

[125] 'You are directed within fourteen days from receipt to bring in a list in your respective divisions, setting a mark on the third part of such as may best be spared' (*Mercurius Politicus*), No. 295, 31 Jan.–7 Feb. 1655–6.

[126] Thurloe, iv. 522–3. Cf. commissioners for Cheshire to Thurloe, *ibid.*, and see commissioners for Durham to Protector, *ibid.* p. 541.

[127] See Worsley to Thurloe, Thurloe, iv. 533–4; Whalley to Thurloe, *ibid.* pp. 686–7; *ibid.* Thurloe, v. 211–2.

1656 and reporting that the market bell there, the ringing of which gave signal for the market to begin, was not rung till one o'clock, so that, in the winter, business began too late for the convenience of people who came long distances from the country. 'If,' he wrote, 'his highness and council would issue out a proclamation throughout England, commanding all mayors, aldermen, and bailiffs of cities and corporations to cause their market bell to ring by ten or eleven of the clock at furthest, the major-generals would take care it should be observed.'[128]

Again, a petition for a college at Durham having been forwarded to the council of state by the justices, sheriffs, grand jury, and gentlemen of the county, an order was issued to Lilburne to make the foundation.[129] The inhabitants of Chester having petitioned for a new head of the city hospital, the major-general and three of the militia commissioners were empowered to deal with the subject. As time went on the miscellaneous responsibilities of the major-generals evidently multiplied. Thus we find that on the report of a committee appointed to supervise and regulate the work of the sheriffs, to the effect 'that complaints have been made of the excessive charges burdening the office of sheriff through the example of some which discourage those employed,' the major-generals were ordered to appoint in their respective counties troops of horse to attend the sheriff at the assizes, to wait on the judges, and to perform the services previously required of the sheriff's men.[130] Again, on a petition of the inhabitants against the bad work of the worsted weavers of Norwich and Norfolk, Major-General Haynes, along with the sheriff and others, was ordered to advise with the justices of assize at the following circuit as to the best way of securing the good quality of the manufacture.[131] We find Desborough ordered on behalf of the baptists of Exeter to take care that the best repaired public meeting-place of the city which could conveniently be spared should be assigned to them;[132] and similarly Whalley was ordered to consider the repair of the parish church of Scartho, in Lincolnshire, on the petition of the patron.[133]

IV.

When we put together the foregoing evidence and estimate its total import, we are able to form a pretty clear picture of the doings of the major-generals between November 1655 and the summer of 1656. At the latter date the pressure of general politics in England forced their energies into a new channel. At the same time the growth of public opinion about them was stimulated, and

[128] Thurloe, iv. 686–7.
[129] *Ibid.* p. 442; *Cal. State Papers* (Dom.), 1 Feb. 1655–6.
[130] *Cal. State Papers* (Dom.), 13 Feb. 1655–6.
[131] *Ibid.* 27 Feb. 1655–6.
[132] *Ibid.* 13 March 1655–6.
[133] *Ibid.* 15 May 1656. Cf. the order of 28 Aug. 1656.

means were not long wanting of giving it systematic expression. The central events of the year were the alliance with France, concluded in October 1655, just when the major-generals were finally girding themselves for their task, and the outbreak of war between England and Spain in February 1656. The latter event necessitated a very large outlay on military, and a still larger one on naval, preparations; and for the purposes of such outlay the revenue fell far short. The major-generals met in the spring to consult with the council of state, and recommended the imposition of a general property tax. To this proposal Cromwell at last reluctantly yielded; and the tax was imposed accordingly. It encountered much opposition in the country; and in the early summer it became evident that, if public opinion was not to be dangerously irritated, another parliament must be called together.

The unpopularity which a taxing government inevitably incurs fell on the Protectorate before and during the general election, and the attention of the public was specially directed to the strenuousness of the rule of the major-generals. After the issue of the writs on 11 July Cromwell found himself in the midst of baffling cross-currents of opinion, most uncongenial to his temperament; pent-up opposition burst forth on every hand, and he had to content himself with the support of a party instead of that of a united nation. In this state of affairs it occurred to the Lord Protector that the major-generals might be utilised to help the government party in the elections, and there is much evidence to show that from July onwards the activities of the major-generals became mainly electioneering, while their importance in other aspects began to decline. On 27 June 1656 Haynes wrote to Thurloe from Bury St. Edmund's that he would try to sound people about a parliament, warning him at the same time that the chances of government candidates would be poor unless the arrears due to the militia were paid up.[134] On 30 June Goffe wrote from Winchester of the probable parliament in September, and expressed a hope that it would not reopen the question of the form of the government.[135] As July advanced interest in the subject grew keener.[136] It was proposed to elect Goffe for Abingdon, but he asserted that he only wanted to keep bad men out, not to get in himself.[137] On 16 July Haynes wrote expressing his eagerness in the work, at the same time complaining that the electors were insufficiently instructed from headquarters, and again sounding a warning note about the payment of the troops.[138] A few days afterwards he wrote that it was too late to hope anything from the assistance of the militia.[139]

[134] Thurloe, v. 165.

[135] *Ibid.* pp. 171–2.

[136] Packer to Thurloe, *ibid.* p. 187; Haynes to Thurloe, *ibid.* pp. 187–8; Berry to Thurloe, *ibid.* p. 219.

[137] Thurloe, v. 215.

[138] Thurloe, p. 220.

[139] *Ibid.* p. 230.

On 9 Aug. Lilburne reported the existence of a powerful anti-government party in Durham and Northumberland, whose chief grievance seems to have been the doings of the major-generals.[140] On 11 Aug. Whalley asserted that no member would be chosen for Nottingham without his advice, adding that what he called 'the mediterranean part of the nation' was sound. He besought Cromwell not to irritate the constituencies by adding to the militia at that juncture.[141] Kelsey reported trouble at Dover through the candidature of Cony, and hinted that it would be well to 'seclude' him.[142] On 15 Aug. Haynes wrote that he was working hard to influence the elections;[143] and Bridges, who had been appointed Worsley's successor, reported that all the commissioners in his district were doing likewise.[144]

Shortly after the middle of August the elections began. On the 20th Haynes wrote that they were proceeding in his district; that the opposition was strong and troublesome, chiefly on account of the militia arrears. On the 23rd Goffe reported with regard to Surrey that the opposition cry was, 'No soldier, decimator, or any man that hath salary.'[145] On the same day Whalley was able to report satisfactorily of the results in his district.[146] On the 26th Kelsey sent a disquieting report to the Lord Protector himself. At Maidstone there was a coalition of cavaliers and presbyterians against the government and all 'swordsmen, decimators, and courtiers;' and most of those chosen to sit in the ensuing parliament were, he considered, of the same spirit. There was a likelihood of violence: the party wished to destroy major-generals, decimators, and the new militia. He then went on to make suggestions to Cromwell. New justices of an 'honest' complexion should be added to the commission of the peace; and all members of parliament should engage not to meddle with the Instrument of Government or with the doings of Protector or council without the Protector's consent. 'There is such perverseness,' Kelly concluded, 'in those chosen, that without resolution in you and the council to maintain the interest of God's people, which is to be preferred before a thousand parliaments, against all opposition, we shall return to our Egyptian taskmasters.'[147]

Not only did the major-generals work hard for government candidates; they became candidates themselves; and were all returned—Skippon for Lynn, Barkstead for Middlesex, Kelsey for Guildford, Goffe for Hampshire, Fleetwood for Oxfordshire, and his deputy, Haynes, for Essex; Whalley for Nottinghamshire, Butler for Bedfordshire, and Bridges for Chipping Wycombe; Lambert

[140] Thurloe, v. 296. 'The people are perfect in their lesson, saying they will have no swordmen nor decimator, or . . . to serve in parliament.'

[141] *Ibid.* pp. 299–300. Cf. Haynes, *ibid.* pp. 312–3. [142] *Ibid.* p. 308.

[143] *Ibid.* pp. 311–2. [144] *Ibid.* pp. 313–4. [145] *Ibid.* p. 341.

[146] *Ibid.* p. 343. [147] *Cal. State Papers* (Dom.), 26 Aug.

for the West Riding of Yorkshire, and his deputies, Lilburne and Howard, for the North Riding and Cumberland respectively. Desborough was associated with Skippon in the representation of Lynn; Berry was elected for Herefordshire, Rowland Dawkins for Carmarthen, and Packer for Woodstock.[148]

V.

Enough has been said in connexion with the elections of 1656 to show the existence of vigorous opposition to the new institution. As an agency of arbitrary and severe taxation it necessarily incurred the detestation of the entire royalist party; as a police and military force, designed to detect and suppress rebellion of all sorts within the Commonwealth, it was hated by the heterogeneous mass of anti-Oliverians everywhere, from semi-royalists to fifth-monarchy men and Levellers; as a stringent licensing authority it was obnoxious to 'the trade' and all connected with it; in its efforts on behalf of religion and morals it met the inevitable fate of unpopularity; while, as a novel and arbitrary device, interfering on all sides with individual liberty, and lying wholly aside from the tried ways of constitutional and administrative routine, it was intolerable to the staunch parliamentary republicans, who regarded the Protectorate as a disease within the body politic.

What the last-mentioned party thought of the major-generals and their rule is sufficiently shown in Ludlow's 'Memoirs.'

> In the meantime [wrote Ludlow, with reference to the summer of 1656] the major-generals carried things with unheard of insolence in their several precincts, decimating to extremity whom they pleased, and interrupting the proceedings at law upon petitions of those who pretended themselves aggrieved, threatening such as would not yield a ready submission to their orders with transportation to Jamaica or some other plantations in the West Indies; and suffering none to escape their persecution but those that would betray their own party. . . . And here I cannot omit to mention a farmer in Berkshire, who, being demanded to pay his tenth, desired to know of the commissioners, in case he did so, what security he should have for the other nine parts; and answer being made that he should have Cromwell's orders and theirs for the enjoyment of the rest, he replied 'that he had already an act of parliament for the whole, which he could not but think to be as good security as they could give. But,' said he, 'if goodman such a one,' and another whom he named of his neighbours, 'will give me their bond for it, I know what to say to such a proposal; for if they break their agreement I know where to right myself; but these swordmen are too strong for me.'[149]

Take, on the other hand, a specimen of royalist opinion. Writing about the same time, Roger Coke tells us—

> These major-generals acted their parts to the life; and being an

[148] See Cobbett's *Parl. Hist.* iii. 1479.

[149] Ludlow's *Memoirs* (Clarendon Press ed. 1894), ii. 3.

obscure company of mean fellows (except Fleetwood), lorded it over the nobility, as well as gentry and clergy, with an unheard of insolence.

He goes on to tell how his father, a country gentleman of Suffolk, fared at the hands of Fleetwood's deputy, Haynes. He had been expelled from the long parliament for 'malignancy,' and imprisoned in London, but afterwards liberated through the solicitation of his wife, when he returned to the ordinary life of a quiescent royalist in Suffolk, his two sons, Roger and a brother of nineteen, living with him. In 1656 Roger was induced to show active sympathy with a meditated cavalier rising, and to buy arms which were to be secretly imported into his father's house. The authorities got wind of the plot; and one Sunday at midnight horsemen from Yarmouth broke into the Cokes' house, seized the father and the younger son, put them in ward at Yarmouth, and extracted from the boy the story of the plot by holding lighted matches between his fingers. On Roger Coke's remonstrating with the authorities he was told that the Lord Protector only wanted security for his father's good behaviour. Roger repudiated the necessity in his father's case, urging that he was already 'decimated' for having been sequestered. It turned out that Coke senior had given much offence by the irreverent way in which he had spoken of the Lord Protector; but in a few days he was set at liberty. Soon after he was sent for to appear before Haynes at Bury St. Edmund's, to give security, and show cause why he should not be 'decimated.' His son pleaded that he was not within the scope of the major-general's instructions, as, though he had been sequestered, no charge was alleged against him. Haynes discharged the sequestration, but persisted in demanding the truth. Roger Coke thereupon went to London, and in the end Coke senior was not decimated. 'I believe,' adds his son, 'he was the only man sequestered in England who escaped.' [150]

This story is intended to redound to the discredit of the major-generals, but the impartial reader will probably find that another inference may be drawn from it. The major-generals may have been 'mean fellows' from the country gentleman's exalted point of view, and the Yarmouth gaolers may have been cruel; but Roger Coke was a detected conspirator; his father lent his house for the storage of arms for an illegal purpose, and he ultimately got off scot free. On the whole the evidence of the correspondence goes to show that the major-generals were high-minded and conscientious men, aware that their functions were novel, and at many points

[150] Roger Coke's *Detection of the Court and State of England*, ii. 60–6. The Verney manuscripts give some hints as to the feeling of the country gentry with out strong royalist prepossessions. With regard to liability, Dr. Denton wrote to Sir Ralph Verney on 17 Nov. 1655: 'I hear . . . that sequestration and delinquency

lacking in legal definition, and eager, therefore, that these drawbacks should be met by tact and wisdom at headquarters.

The currents of outside opinion were soon collected in the one regular channel. The second protectorate parliament met on 17 Sept. 1656. The government was aware that, in spite of all its electioneering efforts, it had only a party, and probably only a minority of the new house of commons, behind it. The Protector, accordingly, after addressing to all the members the long speech in which he made his apology for the major-generals,[151] reverted to the tactics he had used at the beginning of the first protectorate parliament. By the twenty-first clause of the Instrument of Government the council of state had the right to examine the list of persons elected, to sit in judgment on their qualifications, and to prevent them from taking their seats without their approval. Those who were approved were presented with tickets of admission; those who had no tickets to produce were incapacitated from sitting in parliament. On this occasion the clause was put in force with startling effect. Nearly one hundred members holding opinions hostile to the government were refused the necessary tickets, and sent back to their homes to swell the mass of opposition out of doors.[152]

Parliament sat three months before the question of the major-generals came before it. When it did present itself it was in its financial aspect. The main reason for calling parliament together had, after all, been the need for putting taxation on a satisfactory footing; money was needed for the war with Spain as well as for the exigencies of internal government. As Christmas approached it became necessary to decide whether the new militia and executive should be continued; and whether, if so, they were to be supported by the same plan of taxation as formerly. In the discussion of the questions the 'decimation' of the past year inevitably came up for judgment. On Christmas Day a long and heated debate arose on the question of 'leave to bring in a bill of assessments for maintenance of the militia forces; the same to be levied on such persons as have been in arms against the parliament, or sequestered for their

shall not be the only standard, but disaffection shall in due time have its place.' Again, Sir Roger Burgoyne wrote to Verney on 10 Dec. 1655, 'Sir Francis Willowby . . . pleaded a non-sequestration. "The more to blame," replied Major-General Whalley, "was the committee, for you sent two horses to the king.' So he was cast as for the tenth part. Sir Clement Fisher, though sequestered, pleaded an article which runs to this sense: that those are to be excepted who have manifested their good affections to the Commonwealth since, which he pretends to have done by a voluntary offering of himself . . . to serve the Lord Protector when the late insurrection began to appear; this, if he can get but the testimony of Sir Gilbert for, will free him. Sir George Devereux, though not sequestered, being charged for sending in two orses, pleaded that his unruly son took them out of the stable without his knowledge or consent, and went to the king with them. This reprieved him for the present, however, and was dismissed upon it, and hopes not to be questioned any more about it.'

[151] Speech v. in Carlyle's *Cromwell*. [152] See Godwin, iv. 286–98.

delinquency in the late wars, with the restrictions, exceptions, and provisoes to be contained therein, for some persons and in some cases.'[153] The bill was brought forward by Desborough, the first major-general, it will be remembered, who was appointed under the scheme. His argument was simple and familiar. The tax, he said, was essential to the maintenance of internal tranquillity; and it was only just that its incidence should be solely on those by whom the peace of the nation was endangered.[154] The speakers in favour of the motion for the most part followed Desborough's lead. The opposition, from the outset, maintained the inconsistency of the tax with the Act of Oblivion, passed on 25 Feb. 1651–2, a difficulty anticipated in Cromwell's Declaration. The substance of that measure was that all political offences whatever, committed before the date of the battle of Worcester (3 Sept. 1651), were pardoned (a few exceptions being specified); and all who would promise allegiance to the Commonwealth as it was then constituted were accepted as satisfactory citizens without any deduction or reflexion. In other words, the great bulk of the royalist party began on 3 Sept. 1651 to face the world with a politically stainless record. This aspect of the case was brought into prominence by the opponents of Desborough's motion; and their main argument was that while individual royalists might of course lose the benefits of the act of oblivion by subsequent offences, the whole body of royalists could not, by the sins of any minority of them, forego the benefits of their corporate exemption in the manner involved in the 'decimation.' The tax by which the institution of the major-generals was supported was levied on all royalists simply as such; and the opposition held, surely not without justice, that this was a direct breach of the Act of Oblivion.

The parliament to which this issue was presented was naturally, after the exclusion of the ninety odd members, mainly Oliverian in opinion. Chief among the obvious supporters of the motion for continuing the major-generals were, first of all, the major-generals themselves, all of whom, as we saw, were elected to the second Protectorate parliament. Secondly, there were the members of the council of state, of whom thirteen at least had seats in the assembly. Thirdly, there were miscellaneous officials, such as Thurloe, the secretary of state; and miscellaneous military or naval men, who would probably support the government measure, but were by no means as certain to do so as major-generals in the specific sense, or councillors of state. In the opposition were first of all the large body of lawyers, who had never much liked the Protectorate and the Instrument of Government, and who were bound to suffer no breach, open or insidious, of the Act of Oblivion. With the lawyers would naturally go any country

[153] *Commons' Journals*, 25 Dec. 1656, vol. vii.

[154] Burton's *Diary*, i. 230.

gentlemen who might be in the house—men who, with or without royalist antecedents or secret royalist sympathies, would be conscious of solidarity with all heavily taxed landlords, and would dislike all excessive military or executive espionage. Doubtful groups, again, would be the law officers of the crown, who would oscillate between the bias of professional *esprit de corps* and that of co-operation, as far as possible, with the head of the state; and miscellaneous republicans, either actively hostile to Cromwell or lukewarm and suspicious in their attachment to him.

In the Christmas Day debate eight of the fifteen speakers in favour of the bill were either major-generals or members of the council of state,[155] while the rest were new-model officers or staunch Cromwellians.[156] Of the nine speakers on the opposition side four, viz. Lenthall (master of the rolls), Widdrington (the speaker), Bampfield, and Godfrey, were lawyers; two, viz. Dennis Bond and Sir John Hobart, may be taken as representing the class of country gentlemen loyal both to Commonwealth and Protectorate. Two others, viz. Major-General Jephson and Colonel John Jones, represent the non-official opinion which was free to attach itself to one side or the other. In the first of the two divisions which followed the debate the two tellers against the motion were Sir W. Roberts, a Cromwellian country gentleman who held offices under the state, and Richard Hampden, son of John Hampden, the inheritor of his father's position and (it is to be presumed) of his dislike of arbitrary taxation.

All the essential argument in the debate turned on the Act of Oblivion and on the punishment of the royalists as a class involved in the proposal. Robinson maintained that the royalists as a body had broken the Act, and therefore ought to suffer as a body. To this Jephson retorted that such an allegation must be proved. Whitlock suggested the reference of the bill to a grand committee. This proposal took deep root in the lawyer mind, and was supported by the speaker and by Godfrey. The major-generals, however, set themselves resolutely against delay. On this point they prevailed, and, after two divisions, leave was given to bring in the bill. The debate on the first reading began on 7 Jan. 1656–7, with a dramatic surprise. The first serious speech was made by John (often called Lord) Claypole, Cromwell's son-in-law, the master of the horse and a lord of the bedchamber. Whoever opposed the bill, it might have been expected that Claypole would support it. Instead of doing so he rose to move its rejection. The renewal of the tax, he said, would be inconsistent with the Act of Oblivion, though he was prepared to give parliamentary

[155] The major-generals were Desborough, Lambert, Whalley, Packer, and Kelsey. The councillors of state, besides Lambert, were Sydenham, Pickering, and Strickland.

[156] Cols. Holland, Hewson, and Clarke, with Lisle and Fiennes.

sanction to the doings of the major-generals in the past. Such a speech, coming from such a quarter, seemed to indicate that the bill was, to say the least of it, no longer to be regarded as a government measure.

The subsequent debate was overwhelmingly against the bill. Lord Broghill, whose position and character gave great weight to his words, condemned the measure uncompromisingly as being unprecedented, ungenerous, and dishonourable. Nor was it even a prudent measure, for it would probably give to the cavaliers the corporate character which it attributed to them. This last point was emphasised by Trevor, one of the members for Flint, who also objected to the institution of the major-generals as involving what he called a 'cantonisation' of the nation, *i.e.* the setting up of provincial military government, which, he considered, would rivet the fetters of despotism on the state. Desborough thereupon asked whether the old militia of England had produced any of the terrible consequences which Trevor expected from the new one. The obvious answer, of course, was that the major-generals were objectionable, not because they were the heads of a military force, but of an inquisitional taxing authority and police backed by a military force.

Whitlocke wound up the debate with an impassioned appeal to the Act of Oblivion, and nothing then practically remained but to divide the house. A series of adjournments of the debate, however, intervened. On Wednesday, 21 Jan., we are told that 'exceptions were taken against words spoken by Mr. Cromwell as charging some major-generals to have acted unjustly and against law. It was desired that they might be named, but it was put off until the main debate ended . . . and the debate was again adjourned. From the letter of a certain Mr. Vincent Gookin, preserved among Thurloe's State Papers, we learn that the 'Mr. Cromwell' above mentioned was not the Lord Protector's son Richard, but Colonel Henry Cromwell, his first cousin once removed, and that the attack was instigated by a speech of Major-General Butler in favour of the bill. Subsequently the Lord Protector conferred with his bold young relative, and expressed anything but unmingled disapprobation of his conduct.

After more adjournments Wednesday, 28 Jan., was reached. An attempt seems to have been made by those in favour of the bill to apply a sort of closure; and the house divided on the question 'whether this debate shall be further proceeded in.' The majority against the closure was 75. The debate, therefore, was 'proceeded in,' but only to be once more adjourned. On Thursday, 29 Jan., the last scene began, and two divisions were taken. The first question put was, 'that a day be appointed for the second reading of this bill.' The negative was carried by a majority of 43,

one of the tellers for the 'noes' being Richard Cromwell. A second division was then taken on the direct question, 'that this bill be rejected.' Here the votes for the motion were 124, and those against it 88, the majority in favour of rejection being 36. It was, therefore, resolved 'that the bill concerning the militia forces be rejected.'[157]

And so, the means for their support being denied, Cromwell's major-generals practically disappeared from English history. It was said, indeed, that they lingered on at Cromwell's pleasure;[158] and in the early months of 1657 there is some evidence that they kept their places, and discharged some few of their old duties.[159] But the Protector had fallen out of sympathy with them, and they with him. Scrutiny of the final stages of the debates, in which Cromwell's son and cousin, as well as his son-in-law, are seen to be working against the major-generals, shows that they had ceased to be a Cromwellian institution, and that for some reason which is not on the surface the Protector must have been, to say the least of it, willing to acquiesce in their abolition. On the other hand it is worthy of notice that the two decisive majorities of 43 and 36 by which the bill was destroyed were not overwhelming, and that the final one was the smallest of all.

Ludlow had no hesitation about ascribing the fall of the major-generals to Cromwell's moral turpitude, which could impose odious duties on a body of men, and then leave them to sink under the *odium*, without the offer of support or sympathy. It is surely possible to find some explanation less damaging to the reputation of a great man. The major-generals were a creation of personal government; they were instituted, and the taxation which supported them was imposed, because Cromwell could not, or would not, work in harmony with parliament. After September 1656 this state of things was altered. Parliament and the Protector found ou ways of being at peace with one another; English arms were successful against the Spaniard, and parliament took heart to vote a subsidy of 400,000*l.*, which was enough to meet all instant emergencies. When Sindercomb's plot again put the state in jeopardy, parliament proposed to make the threatened chief magistrate a king. The hour for military government seemed to have passed away, and the time seemed to have come for the state to feel its way back to some at least of the old and tried paths, though the shrewdest observer then living can hardly have foreseen how soon and how completely the return was to be made.

David Watson Rannie.

[157] *Commons' Journals.*

[158] See Hum. Robinson to Williamson, *Cal. State Papers* (Dom.), 29 Jan. 1656–7.

[159] *Cal. State Papers* (Dom.), 5, 10, 12 Feb.; 3, 5, 17, 19 March; 16, 28 April 1657.

John Robert Seeley

SINCE Sir John Seeley's death a good deal that is interesting has been said, both about his remarkable personality and his historical and literary work. Older men have recalled the half-forgotten controversy that raged round 'Ecce Homo' and the well-kept secret of its authorship, and younger men have contributed appreciations of 'The Expansion of England,' and have pointed out how Seeley's exposition of English colonial policy touched a new chord of patriotism, and roused in ordinary men a new feeling towards their splendid inheritance. The result of this has been that although during his lifetime Seeley's name was not much before the public, yet the public have been enabled to realise the extent of their loss. They understand now the magnificent range and vitality of the writer who in the sixties was discussing at once reverently and suggestively the historical problems connected with the life of Christ, and in the eighties was popularising the imperial idea, and promulgating doctrines from a professorial chair which have already had a considerable influence upon practical statesmanship. But one very important aspect of Seeley's work has been left untouched—his work as one of the most stimulating and inspiring of Cambridge teachers. Of this the present article seeks to give grateful account.

His old pupils used to say that Seeley's lectures were, at any rate, an education in lucidity and thoroughness—virtues which they were accustomed to claim as specially characteristic of the university in which he was, for a quarter of a century, Regius Professor. His published work was elaborated in a way that his readers never realised, for as a rule he was sparing of footnotes and references, and made no parade of the pains he took. The exception is his diploma work, 'The Life and Times of Stein.' Dedicated to Reinhold Pauli, and with a quotation from Goethe at the back of the title-page, it is conceived and carried out after the German plan. The biography of Stein involves a detailed history of Prussia between 1806 and 1822, 'abundant information about other German states, and about Germany in general' is given, and 'biographies of other distinguished men, such as Hardenberg,

Scharnhorst, and others,' are 'interwoven with the biography of Stein.' The authorities on which the text is based are classified and described in the preface in an orderly manner, and though the style is dry and unimpassioned, nothing escapes the writer. And the method of 'Stein' was Seeley's ordinary method. The posthumous work on 'The Growth of British Policy,' still in the press, is based on forty manuscript volumes of extracts copied from the Record Office and other sources. Critics who read his finished work, and talk of 'hasty generalisation,' fail to appreciate the laborious process by which the finished work was produced. This habit of thoroughness Seeley communicated insensibly to his pupils. He never preached it to them, but it soon came to influence unconsciously the standard of criticism which they were accustomed to apply to what they wrote for him. To spare trouble was regarded by him as a kind of treason, and thus, though some of us might be flighty and others dull, we never scamped our work.

The other transcendent merit of Seeley as a teacher was his habit of insisting first of all upon clearness of thought and expression. It was never permitted to us to wrap up fallacies in fine phrases, or to use high-sounding terms that had not been defined. There was nothing that the professor enjoyed more than exposing this kind of imposture, and with him it was rarely attempted. He hated above all things the picturesque in history. 'That is the business of the stage-manager and scene-painter,' he would say, 'and not of the historian.' The business of history was with serious things, with great causes and great results. 'I fully admit,' he writes in 'The Expansion of England, 'that history should not be solemn and pompous, and I admit that for a long time it was both. But solemnity is one thing, and seriousness is quite another.' And this hatred of the picturesque in history was largely due, as a correspondent in the 'Journal of Education' has acutely pointed out, to the severity of his artistic feeling. He was accustomed to keep strong restraint upon himself, to concentrate deliberately his whole attention upon clearness, and clearness only. His lectures consisted largely of dry statements of fact, marshalled, indeed, with such skill that their very order and arrangement were suggestive, but handled as a lawyer would handle them who was directing his argument not to the jury but to the judge. Yet in spite of this resolute self-restraint, Seeley, himself a poet, as we have come to know since his death, was always keenly alive to the poetry of history, and when he chose, the effect was irresistible. The modern theory of our colonial empire has become practical and prosaic under the hands of recent writers. Captain Mahan has worked it out on the naval side, and Mr. Spencer Wilkinson has popularised its more business-like aspect, until even the man in the street knows something of the way in which the empire

was built up, and of the policy by which it may be preserved. But the romantic story was first told in a Cambridge lecture-room, and told in such a way as to stir the imagination and quicken the pulses of the dullest undergraduate among the audience. Seeley's conception of the empire was the conception of a poet as well as an historian. To him it was a 'world-Venice'—

> The sea is in the broad, the narrow streets,
> Ebbing and flowing.

This is almost commonplace now, but upon some of us it came fifteen years ago as a revelation.

If Seeley's style was highly artistic, it was also highly artificial. The effects were consummate, but they were all carefully planned. His voice was never strong, but it was clear, and he managed it with the utmost ability, using all the delicate shades of emphasis. The lucidity of his arrangement seemed almost to communicate itself to his reading, and to find physical expression, as it were, in his modes of speech. His old pupils will recollect also with what infinite skill he utilised a slight cough, in order to point a sentence or emphasise a phrase. His use of quotations was masterly and suggestive in the highest degree. He once summed up a long passage that dealt with the important place occupied by religion in early states: 'We may say of states, as Wordsworth did of men,

> Heaven lies about them in their infancy.'

Readers of the little-read volume published in 1870 under the title 'Lectures and Essays,' and republished only a few weeks ago, will also remember the quotation with which he concludes his striking parallel between Milton and Carlyle at the end of the essay on 'Milton's Political Opinions.' The same habit of deliberately working up his effects is to be traced in the subject-matter of his lectures as well as in the literary form into which they were thrown. He would take pains to travel to the same conclusion by several roads in order to make it appear irresistible. Lines of argument, however different, converged inevitably upon the same point. The result was that one of the greater objects of the teacher was secured, and it became impossible for his scholars to misunderstand or to forget what he was teaching them. They left the lecture-room feeling that though other departments of knowledge might be affected by the process of the suns, the conclusions of the Regius Professor of Modern History were established upon adamantine foundations. This note of dogmatism was in all Seeley's professorial utterances. Personally reserved and reverent, when he spoke *ex cathedrâ* it was with no uncertain sound. Even in its published form 'The Expansion of England' begins with the words, 'It is a favourite maxim of mine,' and those who were accustomed to hear him lecture will recollect the autocratic phrase, 'according to me.'

Yet this dogmatism appeared as the natural expression of an austere and dignified personality, and it was impossible that it should ever be resented. The professor had studied all the sources, and had arrived at certain results; why should he make a pretence that he did not himself believe in them? The monarchical manner sat well upon one whose sovereignty in his lecture-room was so absolute and unquestioned.

In selecting subjects for his public lectures Seeley was attracted most by the international history of modern Europe. Of late years he has lectured on 'Napoleon,' on 'English Foreign Policy in the Eighteenth Century,' 'International History from the Sixteenth Century,' 'The Wars of Louis XIV,' and congenial subjects of the kind. 'The Expansion of England' itself was a course of lectures delivered in 1881–2. Quite recently he delivered a course on 'Political Science,' dealing especially with the classification of states. Thus he was accustomed to study the broad effects. He preferred what he called 'large considerations,' and was much more at home in dealing with a century than with a decade. The whole drift of his mind was towards the suggestive treatment of large phenomena, rather than the microscopic investigation of details. Thus 'The Expansion of England' rather than 'Stein' represents the kind of work he liked best. His method was, as it were, astronomical. He swept the whole heaven with his telescope. It was the heaven that had overarched all our lives, but he found new things there, and his hearers shared the delight of discovery. The old familiar facts became instinct with new meaning, and they felt 'like some watcher of the skies, when a new planet swims into his ken.'

If the various courses of public lectures delivered by the late professor during the last fifteen years were passed in review, the most characteristic, though not the best, would be found to be a course on the 'Holy Roman Empire,' delivered in the academical year 1879–80. It covered an enormous area of history, for the first lecture was concerned with the fall of Rome before the barbarians, and the last dealt with the characteristics of modern democracy. The purpose of the course was 'to follow out in each of its stages the transformation of the Roman empire into modern independent states,' and this gave abundant opportunity for the historical paradoxes which Seeley loved. In these discursive lectures he summed up, as it were, all the views with which his name has been specially identified. From time to time, in parallels drawn from Scripture history, the author of 'Ecce Homo' spoke. In a lecture that dealt with the progress of the 'nation-states' in the eighteenth century, 'The Expansion of England' was foreshadowed. In the final lectures of the course Seeley sketched out the conception of Napoleon that was to come before the world in his 'Short History of Napoleon' in 1886. The lectures are full of the protests

in which he took so much pleasure against rhetorical views of history.

> We are not to imagine that the claims of Hildebrand had been deliberately planned from the beginning, and held in reserve by generations of popes till the time was ripe for urging them. These are melodramatic and sentimental, not sober views of history. We have to explain, not an incredible priestly plot, woven through a thousand years, but a transitory exaggeration of a sacerdotalism which had been in existence since the beginning.

A similar opportunity came again in his treatment of English liberty, which he was careful to regard as the result of geographical and other favourable conditions.

> When we look at Europe from a distance we shall be tempted by the ethnological fallacy, we shall attribute the political success of Englishmen exclusively to 'English political capacity,' or to the 'quiet perseverance,' the 'common-sense,' or the 'natural moderation' of the Anglo-Saxon in distinction to all other races. It is, no doubt, hard to reject the doctrine that we are better than other people when it presents itself in the form of a grand inductive law.

But while he denounced rhetorical views of history, the majestic longevity of the Holy Roman Empire inspired him to a rhetoric of his own. After a long and close discussion of the 'Romanism' of the middle ages, in which he saw a combination of 'Romanity, the religion of the Seven Hills,' and 'Christianity, the religion of Mount Zion,' he pointed out that Dante perceived the double character of Romanism in his day.

> Dante, led by two guides, Beatrice, who symbolised Christian theology, and Virgil, who 'was born under Julius and lived under the good Augustus,' sees in the deepest pit of hell's ninth circle the giant Lucifer, with his three mouths, in which he champs eternally three great criminals—in the one Judas Iscariot, for a reason we can easily understand; and in the other two, Brutus and Cassius, because they murdered the first Roman emperor.

The point is not that there is anything new here, for the passage is little more than a paraphrase of Mr. Bryce, but that Seeley, in spite of his apparent renunciation of rhetoric, was keenly alive to the rhetorical possibilities of his subject. He rejected a rhetorical view, but he did not reject a rhetorical statement of a sober view, and his habit of deliberate self-restraint enabled him, when he did use rhetoric, to use it with prodigious effect. He was himself the pattern of these austere virtues, and yet he wielded all the spells of eloquence as well. It was as though, like King Solomon, we had chosen wisdom, and received riches also. Thus from the beginning Seeley's supremacy over young men was assured.

But this supremacy did not rest upon the professor's public lectures alone. His old pupils carry with them grateful recollections

of his 'Conversation Class.' The subject was political science studied by way of discussion, and discussion under the reverential conditions that prevailed resolved itself into question and answer—Socrates exposing the folly of the Athenians. It was mainly an exercise in the definition and scientific use of terms. What is liberty? Various definitions of the term would be elicited from the class and subjected to analysis. The authors of them would be lured by a subtle cross-examination into themselves exposing their inconsistencies. Then the professor would take up his parable. He would first discuss the different senses in which the term had already been used in literature. Coleridge admired the French Revolution as a triumph of liberty because he liked 'the free motion of the clouds;' Shelley, in the 'Masque of Anarchy,' suggests that starving men are not free; according to him liberty is something to eat. Some writers speak as though it were decentralisation, and Mill uses it to express independence of public opinion. From an examination of these inconsistent accounts the professor would proceed to the business of building up by a gradual process, and with the help of the class itself, a definition of his own. Liberty is the opposite of government, and there is perfect liberty only where there is no state. Thus liberty is not necessarily good, and there is no point in the common antithesis between liberty and licence. We are not concerned here to defend the definition, but only the method of the great teacher who promulgated it. It was not told us on authority as something to remember, but we assisted ourselves at the creation of it. Thus it became a possession to be enjoyed with a title analogous to the title of authorship. It took an hour to define liberty, but the leisurely process had the highest educational value. It was an application to literature of the methods that are usually regarded as peculiar to science.

And this leads naturally to what lay behind all Seeley's public teaching, his definite and reasoned conception of the nature and functions of history. According to him, history has an allotted place among the sciences, and is in a fair way to become an exact science itself. He would sometimes put it that history is the residuum left by the sciences as they take possession one by one of the various departments of phenomena. 'At one time all phenomena were recorded by historians. Livy tells us that a bull spoke, but now this department has been annexed by physiology.' But the phenomena that are left to history can be dealt with scientifically. There is a 'political' science, the science of states. The method of this science is similar in character to that of other sciences; it proceeds by observation and induction, though it is unable to conduct experiments. It is therefore all the more dependent upon a large supply of trustworthy registered observations. These are history. Thus the method of modern political science differs from that of the

earlier political thinkers in two ways. In the first place, where early historians took little pains to secure trustworthy observations, modern historians take immense trouble about the authentication of facts, and apply to recorded observations tests which are not needed in any other science. In the second place, where Aristotle reasoned concerning the best state, modern political science sets aside deliberately the problems of good and bad. There is also another close resemblance between the method of political science and that of the other sciences, for in a sense the state can be described as an organism. The analogy was noticed by early writers, as in the fable of the Belly and the Members, or in the phrase of St. Paul, 'schism in the body.' But it is not more than an analogy, since the development of the state is partly self-conscious.

Though Seeley makes large concessions to his critics when he admits that the conclusions of political science are incapable of verification, and the development of the state organism is partly self-conscious, he held firmly himself in all his public teaching to his main position that a scientific treatment of history is possible. He set himself 'problems,' constructed 'formulæ' for the 'solution' of these problems, and regarded the explanation of historical 'causation' as his principal business. Thus his attitude towards the political controversies of history was naturally that of a man of science. 'Some historians,' he would say, 'do not classify corrupt governments or states of low civilisation. It is as though a scientific man should refuse to classify a centipede on the ground that he disapproved of creatures that had more than four legs.' Thus he thought with Freeman that there was no real distinction for the historian between ancient and modern history, although, unlike Freeman, he found it convenient for certain purposes. And the same attitude of mind led him to refuse to distinguish, on the other side, between history and politics. According to him all the phenomena of states are the proper business of the historian, and it is from the labours of the historian that the statesman obtains materials for forming a judgment. 'History,' he said, 'is the school of statesmanship.' If the question had ever been put to him, he would probably have held that the functions of a royal commission are historical in the strict sense of the term. That his literary instincts should have prevented his being always consistent is not surprising. It is the author of a vehement moral condemnation of Napoleon who writes:

> The danger of the controversial study of history is, not that it makes us judge unjustly, but that it makes us judge at all. Men are apt to forget the proper historical question, and to lose exactitude of definition in exuberance of praise or blame.

No one was more sensitive to the charm of romance, or more habitually inclined, by stating a paradox in the very process of

explanation, to make his audience feel the attraction of the unexplained. Yet it is he who says in another place:

Some would have all history partake of the nature of romance, but in reality history is the exact opposite of romance. Romance excites wonder: history appeases it; romance seizes upon the marvellous, the unaccountable: history, by explaining causes, destroys the existence of the unexplained.

It will be doubted by some whether Seeley's view of history is one that can be maintained in the present imperfect state of human knowledge. His critics may be disposed to regard his use of the terminology of science as somewhat misleading; they may urge that the concessions made to them are so great as to involve a practical surrender of the whole position; the fact remains that for five-and-twenty years an acute and subtle thinker invested this view with an irresistible fascination. And there can be no doubt that for the purposes of education it possessed great practical value. Seeley's method taught a high sense of the dignity of history, and this in turn drew out the best powers of those who studied it under him, and inspired them with the kind of devotion to a subject which is only found among those who thoroughly believe in it. They felt that they were not concerned with musty records so much as with the great elemental forces that determined over centuries of time the organised life of mankind. The method also encouraged definiteness in investigation, for the true historian was not a mere digger in likely places on the chance of finding spoil. And if it was all based on a dream, a suspicion may sometimes cross our minds that the hope of completing the imperfect chains of causation and filling up the gaps in human knowledge, which at once inspires and gives definiteness to ordinary scientific investigation, is based upon a dream also. Whether Seeley was right or wrong in his view of history, matters little to his memory. It is sufficient that he was a great influence in his day and generation in favour of thoroughness of investigation, of habits of clear thinking and lucid expression, and that he did all in his power to bestow upon his pupils the incommunicable gift of style. Many who are middle-aged men to-day, in the full stream of active life, thought of him to the end with the same reverence as when they sat at his feet as scholars. It is in his teaching that they find the source of that intellectual inspiration which sometimes comes at the impressionable time of life, like the philosopher's stone, to transmute base metal into gold.

J. R. Tanner.

Notes and Documents

THE PASCHAL CANON ATTRIBUTED TO ANATOLIUS OF LAODICEA.

I.

The Paschal List of Nineteen Years attributed to Anatolius, Bishop of Laodicea, c. A.D. 280.[1]

—	Feria Aequinoctii	Luna Aequinoctii	Dies Paschae	Luna Diei Paschae
1	Sabbato	xxvi	xv Kal. Maii	xviii
2	Dominica	vii	Kalendis Aprilis	xiv
3	ii feria	xviii	xi Kal. Maii	xvi
4	iii feria	xxix	Idibus Aprilis	xix
5	iv feria	x	iv Kal. Aprilis	xiv
6	v feria	xxi	xiv Kal. Maii	xvi
7	Sabbato	ii	vi Kal. Aprilis	xvii
8	Dominica	xiii	Kalendis Aprilis	xx
9	ii feria	xxiv	xviii Kal. Maii	xv
10	iii feria	v	viii Idus Aprilis	xv
11	iv feria	xvi	iv Kal. Aprilis	xx
12	v feria	xxvii	iii Idus Aprilis	xv
13	vi feria	viii	iii Nonas Aprilis	xvii
14	Sabbato	xx	ix Kal. Maii	xx
15	Dominica	i	vi Idus Aprilis	xv
16	ii feria	xii	ii Kal. Aprilis	xviii
17	iv feria	xxiii	xiv Kal. Maii	xix
18	v feria	iv	ii Nonas Aprilis	xiv
19	vi feria	xv	vi Kal. Aprilis	xvii

THE construction of the Paschal canon in which this list of Easters is contained is attributed to Anatolius of Alexandria, who was bishop of the church of the Laodiceans towards the close of the third century.[2] By some modern writers this attribution has been regarded as a well-authenticated and trustworthy one;[3] by others

[1] *Anatolii Alexandrini Laodicensis in Syria Episc. Canon Paschalis nunc primum e veteri MS. in lucem editus et brevi commentario illustratus ab Aegidio Bucherio, Soc. Jesu; opus De Doctrina Temporum* (Antwerp, 1634, fol.), pp. 433 *et seqq.* Dr. Bruno Krusch, in his paper in the *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, 1884, Bd. ix. p. 142, has edited the canon from a different manuscript.

[2] Eusebius, *H. E.* vii. 32; Jerome (*De Viris Illustribus*, cap. 73) says of Anatolius, *cuius ingenii magnitudinem de volumine quod super pascha composuit, et decem libris de arithmeticae institutionibus intelligere possumus.*

[3] Bucher dates the compilation of this canon in A.D. 276, and refers (p. 465) to George Heerwart, who, in his *Nova Chronologia*, cap. 236, had dated it in A.D. 277.

the whole compilation has been pronounced to be a forgery.[4] The ecclesiastics of the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries do not appear do have suspected that this Paschal list and canon were a product of the fifth century; and though Baeda rejected it he did not do so because it could not have been written by Anatolius, but because the Latin version of it, with which he was acquainted, was evidently the work of schismatic computists, who had not scrupled to alter and emend (at least so Baeda judged) in accordance with their peculiar views.[5] Both schismatic and orthodox celebrants professed to regard the supposed author of the canon as one who was worthy of all praise. The canon attributed to Anatolius plays a very prominent part in the disputations and the epistolary controversies connected with the Easter observances of the schismatic churches of the British Isles. This prominence is the more remarkable on account of the fact that those ecclesiastics who invoked the authority of Anatolius as that of one who provided the sanction of their schismatic observance of Easter did not obey the Paschal decrees which they undoubtedly believed him to have promulgated. Notwithstanding this disobedience they always referred to the canon of Anatolius as that upon which their custom of celebrating Easter upon the 14th moon, when that fell upon Sunday, was founded.[6]

There can be no doubt but that the Paschal canon which we possess is identical with that which is so frequently referred to in the disputes respecting the proper time of Easter observance. Columbanus of Luxeuil, in his Paschal epistle to Pope Gregory

Denis Petau (*opus De Doctrina Temporum* (Lutet. Paris. 1627), iv. 15 and vi. 11) attributes the grave errors of the West respecting the date of the vernal equinox to an incorrect version of this canon. This version both Petau and Bucher assigned to Rufinus. Fabricius also (*Bibl. Graec.* tom. iii. p. 461) regarded this canon as a genuine work of the bishop of Laodicea.

[4] Dr. Ludwig Ideler (*Handbuch der Chronologie*, 1826, Bd. ii. pp. 229–33), where he was not misled by Van der Hagen, undoubtedly arrived at correct conclusions relative to the spuriousness of the canon. Van der Hagen (*De Cyclis Paschalibus*, p. 115 *seqq.*) dated the construction of this canon about A.D. 650 (see, however, note 46, *infra*). The Rev. Lewis Hensley (article 'Easter,' *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, 1875, p. 593) declared it to be a forgery.

[5] *Ipsum vero libellum Anatolii postmodum in aliquibus Latinorum exemplaribus esse corruptum eorum nimirum fraude qui paschae verum tempus ignorantes* [*sc.* the Scots of Ireland and the Britons] *errorem suum tanti Patris auctoritate defendere gestirent*; *v.* Baeda's Epistle (iv.) to Wicraed, *De Paschae Celebratione, sive de aequinoctio vernali juxta Anatolium* (*ap.* Migne, *Patrol. Cursus*, tom. xciv. col. 679, D).

[6] Columbanus is the earliest schismatic who mentions it; see his epistle to the fathers convened to the Gallican synod of A.D. 602 in order to discuss the question of the Scotic Easter (*ap.* Migne, tom. lxxx. col. 266, D); and also his epistle to Pope Gregory I (*ibid.* col. 260, C), written before A.D. 604. In the time of Aedan of Holy Island (*c.* A.D. 650) the Picts asserted that they followed the Paschal directions of Anatolius (Baeda, *H. E.* iii. 3; ed. Stevenson, 1838–41, § 155, p. 160). Colman, in the Paschal dispute at Whitby, in A.D. 664, made a like assertion (Baeda, *H. E.* iii. 25; § 232, p. 225).

(written before A.D. 604), presents quotations from it;[7] Cummian, in his Paschal epistle to Segene, abbot of Iona (written A.D. 633), also quotes it;[8] Wilfrid's references, in the controversy at Whitby (A.D. 664), to its doctrine of the νυχθήμερον, or lunar day, are unmistakably occasioned by a superficial review of the peculiarities which the canon embodies.[9] Baeda, in his epistle addressed to Bishop Wicraed concerning the date of pseudo-Anatolius's equinox,[10] presents several direct references to the lunar method of this canon, and also elsewhere[11] criticises the peculiar position of the *saltus lunaris* in this Paschal list.

It is certain that this Paschal canon could not have been written before the middle of the fourth century. Anatolius became bishop at Laodicea in A.D. 270; the compiler of the canon which is erroneously attributed to him refers (*vide infra*) to the advancement of the vernal equinox in the calendar, and declares that those who should celebrate upon any one of the three days which had been added to the Paschal period by this advancement would be involved in error. In the first place the alteration in the calendar date of the vernal equinox did not take place until A.D. 325;[12] in the second, even if Anatolius of Alexandria, somewhile bishop of the church of the Laodiceans, had outlived the date of the council of Nicaea, he would certainly not have maintained that the Alexandrine computations respecting the date of the ecclesiastical equinox were erroneous. Neither would he have resisted the decree of Nicaea respecting the observance of the equinox.[13]

[7] This quotation is one of considerable length; it varies a little from the canon. Cf. the epistle in Migne (tom. lxxx. col. 260, C and D, and col. 261, A) with the canon in Bucher (p. 443, cap. iii.)

[8] Cf. the epistle in Migne (tom. lxxxvii. col. 975, C, ll. 8–11) with the canon in Bucher (p. 439, cap. i. ll. 15–7).

[9] Baeda, *H. E.* iii. 25; § 233, p. 225.

[10] *V.* note 5, *ut supra*.

[11] *V.* Baed. *opus de Temporum Ratione*, cap. xxx. (*ap.* Migne, tom. xc. col. 430, A); and also the same work, cap. xlii. (*ibid.* col. 475). In the last passage cited Baeda says, . . . *in xiv. ejus* [*sc. Anatolii canonis*] *anno qui est ultimus Ogdoadis mutationem Lunae posuit*: *faciens illam ascendere in aequinoctio de viii. in xx.* Bucher makes use of this passage, in conjunction with a remark of St. Cyril, to prove that this Latin version of Anatolius existed before St. Cyril wrote. A reference to the passage in Cyril's Paschal prologue which is cited by Bucher (cf. p. 483, par. 5, with p. 481, par. 1) will show that Cyril spoke of a cycle which effected the *saltus lunaris* every fourteen years (i.e. *circulus lxxxiv. annorum per sex quatuordecennitates* of the Quartodecimans), and not of one which effected the *saltus* in the fourteenth year of a period of nineteen years.

[12] *V.* Baed. *Epistol. ad Wicred* (*ap.* Migne, tom. xciv. col. 680, C).

[13] The fathers at Nicaea fixed the vernal equinox for ecclesiastical purposes at *xii. Kal. April.*, not because they had performed or had accepted any abstruse astronomical calculations, as Gibbon thought (*Decline and Fall*, &c., cap. xlvii.) and other writers have maintained, but because the *ratio* of the epact assigns the earliest possible Easter Day to 22 March; consequently 21 March is necessarily the prior term of the Paschal period in the Julian calendar. As the equinox is the prior term of the Paschal period according to the law of Moses, the law and the calendar,

This Paschal canon contains, in short, nothing whatever which can be correctly ascribed to Anatolius, except those passages which are extracted from the 'Church History' of Eusebius (vii. 32).

II.

In any comparative consideration of the Paschal principles of the British and Irish schismatics there are three criteria to which priority of application must be accorded. These are (*a*) the date of the equinox (this was attached by the Britons to 25 March);[14] (*b*) the date of the posterior limit of the Paschal period (this the Britons fixed at 21 April);[15] and (*c*) the treatment accorded to the 21st moon of the Paschal lunation (this moon the Britons and the Irish entirely eliminated from their Paschal observance).[16]

The date at which Anatolius of Laodicea fixed the vernal equinox is in dispute; the remarks of Eusebius do not enable us, it is contended, to determine this date with certainty.[17] We are not,

it was supposed, were reduced to agreement by fixing the ecclesiastical equinox at this date.

[14] Cf. the Monastic Rule of Columbanus, cap. vii. (*ap.* Migne, tom. lxxx. col. 212, B) . . . *in vernali aequinoctio, id est octavo Kalendas Aprilis*; and the Paschal canon of Anatolius, cap. xii. (*ap.* Bucher, p. 448), *Nobis ergo similiter* [the comparison is with the Jews, by whom, so pseudo-Anatolius supposed, the Paschal lamb was never sacrificed earlier than *viii. Kal. April.*] *si eveniat ut vii. Kalendas Aprilis, et dies Dominica et luna xiv. inveniatur, xiv. Pascha celebrandum est.* This rejects *viii. Kal. April.* as unfit for the celebration of Easter. Both pseudo-Anatolius (cap. xiii., Bucher, p. 449) and Columbanus (*loc. cit.*) divide the year into four parts, commencing respectively upon the eighth day before the Kalends of April, July, October, and January. Compare F. O. Seebass (*Ueber Columba von Luxeuil's Klosterregel und Bussbuch*, 1883, p. 19, note, and pp. 13, 30–3), who directly and convincingly replies to the doubts of Dr. Ebrard (*Die iroschottische Missionskirche*, 1873, pp. 39–41) respecting the date (25 March) of the schismatic equinox. Dr. Krusch ('Die Einführung des griechischen Paschalritus im Abendlande,' *Neues Archiv*, 1884, Bd. ix. p. 142) is less helpful, inasmuch as he confines his remarks upon this point to ridiculing Ebrard.

[15] Baeda's statement (*H. E.* ii. 2; § 91, p. 99), *quae computatio* [*sc.* that of the schismatics] *octoginta quatuor annorum circulo continetur* when amplified and explained by a reference to the Paschal epistle of St. Ambrose (*ap.* Bucher, pp. 477–8, par. 8), in which we read that the posterior Latin limit of celebration of Easter was *xi. Kalendas Maii*, should put this terminal date of British Paschal celebration beyond cavil. Dr. Ebrard and Dr. B. MacCarthy, however, question its correctness. See also Baeda (*H. E.* v. 21; § 444, p. 408) and Ideler (*Handbuch*, Bd. ii. p. 295) in support of the date assigned.

[16] Wilfrid, replying to Colman (*H. E.* iii. 25; § 231, p. 225), says, *Item, lunam vicesimam primam . . . a celebratione vestri Paschae funditus eliminatis.* Ceolfrid (*Epistola ad Naitanum, ap.* Baed. *H. E.* v. 21; § 433, p. 399) makes an identical remark: *Et cum vicesima prima die mensis Pascha Dominicum celebrare refugiunt* [*sc.* the Scots and Britons], *patet*, &c. In any other field of research such statements, in such an authority, would, I am convinced, be regarded as conclusive. In investigations of early British and Irish history, however, it is the practice to discard ancient or contemporary notices when they disagree with modern theories. *E.g. vide* Van der Hagen (*Observationes in Prosperi Chronicon*, 1733, cap. xxxviii. p. 338) and Dr. Krusch (in *Neues Archiv*, Bd. ix. p. 169).

[17] If the true decemnovennal canon of Anatolius had been constructed in A.D. 276, as Bucher maintained respecting the false canon, then the opinion of some commen-

however, concerned with the determination of this date, inasmuch as the following passage clearly indicates that this Paschal canon, having been written, as I have just observed, later than A.D. 325, could not have been written by Anatolius, who was already famous for his learning in A.D. 262. After blaming the Gallican computists for their willingness to celebrate upon moon 21 and moon 22, the canon (cap. v.) continues (Bucher, p. 444)—

Sed quid mirum si in xxi. luna erraverint qui tres addiderunt dies ante Aequinoctium in quibus Pascha immolari posse definiunt?

The three days referred to are 22, 23, and 24 March, which were added to the Paschal period by the council of Nicaea; therefore the computist who constructed this Paschal canon dated the vernal equinox, in theory, at 25 March, even as the Scots and the Britons did in practice.

The Paschal canon of pseudo-Anatolius differed from British and Irish custom, however, in dating its posterior limit of celebration *ix. Kal. Mai.* It consequently exceeded the proper time, from the point of view of British custom, by two days, and could not, upon this account, have been regarded by the Britons as a trustworthy guide.

The lunar observance enjoined by pseudo-Anatolius is presented in cap. iv. of the canon (Bucher, p. 444) in the following rule:—

Omnis namque dies in lunae computatione non eodem numero quo mane initiatur ad vesperum [18] finitur, quia dies quae mane in luna, id est,

tators that Anatolius of Laodicea dated the equinox at 19 March is supported by the fact that the vernal equinox fell at this period on 20 March. Therefore in a leap year (*e.g.* 276) it fell one day earlier in the calendar. Mr. Hensley, in his article concerning Easter, already referred to, makes a curious mistake respecting this point. He says that the (supposed) calculations of the council of Nicaea which resulted in dating the equinox 21 March were incorrect—'because the equinox only fell upon that date once in four years.' The effect of intercalation is to advance an astronomical event in the calendar and not to retard it.

[18] *Vesperum* is one of the seven unequal portions into which the ancient computists divided the night season; it must not be confounded with the more frequently recurring *ad vesperam*. *Vesperum* immediately succeeds *crepusculum*, which extends from the going down of the sun to the appearance of the evening star in the west. Cf. the *Monastic Rule of David*, which is preserved in Ricemarch's *Life of St. David* (ed. Rees, *Cambro-British Saints*, 1853, pp. 127–8), with Baeda, *De Temporum Ratione*, cap. vii., 'De Nocte' (*ap.* Migne, tom. xc. col. 325, A). David's rule required the monks, at the evening office, to serve God upon their knees, in prayer—*quoadusque sidera celo visa finitum clauderent diem.* As with the Britons the appearance of Vesper rounded the divinely appointed day, therefore the day of the Britons was made up of the evening and the morning, and was consequently a *νυχθήμερον*. Proofs of this abound in the lives edited by Rees. Similarly pseudo-Anatolius, cap. iii. (Bucher, p. 443), uses 'vigil' as coincident and conterminous with *feria*, both the vigil and the *feria* being completed at midnight.

Dr. Reeves, long ago, showed that this was the case in Iona (v. *Columba*, ed. 1857, 'Additional Notes,' p. 310). This important fact has not been realised by continental inquirers; see the wholly erroneous computation of the obit of St. Columba by Dr. Bruno Krusch (*loc. cit.* p. 143), and the unnecessary emendation by Seebass (*Ueber*

usque ad sextam et dimidium horae xiii. annumeratur, eadem ad vesperum xiv. invenitur. Unde ergo et Pascha usque ad xxi. in vesperum extendi praecipitur; quae mane sine dubio, id est, usque ad eum quem diximus horarum terminum xx. habebatur.

Computa ergo a fine xiii. lunae quod est initium xiv. ad finem vicesimae, unde et xxi. principium inchoatur; et invenies septem tantum dies Azymorum, in quibus verissimum Pascha Domini ducatu praefinitum est immolari debere.

The computistical contentions of pseudo-Anatolius are, therefore, as follows: (1) The *feria*, or Roman day, which extends from midnight to midnight,[19] has portions of two lunar days, and has, therefore, two lunar values, one a diurnal value, the other a nocturnal value.[20] (2) The Paschal week, or rather the se'nnight, should commence with the beginning of the fourteenth moon, and should not be extended beyond the end of the twentieth moon. Consequently Sunday, moon 13–4, ought to be regarded as the true Pasch, and Sunday, moon 20–1, ought to be rejected. In this particular pseudo-Anatolius is not in agreement with the custom of the Irish and the Britons. He is not, however, consistent in his observance of Easter. It is clear that he considered that the Paschal feast should be celebrated upon Sunday evening; consequently, when he assigns Easter Day to moon 20, as he does in the years 8, 11, and 14, by so doing he enjoins celebration upon the twenty-first moon, because moon 20 marks the morning of Sunday in these years. Colman, in the famous dispute at Whitby (Baeda, 'H. E.' iii. 25; § 229, p. 222), declared that in continuing to observe Easter after the fashion of his forefathers he was guided by the authority and depended upon the sanction of St. John the Apostle and of Anatolius. Wilfrid replied to Colman in these words (*ibid.* § 233, p. 225):—

Constat . . . . Anatolium virum sanctissimum doctissimum ac laude esse dignissimum; sed quid vobis cum illo cum nec ejus decreta servetis? Ille enim in pascha suo, regulam utique veritatis sequens circulum decem et novem annorum posuit, quem vos aut ignoratis, aut agnitum et a tota Christi ecclesia custoditum pro nihilo contemnitis. Ille sic in pascha dominico quartam decimam lunam computavit ut hanc eadem ipsa die, more Aegyptiorum, quintam decimam lunam ad vesperam esse fateretur. Sic item vicesimam die dominico paschae annotavit ut hanc, declinata

Columba von Luxeuil's Klosterregel und Bussbuch, p. 13) of a reference to the coincidence of the vespers of the νυχθήμερον of the Lord's Day with the vigil of *septima feria*, viz. *nocte Dominica sabbati vigiliae*.

[19] . . . *Romani a medio noctis in medium*; Baeda, *De Temporum Ratione*, cap. v. (*ap.* Migne, tom. xc. col. 313, B), and *De Divisionibus Temporum*, cap. viii. (*ap.* Migne, tom. xc. col. 656, B); and compare Censorinus, Pliny, and other writers quoted by Ideler (*Handbuch*, Bd. i. pp. 80, 100).

[20] Cf. the lunar computation of the trabeation by Epiphanius, in his work *Adversus Haereses*, ii. 26 (*ap.* Migne, *Patrol.*, *Series Graeca*, tom. xli. col. 934, C D).

eadem die, esse vicesimam primam crederet. Cujus regulam distinctionis vos ignorasse probat, quod aliquoties pascha manifestissime ante plenilunium, id est, in tertia decima luna, facitis.

From these remarks we may assume that Wilfrid did not question the authenticity of the Paschal list attributed to Anatolius. Wilfrid asserted (1) that the schismatics did not obey the decrees of Anatolius; (2) that Anatolius presented orthodox decemnovennal computation, which the schismatics despised; (3) that Anatolius treated the Paschal *νυχθήμερον* according to the custom of the Alexandrines; (4) that where he dated the Paschal Sunday upon moon 14 he actually assigned celebration to moon 15, and (5) that where he dated the Paschal Sunday upon moon 20 he actually assigned celebration to moon 21.

The first assertion of Wilfrid must be admitted to be correct, inasmuch as the schismatics would not obey this Paschal canon in celebrating after 21 April. The second and third assertions are inaccurate. The day of the Alexandrine computists proceeded from sunset to sunset;[21] the lunar day of this computist commenced and terminated at 12.30 P.M. This day, consequently, was not the Alexandrine or Egyptian day.[22] When Wilfrid asserted that the Alexandrine Pasch is discoverable in the Paschal canon which we are considering, he was in error; the Alexandrines never kept Easter upon moon 15 [23] when the evening of that moon fell upon Sunday. Wilfrid's fourth assertion is equally erroneous when viewed from the standpoint of pseudo-Anatolian principle; as the anonymous computist included the whole of the 14th moon in his Paschal se'nnight, he necessarily rejected the whole of the 21st moon. His practice, however, as displayed in the years 8, 11, and 14, reveals inconsistencies which have already been referred to, and which give some countenance to Wilfrid's assertion.

If we examine the lunar method of this computist, as it is exhibited in cap. ix. of the canon (*v.* Bucher, p. 446), we shall discover other peculiarities. The commencement of the lunar year is dated 1 Jan. The lunations, after that of February, are divergent throughout the year from those which are computed by decemnovennal rules. These lunations run: *Kal. Ianuar.*, *l.* i. *Kal. Februar.*, *l.* ii.; *Kal. Mart.*, *l.* i.; *Kal. April.*, *l.* iii. After April

[21] . . . *Aegyptii ab occasu ad occasum* [*diei cursum deducunt*]; Baeda, *De Temporum Ratione*, cap. v. (*ap.* Migne, tom. xc. col. 313), and cf. other authorities in Ideler (*v. ut supra*, note 19).

[22] The Umbrians commenced their day at high noon; *v.* Baeda and Ideler, *locc. citt.* I cannot trace any connexion, nor yet do I know if the custom of the ancient Umbrians which is mentioned by Pliny (*H. N.* ii. 79) lingered into later ages.

[23] Sunday evening, moon 15, falls upon the same day of the calendar month as Sunday morning, moon 14. When the Paschal moon 14 fell upon Sunday the Alexandrines always deferred celebration to moon 21. Cf., from among many references to this practice, S. Theophil. *Prolog. Paschal.* (*ap.* Bucher, p. 472, par. 3), and S. Ambros. *Epistol. de Festo Paschali* (*ibid.* p. 476, par. 5).

one day is added for each month, and the full and hollow moons alternate until the end of the year. The lunations of March and September have only 29 days allotted to them. When this treatment of the lunations is compared with Alexandrine practice, the following differences are discoverable: The Alexandrine computists, when using the Julian calendar, commenced the year upon 1 Sept.[24] They gave thirty days to the lunation of March in common years, and always thirty days to the lunation of September, which was the head of their lunar year; [25] in those lunar years in which thirteenth month is intercalated, *i.e.* in embolismic years, the Alexandrines allotted thirty-one days to the lunation of March. These divergencies demonstrate that the computation embodied in the Paschal canon falsely attributed to Anatolius of Alexandria is not purely Alexandrine. As, however, the Paschal list is one of nineteen years and the *saltus lunaris* is effected only once in this period, the computation of these nineteen Easters is decemnovennal. The decemnovennal nature of the computation is the only characteristic which is common to both pseudo-Anatolius and the Alexandrines.

III.

The reconstruction of the Paschal list of pseudo-Anatolius necessarily depends upon the application of his Paschal method to the analysis of the data which are embodied in the list. These data are presented in four classes. We find the *feria* of the day of the equinox, the calendar date of Easter Day, the moon's age at the equinox, and the moon's age on Easter Day. Two of these classes of data, therefore, belong to the Sabbatical cycle and the other two to the pseudo-Anatolian lunar cycle.

It is well known to computists that, if the bissextile position of any year be given, as well as the moon's age, by table, upon any day in that year, the Paschal year indicated by these data can only occur twice in 1,064 years. If, therefore, we can discover the true Sabbatical sequence of the years whose Easters are dated in this Paschal list, the completion of the task is merely a matter of inspection, whose result, when the wide intervals just referred to are kept in view, has every element of apodictic certainty.

A superficial examination of the list which heads these notes will show that only two years, 7 and 17 namely, appear to have been treated as bissextile; that the annual increase of lunar worth of the day of the equinox is eleven days, and that the triennial intercalation is one of thirty days; that the *saltus lunaris* occurs in the middle of the lunar period and not at the end; that some of

[24] *V.* S. Ambros. *Epistol. de Festo Paschali* (*ibid.* p. 477, par. 7, ll. 16 *et seqq.*); and cf. Baed. *De Temporum Ratione*, cap. xx. (*ap.* Migne, tom. xc. col. 395, C), and also *L'Art de vérifier les Dates*, tome i. p. 52.

[25] Concerning the lunation of Thoth-September see *L'Art*, &c., tome i. sec. xi., 'De l'Ère de Dioclétien,' pp. 50–2.

the dates of Easter do not mark the Lord's Day; and that the calendarist has, apparently, produced a Sabbatical cycle which repeats after nineteen years. This list, therefore, as we possess it, is an impossible one. Its Sunday letters run: A (or B), G, F, E, D, C; A (or G), G, F, E, D, C, B, A, G, F; D (or C), C, B. As it stands the list is either an irresponsible and worthless confusion, or else the Sabbatical sequence has been tampered with in order to conceal a fraud.

(1) We know that the British and Irish schismatics would not celebrate Easter later than 21 April; the Paschal list enjoins one celebration—that of 14, upon 23 April. This transgression of the Latin limit of the Paschal period is very noteworthy; it recalls to the memory the important schism of A.D. 444, in which year, as the day of the Passion was extended to 21 April, the games at Rome in honour of the building of the city were not celebrated, and Easter was kept upon Sunday, 23 April.[26]

(2) If we analyse the data which are supplied by the year 7, we find that this year is bissextile, inasmuch as its equinox falls two days later in the week than that of the preceding year. As the moon of the equinox is two days old, and as the moon of Easter Day is seventeen days old, therefore, moon 17 should fall in April. Consequently *dies Paschae, vi. Kal. April.*, as it is in the list, is incorrect.

If we emend this to *vi. Id. April.* we still do not insure the concurrence of all the data. If *vi. Id. April.* be moon 17, then moon 2 must fall *ix. Kal. April.* This date is the prior term of the British Paschal period, however. 25 March, Saturday, moon 2, gives 9 April (*v. Id. April.*), Sunday, moon 17, as Easter Day. This, however, neither agrees with the date in the list nor yet with the emendation suggested. Therefore either we must alter the numerals which date the Easter of year 7 or we must assume that, in his computation of the *νυχθήμερον*, pseudo-Anatolius preferred to give the *feria* of 24 March, and to compute the lunar worth of that day.

If we read—equinox term [24 March]: Saturday, moon 2; Easter Day: 8 April (*vi. Id. April.*), Sunday, moon 17—all the data of year 7 are in agreement. As 8 April is moon 17, 1 April must be moon 10; moon 10 is the lunar value of the Kalends of April in the first year of the decemnovennal cycle—*i.e.* in the year of *nulla epacta*.[27] Therefore we have these data—year i. of XIX. and

[26] Plutarch, *Vita Rom.* cap. xii., says that Rome was built on the *xi. Kalendas Maias*; *v.* Ideler, *Handbuch*, Bd. ii. p. 266. Prosper, in his chronicle (*ap.* Migne, tom. li. col. 600, B), refers to the Easter of A.D. 444 in these terms: *Pascha Domini ix. Calendas Maii celebratum est. Nec erratum est, quia inde xi. Calendarum Maiarum dies passionis fuit. Ob cuius reverentiam natalis urbis Romae sine circensibus transiit.*

[27] For the meaning of this and other computistical terms the reader is referred to Petau (*De Doctrina Temporum*, tom. i. cap. xxiv. p. 597) and to the computistical

leap-year with Sunday upon 8 April—to discover the A.D. Golden number I. and Sunday letters A G concur in A.D. 456 and in A.D. 988.

(3) In the year 17 of the list we find the second bissextile. The years 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19 have, respectively, if we compute with the dates of the Easter Days which are assigned to these years in the list, the Sunday letters A, G, F, C, C, and B. Such a sequence of letters is, of course, impossible. Year 17, equinox: *quarta feria*, moon 23; Easter Day: moon 19, requires Sunday to fall *xii.* and not *xiv. Kal. Mai.* The Sunday letter of 17, therefore, is E, and this year is not a leap-year. The true leap-year, upon examination, will be found to be 18. This year has—equinox: *quinta feria*, moon 4; Easter Day: 4 April, moon 14—all which dates are in agreement. 4 April, moon 14, allots moon 11 to 1 April; moon 11 *minus* 10 (the lunar regular of the Kalends of April) gives one moon of epact. This epact is connoted with the golden number XII. Therefore we have these data—year xii. of XIX. with Sunday upon 4 April—to discover the A.D. Golden number XII. and Sunday letters D C concur in A.D. 448, and in A.D. 980. Thus the year 14 of the list equals A.D. 444; the year 18 equals A.D. 448, and the year 7 equals A.D. 456.

The years 14 to 19 and 1 and 2 indicate, in the age of the moon at the equinox, the golden numbers VIII. to XV.; the year 7, as we have just discovered, is a year whose golden number is I. Therefore from 1 to 13 of the list the golden numbers are XIV. to VII.; from 14 to 19 the golden numbers are VIII. to XIII. How are we to account for this obvious dislocation?

This Paschal list presents seventy-six computistical items. Analysis of these items, both in their annual groupings and in their particular sequences—a method of investigation which is not more tedious than it is necessary—will reveal the correctness of the following assertions:—

(1) The equinox is dated *viii. Kal. April.* in the years 1 and 2 and from 14 to 19; it yields place to the prior term of British celebration, *ix. Kal. April*, namely, from 3 to 13.

(2) The true incidence of the leap-years is concealed by the variation from the equinox date, and also by the erroneous connotation of the bissextile with the year 17. This error has already been discussed, and its correction renders it obvious that the leap-years are 3, 7, 11; and 14 and 18. The intercalation in 3 is concealed by the advancement of the equinox term in that year from 25 March to 24 March; the leap in 11 has been purposely ignored, and the

'Dissertation' in tome i., *L'Art*, &c. Dionysius Exiguus (Epistola II., *De Pascha*, *ap.* Bucher, p. 490) says, . . . *decemnovennalis Cyclus per Ogdoadem et Endecadem semper in se revolvitur.* The first eight years form the ogdoade, the remaining eleven the hendecade. Baeda, *De Temporum Ratione*, cap. xlii. (*ap.* Migne, tom. xc. col. 475, A), says of the 14th year of pseudo-Anatolius, *qui est ultimus Ogdoadis*, i.e. has golden number VIII.

leap in 14 reveals the fraud of which the computist who framed this Easter list was guilty.

(3) The age of the moon at the equinox is that of 25 March in 1 and 2, and from 14 to 19; it is that of 24 March from 3 to 6 and from 7 to 13. As the computist purposely omitted to effect the *saltus* in the year 7, after the year xix. of XIX., the moon is one day younger on 24 March from 7 to 13 than it should be.

(4) The Easter dates are divisible into two classes—(*a*) those dates which indicate Easter Day; (*b*) those dates which indicate what pseudo-Anatolius regarded as the morning of the Paschal *νυχθήμερον*, *i.e.* Monday morning. In the former case the lunar value is that of the calendar date; in the latter case the lunar value is that of the day preceding the calendar date.

(5) The dates of Easter Day after the intercalation in the bissextile year 11—*i.e.* of the Easter Days in 11, 12, and 13—are incorrectly computed, the intercalation having been overlooked; they must be emended *v. Kal. April.*, instead of *iv.*; *iv. Idus April.*, instead of *iii.*; *iv. Nonas April.*, instead of *iii.*

These peculiarities show that a period of nineteen years has been split into portions, one of which is intended to represent the ogdoade, the other the hendecade; [28] and that the order of these years has been purposely broken, so that the list might conceal its true period and yet commence with a year whose Sunday letter, viz. A, should be identical with that of A.D. 271, which year enclosed the first Easter that Anatolius computed after he became bishop at Laodicea. The Easters of the quasi-ogdoade are dated, with the exception of two celebrations upon moon 14, upon orthodox Easter Days; the Easters of the quasi-hendecade are schismatic *νυχθήμερα*.

The first year in the list which exhibits a schismatic peculiarity which we are able to point to as being one which is discoverable in British celebration is 3. In this year Easter is dated one month later than orthodox computation enjoined.[28] In 3 Easter should have fallen on 23 March; this was too early, as the British churches would not celebrate before the Julian equinox. Therefore the date of Easter was put back to 20 April. Having occasion, in this year, to reject Alexandrine methods, the computist substituted his own corrections and adaptations of the decemnovennal method.

In the light of these discoveries I restore the Paschal list of pseudo-Anatolius to its true decemnovennal and soli-cyclic

[28] Compare the remarks of Cummian respecting an identical deferment presented by the celebration of the schismatic Easter of A.D. 631 (*Epistola de Controversia Paschali, ap.* Migne, tom. lxxxvii. coll. 977–8). Speaking of the orthodox celebration of Easter in Rome of this year, Cummian says, *in quo* [sc. *in Pascha*] *mense integro disjuncti sumus.*

sequences, as follows (pseudo-Anatolius's lunar computation, except in 10, being retained) :—

Reconstruction of the Paschal List of Pseudo-Anatolius.

Year of the List	*Feria* of the Equinox ; 25 Mar.	Moon of the Equinox ; 25 Mar.	Date of Easter Day	Moon of Easter Day	Golden Number	Sunday Letter	A.D.
14	vii	xx	23 April	xx	VIII	BA	444
15	i	i	8 „	xv	IX	G	445
16	ii	xii	31 March	xviii	X	F	446
17	iii	xxiii	20 April	xix	XI	E	447
18	v	iiii	4 „	xiv	XII	DC	448
19	vi	xv	27 March	xvii	XIII	B	449
1	vii	xxvi	16–17 April	xviii	XIV	A	450
2	i	vii	1 „	xiv	XV	G	451
	Feria of the Equinox ; 24 Mar.	Moon of the Equinox ; 24 Mar.	Date of the Paschal Νυχθήμερον				
3	ii	xviii	20–21 April	xvi	XVI	FE	452
4	iii	xxix	12–13 „	xix	XVII	D	453
5	iiii	x	28–29 March	xiv	XVIII	C	454
6	v	xxi	17–18 April	xvi	XIX	B	455
7	vii	ii	8–9 „	xvii	I	AG	456
8	i	xiii	31 March–1 A.	xx	II	F	457
9	ii	xxiiii	13–14 April	xv	III	E	458
10	iii	v	5–6 „	xvii	IV	D	459
11	v	xvi	27–28 March	xx	V	CB	460
12	vi	xxvii	9–10 April	xv	VI	A	461
13	vii	viii	1–2 „	xvii	VII	G	462

IV.

The date at which this Paschal list was constructed is fixed by four indications. It was after A.D. 455 ; it was before A.D. 462 ; the computistical errors after A.D. 458 are thrice as numerous as they are in the preceding fifteen years, and the sequence of the lunations set forth by the computist in cap. ix. of his canon (*v. supra*, p. 521) is the sequence of the lunations of A.D. 458.

In A.D. 455 the Paschal Book of St. Theophilus enjoined the celebration of Easter upon *viii. Kal. Mai., l.* xxi.[29] As this date exceeded the Latin limit by three days, the Latin churches were in great doubt respecting the proper time of Easter in this year. Pope Leo [30] decreed that, instead of celebrating upon 24 April, moon 21, the Latin churches should celebrate upon 17 April, moon 14. Leo, after corresponding with the emperor and with the

[29] Only the prologue of Theophilus has survived ; the list of Easters has perished. We know, however, from Leo's letters to Marcian, Eudocia, and Bishop Julian, that the *Paschal Book for One Hundred Years* enjoined the celebration of Easter, in this year, at *viii. Kal. Mai.* The important dispute concerning the Easter of A.D. 455 is very fully treated by Bucher (pp. 78–92) ; *v.* also Ideler (*Handbuch*, Bd. ii. pp. 265–270).

[30] *V.* Prosper, who says, in his chronicle (*ap.* Migne, tom. li. col. 606, A), *S. Papa Leo xv. Kalendas Maias potius* [*sc. quam viii. Kal. Mai.*] *observandum protestaretur.* Leo, in his epistle to Marcian (*v.* Ideler, *Handbuch*, Bd. ii. p. 267), asserted that *ab xi. Calendarum Aprilium usque in xi. Calendarum Maiarum legitimum spatium sit praefixum intra quod omnium varietatum necessitas concluda-*

bishop of the church of the Alexandrines,[31] rescinded this decree and ordained that the Pasch of Theophilus should be celebrated in the west.

In A.D. 444 pseudo-Anatolius dated Easter upon 23 April. As he had no objection to celebrating later than the Latin limit in this year, it is very noticeable that, in A.D. 455, he should avoid exceed ing the Latin limit, and should assign Easter to the day which Prosper informs us Pope Leo regarded as the correct day before he had corresponded with the orientals.

Pseudo-Anatolius does not, it is true, assign moon 14 to 17 April in 455. This year is the last of one cycle of XIX.; consequently the Alexandrines treated it as an embolismic year and allotted thirty-one days to the lunation of March, which it enveloped. Pseudo-Anatolius allotted twenty-nine days only, and thus commenced the lunation of April two days earlier than its proper date. Hence, when we read in this Paschal list: [year 6] *aequinoctium: quinta feria, l. xxi.*; *dies Paschae*: *xiv. Kal. Mai., l. xvi.*—which data we must render, 24 March, Thursday, moon 21, assigning Easter to 17–18 April, moon 16—we need have no doubt but that this connotation was penned after the earlier opinion of Leo became known, and after the Paschal method of pseudo-Anatolius had been elaborated.

The period of nineteen years in which pseudo-Anatolius constructed his list of Easters is not extended later than A.D. 462. If it had been extended later, then, obviously, the year 444 would have been rejected and the limits assigned by the computist (*v.* Bucher, p. 447) for his computation—*Hoc Pascha a vi.* [sic] *Kalendas Aprilis, usque in ix. Kalendas Maii*, namely—would have lacked the authority and the precept of the Easter of A.D. 444. I infer from this that pseudo-Anatolius was not a member of any church, such as that of Gaul or that of Spain, which entertained an insuperable objection to celebrate Easter later than 21 April.[32] If he had been averse from exceeding the Latin limit, nothing would have been easier than to have retained it by commencing his period of nineteen years with the year 445, or with a later year, and thus rejecting and ignoring the decree of Leo in 444 entirely.

Pseudo-Anatolius accepted the decree of Leo, however, even as Victorius accepted it.[33] From this acceptance, and from the subsequent rejection of 24 and 25 April by Leo as unfit for

tur, ut pascha dominicum nec prius possimus habere nec tardius. Ideler points out that this certainly rejects the cycle of LXXXIV., and draws attention (p. 269) to the discontent of Prosper, who believed that *xv. Kal. Mai.* (*l.* xviii., *in secundo mense*, by LXXXIV.) was the true Pasch.

[31] *V.* Leon. *Epistol.* (No. xcv.) *ad occidentales Episcopos*; this letter enjoins celebration upon *viii. Kal. Mai.* (Bucher, pp. 88–9; Ideler, *loc cit.*)

[32] Cf. Leon. *Epistol.*, cited note 31.

[33] Cf. the Easters in *ann.* 455, 539 in the Paschal canon of Victorius (Bucher, *De Doctrina Temporum*).

celebration, there arose that tampering with the decemnovennal method which has been referred to already. As the latest Alexandrine Paschal term—that of VIII., namely—falls 18 April, and as its latest Easter Day would fall, by the lunar method of pseudo-Anatolius, upon 24 April, it is clear that some method of advancing the date of this Paschal term, so that its latest Easter Day might fall 23 April, would be at once perceived to be necessary. The artifice of allotting only twenty-nine days to the lunation of March would enable the computist to date the Paschal term of VIII. upon 16 April, and thus to bring all the Sundays which are thereby co-ordinated with VIII. within the pseudo-Anatolian period.

As this Latin computist dates the posterior limit of celebration at 23 April, it is clear that he wrote after the year 444, which was the first year in the fifth century in which the Latins exceeded their ancient limit of 21 April.

The lunations of a certain year are computed in cap. ix. of the canon; in this computation it is natural to suppose that the figures would represent the tabular age of the several lunations at the several Kalends in the first year whose Easter was independently computed. In this computation we find that moon 3 fell upon the Kalends of April. What we seek, therefore, in the Paschal list which we are analysing is an Easter Day in April whose date and moon shall assign moon 3 to 1 April. There are, however, two such Easter Days: the year 1 of the list has 16 April, moon 18; the year 9 has 13 April, moon 15. The former year agrees with Alexandrine computation in its lunation; consequently we must reject it. The latter year, a common lunar year, not only presents the position which we seek, but also, if it be computed by Alexandrine methods, shows the difference of one day between pseudo-Anatolius and the Alexandrines, which has been already explained. Therefore year 9, which equals A.D. 458, is the year whose lunations are computed by pseudo-Anatolius according to his own lunar method.

The preceding year, therefore—namely A.D. 457—is necessarily the year in which pseudo-Anatolius constructed his Paschal list.

V.

The British and Irish churches were unable to obey the rule of pseudo-Anatolius, for the following reasons: (*a*) they kept no Pasch later than 21 April; (*b*) they rejected moon 21 entirely; (*c*) they broke fast in the evening of moon 13 when the Easter moon 14 fell upon Sunday;[34] and (*d*) they did not fast upon Sunday.

[34] In Wilfrid's reply to Colman (Baeda, *H. E.* iii. 25; § 231, p. 225) we find him asserting . . . *ita ut tertia decima luna ad vesperam saepius Pascha incipiatis. V.* also Ceolfrid's letter to Nechtan (*ap.* Baeda, *H. E.* v. 21; § 433, p. 399), and cf. S. Theophil. *Prolog. Paschal.* (*ap.* Bucher, p. 472, par. 3).

Now pseudo-Anatolius, as we have seen, acted in this manner: (*a*) he was willing to celebrate later than 21 April; (*b*) he assigned certain celebrations to the vespers of moon 21; (*c*) he broke fast upon the evening of moon 14, Sunday, and, consequently, (*d*) he fasted with the Manichees upon the Lord's Day.[35] That is to say, his Paschal rule and his wholly erroneous and unparalleled theory respecting the *νυχθήμερον* required this fast. That any community kept Easter by this list cannot, I imagine, be admitted for one moment.[36] Only five of its Easters (A.D. 458–462) can be presumed to present a computation which is both a forecast and is independent of that of the 'Paschal Book for One Hundred Years' of Theophilus; and these five Easters are burdened with no less than ten computistical errors. The fourteen earlier Easters only present four errors among them, and of these two were certainly made of set purpose to conceal the Sabbatical sequence.

The Easter of A.D. 444, it was known to pseudo-Anatolius, had been celebrated at Rome and in some parts of the West upon 23 April. Other occidentals had celebrated upon 26 March. This day, by the computation of the Latin cycle of LXXXIV., was moon 23. The Easter of A.D. 444 is dated by the Latin cycle upon 19 March, moon 16. This is an impossible date, being two days before the equinox. Hence, in this year, it is certain that no Latin church either kept the Easter of LXXXIV. or computed by the lunar method of LXXXIV. 26 March is moon 21 by the decemnovennal method in VIII.; this day, according to Latin views, was a fit day for the celebration of Easter.[37]

[35] V. Theophil. *Prolog. Paschal.* (*ibid.*): '*Deinde ne Dominicâ Lunâ decimaquartâ existente jejunare cogamur: hoc enim Manichaeorum recte consuetudo possidet. . . . neque consequens est ut si in Sabbati* [*sc. ad vesperam*] *die decima quarta Luna veniat solvamus jejunium.*' The reason for the British churches breaking the Lenten fast at the end of moon 13, Saturday, is thus rendered manifest: they did so in order to avoid the error of the Manichees and Priscillianists, who fasted upon the Lord's day. Compare also upon this point St. Ambrose's epistle *De Festo Paschali* (*ap.* Bucher, p. 476, ll. 18, 19).

[36] As the leaders of the Priscillianists were banished to the Scilly Isles by Maximus, it is not impossible that the heresy of Priscillian should have been implanted and received upon the mainland of Britain. If the false canon of Anatolius were the work of a Priscillianist, we should look, however, to find some allusion to, and pretended sanction of, heretical doctrine. Such are absent, I believe, from the canon. This view of the question, however, I must leave to scholars who are conversant with the history of heresies, and who are skilled in tracing their ramifications and recrudescences.

The Montanists of Phrygia, a sect of the Quartodecimans which was persecuted by Justinian, fixed the equinox at the same date as did pseudo-Anatolius, viz. at *ix. Kal. April.* (*v.* Adolf Hilgenfeld, *Der Paschastreit der alten Kirche*, 1860, p. 395). This, similarly, I regard as a coincidence, and no more.

[37] According to the Latins the Paschal xiv. might fall *ex xv. Kalendarum Aprilium usque in xvii. Kalendarum Maiarum diem*; see the *Expositum de Die Paschae et Mensis* of Hilarianus (*ap.* Galland, *Bibliotheca Patrum* (Venet. 1772), tom. viii. pp. 745–8). This tract was compiled . . . *in die . . . iii. Nonarum Martiarum post Consulatum Arcadii IV. et Honorii III.*; i.e. 5 March A.D. 397. It holds the same place with regard to the cycle of LXXXIV. as the Prologues of Theophilus and Cyril hold with regard to their Paschal productions. In cap. viii. (p. 746 *b*) the lunations of

The appearance of the Alexandrine date of Easter in the Paschal list of pseudo-Anatolius does not, of course, warrant the assumption that the Church in Britain celebrated Easter in A.D. 444 according to the directions of Pope Leo and the 'Paschal Book' of Theophilus. The circumstances surrounding the computation of the Easters of 444 and 455 are so peculiar, however, that we may certainly assume that pseudo-Anatolius constructed his canon in Britain and that the views of Leo were partially known in that country.

In A.D. 444 Leo decreed that the Latin limits should be exceeded; in pseudo-Anatolius these limits are exceeded in this year, and the date of this Easter is asserted by him to be the true limit of the Paschal period. In A.D. 455 Leo decreed, at first, that the Latin limits should not be exceeded, but that Easter should be celebrated upon 17 April, which was the fourteenth moon; in pseudo-Anatolius the lunar method of the decemnovennal computation is changed, and in this year the Latin limits are not exceeded, while Easter is assigned to 17 April, in accordance with the opinion which Leo had expressed at first.

Now, in the 'Annales Cambriae' we read:

> *Annus IX.*—Pasca commutatur [super diem dominicum] cum Papa Leone episcopo Romae.[38]

I have elsewhere pointed out that this item must be dated in the ninth year of the false era of St. Germanus. Some ancient writers misdate the coming of St. Germanus to Britain in A.D. 446; 446 plus ix. = A.D. 454. Towards the close of this year, *i.e.* in September, when the Latin ecclesiastics commenced their year,[39] the determination of the date of the first day of Lent and of the date of Easter Day would necessitate a reference to the 'Paschal Book for One Hundred Years' of Theophilus. It would then be found that Theophilus's date exceeded the Latin limit by three days. A correspondence among the bishops of the west no doubt ensued. Leo had serious misgivings respecting the righteousness of celebrating so late as 24 April, and at first, as we have already remarked, gave his sanction to those Latin computists who demanded the rejection of the 'Paschal Book' of Theophilus. This earlier opinion of Leo

the year are dated according to the principles of the Latin cycle of LXXXIV.: these lunations were, assuredly, the first to be computed by this method, and in this year, viz. A.D. 397, LXXXIV. originated. This tract is not considered by those continental writers—Bruno Krusch, De Rossi, and Mommsen—who follow Van der Hagen. Amidst the cloud of dogmatising respecting LXXXIV. it is not surprising that a fourth-century document which forms the prologue to that method of computation should have remained unreviewed.

[38] Ed. J. Williams ab Ithel, 1860, *Rolls Series*, p. 3. The words in crotchets are omitted from the similar notice respecting Elbod in *an. cccxxiv.* p. 10.

[39] *V.* S. Ambros. *Epistol. de Festo Paschali* (*ap.* Bucher, p. 477, par. 7): *Hic* . . . *mensis* [*sc. mensis Aprilis*] *octavus secundum consuetudinem nostram* [*est*].

undoubtedly reached Britain, and is reflected in the extract from 'Annales Cambriae' given above.

The position, therefore, at which we have arrived is as follows: An opinion of Pope Leo respecting the proper time of celebrating Easter in A.D. 455 reached Britain. This opinion was regarded in Britain as one which directed an alteration in the observance of Easter. Leo's opinion, and also his decree respecting the Easter of A.D. 444, are reflected in a Paschal canon which was constructed in A.D. 457. This canon, moreover, forbids the celebration of Easter before 25 March, and enjoins the observance of Easter from moon 13 to moon 20.

At the close of the following century the Britons presented Paschal peculiarities which are distinct from those presented by any other ecclesiastical community.[40] Not only did they avoid transgressing the Latin limit by celebrating upon moon 14 when moon 21 fell beyond the Latin limit, but they also reflected the theory of pseudo-Anatolius in so far as the observance of Easter from moon 13 to moon 20 is concerned, and in rejecting the three days which fall before 25 March as unfit for the celebration of Easter.

The origin of the British Paschal schism is manifest herein. Leo's earlier decision respecting the Easter of A.D. 455—the decision, namely, to celebrate upon 17 April, moon 14, in preference to exceeding the Latin limit by celebrating upon 24 April, moon 21—was undoubtedly regarded in Britain as the promulgation of a new Paschal rule; and his direction to celebrate in one particular instance upon the 14th moon was viewed by the clergy in western Britain as a direction whose application was to be universal. Hence they rejected the 21st moon; their observance was altered to an observance from moon 13 to moon 20; the retention of the Julian equinox, for reasons to which I shall presently revert, was not corrected, and the observance of the posterior Latin limit of the Paschal period, which all Latin churches were prone to regard as the true limit of Easter-tide, became eventually the established custom.

VI.

The discovery of the method of computation made use of by the church in Britain before A.D. 455 depends upon our ability to reply to this question:—In A.D. 455 Pope Leo changed, or altered in some way, the celebration of Easter; what was it that was changed in Britain? We know that at Rome it was the Easter of Theophilus that was changed. With regard to Britain, many writers assert that the British churches computed the date of Easter by the lunar method of LXXXIV.[41] For this assertion there is neither foundation

[40] Cf. Cummian. *Epistol. ad Segienum* (*ap.* Migne, tom. lxxxvii. col. 974, D).

[41] Every English investigator in theory asserts this to be the case. When the question of practice arises none can be found who computes the xiv. of the Paschal

nor authority. No writer has considered it necessary to submit to proof either (*a*) the facile assumption that the Latin cycle of LXXXIV. was known out of Italy before the fifth century, or (*b*) the illusory one that the British churches were acquainted with, and made use of this lunar method during four centuries and a half—*sc.* from 314 to 750.

St. Cyril assures us that the lunar calculations of the Alexandrines were accepted throughout the Christian world; I am not acquainted with any reason for rejecting his assurance, neither do the writers who parade the Latin cycle of emergency seem willing to recognise the fact that they should provide some reason for such rejection. As St. Cyril, writing in 436, asserted that the Alexandrine lunar method had been accepted throughout the Christian world, therefore it had been accepted in Britain.

I have elsewhere shown, on the authority of Cummian,[42] that St. Patrick introduced the Alexandrine computation and observance into Ireland in A.D. 433, and we have seen, in this disquisition, that pseudo-Anatolius, writing in Britain in A.D. 457, was acquainted with decemnovennal computation, and that he had perverted Alexandrine rules to suit his own ends. In Gaul also Victorius adapted, in A.D. 457, the Alexandrine method to Latin views, while, from the epistles of Leo respecting the Easter of A.D. 455, we are able to infer that the lunar method and the Paschal limitations enjoined by LXXXIV. were cast aside by Leo entirely.[43]

Pseudo-Anatolius refers to the Alexandrine computations in these terms (cap. xi. Bucher, pp. 447-8):

> Hic Circulus XIX. annorum [the computist means his Paschal list] a quibusdam Africanis rimariis qui ampliores Circulos conscripserunt non

lunation by LXXXIV. Dr. Ebrard (*Die iroschottische Missionskirche*, 1873, pp. 73-4) is the only writer with whom I am acquainted that has challenged this view; he erroneously contended that the British church only deviated from the Alexandrine Pasch when the latter fell upon moon 21. Dr. Krusch has computed the dates of British and Irish Easters for some hundreds of years according to LXXXIV. (v. *Neues Archiv*, 1884, Bd. ix. pp. 167-9.) His table dates no celebrations at all upon moon 13, upon which day, if we may believe Baeda, the Britons sometimes celebrated; to compensate for this several celebrations are arranged (p. 169) upon moon 21, which day, if we may believe Wilfrid and Colman and Columbanus, the Britons and Scots wholly eliminated from their observance. The reader who seeks for Dr. Krusch's authorities respecting Paschal observance in Rome and Britain during the fourth century will discover that the Nicene encyclical to the church of the Alexandrines (A.D. 325); the Paschal epistles of Constantine (A.D. 325), Ambrose (*ante* A.D. 387), Innocent (A.D. 414); as well as the Paschal Prologues of Theophilus (A.D. 380), Hilarianus (A.D. 397), Cyril (A.D. 436); and even the *Circulus CXII. Annorum* of Hippolytus (A.D. 222) are not considered.

[42] Cummian declares in his Paschal letter to Segene (*ap.* Migne, tom. lxxxvii. col. 975, C) that Patrick introduced the Alexandrine Pasch into Ireland: *Primum illum* [cyclum] *quem sanctus Patricius papa noster tulit et facit* [sic]; *in quo luna a decima quarta usque in vigesima prima regulariter et aequinoctium a xii. Kal. April. observatur.*

[43] *V.* Ideler, as cited *ut supra*, notes 29 and 30.

probatur quia eorum suspicationibus ac opinionibus videtur satis esse contrarius.

The longer cycles to which this computist refers, and with the 'guesses and fancies' of which he challenges us to compare his own clear and correct supputation, are the hundred years and the ninety-five years cycles of Theophilus and Cyril respectively. Of the Alexandrine limits the computist remarks—

Quos terminos non solum non sequendos sed etiam detestandos ac succidendos[44] esse decernimus.

Speaking of preceding computations he remarks (cap. i., p. 439)—

E quibus Hippolytus XVI. annorum Circulum quibusdam ignotis Lunae cursibus composuit. Alii XXV. [*lege* XCV.] alii XXX., nonnulli LXXXIV. annorum Circulum computantes numquam ad veram Paschae computandi rationem pervenerunt.

The last lines are merely a flourish; no cycle whose method of observance awaits the arrival of the Lord's Day before celebrating Easter could be so incorrect that it never assigned Easter Day correctly. The reference to a cycle of thirty years relates, no doubt, to some obscure and neglected attempt by a Gallican computist to use the ancient lunar cycle of his country.[45] The cycle of 'XXV.' is certainly the cycle of XCV. of Cyril. This cycle was composed in A.D. 436. From pseudo-Anatolius's reference to LXXXIV. we perceive that in Britain, as well as in Rome, that method of computation had been rejected entirely.

Other writers upon Paschal matters who are referred to as such by pseudo-Anatolius are Clement, and Origen, and Isidore, and Hieronymus.[46] This Isidore can be no other than the abbot of

[44] By what must be presumed to be an error of the copyist the Latin limit, *xi. Kal. Mai.*, stands for the limit of the 'African' computists, i.e. *vii. Kal. Mai.*; *succidendos*, from the pen of one who fixed the posterior limit at *ix. Kal. Mai.*, could not, it is clear, refer to a limit dated *xi. Kal. Mai.*

[45] *V.* the work of Joseph Justus Scaliger, *De Emendatione Temporum* (Col. Allobrog. 1629). In his chapter *De Veterum Gallorum Anno* (fol. 172) Scaliger suggests difficulties respecting the Gallic period of thirty years which have no actual existence. If we add eleven days of epact, year after year, nullity, *i.e.* thirty days of epact, is necessarily attained to in thirty years. It would be quite possible to compute in this manner; as this method, however, cannot effect the *saltus lunaris*, the Gallic full moon in ninety-five years would fall four days later than the phase.

[46] Ideler (*Handbuch*, Bd. ii. p. 230) remarks, *Van der Hagen, der umständlich von diesem Product handelt* ('*De Cyclis Paschalibus*,' S. 115 ff.), *glaubt dass es nicht vor der ersten Hälfte des siebenten Jahrhunderts entstanden sein könne, weil darin des bekannten Bischofs* Isidorus *aus Sevilla gedacht wird, der* 636 *gestorben ist.* . . . Isidore became bishop of Seville in, or soon after, A.D. 600; we have already seen that Columbanus mentions the Paschal canon of Anatolius in A.D. 602, and that the Picts, who were converted about A.D. 580, also revered this Paschal canon. Ideler (*loc. cit.*) remarks respecting Baeda, *Dass jener der Chronologie sonst so kundige Schriftsteller den offenbaren Betrug nicht geahnet hat ist allerdings auffallend; doch die Kritik war damals in der Kindheit.* Neither Van der Hagen nor Ideler, it would seem, was acquainted with the Paschal writings of Columbanus, and Ideler had not, it may be presumed, examined Baeda's epistle to Wicraed (*v.* note 5, *supra*).

Pelusium, who espoused the cause of Chrysostom and wrote against Theophilus and Cyril. Theophilus distinguished his episcopate by a bitter persecution of the Origenists. Jerome joined him in this, though he had at one time accounted Origen as second only to the disciples of Jesus. Isidore died about 450, Jerome in 420.

As the decemnovennal computation was known to pseudo-Anatolius, as he was also acquainted with the lengthy cycles of the Alexandrine patriarchs, and as he exceeded the Latin limits in assigning the Easter of A.D. 444, therefore it is not unreasonable to assume that the change produced in Britain by Leo's earlier judgment in A.D. 455 took the form of a rejection of the 'Paschal Book for One Hundred Years' of Theophilus.

The consequence of such a rejection would be the construction of a new Paschal method; this construction has been dated, in this examination, in A.D. 457 for the following year. Why, it will be asked, did not the British computist construct his new list at once, *i.e.* in A.D. 455, instead of deferring the appearance of his novelty for three years? The 'Paschal Book' of Theophilus dated the Easter of its year lxxix., *i.e.* of A.D. 458, 20 April, moon 21. When the British computists came to consult the 'Paschal Book' of Theophilus, in order to learn the date of Easter in 458, they found that a celebration upon moon 21 was ordained. Their obedience in rejecting the twenty-first moon in 455, at the instance of Leo, would necessarily be fresh in mind; the supposed command to reject moon 21 and to celebrate upon moon 14, Sunday, would be recalled; the Paschal canon of pseudo-Anatolius, which computes the lunations of A.D. 458, was constructed, and the isolated church of the Britons entered upon its long schism of three centuries.

VII.

The question of the equinox date must now be considered. In view of my assertion that the British church in the fifth century kept the Easter of Theophilus of Alexandria, and also of the fact that the Britons retained the Julian equinox and rejected the Nicene equinox, the following question at once suggests itself: How could the Britons, who retained from earlier times the equinox date 25 March, have kept the Easters of Theophilus, who dated the equinox 21 March, and consequently celebrated before 25 March?

The Alexandrine computists, it has already been observed, were accustomed to allot thirty-one days in years of embolism to the lunation which is extinguished in March. The result of this is that the Paschal term in the lunation of April in those embolismic years which are connoted with the golden numbers V. and XVI. is deferred one day. As these years are the only years in

which it is possible for orthodox computists to celebrate before 25 March, I regard this peculiarity of Alexandrine computation as a direct concession to the susceptibilities of those Latins who were desirous of retaining the ancient date of the equinox.[47]

When Sunday fell in V. upon 24 March, moon 15, and when Sunday fell in XVI. upon 23 March, moon 15, or upon 24 March, moon 16, the Alexandrines required the Latins to celebrate in company with them.

Now in V., G F, A.D. 384, Easter was dated 24 March; no other celebration before the Julian equinox could be required until A.D. 452, XVI., F E, Easter Day, 23 March. That is to say, in seventy years the 'Paschal Book' of Theophilus only once enjoined celebration of Easter before 25 March. In this year pseudo-Anatolius dates Easter, as I have already pointed out, one month later than its proper time. There can be no doubt but that such apparent desuetude as that which has just been discovered would confirm the British computists in their belief that the three days between 21 March and 25 March were, as pseudo-Anatolius maintains, unfit for the celebration of Easter.

In A.D. 414, XVI., D, and in A.D. 441, V., E, the Easters of Theophilus were dated, respectively, 29 March and 30 March. These dates, we shall find, if we inspect the lists of Paschal schisms compiled by the Benedictines,[48] proved to be the occasion of schism. In A.D. 414 Pope Innocent rejected the Paschal date of Theophilus[49] and celebrated upon 22 March. In A.D. 441 some of the Latins celebrated upon 23 March.

Both these dates are discoverable in the 'Circulus LXXXIV. Annorum.' As the Britons in 452 would not celebrate before 25 March, we are not at liberty to assume, without any attempt at proof, that they were willing to celebrate before 25 March in 441. This assumption, however, is inherent in the assertion that the British church, in the fifth century, computed the date of Easter by means of the cycle of LXXXIV. Innocent, in 414, knew that the cycle of LXXXIV. was one day in precession of the moon of XIX.; Cyril in 436, pointed out that this precession amounted to two days.[50] As the moon of LXXXIV. continuously and in an increasing degree preceded the moon of the heavens, it is certain that in a very short time after A.D. 450 the cycle of LXXXIV. became useless and was rejected universally. A. ANSCOMBE.

[47] Note the frequent remarks of Theophilus (*Prolog. Paschal.* ap. Bucher, p. 473, par. 5), of Ambrose (*Epistol. de Festo Paschali*, ibid. p. 477, par. 8), and of Cyril (*Prolog. Paschal.* ibid. p. 484, par. 6) respecting the computations of the common people and their obstinacy respecting the equinox date.

[48] *L'Art de vérifier les Dates*, tome i. Easter Tables.

[49] *V.* Innocent. Pap. *Epistol.* (*xi.*) *ad Aurelium* (*ap.* Bucher, p. 480).

[50] V. *Prolog. Paschal.* (*ap.* Bucher, p. 484, par. 8).

THE POPE WHO SENTENCED HIMSELF.[1]

My friend Professor Maitland has now found this story in the Year Book, in an interesting case on the privileges of the chancellor of Oxford, 8 H. VI, 18; it occurs on p. 20. The question before the court being whether a certain charter of Richard II gave the chancellor jurisdiction in cases where he was himself a party, and, if so, whether such a grant was good, Rolf, of counsel for the chancellor, is reported to have said—

> Jeo vous dirai un fable: En ascun temps fuit un Pape, & avoit fait un grand offence, & le Cardinals vindrent a luy & disoyent a luy, Peccasti, & il dit, Judica [*sic*] me: & ils disoyent, non possumus, quia caput es Ecclesiae, judica te ipsum: Et l'Apostol' [*sic*] dit, Judico me cremari: & fuit combustus: & en cest cas il fuit son juge demesne, & apres fuit un Sainct: & issint n'est pas inconvenient que un home soit [son] juge demesne, &c.

This is probably the source of the story as current in England, though I am quite sure that as I first heard it the whole was in Latin. Obviously Rolf's version is a long way from Bonitho's, and the intermediate stages remain unaccounted for. F. Pollock.

HENRY I AT 'BURNE.'

In working at the charters of Henry I, I have long been puzzled as to what place is represented by 'Burna.' It is connected with the king's departures for Normandy, especially in 1114, when we learn from the 'Anglo-Saxon Chronicle' that the forcing of the see of Rochester on the reluctant Ernulf took place at a 'tune' called 'Burne' on 15 Sept., while the king was waiting for a favourable wind; that he was at Rowner ('Rugenor'), opposite to Portsmouth, six days later, and that he took ship at Portsmouth the same day (21 Sept.)[1] Eastbourne is the only obvious 'Burne' lying on the south coast, and local research has assured the identity of the two names.[2] The Rolls edition of the 'Chronicle' also identifies them here,[3] and Mr. Eyton observes that 'we have a charter of King Henry I, dated *apud Marendonam*, and that it passed in the same week or month as other charters which that king expedited at Fareham (Hants) and at Eastbourne (Sussex) when about to cross to Normandy.'[4] In spite of these identifications it has always seemed to me that Eastbourne was not a probable point of departure, was not, so far as we know, a recognised port at all, and was not, in any case, near Portsmouth or Fareham. Seeking for a place fulfilling

[1] See above, p. 293.

[1] Plummer's *Two of the Saxon Chronicles*, i. 245–6.

[2] *Sussex Arch. Coll.* xiv. 120.

[3] As does the life of Ernulf in the *Dictionary of National Biography.*

[4] *Itinerary of Henry II*, p. 293, note.

this last condition, I found it in Westbourne, Sussex, on the Hampshire border, close to the sea. But what, it may be asked, took Henry to Westbourne, which is off the main road? The answer is that Westbourne ('Borne'), like Marden ('Meredone'), which lay to the north of it, formed part of the honour of Arundel,[5] then by forfeiture in the king's lands, and afterwards his widow's dower. In accordance with immemorial practice Henry would sojourn at his own manors when he found himself in their neighbourhood.

The statement of the 'Chronicle' implying the presence of magnates, ecclesiastical and lay, on the occasion at 'Burne,' is confirmed by the charter settling the differences between Hyde Abbey and the bishop of Winchester, which was there granted, 13 Sept. (1114).[6] It was witnessed by the archbishops of Canterbury and York, the bishops of Salisbury, London, Lincoln, Bath, Exeter, and Durham, the count of Meulan, and Henry, earl of Warwick, Walter (of Gloucester), the Constable, William 'Camerarius' of Tancarville, Adam de Port, Nigel d'Oilli, H. de Port, Ralph de Limesi, and Nigel d'Aubeni. This list of witnesses, on the roll, is of special value, because in the 'Monasticon' all those after the earl of Warwick are omitted, Dugdale having taken for his text the Cottonian manuscript Dom. A. xiv., where, also, the name of the place is given as Barnham ('Mon. Angl.' ii. 444). He does, indeed, print the *inspeximus* also (*ib.* 445), but gives the date of the original charter in it as 1110 *quarto die idus Sept.*, instead of 1114 *die idus Sept.*

To Westbourne also I am tempted to assign two Ramsey charters granted *apud Burnham*,[7] though Mr. R. E. G. Kirk in the index identifies this place with 'Brunham,' Norfolk.[8] The evidence may be short of actual proof, but seven of the nine witnesses to the first of these Ramsey charters witnessed that to Winchester, which certainly suggests that the documents belong to the same place and the same occasion.[9] Both these charters, one must add, are gravely misdated, as '1119' and '1119–1123,' for both are previous to the king's departure in 1116.

Henry's great charter of confirmation to the church of Cirencester ('Mon. Angl.' ii. 177) is dated *apud Burnam in transfretatione mea anno Inc. Dom. MCXXXIII, regni vero mei XXXIII*, and is no less valuable than that to Winchester in 1114 for its long list of witnesses, nineteen in number, in conjunction with a fixed date (August 1133). J. H. ROUND.

[5] *Domesday*, i. 23 b., 24.

[6] *Thirtieth Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Records*, p. 200.

[7] *Ramsey Cartulary*, i. 245. [8] *Ibid.* iii. 368.

[9] The Norfolk Burnhams lie in the remote north of the county, an unlikely spot from which to expedite a charter. There is also a Barnham in Suffolk, close to Thetford. As Ramsey held lands at Burnham, the cartulary scribe may well have interpolated an 'h,' confusing the two places.

THE 'HERSE' OF ARCHERS AT CRECY.

Few passages have been more variously interpreted than that in which Froissart describes how the English archers of the front division were drawn up at Crecy—*mis leurs arciers a maniere d'une herce et les gens d'armes ou fons de leur bataille.*[1] Mr. Oman, in his 'Art of War in the Middle Ages,' supposed them to be formed in line in the centre of the 'battle,' with a solid phalanx of dismounted men-at-arms at each end of the line, to guard their flanks; but he has recently taken a different view. The line,' he now says, 'was composed alternately of triangular bodies of archery and smaller squares of dismounted knights using the long lance.' 'The archers were drawn up in wedge-shaped formation, "like a [triangular] harrow," as Froissart expresses it.'[2] In adopting this sense of *herse* he agrees with Père Daniel,[3] but the latter supposed the men-at-arms to be in the centre and the archers on the flanks. He took Froissart's phrase to mean *que ces deux corps d'archers étaient prolongés bien au-delà de la ligne, et formaient chacun comme un triangle, dont la base fort large était tournée du côté des Français.* Why it should be turned that way he does not explain.

But other writers of authority in medieval warfare have dismissed the idea of a harrow, and have understood Froissart to say that the archers were extended in a line in front of the men-at-arms. So Napoleon III,[4] who thinks Froissart likened them to a portcullis, because, with their stakes fixed in front of them, they form an impassable barrier. So Colonel Rüstow,[5] who renders *herse* by *Staketenzaun*, and takes it to mean that the archers with their stakes enclosed the men-at-arms, at all events in front, as a fence does a house. So also Viollet-le-Duc says of Edward III,[6] *Ses archers, en avant, étaient disposés en herse,* and elsewhere explains this to mean *se développer en lignes de batailles . . . comme le font encore nos tirailleurs.*[7] He quotes from a manuscript how Godefroy d'Harcourt, at the beginning of the action in which he was killed, (near Coutances) in 1356, *mist ses archiers tout devant ce qu'il en avait.* Sir Sibbald Scott [8] comes to the same conclusion.

That the archers were in front and the men-at-arms behind is suggested by the expression *ou fons de leur bataille.* It is distinctly stated in the Rome manuscript of the 'Chronicles,' *missent les archiers tout devant en fourme de une erce et les gens d'armes ou fons.*[9] It is also implied by the statement that in the course of the battle certain knights and squires of the French army *par force d'armes rompirent les arciers de la bataille dou Prince et vinrent jusques os*

[1] Ed. Luce, iii. 175.
[2] *Social England*, vol. ii. p. 75.
[3] *Histoire de la Milice Française*, i. 220.
[4] *Œuvres*, iv. 40.
[5] *Geschichte der Infanterie*, i. 105.
[6] *Dictionnaire de Mobilier Français*, vi. 374.
[7] *Ibid.* v. 49.
[8] *British Army*, ii. 540, &c.
[9] Ed. Luce, iii. 416.

gens d'armes combattre as espées, main a main, moult vaillamment [10] Again, if we turn to the account of Poitiers, in which Froissart uses the same illustration, we find that Eustace de Ribeaumont reports to the French king, after mentioning the archers who lined the hedges of the road of approach, *et ont mis leurs gens d'armes tout devant yaus leurs arciers à manière d'une herce.*[11] In the Amiens manuscript this description is varied, and stands, *Apriés ce tenoient ou fons de ce chemin les gens d'armes en bon convenant, deux hayes d'archiers devant yaux, a mannière d'une herce.*[12] While Froissart says that the archers—not all of them, but those of the prince's 'battle'—were in front, Baker of Swinbrook says they were on the flanks. *Sagittariis eciam sua loca designarunt [Anglici], ut, non coram armatis, set a lateribus regis exercitus quasi ale astarent, et sic non impedirent armatos neque inimicis occurrerent in fronte, set in latere sagittas fulminarent.*[13]

At Agincourt Henry's small numbers obliged him to draw up van, main body, and rear all in one line, instead of in successive 'battles,' and there, according to the chaplain who witnessed the battle,[14] *intermiscuisset cuneos sagittariorum suorum cuilibet aciei, et fecisset eos affigere palos coram eis.*[15] But the herald St. Rémy, who was also present with the English army, and who also says that in the original order of battle the archers were placed *aux deux costez des hommes d'armes*, says that just before the battle began Sir Thomas Erpingham was directed by Henry *pour ordonner ses archiers et les mectre au froncq devant, en deux elles*, and did so.[16] Hence Viollet-le-Duc concludes that Henry *rangea sa petite armée . . . en trois corps, entre lesquels il posta des archers en ordre triangulaire,*[17] *avec leurs pieux fichés devant eux. Puis en avant de ce front de bataille il établit une double ligne d'archers en herse.*[18]

According to Christine de Pisan the usual (French) practice at the beginning of the fifteenth century was to draw up the army in three divisions, the foremost, or vanguard, consisting

> of a long train of men of arms, all close together and ranged full smoothly, that the one pass not the other . . . and at the foremost sides are made wings, in which be all manner of shooters ranged, and in good array, as well gunners as balesters and archers.[19]

This corresponds to the arrangement adopted in later times for pikemen and musketeers; but at the beginning of an action 'shot' were usually placed in front of the pikes, either as skirmishers or

[10] Ed. Luce, iii. 182. [11] *Ibid.* v. 22. [12] *Ibid.* 252.

[13] *Chronicon Galfridi le Baker de Swynebroke* (ed. 1889), p. 84.

[14] Chronicler A of Sir Harris Nicolas.

[15] *Gesta Henrici Quinti*, p. 50. [16] *Chronique*, ed. Morand, i. 253.

[17] It is not safe to regard *cuneus* as decisive of shape. It seems often to have been used for masses or columns of troops. Cf. *coin de terre.*

[18] *Op. cit.* vi. 385.

[19] *Book of Faittes of Arms*, Caxton's translation, B. 1, ch. 23.

in close order. In the latter case we find the term *herse* still used in the seventeenth century. Robert Ward, in his 'Animadversions of War' (1639), describes what he calls a 'demi-hearse Battell,' to form which

> the two wings of shot are advanced before the front of the body of pikes: and closing their divisions they shelter the pikes from the fury of the enemies' shot.[20]

Sir John Smythe, writing while archers were still seen in the field (1590), says—

> The ancient order of reducing archers into form by our most skilful and warlike ancestors was into hearses—that is, broad in front and narrow in flank, as, for example, if there were 25, 30, 35, or more or fewer archers in front, the flanks did consist but of 7 or 8 ranks at the most. . . . They placed their hearses of archers either before the front of their armed footmen or else in wings upon the corners of their battles, and sometimes both in front and wings.[21]

By supposing that at Crecy they were originally in masses on the flanks, but were afterwards extended (in whole or part) across the front of the men-at-arms before the battle began, we may partially reconcile Froissart's statement with that of Baker of Swinbrook.

The question remains, How came the term *herse* to be applied to them in this linear formation? In Du Cange's 'Glossary' (ed. Henschel and Favre) *hericia* is defined as *septum quod portis urbium objicitur, seu quodvis repagulum, quo locus aliquis occluditur ac munitur, nostris Herse.* A passage is quoted in illustration (from 'Reg. feudor. Norman.,' &c.): *Homines sui debent reparare unam perticatam de fossatis . . . et facere Hericiam supra illam perticatam cum reparata fuerit.* This is closely parallel to the lines in the 'Roman de Rou:'—

> Avait a cel tens une fosse
> Haut e parfont e reparé
> Sor le fosse out heriçon. (ii. 204.)[22]

Heriçon is defined in the 'Glossary' (ix. 234) as *défense qu'on mettait aux passages pour servir de barrières, cheval de frise.* In this sense, as well as in its primitive sense of 'hedgehog,' *hérisson* is derived from *ericius.* In describing the attack on one of Pompey's camps Caesar mentions [23] *erat objectus portis ericius . . . excisoque ericio . . . irruperunt.* Following the latest editors of Du Cange, then, we may trace *herse,* as used by Froissart, not to *hirpex,* a harrow, but to *hérisson, hericia,* and *ericius,* and understand by it a bristly fence, of varying extent, of the nature of *chevaux de frise,*

[20] Part i. p. 262.

[21] *Discourses concerning the Form and Effect of divers Sorts of Weapons,* p. 30.

[22] Quoted by Mr. Archer in *Contemporary Review,* March 1893.

[23] *Bel. Civ.* iii. c. 67.

placed in front of an entrance or along the top of a scarp.[24] In this sense it is quite as applicable to the line of archers as the term *haie*, which Froissart also uses. It is not necessary to refer to their stakes in justification of it, any more than we seek material means of explaining the historic exclamation, 'See how Jackson's brigade stands like a stone wall.' The archers were a fence or hedge to the men-at-arms.[25] Their arrows were their bristles. There is no direct evidence that they had stakes at Crecy[26] or Poitiers; and at Agincourt, where they had them, they seem to have planted them not across the whole front of the line of battle, but as a protection for their rallying points in that line. So the chaplain says; and this makes it easier to understand the English advance to provoke the French onset after the stakes had been fixed.

If the above explanation is correct, it is a curious reversal of metaphor that the *herse*, after lending its name to a line of infantry, should have been itself renamed *chevaux de frise* in the Low Country wars.

E. M. LLOYD.

HERALDRY OF OXFORD COLLEGES.

IN the April issue of the ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW there appeared a paper by the Rev. Andrew Clark commenting upon some articles that had appeared in *Archaeologia Oxoniensis* upon the heraldry of Oxford colleges. I should be glad to discuss briefly the charges made by Mr. Clark, and the evidence with which he supports them.

I. I am quite willing to accept his correction upon a subject that he has made his own. The question of the technical right of the elder Wood to claim the privileges of the university was, perhaps, outside the scope of my subject.

II. Mr. Clark does not accept the distinct statements of Twyne (1) that the university enjoyed exemption *a marescallis regiis* by virtue of two royal charters, and (2) that the 'visitation' of 1574 alleged by the heralds in 1634 was a pretence of which the records of the university bore no trace. As evidence of his contention Mr. Clark produces the exemplifications of the arms of Lincoln College and of one or two others signed as correct by Lee in 1574. In any case I should be unwilling to admit that these emblazoned copies indicated more than that a

[24] I find this is the view of Köhler (*Die Entwickelung des Kriegswesens in der Ritterzeit*, ii. 364) both as regards the meaning of *herse* and its derivation. Cf. also Hewitt, *Ancient Armour and Weapons*, ii. 76.

[25] In the same way the lines of men told off to guard the flanks or rear of an army, or the ranks of musketeers round a square of pikemen, were termed an *impalement* by writers of the seventeenth century.

[26] It is so far evidence to the contrary that Baker says the English dug what are now called shallow military pits along their front, as an obstacle to the French horse, at Crecy. At Poitiers the hedges formed an obstacle.

few colleges took advantage of the presence of a skilled heraldic draughtsman in their midst; but that the copies in question were not considered the work of any one having authority to pronounce upon the true bearings is clearly shown in the case of Christ Church. Here the herald, Richard Lee, Portcullis, emblazons as the arms of Christ Church a coat that was not then, and never has been, recognised by that house.[1] The coat had been granted, apparently on their own motion, by the College of Arms in 1546, but the scant respect shown for their 'grant' both then and after Lee had, in his attempted visitation of 1574, again tried to foist the coat upon Christ Church, indicates clearly enough the value that the university set upon the authority of the Heralds' College. I do not think that these coats can be regarded as other than the result of the wish of the college authorities to have their arms blazoned by a qualified herald, who was probably glad to get the chance of inserting the 'confirmation' clause as a protest against the claim of the university to exemption. Certainly the College of Arms would be very unlikely either to lose or to omit to copy into its official records notes of such a triumph as a successful visitation of the university in 1574. And no such record exists either in London or in Oxford.

III. I am indebted to a recent writer in the *Academy* for an opportune and clinching proof of the tincture of archbishop Rotherham's stags.[2] But almost from Mr. Clark's own words can the unreasonableness of his contention be deduced. The coats of Rotherham's 'proximate predecessors and successors' *are* all known, and not one resembles that of the cardinal. In fact, extremely few families bear arms even approximating to that in the impaled coat of Lincoln College, and not one, with the exception of the Trollops of Durham, arms that are identical.[3] Mr. Clark's sole piece of evidence in favour of golden stags is Richard Lee's emblazoned copy of the arms of Lincoln College—one of those just referred to. Whatever authority this may have attaches also to another statement by Lee in a work Mr. Clark seems to have overlooked; in his 'Gatherings of Oxfordshire,' a collection of church notes made at the same time as his visitation, 1574, he records the arms of Rotherham in All Hallows Church, in Oxford, as *vert, three stags argent attired or*. So that Lee's oversight can be

[1] The arms thus 'confirmed and allowed' by Lee are *France and England quarterly, over all a cross argent charged with an open book having six seals ppr and ensigned with an imperial crown.* (Harl. MS. 5812.)

[2] In the issue of the *Academy* for 11 May, 'J. S. C.' points out that the original statutes of the archbishop's college at Rotherham, now preserved at Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, have Rotherham's arms emblazoned on the first leaf, and that the stags or 'roes' are argent.

[3] Papworth, it is true, admits Green, but Guillim (writing at a date almost contemporaneous with that of the assumption of arms by Jesus College) decides in favour of an azure field for this family.

corrected by his own hand.[4] Were this not the case, and were Lee's blazon supported by other sources of earlier date than 1574, some question as to the balance of evidence might arise, but as it stands Mr. Clark will probably be the first to admit that Lee's blazon in the Lincoln exemplification can hardly weigh against the earlier evidence of York, Bolton, Sarnesfield, and Cambridge.

IV. To answer fully Mr. Clark's criticisms of the notes upon the arms of Jesus College would occupy more space than I have at my disposal. I should, however, be glad to state succinctly—

1. Mr. Clark bases much of his criticism upon a misquotation. I carefully abstained from the use of the words 'without authority.'

2. The absence of any other source for the arms makes a confusion with those of a college not twenty yards away (admitted, indeed, by Mr. Clark himself), and a subsequent acquiescence by the authorities of Jesus College in the mistake, the only reasonable explanation.

3. The earliest authority for the college arms gives azure as the field,[5] and the College of Arms, the weight of whose opinion Mr. Clark will readily admit, blazons the coat thus.

4. I intended rather to indicate that the choice of green as the 'colours' of the college had probably been the immediate cause that made the error popular and practically universal.

5. Not having seen the will of Dr. Price myself, I can only say that the margin of a will is an unusual place for desultory sketching, that the custom of inscribing the arms of the testator upon the margin of a will is well known,[6] and that Anthony Wood distinctly states that the arms there found are those of Dr. Price.[7]

Under the circumstances I gave the 'azure' coat as the more probable rendering of 'the' arms, but I gave it with an admission of uncertainty, to which Mr. Clark does not advert.

The whole subject is one of extreme difficulty, and I fully admit that several corrections should be made in the 'notes' both here and elsewhere; but though criticism and expansion are most necessary to clear up a neglected branch of heraldry, I do not think that Mr. Clark's somewhat vigorous denunciation will have convinced many that I have approached the matter in an intemperate spirit, or that I am open to a charge of 'inventing reasons and imagining motives.' PERCEVAL LANDON.

In the April number of this REVIEW I tried to show that the very decided terms in which Mr. Landon had expressed his conclusions on some points of Oxford heraldry made several matters of inference and opinion (and possibly of erroneous inference) appear

[4] See also Harl. MSS. 1754 (c. 1623) and 1993 (c. 1585). [5] Harl. MS. 6331.

[6] The first example of about the date that comes to mind is that of Mary, daughter of Sir John Gresham (1582, P.C.C.) [7] *Fasti*, 1525.

as matters of fact. I have read Mr. Landon's defence of his positions, and am content to abide by the arguments of my former paper.

But there is one point of general historical interest at issue between us which may be stated rather more fully. Did the heralds in 1574 include in their visitation the university and colleges of Oxford?

I. As to the fact: In 1634 the heralds, who then came to visit in the university, positively asserted that '*anno* 1574 their predecessors had done the like.' Twyne's note of what then took place, far from rebutting that statement, goes a long way to confirm it. He confesses that he forgot 'to procure of them *the sight of* the allegation which *they produced* for their visitation' in 1574, the plain inference from which is that they brought with them and exhibited (to the vice-chancellor apparently) some documentary evidence that a visitation had then been held. Against this assertion and implied evidence for it what have we to set? (i.) In 1634 the university claimed exemption. But there is no evidence that the heralds then allowed this claim. They abandoned the visitation for that time, it is true; but for the sufficient reason, as stated by Twyne, that they would make no money by it, the university intending to impound any fines they inflicted on its members. And, in the next generation, Anthony Wood, the close friend of Dugdale, St. George, and others of the College of Arms, and likely to represent their views, rejected the claim as 'false' ('Life,' i. 45). Besides, even were the claim just, we must remember that in Leicester's chancellorship the liberties of the university and colleges were constantly set aside by the court and court officials. The heralds in 1634 came down with a recommendation from Laud (then chancellor); what is there to prevent a similar recommendation before, with the difference that Leicester's recommendations had the force of commands? The preferring of a claim of exemption in 1634 does not establish the slightest probability that the claim was allowed or even preferred in 1574. (ii.) The university registers of 1574 do not mention the visitation. This silence, if it proves anything, confirms the statement that a visitation then took place. The university and college registers are not a record of events in Oxford, but of proceedings in convocation and congregation and acts of the colleges. If the vice-chancellor and officers of the university and colleges in 1574 allowed the visitation, then the registers of the university and of the colleges would not mention it; and they do not, so far as is known. If the visitation had been disputed, there would have been some record of the claim of the heralds and the objection to it.

II. The existing records of the visitation, in the archives of certain colleges and in MS. H. 6 of the College of Arms, Mr. Landon sets aside, alleging against them their incompleteness, and being prejudiced (as I think) by his belief that a visitation in 1574 was

impossible. Now the incompleteness of the records is no argument against their validity. Two colleges at least possess Lee's certificates. Others may exist, for outsiders know nothing practically of the present contents of most college muniment rooms and other receptacles of college documents. Even if no additional certificates are to be found, no presumption is established that they never existed. Losses of single documents and whole sets of volumes are on record. The wonder rather is that any of these separate parchment sheets have survived. The College of Arms MS. is *unfinished.* A book, as I infer, large enough to contain all the college coats was provided, some six or eight shields (I speak merely from recollection) were blazoned, and then the work was left off. But there is nothing to show that Lee's rough notes, from which presumably he worked, went no further; many of us leave unfinished work we begin, and our rough notes perish. And every shield, both in the College of Arms MS. and in the Oxford parchments, contains an explicit statement that it was taken at 'his visitation.' I am not concerned with the competency of Lee to copy correctly or to confirm coats; but I feel that we must choose between two alternatives, either that Lee 'visited' the university or that he used his official position to make a deliberate lie. No one could accept the latter alternative, except under compulsion of the most positive evidence.

With respect to the intricate problem of the Jesus College coat Mr. Landon seems still involved between two hopelessly contradictory positions—(i.) that the college authorities borrowed the third of the Lincoln college coat, *i.e. vert*, three stags; (ii.) that the coat adopted was *azure*, three stags, and that the colour was subsequently changed by some person unknown. ANDREW CLARK.

Reviews of Books

Christianity and the Roman Government: a Study in Imperial Administration. By E. G. Hardy, M.A. (London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1894.)

The Church in the Roman Empire before A.D. 170. By W. M. Ramsay, M.A. (London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1st edition, 1893; 4th edition, 1895.)

So far as they are concerned with the persecution of Christianity in the early empire (Professor Ramsay's is concerned with a good many other things as well), both these books appear to have owed the impulse which brought them into being to Mommsen's famous essay on 'Der Religionsfrevel nach römischem Recht,' in the *Historische Zeitschrift* for 1890. Mommsen's essay, itself occasioned by the appearance of the first volume (no second volume has as yet appeared) of K. J. Neumann's important book on 'Der römische Staat und die allgemeine Kirche bis auf Diocletian,' which had been published earlier in that year, was chiefly devoted to an exposition of the view that Christianity came under no definite law against which it offended; that the purely religious offence did not come into Roman law at all, and that there was no *quaestio* under which it could be tried; but that the magistrates commonly acted against the Christians in virtue of the summary *coercitio* which was inherent in the very conception of the magisterial power. This *coercitio*, or summary intervention of the magistrate against a publicly disobedient person or disturber of public order, is not a conception which it is easy to bring home to Englishmen; but perhaps our punishment for 'contempt of court' may be regarded as a vestige of it. It took place, according to Mommsen, without fixed name for the alleged offence, without fixed procedure, and without fixed penalty. The personality of the official concerned and the popular feeling of the moment were consequently all-important. The Roman government, says Mommsen, was constantly pressed to treat Christianity as a crime, but on the whole resisted. Christianity was not a public danger. Its unnational, universal tendencies worked in well with the universal Hellenic culture and imperial citizenship, and were not objectionable. The impracticable Sabbath privileges were not claimed by the Christians. They made no difficulties about military service.[1] They were not—in this early

[1] Mommsen is surely right in taking this view, and Mr. Hardy (p. 48) wrong in asserting the contrary. See Tertullian, *Apol.* 42. It is true that Tertull. *De Cor.*

period before episcopal government and œcumenical councils—centralised, and therefore not dangerous. The Roman government was very tolerantly disposed towards them; it was the masses that were fanatically hostile. *Thatsächlich überwog entschieden die Toleranz.* The doubts thrown on the genuineness of Hadrian's rescript to Fundanus (laying down that the Christians must be punished for non-religious offences only[2]) show only, according to Mommsen, how little the moderns as a rule understand the attitude of the Roman government towards Christianity. There were martyrdoms, but few. Origen expressly says so (*ὀλίγοι κατὰ καιροὺς καὶ σφόδρα εὐαρίθμητοι ὑπὲρ τῆς Χριστιανῶν εὐσεβείας τεθνήκασι*, 'Contra Cels.' iii. 1), and most of them were no doubt due to the blind fanaticism of the mob. It was not till the third century, he maintains, that barbarous emperors like Decius, Valerian, Galerius, themselves adopted that fanaticism.

Mr. Hardy takes over Mommsen's theory of *coercitio* and attaches much importance to it. It is no doubt useful to explain the vagueness and irregularity of the proceedings against the Christians, if they really were vague and irregular. But I agree with Mr. Headlam[3] in thinking that doubtful. Also, one can very well understand *coercitio* in emergencies, but that it should be the method employed in the 'practically continuous proscription of the Christians from 64 onwards'[4] seems strange. Mr. Hardy certainly overstates the irregular, non-legal aspect of the proceedings, and accordingly misstates (against Professor Mayor) the character of an imperial rescript, which frequently came to have full force of law. Sohm's 'Roman Law,' p. 75, states the accepted view, which rests of course on such familiar texts as Gaius, i. 4. Both Mr. Hardy and Professor Ramsay follow Mommsen in scouting the idea of there being any definite law against the Christians. It is necessary, therefore, to explain away passages like Sulpicius Severus, ii. 29 (*Hoc initio in Christianos saeviri coeptum. Post etiam datis legibus religio vetabatur; palamque edictis propositis Christianum esse non licebat*); and Professor Ramsay (pp. 255, 258, *Expositor*, viii. 295, where, however, I fail to find the point in the references to Pliny) is equal to the enterprise. Hermas, iii. 1, is also interesting; so are the *κατὰ δόγματα* of Melito[5] and the 'con-

Mil. 11, and *De Pall.* 5, may be quoted on the other side; but the broad fact that Christians did serve is certain.

[2] This is Mommsen's gloss on the rescript. All that Hadrian says is that Christians must be shown to have done something 'contra legem.' As to the genuineness of the rescript, the double testimony of Justin and Melito can hardly be got over, but the suspicions of which it has been the object are eminently natural, and Hilgenfeld still stoutly maintains, despite Mommsen, that Keim's argument against its genuineness stands just where it did. See *Berliner phil. Wochenschrift*, xv. 663. (1895). The matter is not settled by the *ipse dixit* of Mommsen, though that appears to be enough for Mr. Hardy (p. 144, note); but it must be admitted that the doubtfulness of the rescript is greatly enhanced by Mommsen's arbitrary version of 'contra legem,' and it is worth noting that both Mr. Hardy and Professor Ramsay are too wary to accept the latter. Mommsen makes the rescript an absolute edict of toleration, which in view of later events seems to me, as it seems to so competent a judge as Hilgenfeld, incredible.

[3] *Supra*, p. 127.

[4] Ramsay, pp. 277, 339, who also accepts the *coercitio* theory. It should be mentioned that Mr. Hardy denies the 'continuous persecution' (pp. 120, 166), of course quite consistently with his general minimising view.

[5] Eusebius, iv. 26.

tra legem' of Hadrian's rescript. Is it fanciful to find hints of possible laws also in such passages as that in the 'Acta' of Cyprian (*imperatores . . . praeceperunt eos qui Romanam religionem non colunt debere Romanas cerimonias recognoscere*) or in what is recorded of Severus (*Judaeos fieri sub gravi poena vetuit; idem etiam de Christianis sanxit*)?

All this disproportionate stress on *coercitio*, and this refusal to hear of definite laws against the Christians, or even to allow an imperial rescript the force of law, is part of Mr. Hardy's general minimising attitude. He does not for a moment believe that Christianity was regarded under the early empire as a danger to the state, and he habitually understates the antagonism between the state and it. 'It is inconceivable to me,' he writes (p. 162), 'how Professor Ramsay can say that Trajan found himself unable to resist the evidence that this organisation was illegal and dangerous.' Professor Ramsay seems to be justified in his contention. Indeed Mr. Hardy's remarks about the non-political character of Christianity strike me as decidedly overdone, and the least successful portion of his most instructive little book. He himself admits that 'Christianity was at variance with some of the essential features of Roman society,' and that the *obstinatio* of its adherents 'constituted logically potential disobedience and disloyalty to the state.' The Roman government from its very nature as an autocracy could not brook avowed and obstinate nonconformity. Once Christianity was found to be contumacious, it was *ipso facto* treasonable. It may be that Christianity was not strong enough to be in fact a danger, but it was *pessimi exempli* to tolerate open disobedience,[6] and it is my conviction that it is hardly possible to date too early the moment at which the state became fully conscious of the difference between Christianity and Judaism, and of the superior formidableness of Christianity as being proselytist, aggressive, and, in its claims, universalist as well as exclusive, and at which it became deliberately hostile to the new religion on principle. It seems to me clear that Mommsen (and apparently Mr. Hardy) is right in dating persecution for the 'Name' back to Nero; that Professor Ramsay is wrong in putting it as late as the Flavian emperors (though the first use of the Caesar-worship as a test for Christians may very plausibly be referred to Domitian); and that the current German view, which has hitherto put it as late as Trajan, is out of the question. That view depended on a misconstruction of Trajan's correspondence with Pliny which Mr. Hardy and Professor Ramsay combine their forces to destroy, and which is now practically dead. It will be seen from what has been said that in minimising and post-dating the antagonism between the state and Christianity Mr. Hardy appears to me to have made a great mistake, and to have injured the consistency and total effectiveness of his book. But it is impossible for any serious reader to lay it down without the most cordial acknowledgment of its great utility and of the general clearness and

[6] Mr. Hardy is so candid and careful a writer that when one disagrees with him it is often unnecessary to go beyond his own pages to find one's reasons. Thus on p. 119 I find what I regard as a perfect explanation of the matter: 'Yet if we interpret the situation into modern language, the Christians were punished on political and not on religious grounds, because it was not the slight to the national religion which the government really cared about, but the disobedience shown through the religion to the imperial government.'

consecutiveness with which the fragmentary material has been pieced together.

Professor Ramsay's book is the greatest possible contrast to Mr. Hardy's: by which I by no means desire to imply that it is lacking in great and distinguished merits of its own. That such a book on such a subject should reach a fourth edition in little over two years shows the vividness with which it has been conceived, the freshness with which it has been written, and the novelty of many of its points of view. The essay on 'Paul and Thekla' is a most brilliant and ingenious as well as convincing piece of work, and hardly a page is without some interest or suggestiveness of its own. But it has the defects of Professor Ramsay's qualities. It is too composite and miscellaneous, and really consists of two treatises on two quite different subjects—(1) the early persecutions of Christianity and (2) St. Paul's Galatia—with a number of essays, only connected by the fact that they all relate to Christianity in Asia Minor, thrown in. It is not without the superfluous personal remarks (*e.g.* p. 6) which are somewhat of a trial to Professor Ramsay's most appreciative readers. It is unduly disrespectful and 'superior' to German scholars of the rank of Pfleiderer[7] or Schürer; and the latter, who only just abstained from using the word 'humbug' of the condescending criticisms to which he had been subjected,[8] had no difficulty in showing that the page (Ramsay, 14) which was intended to demolish him contains a mass of inaccuracies.[9] There is far too much talk about positions being inconceivable or incredible (*e.g.* pp. 238, 285), when all that is really meant is that Professor Ramsay does not agree with them. There is a tendency to colour the text and to read more into them than they will stand, in order to bolster up a theory. Thus on p. 241 the whole passage from Tacitus is misrepresented. There is nothing about 'satiety' in it. It was not the Christian sufferings, but the belief that Nero was guilty, which made the populace turn from the persecution of the Christians. Again (p. 238) there is nothing in Tacitus about the Christians being 'innocent and ill-treated' (*sontes et novissima exempla meritos*, says Tacitus), and the view of C. F. Arnold, who is there referred to, is not accurately represented. Again, on p. 192 there is a very unfortunate ambiguity, if not actual misrepresentation, in the statement given of the views of Mommsen. 'I am glad,' writes Professor Ramsay, 'to be able to refer to the eloquent and weighty pages in which Mommsen last year showed that Christianity was in reality not the enemy but the friend of the empire, that the empire grew stronger when the emperors became Christian.' It would appear, then, that Mommsen can be quoted as directly opposed to the view of Renan—*le Christianisme était un mal général qui minait l'empire*'—and it would seem odd therefore that elsewhere[10] Mommsen says that 'Christianity

[7] The passage quoted from Pfleiderer on p. 187 is, it must be admitted, an extraordinary one to come from such a man.

[8] 'Wir Deutsche pflegen diese Ausdrucksweise mit einem guten englischen Wort zu bezeichnen, das ich aber lieber verschweigen will' (*Theologische Litteraturzeitung* for August 5, 1893).

[9] This applies only to the first edition. 'Inscriptions' for 'an inscription;' 'A striking case'—there is only one case; 'governor' should be 'procurator;' 'Galatia should be 'the Galatic province.' See *Classical Review*, viii. 396.

[10] *Expositor*, viii. 5.

ruined the base of the existing society,' and that Professor Ramsay himself refers [11] to Mommsen's contention that 'Christianity was opposed to the most fundamental principles of the Roman state; it was far more than merely illegal, it was anti-Roman.' Of course in reality Mommsen contradicts neither himself nor Renan. Reference to his article shows that (1) he 'showed' nothing, but asserted something; (2) he said nothing about the empire, but only something about the centralised imperial government; (3) he said nothing about 'far stronger:' he did say *vielmehr gestützt als geschwächt.* The passage in fact asserted what is no doubt the fact, that Christianity was favourable to the imperial absolutism. Whether that was or was not a good thing for 'the empire' is quite another question.

Downright errors of fact are not easily to be found in Professor Ramsay's work. The 'Thrace' on p. 331 is a mere *lapsus calami.* But the statement about 'committees' and majority voting being unknown to the Roman official system (p. 367) seems highly disputable in view of the frequency with which, as Mommsen has remarked in the 'Staatsrecht,' such bodies of officials numbered three. To discover the new system of 'searching out' the Christians in 1 Peter v. 8, iii. 15, is surely quite extravagant.[12] To translate *odium generis humani* as 'some *act* of hostility to society' (p. 243) is the merest gloss. The Jerome passage about the Galatians speaking Celtic in the fourth century (p. 82) is now generally given up,[13] and should not have been mentioned without a warning. Finally, the argument about the First Epistle of St. John, on p. 305, strikes me, if I may venture to say so, as puerile and unworthy of the writer. It would have been far better to admit frankly that the epistle proves nothing whatever to Professor Ramsay's purpose. But it is an essential characteristic of his work that he is never, or hardly ever, content to say 'non liquet,' or 'the evidence is insufficient for a decision either way.' What J. Weiss has said of Spitta is very applicable to Professor Ramsay:—

> Daneben fehlen freilich auch nicht die, wie es scheint, unvermeidlichen Schattenseiten eines Pfadfindertalentes: eine oft allzu lebhafte Phantasie, eine Überkuhnheit im Durchhauen verwickelter Probleme und ein zu gutes Vertrauen zu der Willigkeit seiner Leser, überzeugt zu werden.

At the same time, it is not every scholar who deserves, as Professor Ramsay undoubtedly deserves, to be called a 'path-finder.'

Professor Ramsay begins his exposition, which occupies 200 of his 480 pages, with Pliny and Trajan, as the period for which we possess the fullest evidence; then works back to Nero; then picks up the intermediate stage (in his view) of the Flavian emperors; and then goes on to Hadrian and his successors. It is unnecessary to go into his discussion of Pliny and Trajan further than to note the acceptance of the Mommsen theory of *coercitio*, and the conclusion that Trajan's rescript 'marks the end of the old system of uncompromising hostility.' Pliny acted according to a standing procedure already in existence. He did not originate

[11] *Expositor*, viii. 295.

[12] And the case is not mended by the attempted defence of it in *Expositor*, viii. 286 foll.

[13] See Perrot, in *Revue Celtique*, i. 179, *Revue Archéologique*, xxi. 386.

it. Now the interesting question is, who did? Professor Ramsay replies ('on arguments evidently unsolid,' Mommsen in *Expositor*, viii. 5), Vespasian. The true answer is, Nero. Professor Ramsay admits that Suet. 'Nero,' 16—*afflicti suppliciis Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis novae et maleficae*—points to a permanent settled policy against a mischievous class, not merely to a particular prosecution on a particular charge of incendiarism, and that if the pagan evidence were all, 'Suetonius's few weighty words must be accepted as the supreme authority.'[14] Nero, he concedes, 'laid down a permanent principle regulating the attitude of the government towards the Christians.' 'The persecution of Nero, begun for the sake of diverting popular attention, was continued as a permanent police measure under the form of a general persecution of Christians as a sect dangerous to the public safety.' Quite so. But, argues Professor Ramsay, though Nero introduced a new principle, it was not the principle under which Pliny acted. The latter was one of punishment 'for the Name.' With Nero, the punishment is either for ordinary crime or for *odium generis humani*,[15] i.e. for proof of 'some act of hostility to society.' (This translation is quite unjustifiable.) The further stage which we find in Pliny is that all Christians as such are guilty of that *odium*, and may be condemned offhand on confession of the Name. Now, was that further stage reached under Nero? Professor Ramsay thinks not—that there was not time; that the persecution practically ceased in A.D. 64 (yet on p. 277 he apparently accepts Lightfoot's view, that St. Paul was executed in A.D. 67). But the passage from Sulpicius Severus (already partially quoted) is against this. It clearly seems to prove a continuous procedure against the Christians established by Nero *after* his first trumped-up indictments for incendiarism. Professor Ramsay holds that the words *post* &c. in the Severus passage refer to the 'action of subsequent emperors.' It will not do; the whole collocation of the passage, in particular the following *tum*, makes that interpretation impossible. His next step is to deny that Sulpicius Severus is any authority at all except where he is demonstrably copying from Tacitus, although he admits that it is quite possible he may be copying from lost books of that writer.

Again, the view that punishment for the Name dates back to Nero is quite consistent with the early date of 1 Peter and with St. Peter's death in the Neronian persecution. Professor Ramsay's view is not. Accordingly he postdates 1 Peter to quite the latter part of the first century in just the free and easy fashion which he reprehends so often and so severely in the Germans. Professor Ramsay's theory is that Christianity itself became a crime, that persecution for the 'Name' alone began, not under Nero, but under Vespasian. If, therefore, 1 Peter, which clearly indicates the fully developed persecution for the Name as in existence when it was written, was written before Nero died, Professor Ramsay's theory, as he himself admits, must disappear. He therefore insists, despite of Origen, Tertullian, Sulpicius Severus, &c., that Peter could not have perished under Nero; Peter lived a long time in Rome (here Professor Ramsay misquotes Harnack), and outlived Nero. 'The tradition that he died under Nero is not a real tradition but an historical theory.' It is 'incon-

[14] *Expositor*, viii. 283. [15] Tac. *Ann.* xv. 44.

ceivable' that the northern provinces of Asia Minor addressed in 1 Peter i. 1 should have been evangelised as early as A.D. 64. 'The history of the spread of Christianity imperatively demands a later date.' All which only shows what comes of making evidence suit theories, instead of theories suit evidence.

In the *Expositor* for 1894 Professor Ramsay admits that Tacitus ('Ann.' xv. 44) implies that there were two stages in the persecution under Nero. Was the second stage the 'Name' stage? Professor Sanday, Hort, and Mommsen agree that it was. Professor Ramsay still says No. He admits that Suetonius is against him, and that Sulpicius Severus, if accepted, is fatal. But he once more argues that Sulpicius Severus is of no account. He thinks he can save his view by the Pastoral Epistles.

'The really weighty evidence is the striking agreement between Tacitus [that is, Professor Ramsay's interpretation of Tacitus] and the Christian documents which have the best claim to be dated between A.D. 64 and 80, especially the Pastoral Epistles.' 'The tone of the Pastoral Epistles is to me incomprehensible on the supposition that they were written after the fully developed procedure of "condemnation for the Name" had been introduced.'

The tone of the Pastoral Epistles is one of patience, indulgence to the state, and allowance for its difficulties. It is absolutely different from the tone of the Apocalypse, which Professor Ramsay seems to agree with Mommsen in dating under Domitian; and the two sets of documents could not have been contemporary. The Pastoral Epistles were either written A.D. 65–67, or cannot be ascribed to St. Paul. I do not deny that there is some force, as well as much interest, in these considerations. But the Apocalypse, with the uncertainty as to what is Jewish in it and what Christian, is unsafe ground to go upon, even if we admit that Professor Ramsay has quite correctly interpreted its tone—which Mr. Hardy (p. 96), I see, denies—and so is the date of the Pastoral Epistles, itself an endlessly controverted matter. Is it certain, moreover, that the Pastoral Epistles reflect contemporary politics at all? When it suits him, Professor Ramsay is the first to throw doubt on any such assumption, as may be seen from what he says of the First Epistle of St. John on p. 304. On the whole, then, I think that Professor Ramsay's notion that Vespasian was the first to introduce persecution for the 'Name' is a figment; that Mr. Hardy is right (p. 126) in identifying condemnation for Tacitus's *odium generis humani* with condemnation for the 'Name,' and that Mommsen, with whom Hort and Professor Sanday agree, hits the nail on the head when he says [16] that the two persecutions—for *flagitia* and for the *Nomen*—'without doubt sprang up together.'

I have not left myself space to discuss Professor Ramsay's Galatian theory so fully as I should like. It is Perrot's theory over again, with fresh proofs and illustrations. That is, Professor Ramsay holds that the Galatians to whom St. Paul addressed his epistle were not the men of Celtic race properly so called in northern Asia Minor, but the Lycaonians and others, of Derbe, Lystra, Iconium, and the Pisidian Antioch, to whom he preached on his first missionary journey. A beautiful congruity between the Acts and the epistle is thus established, which on the ordinary theory that the Galatian churches were Ancyra, Pessinus, Tavium—not a word

[16] *Expositor*, viii. 4.

about which is breathed in the Acts—does not exist. But why were Lycaonians, &c., called Galatians? Because they were all members of the great Roman province of Galatia, which included far more than Galatia proper. There was only one common name for the whole territory—Galatia; only one common name for the whole population—Galatians. How, asks Professor Ramsay, could you call the Roman colonists of Pisidian Antioch 'Pisidians'? You might as well call them 'bandits' at once. Or how could you call the people of Iconium 'Phrygians,' a term which to the Roman ear had the connotation almost of 'slaves'? Lystra, again, as a Roman colony, was a bulwark of the province Galatia, and its citizens might therefore well be called Galatians, but not Lycaonians, as if they were common subjects of King Antiochus. But the great point is that there was no other common name available, and that it was necessary to make shift with *Γαλάται*, just as we have to make shift with 'Britons.' As Oskar Holtzmann says,[17] St. Paul could hardly have substituted for *ὦ ἀνόητοι Γαλάται, ὦ ἀνόητοι Πισίδαι καὶ Λυκάονες*! The other strong, though comparatively familiar, evidence, adduced by Professor Ramsay, O. Holtzmann, Weiszäcker, and Professor Rendall[18] need not here be discussed. If Professor Ramsay had been content to hold that the balance of evidence was in favour of the South Galatian theory, while admitting that it had difficulties of its own, probably no one would have gainsaid him. But, as usual, it is a case with him of all or nothing. He tries to prove that all the evidence is on his side, and he conspicuously fails. No fair-minded person can read the controversy between Professor Ramsay and Dr. Chase in the *Expositor* without coming to the conclusion that in that 'barren logomachy' (Professor Ramsay's very superfluous nickname for a discussion which, by the nature of the case, turned largely upon words, and which, as he originally stated it before any one attacked him, turned largely upon words) Dr. Chase got decidedly the best of it. In Acts xvi. 6, *τὴν Φρυγίαν* and *Γαλατικὴν χώραν*, *Φρυγίαν* is no more an adjective, as Professor Ramsay declares it to be, than it is in the companion phrase of Acts xviii. 3, *τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν*. It is simply impossible to separate the two passages, and to say that *Φρυγίαν* is a substantive in one of them, and an adjective in the other. The absence of the article before *Γαλατικὴν χώραν* is adequately explained by Dr. Chase as due to the fact that the adjective and noun in reality coalesce to form one conception—as it were, united by a hyphen. That being so, Socrates, 'Eccl. Hist.' v. 21 —*οἱ ἐκ τῆς Φρυγίας καὶ Γαλατίας ὁρμώμενοι*—is a sound parallel to Acts xvi. 6. Luke iii. 1, which Mr. Chase discovered, is even closer —*τῆς Ἰτουραίας καὶ Τραχωνίτιδος χώρας*. Professor Ramsay tried to invalidate it, first by alleging that Ituraea and Trachonitis meant the same country, just as he contends is the case with the two limbs of *τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν*, and was duly refuted by Dr. G. A. Smith; secondly, by denying that *Ἰτουραῖα* was ever found as a substantive in any but very late Greek. But the Appian passage ('Bell. Civ.' v. 7) is conclusive to the contrary. Mendelssohn's critical edition shows that the best manuscripts read *τὴν Ἰτουραίαν*, and only an inferior group reads *Τουραίωνα*, emended by Musgrave into Professor Ramsay's *Ἰτουραίων*. As for the

[17] *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, xiv. 342. [18] *Expositor*, ix. 254 foll.

notion that verse 6 of Acts xvi. is a 'recapitulation' of verses 4 and 5, it is purely fantastic and could have occurred to nobody who had not a preconceived theory to defend at all hazards. Of the theory about *κωλυθέντες* the same must be said. The whole contention is a piece of far-fetched and misguided ingenuity, which was quite unnecessary on Professor Ramsay's own view (p. 77, 4th edition) that verses 4 and 5 are 'an addition made to the original document.' Weizsäcker is equally severe on verses 5–8, in which he finds a mere connecting link, one of those which 'reveal by the poverty and hesitancy of their statements that they were simply composed by their author to fill a gap.' The passage is hopeless (Dr. Chase, by the way, fails to see that even on the North Galatian theory the geography of verses 6–8 is, as Oskar Holtzmann points out, extraordinary), and no torturing will set it right.

Finally, though I accept the South Galatian theory, I suspect that Professor Ramsay has overstated the Celticism and barbarism of Galatia. I think it probable that these adaptable Celts were hellenised early. The term 'Gallograecia,' compared with Themistius's (p. 360) *Γαλατίᾳ τῇ Ἑλληνίδι*, is significant. There is plenty of evidence as to the early splendour of Ancyra (*Ἄγκυρα τερπνὴ παμφαεστάτη πόλις*) and the facts collected by Perrot ('Revue Celtique,' i. 179) could easily be added to.

William T. Arnold.

Adamnani Vita S. Columbae. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Glossary, by J. T. Fowler, M.A., D.C.L. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1894.)

The lives of saints, such as the later lives of St. Patrick and the lives of Welsh saints preserved in the 'Liber Landavensis,' are for the most part dreary reading, consisting very often of collections of improbable or impossible puerilities, and quite untrustworthy as history. But there are a few early 'Vitae Sanctorum' which by no means fall under this sweeping condemnation. Pre-eminent among such early biographies is the life of St. Columba, founder and first abbot of Iona (*ob.* 597), written by Adamnan, ninth abbot of Iona, who ruled A.D. 679–704. Its popularity is proved by the fact that it has been printed eleven times. Its value is due to more than one cause. It is written by one who was born only twenty-seven years after the death of St. Columba. It survives in a manuscript which, if not written in Adamnan's lifetime, was certainly written within nine years after his death. It has been edited by the late Bishop Reeves, in a way and in a volume which Dr. Fowler justly describes as 'a truly monumental work,' and with an accuracy and a wealth of illustration which left nothing to be desired. The present volume is a reissue in an abbreviated form, so far as prolegomena, appendix, and notes are concerned, of Bishop Reeves's work. The abbreviation is achieved by the omission or contraction of many of the notes. But much of their matter is reproduced in an admirable introduction, which gives the life of St. Columba and a sketch—we might almost say a history—of the early Celtic Church. But the difference does not entirely consist in omissions. In a very few instances Dr. Fowler has corrected his predecessor, and in many instances he has introduced either entirely new notes, as on p. 117,

or new illustrations of a classical, antiquarian, scientific, or other character. Much has been printed on the subject of Celtic archæology and ecclesiology since 1857, and Dr. Fowler is well abreast of his subject, and has skilfully introduced the latest conclusions of Celtic scholars and historians into his new volume. Even those who possess and value the older work will be glad to have this new edition, and to those who cannot procure the former it will be indispensable.

F. E. WARREN.

A Student's Manual of English Constitutional History. By D. J. MEDLEY, M.A., Tutor of Keble College, Oxford. (Oxford: Blackwell. London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent, & Co. 1894.)

IN this book Mr. Medley has attempted, to use his own words, 'in a series of sketches to exhibit the separate growth of each great department of our constitution.' He complains that the existing text-books on constitutional history 'deal with the subject on unsatisfactory lines. The development of an institution is subordinated to the details of a general narrative.' Hence he has adopted an arrangement different from that with which we are most familiar, and gives us chapters on 'The Administrative,' 'The Legislature,' 'The Administrative and Legislature in Conflict,' &c. Students will be grateful to Mr. Medley for breaking with what we may now call the traditional method and presenting the old facts in new combinations. But this arrangement, though welcome as a change, has very serious drawbacks. It is the arrangement of a constitutional jurist rather than of an historian. While well suited to a description of the developed forms of government of the modern world, while necessarily adopted in an account of the English constitution as it now exists, it is ill-suited either to a description of the constitution in its earlier stages, when the various functions of government were not differentiated, or to an account of the development of the constitution from the primitive to the modern form. We miss the process of unfolding; we fail to comprehend that very 'evolution and growth' of institutions on which Mr. Medley lays stress in his preface. On the other hand he has done a great service in collecting and incorporating in his book the results of the most recent research. Thus, to give a few instances taken haphazard, the arguments of M. Fustel de Coulanges on the origin of the hundred, Mr. Round's articles on knight service which appeared in this REVIEW, the conflicting views of Professor Ashley and Mr. Leadam on the position of copyholders, come in for due notice. Professor Maitland's interpretation of the crucial clause in the 'Constitutions of Clarendon' and Professor Vinogradoff's explanation of folkland (both first published in this REVIEW) are adopted. In Mr. Medley's careful and cautious summary of the question of villenage one is surprised to find no reference to Mr. Seebohm.

The style is occasionally obscure, chiefly owing to efforts at condensation. Thus the sentence on p. 495, in the very able and useful chapter on 'Revenue and Taxation'—'In 1694 a system of lotteries was introduced, by which part only of the money subscribed was distributed among a small number of the ticket-holders'—would convey little meaning to a

reader who had no previous knowledge of the particular expedient. The grammar of the very involved sentence on p. 92 beginning, 'The truth was that,' is at least open to question. In the opening sentence of chapter ii., while the use of a singular verb after a plural subject ('to which the attempts . . . leads') may be put down to the printers, the use of the phrase 'the science of government' is at best a piece of careless writing. On p. 561 Whitgift must be a slip of the pen for Grindal. It is to be regretted that Mr. Medley has been forced to omit the illustrative cases in 'Constitutional Law' and extracts from documents referred to in the preface, which would certainly have added much to the value of the book. We hope that he will be encouraged to add them in a supplementary volume or in a second edition. A. G. Little.

Die Entstehung des Kirchenstaates. Vereinsschrift der Görres-Gesellschaft zur Pflege der Wissenschaft im katholischen Deutschland. Von Dr. Gustav Schnürer. (Köln: J. P. Bachern. 1894.)

In his pamphlet on the origin of the papal states Dr. Schnürer has given us a timely and valuable review of the investigations of various scholars on the development and growth of the temporal power of the popes in Italy. His account is the more acceptable as it is clear and concise, and serves as a guide to the general reader through the mass of criticism which has been expended on the subject. In chapters iv., ix., and x. the author discusses the *promissio* of Quiercy which King Pippin made Pope Stephen III in 754, and which Charlemagne confirmed in 774 at Rome. He emphasises once more that Pippin's charter as well as Charlemagne's confirmation contained only a promise to grant certain lands in the event of a favourable issue of the forthcoming Lombard war, not an unconditional grant. These chapters deal with the most contested points in the early history of the papal states. For a long time scholars had tried to explain away the contradiction between the promise of Quiercy, of which the original is not extant, and its confirmation by Charlemagne. They tried to show that the account of the latter, which is preserved in the 'Vita Hadriani' of the 'Liber Pontificalis,' was either spurious *in toto* or interpolated in part. But one of the latest investigators of the subject, Paul Kehr, has shown conclusively that the accounts of both the 'Vita Stephani' and the 'Vita Hadriani' are entirely trustworthy in themselves.[1] Dr. Schnürer is quite right in accepting his conclusions in this respect. The fact that both narratives are trustworthy does not, however, remove their inherent contradiction. This point Adolf Schaube makes against Kehr.[2] He claims that the document which Charlemagne confirmed in 774 was not the original promissory grant of Quiercy, but a forgery. From this the writer of the 'Vita Hadriani,' wilfully or not, took his account, Schaube puts Kehr some pointed questions which the latter would, we think, find it hard to answer. It was not Dr. Schnürer's place to reply to them, for he addresses himself to the general public and had to avoid involving himself too much in details. But was it wise of the author to mention Schaube's article only as not worthy of positive refutation? F. Zinkeisen.

[1] See Sybel's *Historische Zeitschrift*, lxx. pp. 385–441.
[2] *Ibid.* lxxii. pp. 193–212.

Die Weltstellung des byzantinischen Reiches vor den Kreuzzügen. Von Dr. Carl Neumann. (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. 1894.)

This readable and stimulating sketch is not addressed merely to specialists. Written in an agreeable style, it sets forth the leading features of the history of the Eastern Empire in the tenth and eleventh centuries, up to the second Comnenian revolution, and treats it as *ein Stück der allgemeinen Geschichte.* The writer, who is well known to Byzantine students by his 'Griechische Geschichtschreiber und Geschichtsquellen im zwölften Jahrhundert,' makes many new and interesting suggestions; but the most instructive part of his sketch is the exposition of the long struggle between the throne and the great landed proprietors of Asia Minor, which culminated in the elevation of Alexius Comnenus. The measures by which Romanus tried to prevent the accumulation of *latifundia*, and their connexion with the military necessities of the Empire, are well summed up. It is shown how Nicephorus Phocas introduced a reactionary policy in favour of the influential landowning class, to which he belonged himself, and endeavoured to meet the difficulties connected with the military system, which such a policy occasioned, by laws restricting 'mortmain.' Basil reversed the policy of Nicephorus and Tzimisces, and did all in his power to annihilate the growth and influence of the great proprietors; but they grew notwithstanding. Dr. Neumann plausibly proposes to account for the long resistance of the throne, after Basil's death, to the attempts of the Asiatic 'baronage' (including the fiasco of Isaac Comnenus) by the length of the imperial purse: *Die Überlegenheit der hauptstädtischen Regierung kam daher, dass ihre finanzielle Kraft die grössere war* (p. 75). Very instructive are the remarks on the effect of Basil's conquest of Bulgaria upon the position of the emperor in regard to this struggle. It altered the centre of gravity, and made the emperor comparatively independent of the arrogant nobility of Asia Minor. *Die Geschichte der kleinasiatischen Fronde, die den Schwerpunkt des Reichs nicht verschoben haben wollte, ist ein grosses Stück der Geschichte der Regierung Basils II. Wie viel unabhängiger aber wurde durch seine Erfolge das Kaisertum in seiner Hauptstadt! Die Ordnung der Balkanhalbinsel machte Konstantinopel frei von der asiatischen Vormundschaft* (p. 62). In the course of some interesting pages on Michael Psellos we find the new and valuable remark that he prided himself on psychological analysis, and in writing his memoirs cared little for the historical circumstances in comparison with reading the souls of the actors (p. 89). It may be added that Neumann has made use of the 'Sovjety i Raskazy' of Kekaumenos—anecdotes and adventures of a noble soldier of the eleventh century—which Vasiljevski published in 1881 in three numbers of the *Zhurnal ministerstva narodnago prosvjestchenija.* J. B. Bury.

Eine neue Handschrift der Chronik Albert's von Aachen. Von Dr. Bernhard Kugler. (Tübingen: W. Armbruster & O. Riecker. 1893.)

The manuscript of the 'Chronicle of Albert of Aix,' of which Dr. Kugler has here furnished a collation, is now in the possession of Baron von dem Bussche-Hünnefeld, but, as a note in the manuscript ('Liber Monasterii Sancti Viti in Gladbach') indicates, it anciently belonged to the Abbey of

Gladbach. The manuscript now contains 161 unnumbered folios, and on the face of it dates from the twelfth century. It is richly adorned with arabesques and illuminated initials; on the initial letter of Book XII. (of which Dr. Kugler gives a reproduction) there appear the figures of two monks, who clearly represent the illuminator and writer of the manuscript. Above these figures are written respectively the names Conrad and Godfrey. In a 'Liber de Fundatione et Abbatibus Monasterii S. Viti Martyris in Gladbach' we find that about or after 1130 a *frater Godefridus subdiaconus*, and about or after 1150 a *frater Conradus subdiaconus*, were resident in this monastery. An ancient 'Necrologium Gladbacense,' which is of older date than 1167, gives the obit of *Godefridus subdiaconus* on 31 March. There is, therefore, sound reason to fix the date of the manuscript about the middle of the twelfth century. Both Conrad and Godfrey were good workmen, and the manuscript which was their joint production must hold an important place in any future recension of the text of Albert of Aix. The editors in the 'Recueil des Historiens des Croisades' employed four manuscripts, which they designated A (Laud. 561–3), B (Bibl. Nationale, 5128), C (Vatican, 509), and D (Vatican, 1999). C is dated 1158; A and B are of the twelfth century, and D of the thirteenth. The last was used by Reineccius in his edition, which was substantially reproduced by Bongars and in the 'Patrologia.' The editors of the 'Recueil' regarded A and C as *chefs de famille*, B for the most part following A, and D coming closest to C. This grouping of the manuscripts requires to be modified by comparison with the Gladbach codex. The latter, which is one of our oldest extant manuscripts, is most closely related to D, but, on the other hand, presents some useful readings peculiar to it, or common only to it and C or A–B, or, still more remarkable, peculiar to it and A. It is clear, therefore, that we must place the authority of D somewhat higher than did the editors of the 'Recueil,' and that a thoroughly satisfactory text will require to take account of all the manuscripts. Dr. Kugler is indebted to Dr. Heinrich Gunter, of Tübingen, for a careful collation of the text of the 'Recueil with the Gladbach manuscript. The collation fills over a hundred pages, but a large proportion of the variants turn only on points of orthography or on the order of words. Dr. Kugler gives reproductions of several initial letters, which justify his praise of the artistic skill of the illuminator.

C. L. Kingsford.

Two Chartularies of the Priory of St. Peter at Bath. Edited by William Hunt, M.A. (For the Somersetshire Record Society. 1893.)

The Somersetshire Record Society will soon obtain a foremost place among our antiquarian societies if it can often command the services of Mr. Hunt. His learning, patience, and industry make him an almost ideally good editor for a cartulary, and the first of the two cartularies with which he here deals—and this he publishes nearly in full—is one which is of very great and general importance. It is the beautiful twelfth-century cartulary of Bath Priory, which lies at Cambridge in the library of Corpus Christi College. Many of its contents have long been well known, for from t Kemble and others have derived some precious Anglo-

Saxon land-books, profitable documents even if they are not all that they pretend to be. These Mr. Hunt has treated judiciously. For one thing, his copy of such portions of the text as are written in the Old English tongue is guaranteed by Professor Skeat, who has been able to point out a few mistakes in the previous editions. For another thing, we have from Mr. Hunt himself not only a long introduction, which, in truth, is an elaborate history of the monastery, but also excellent notes on the names of the persons who are supposed to witness the land-books. A dogmatic judgment as to the genuineness of these ancient documents Mr. Hunt does not give, and his reticence is wise, for it is doubtful whether the man is yet born who combines all the many kinds of knowledge and skill which will be possessed by him who finally assigns to would-be Anglo-Saxon diplomata their proper places in the gently graduated scale of carelessness, improvement, and falsification which lies between unadulterated genuineness and wicked forgery. In the meanwhile the work must be done bit by bit, and the laborious *discussio testium* (if I may adopt an old phrase) which Mr. Hunt has energetically pursued is work of just the right kind.

Again, it is highly expedient that the most ancient cartularies should be printed just as they stand. Of course there is also ample room for chronologically arranged collections of all the land-books, such as Kemble made and Mr. Birch is making. Still each separate cartulary should be printed as it stands. A good instance of the necessity of this procedure appears in Mr. Hunt's volume. To many readers the most attractive of the documents that he prints will be that which describes the services of the men of Tidenham; for has not Mr. Seebohm made it classical? Now this document is undated; but the cartulary also contains a grant of Tidenham by King Edwy to the monastery, which tries to date itself in 956, and a lease of Tidenham to Stigand. A good deal in our conception of some early stages in manorial history may depend on the question whether this statement of the Tidenham services represents matters as they stood in the middle of the tenth century, or on the very eve of the Norman Conquest. In the cartulary it is placed far away from Edwy's grant and immediately precedes the lease to Stigand. This is not conclusive, but I do not think that for the future we can confidently speak of it as describing 'a manor of Edwy's day.'

Some of the charters of the Norman age that are here printed are even more interesting, because more unique, than their predecessors. We have here (p. 49), for example, Modbert's famous lawsuit, which has been made known to us by Madox and Mr. Bigelow. It is perhaps the best of all the 'Placita Anglo-Normannica' that have come down to us. Then there is (p. 52) a deed from 1123 in which a man agrees to do suit to the courts of the hundred and the county for a whole vill. There is (p. 62) a feoffment from 1153 under which the sixth part of the service of one knight is to be done. These are early specimens. But we must not descend to particulars, else we shall be noticing a grant *in pheodo* (p. 51), of which, despite a threat of modernised spelling, Mr. Hunt has not had the heart to deprive us. On purpose I will say nothing of the matters which fill the largest space in his introduction, in particular the relations between the churches of Bath, Wells, and Glastonbury. A first-rate cartulary

has many sides, and Mr. Hunt's work successfully stands the test of being examined from a point of view that is not his own.

The second part of his volume consists of a calendar, elaborately annotated, of a later cartulary preserved at Lincoln's Inn. This, no doubt, will be of great service to the antiquarians of Somersetshire, and there are in it a few documents printed at length which deserve to be set before a larger circle of readers. No doubt Mr. Hunt has here given as much as the finances of the society would permit him to give. Still it may be permissible to remind similar societies that there is a small but growing class of men who take an interest in the form of medieval documents, and who will buy books in which such documents are either given in full or translated word by word. Deeds of manumission, for instance, are not so common that they should be passed by with three or four words. One would like at least to know whether any reason was given for the enfranchisement of the villain, and whether any money passed. Early letters of credit also are curiosities which illustrate the growth of the law of agency. However, Mr. Hunt has behaved so nobly by the earlier that we shall raise no complaint if his calendar of the later cartulary rather whets than satisfies our appetite.

To catch Mr. Hunt in what one hopes to be a mistake is a rare pleasure. Whatever the cartulary may say, the fine on p. 27 can hardly come from 15 Henry III. The judges' names point to a date some ten years earlier. Gerard de Athée (p. 194) was not 'one of John's Flemish mercenaries,' but came from Touraine. At least there is much evidence that points in this direction. F. W. Maitland.

Ueber Pseudo-Cnuts 'Constitutiones de Foresta.' Von F. Liebermann. (Halle: Niemayer. 1894.)

A certain derelict code of Anglo-Danish forest laws has long been famous as the connecting link between the personal policy of Saxon and Norman kings towards the national forests. It was apparently accepted without question from the date of its discovery in the sixteenth century to our own time, and though a very few have boldly denounced it as a forgery, or rather as an interpolation in some genuine code, it has been left for Dr. Liebermann to show exactly what the forgery is, how it was accomplished, and what was the forger's motive. There will be little doubt in the minds of all who read this treatise attentively that Dr. Liebermann has solved the problem of Pseudo-Cnut. He seems to have consulted all the recognised authorities from Baron Manwood down to Mr. Fisher. He is familiar with the whole medieval jargon of forest life, and for this reason alone his treatise has a distinct value. Some would be ready to take Dr. Liebermann's word for the fact that the compiler of Pseudo-Cnut was a forger of the basest kind. But to all this treatise will supply a revelation of the legal history of the forest.

In the first place it must be observed that no ancient text of the 'Constitutiones de Foresta' is known to exist, and that the existing manuscripts are modern and inferior transcripts. It was unknown to older jurists, and was first produced by Harrison in his 'Description of England.' Then it became famous in connexion with the work of Manwood. At

first sight it might seem a suspicious circumstance that this great vindication of the ancient prerogative of the crown in relation to the forests should have been discovered at the very time that the crown was attempting to enforce this same prerogative at the expense of the subjects. It was undoubtedly due to these pretensions that the text of the 'Constitutions' has been preserved to us in the form in which it is printed, with important collations, at the end of Dr. Liebermann's treatise. At the same time we must be careful to remember that Elizabeth and her immediate successors valued their forest rights solely as a means of raising supplies. This was accomplished by extensive sales of forest lands to enterprising subjects—a form of tyranny differing widely from that associated with the exclusive hunting of Norman kings. Dr. Liebermann at once dismisses the possibility of a sixteenth-century forgery, and indeed no antiquary of that day was competent even to attempt such a task. Thence we approach the original position that this code purports, truly or falsely, to be the work of Cnut. Dr. Liebermann proceeds to demolish all the outworks of those who have held this view by a comparison of the state of things described in the 'Constitutions' with the Anglo-Saxon system. It is not too much to say that if Cnut himself had been able to read the 'Constitutions' which pass under his name he would scarcely have understood their meaning, so foreign are they to the whole spirit of the Anglo-Saxon legislation. It is amusing at this point to recall the excuse that has been gravely made for the forest tyranny of the Conqueror, that he merely followed the example of his Danish predecessor. Dr. Liebermann comments on Henry I's significant allusion to the forest policy of the Conqueror in contrast to his familiar reference to the laws of the Confessor, and has some valuable remarks on the dual overlordship of England and Normandy and the exceptional privileges of the palatine earldoms. The proofs which accumulate of the connexion of the 'Constitutions' with the Anglo-Norman rather than with the Anglo-Saxon polity can now be brought to bear upon the question of the date and motive of the forgery. It is true that the scope of the forest laws of Henry I can only be deduced, like that of his judicial and fiscal organisation, from the existing records of his grandson's reign, but Dr. Liebermann is able to show that the forger was not one of the group of compilers who worked about the year 1110; and that he lived at a sufficient distance of time from the date of the compilation which Dr. Liebermann has elsewhere described as the 'Instituta Cnuti' for him to misunderstand the English forms that were familar to a scribe of Henry I's reign.

The chronicles of the twelfth century are next brought into requisition, together with treatises such as the 'Constitutio Domus Regis' and the 'Dialogus de Scaccario,' to prove, in conjunction with the great assizes of the reign, that the forger known to us as Pseudo-Cnut worked under Henry II, and probably during the last years of his reign. Apparently he did not flourish in that later period when compilers of the type so well known to us from Dr. Liebermann's recent work on the London interpolator of John's reign and their thirteenth and fourteenth century successors put their patriotic effusions into the mouths of King Arthur, Alfred the Great, and Edward the Confessor. It is true that a more tempting motive-theory exists in connexion with the agitation for the reform of the

forest laws which preceded the great charter. Dr. Liebermann, however, has good reasons for supposing that the compiler had access to materials which must have existed at the time when Richard Fitz Nigel and 'Glanville' wrote their famous treatises. We know, indeed, only too well that several invaluable *libelli* and *rotuli* of this period have not been preserved in the semi-official registers from which Matthew Paris and other thirteenth-century historians derived their knowledge of constitutional documents, and these losses seem to have been sustained before the close of the twelfth century. Moreover we know that Swereford, the great antiquarian collector of the age, was at work from the earliest years of John's reign; and it is most probable that the hand which transcribed the 'Constitution of the King's House' would have transcribed or noticed the 'Constitutions of the Forest' if they had been produced in his day. Still more certainly they would have been referred to by Matthew Paris, who had access to the whole of Swereford's collections, many of which are now lost to us.

Dr. Liebermann thinks that the forger of the work was solely interested in the legal and antiquarian problems to which the confused knowledge of the forest law gave rise. Literary forgeries have been common in all ages, but antiquarian forgeries like the present one would not have been likely to occur in England before the twelfth century. It was in the very same spirit, let us note, that his contemporary Richard Fitz Nigel exalts and vindicates the prerogative of the crown and of the magnates of the curia. The forger (for forger he was, inasmuch as he professes to translate the actual words of an edict of Cnut), like the compiler of the 'Instituta Cnuti,' from which he borrowed freely, was, beyond doubt, a churchman. Dr. Liebermann finds that although his knowledge of Anglo-Saxon forms was rather uncertain, he was well acquainted with the forms of canon law, and was able to adapt the material from which he worked with sufficient skill to avoid more than a few gross anachronisms and philological blunders. Amongst these are some grave slips connected with the designation of ranks, while to the 'Crimen veneris' of Anglo-Saxon laws the forger appends *et viridis,* to signify that 'vert and venison' were protected *ab antiquo.* He also drops occasionally into the plural 'style,' which was not in vogue before the last years of the twelfth century, and makes other blunders which Dr. Liebermann detects with an unerring eye and corrects with an unsparing hand. But we must not forget that the forger did his work well enough to avoid complete exposure for just 700 years, and that although it was comparatively easy to produce an archaic effect by the liberal use of expressions such as '*Angli et Dani,*' '*quam Angli appellant,*' '*Barones mei,*' and the like, it was quite another matter to sort out, as it were, the proper persons and things, beasts, birds, trees, and the rest, from the most ample collection of Anglo-Norman forms. In any case the harm which this innocent forgery may have done is more than compensated by the fact that it has led to the production of Dr. Liebermann's essay on the medieval forest. HUBERT HALL.

Egils Saga Skallagrímssonar, nebst den grösseren Gedichten Egils, herausgegeben von Finnur Jónsson. (Altnordische Saga-Bibliothek, III.) (Halle: Niemeyer. 1894.)

'Egils Saga' was edited critically by Dr. Finnur Jónsson in 1886–1888, with an introductory essay in Danish, for the Old Northern Text Society in Copenhagen.[1] The present edition is intended for students who are learning Icelandic, and may be found useful, though the notes are too numerous and too easy. The text is far better than the old text of the 1856 edition; the editor's critical work has cleared away a number of unintelligible readings. In the explanation of the verses in the 'Saga' the commentary is full and clear, and affords a good introduction to the Icelandic court poetry, if any one should wish to make himself acquainted with its manners—at the least cost—before committing himself to a deeper study of it. The three longer poems of Egil are appended to the Saga, with explanatory notes, but without any of the critical annotation supplied in the editor's larger work. The historical problems of the Saga are treated in the editor's German preface somewhat more briefly than in his Danish edition, but to the same effect. The credibility of 'Egils Saga' has been a question for historians for some time past. Dr. Finnur Jónsson's Danish essay was made the subject of a rather severe demonstration by Mr. York Powell in his paper on the 'Growth of the Sagas.'[2] The opposing points of view are irreconcilable. The Icelandic editor, who sees authentic history in most of the Saga, is, however, compelled to give up Brunanburh; while, on the other hand, many readers who take the Sagas merely as historical romances, and as literature, will find historic verisimilitude, at least, in the history of the brothers Thorolf and Skallagrim and their dealings with King Harald Fairhair. 'Historical' has many meanings, and it might be argued that the story of Thorolf is, in one sense, an authentic history of the way in which Harald's tyranny brought about the great migration to the west. The historical value of the Saga lies mainly in this earlier part, not in the later romance of Egil's wandering adventures. Whatever his sources may have been, whether the family traditions of the Mýramenn, Egil's descendants, or the suggestions of 'Landnámabók,' or the 'Kings' Lives,' or all together, the writer of the Saga has rendered better than any other extant historian the dramatic motives of the Icelandic migration, and the special character of the revolt against 'the overbearing of Harald Fairhair.' The passages in the Saga relating to Halogaland and the Finnish trade are no longer, apparently, challenged by any sceptic as contradictory of the narrative of Ohthere to King Alfred. W. P. Ker.

An Introduction to English Economic History and Theory. By W. J. Ashley. Vol. I. Part II. (London: Longmans & Co. 1893.)

The first thing that calls for notice in this second instalment of Professor Ashley's work is the complete change which the author has made in both the scope and character of his undertaking since first embarking on it.

[1] Of this text a clear, plain, and faithful version was published in 1893, under the title of *The Story of Egil Skallagrimson*, by Mr. W. C. Green (London: Stock), who adopted Dr. Finnur Jónsson's views as to the origin of the Saga.—Ed. *E. H. R.*

[2] *Folk Lore*, June 1894.

The original intention, as stated in the present preface, was to make the book 'little more than a compilation' and to dispense with much 'fresh investigation' of the authorities. Accordingly part i., dealing with the whole of the period before 1300, was entitled an 'Introduction.' This title is equally borne by the present volume, which deals with the years 1300-1550; but not only has the book increased with the growing complexity of the subject from 200 to 500 pages, but even this amount of space has proved insufficient, and Mr. Ashley has found himself compelled to postpone the treatment of some important sections of his subject to yet another volume. The discussion of foreign trade, for example, is altogether omitted, and that of agriculture left incomplete. Indeed, the method of treatment adopted with regard to the latter topic is altogether peculiar. For only the period of the agrarian revolution from 1450 down to the close of the sixteenth century is described, while the important years between 1300 and 1450 are left wholly untouched, save for a few strictures on Thorold Rogers's opinions concerning the importance of the Black Death and the peasants' revolt as turning-points in our social history. The reason for this strange omission seems to be that Mr. Ashley was unable to make up his mind on the vexed question of the general prosperity or the reverse of the fifteenth century from the rural point of view, and yet at the same time found some discussion of the change from tillage to pasture farming necessary as a preliminary to his chapter on the relief of the poor. He therefore has left the earlier history entirely alone, until more evidence is forthcoming. Some may regard this as the wisest course; but the result is rather unfortunate, for the gap is a large one and the problems left unsolved are of the greatest interest and magnitude, while the reader is perhaps hardly sufficiently made aware that there are any problems omitted or even any gap in the narrative. Nor is it the scope only of the book that has been extended; for the chapters of the present volume are no longer in any sense *résumés*. On the contrary, in order to produce them the author, to use his own phrase, has spared no pains, but laboriously made his own excavations among the original authorities, with the result that the public can be congratulated on gaining access to a series of most careful and thorough essays, each embodying a great deal of independent research and written with great skill and clearness.

The first three chapters of the book are occupied with the internal organisation of the English towns and give an admirable description of the increased control which the municipalities obtained over industry and commerce, and of the measures taken to meet the rapid growth of industrial occupations, and especially of the native woollen industries, which more than anything else made English economic progress possible. Equally good too is the account given of the craft gilds and of the position of the apprentices and journeymen in connexion with them, while their religious side is also thoroughly discussed, and especially the attitude of the government towards them under Edward VI, in consequence of their superstitious characteristics. About the last matter Mr. Ashley's contention is particularly worthy of attention; for he has collected quite a body of evidence tending to show that the legislation of 1547 neither dissolved nor destroyed the gilds, as has sometimes been

stated, but only confiscated so much of their property as was devoted to purely religious purposes, leaving intact all their rights and privileges as commercial corporations.

For the reasons already pointed out the fourth chapter, dealing with agriculture, is comparatively unsatisfactory, but still the systematic attempt made in it to estimate what exact effect the increase of pasture farming had on the different classes of the rural population is highly commendable. Mr. Ashley takes most interest in its effect on the 'customary tenants,' and hence is incidentally led into a valuable discussion of the legal position of the copyholders under the Yorkists. But his investigations do not seem to have altogether solved the problem, though he has satisfied himself that the classes afterwards known indifferently as copyholders had, even at the end of the fifteenth century, legally only a precarious tenure. Mr. Ashley has long ago been attacked by Mr. Leadam for holding these opinions, but after mature consideration he still maintains his view.

The fifth chapter, dealing with the relief of the poor, after showing clearly what agencies had been in existence with this object in the earlier middle ages, is largely devoted to proving that the great increase of poverty in Tudor times was not due, to any large extent, to the dissolution of the monasteries and the consequent cessation of almsgiving; and, further, that the problem to be solved was not at all peculiar to England, but was a general one existing throughout all western Europe. These positions are supported with much effective evidence, especially the latter, which leads Mr. Ashley on into a most interesting account of the various devices for reform which were debated both by scholastic theologians and humanists abroad, and into a sketch of the actual method for coping with the evil which was adopted in 1525 at Ypres, and which subsequently became a model to Charles V and other continental reformers. Finally, Mr. Ashley is able to show that even Elizabeth's celebrated poor law was in no sense an exceptional solution of the difficulty, the system of raising the funds for relieving pauperism by compulsory assessment having been adopted in Paris twenty-eight years earlier than it was by the English parliament.

The sixth and last chapter deals with the economic theories of the canonists, and especially with their doctrines on usury. Here Mr. Ashley is breaking comparatively fresh ground, for the subject, though important, has escaped much attention in England, owing to the idea that even our commercial legislation was a native growth, and but little influenced by the dogmas of the Roman law. In treating of this subject Mr. Ashley does not claim to have any first-hand knowledge, but he has read and assimilated all the best continental authorities, such as Endemann, Funk, and Neumann, and his chapter forms an impartial and well-digested criticism of their main conclusions, showing clearly how the doctrines of the catholic church on points of commercial morality were evolved, how far the views of the protestant and catholic teachers became divergent after the Reformation, and how far English opinion and practice harmonised with and was affected by either school.

Having now alluded to most of the more valuable features of the book, a few small suggestions may perhaps be allowable. For example, would it not be better if Mr. Ashley avoided mere conjectures altogether? We

allude to such a passage as that on p. 132, where the author is speaking of the gradual concentration of the powers of the London companies into the hands of small exclusive committees, to the detriment of the liverymen as a whole, and then adds, 'Doubtless this process could be paralleled from the history of the English town, were the evidence accessible.' Or, again, on p. 134, where he is discussing the differentiation of the greater from the lesser companies in London, Florence, and elsewhere, and then says, 'Similar conditions probably appeared in other English towns.' These guesses may, of course, prove true, but they may only turn out to be misleading. Might not also the map, showing the enclosed areas, be improved? One of the features it professes to represent is the amount of waste land occupied by forest and marsh, but the great mass of the fens are entirely omitted. The enclosed area, too, shown in the case of East Norfolk is not in accordance with the evidence quoted in the text. The authority relied on is Marshall's 'Rural Economy of Norfolk,' a book which deals only with the triangular piece of land bounded on the north and east by the sea, on the west by a line from Cromer to Norwich, and on the south by the Yare, running from Norwich to Yarmouth. The map, however, represents the enclosures as extending over the whole county to the south as well. Another small defect that might be remedied is the frequent absence of actual numerical references in the passages which refer readers to preceding or succeeding sections for further information on the topics discussed. To those who only consult the book on particular branches of the subject, without wishing to read it through, this is a needless but too common source of inconvenience, as, for instance, on pp. 43, 45, 49, 51, 82, 133, 140, 149. None of these small matters, however, detract appreciably from the value of the book as a whole, which, in addition to the good points already mentioned, also possesses the merit of abundant and accurate references. The only slip we have noted is in the dating of Blomefield's 'Norfolk,' vol. ii. This is given as 1845, but should be 1741, if the date of the original preface can be trusted.

W. J. CORBETT.

Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis. Edidit HENRICUS DENIFLE, O.P. auxiliante AEMILIO CHATELAIN. Tom. III. Ab anno MCCCL usque ad annum MCCCLXXXIIII. (Parisiis: ex typis Fratrum Delalain. 1894.)

Auctarium Chartularii Universitatis Parisiensis. Edd. HENRICUS DENIFLE, AEMILIUS CHATELAIN. Tom. I. Liber Procuratorum Nationis Anglicanae (Alemanniae) ab anno MCCCXXXIII ad annum MCCCCVI. (Parisiis: ex typis Fratrum Delalain. 1894.)

THE two first volumes of this great collection having been already noticed in this REVIEW, I need do little more than renew my humble tribute of welcome and admiration on the appearance of the third. The work has now reached a period in which we no longer expect much fresh light upon the origin and early development of the university as an institution, but in which the affairs of the university become far more intimately connected than before with the general course of European history. The volume reaches the beginning of the schism, *i.e.* of the

period during which the political and ecclesiastical influence of the great academic corporation reached its zenith. Among the previously unpublished documents we may particularly notice many which throw light upon the history of the university at three great crises—(1) the suit of the university against the chancellor, Jean Blanchart, who was accused of wholesale bribery in the conferment of degrees (1385–6), (these documents afford some very curious reading); (2) the controversy about the Immaculate Conception originating in the preaching of the Dominican Jean de Montson, 1387; and (3) the attitude of the university during the early years of the Great Schism. By the aid of the editor's notes and copious extracts from the chroniclers the whole history of the relations of the university, and, indeed, of the French church and nation, towards the papacy at this important epoch may be studied in a single volume. It is impossible to praise too highly the care and learning which have been expended upon the elucidation of the many difficult and complicated problems which arise in connexion with this matter. It is so rarely that the most diligent reader can detect the minutest slip in the editor's work that it seems almost ungenerous to call attention to the title of document No. 1468, where the heading runs, *Parlamentum Parisiense jus candidatos in theol. et in arte licentiandi . . . abbati et cancellario S. Genovefae Paris. confirmat*, although there is nothing in the text of the document about theology.

In the *Auctarium* is printed *in extenso* the register of the English nation between 1333 and 1406. The masters of the nations at this time are chiefly Germans and Scotsmen, with a considerable sprinkling of Scandinavians. During the schism the attitude of the nation fluctuated (as the editors point out) according as the balance of power inclined to the Scotch or the German side. Here and there the reader will find important light thrown upon matters of wide historical interest connected with the schism; most of the volume is, of course, taken up with the no less interesting back-stairs side of university life. In fact, much of the document is almost literally a chronicle of small beer, inasmuch as it is largely occupied with a minute record of the times, places, occasions, and expense of the periodical feasts or 'jocund advents' of new proctors and other *perpotationes* or *solacia* celebrated by the nation in various Parisian taverns.

H. Rashdall.

Gli Ordinamenti Politici e Amministrativi nelle 'Constitutiones Aegidianae.' Per Filippo Ermini. (Turin: Bocca. 1894.)

This pamphlet is an analysis of the political and administrative provisions of the statutes for the government of the papal states, framed by Cardinal Albornoz after his reconquest of its nominal territories for the court of Avignon. The code of the Spanish cardinal, if not quite as permanent as the college which he contemporaneously founded, was the basis for all future administrative ordinances in the provinces which recognised the papal government. The present treatise describes the powers of the rector of the province, his judicial and police staff, his fiscal and military attributes. One chapter deals with the relation of the civil to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the rector, another with the respective limits of

municipal and provincial government. On this latter head Albornoz shows a determination that the municipality, whether in the form of despotism or republic, should not once again emancipate itself from the central authority, nor the city develop into a state at the expense of its weaker neighbours. Here by the papacy, as elsewhere by the emperors, an honest attempt is made to lift the administration above faction. The podestà and all other municipal officials are stringently orbidden from taking, according to previous custom, an oath of loyalty to the Guelfic or Ghibelline party which happened to be predominant. A remarkable and recurring feature in the code is the prohibition of any pecuniary composition for murder; such composition, even when accepted by the officers of the law, is regarded as giving the offender no protection. To the present day the 'high stomach' of the dwellers by the Adriatic proves how necessary were the cardinal's precautions. Albornoz was himself a lawyer, and to the layman the elaborate scale of fees authorised by his regulations seems a serious obstacle to their efficiency. E. ARMSTRONG.

Nouvelles Recherches Critiques sur les Relations Politiques de la France avec l'Allemagne de 1378 *à* 1461. Par ALFRED LEROUX. (Paris: E. Bouillon. 1892.)

IN this second instalment of his extremely thorough and suggestive studies on the relations of France and Germany in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries M. Leroux gives us the results of many months' fruitful researches in the archives of Vienna, Munich, and other German cities, and indicates their bearing upon the investigations of other workers in the same field. It is the only work known to us which supplies a good general clue to the main threads of West European policy during the years it covers. The subject is a complicated one, since it is involved with the hundred years' war, the great schism, and the French claims in Italy; but the main interest is skilfully concentrated on the frontier questions between the two countries in the new shape given to them by the efforts of the dukes of Burgundy to erect a middle kingdom in the borderland. M. Leroux denies, perhaps rightly, that Charles VII had any idea, such as was not unfrequently attributed to him by contemporaries, of securing the Rhine frontier. But the evidence he adduces for the conclusion of a treaty between Philippe le Bel and Albert of Austria in 1299, definitely adopting the line of the Meuse as the boundary, seems open to question. M. Longnon, whom he quotes in corroboration, certainly goes no further than to assert that the Meuse was an ideal frontier, which it was the object of the French kings to convert into a real one. And even if it had been recognised as an absolute line of division would that have given Verdun to France? (p. 75). The main thesis of the book is that the Swiss expedition of the dauphin in 1444 was not an attempt to secure the Rhine frontier, as some thought at the time and Janssen has recently maintained, nor a mere diversion to get rid of the *écorcheurs* after the truce with England, which is the view of M. Tuetey, nor a combination of the two, as Beaucourt supposes, but part of a scheme to foil Philip of Burgundy's attempt to link together his two isolated masses of territory, by restoring the ancient limits of the duchy of Lorraine in favour of René of Anjou. In

this view the Swiss expedition was chiefly intended to cover the siege of Metz. There is no positive evidence for it, as M. Leroux admits, nor does it square with the dauphin's language after the battle of St. Jacques, so that for the present it remains an hypothesis and no more. But it may be the right solution for all that.

Upon the emperor Sigismund's well-founded jealousy of the growth of the Burgundian power M. Leroux throws a good deal of light, and it would be unfair to lay too much stress on the mistakes he makes in chap. x., written before Löher's memoir, 'König Sigmund und Herzog Philipp von Burgund' (1866), came under his notice. Sigismund's successor was less careful of the rights of the empire, and one of the most interesting episodes in these researches contains a detailed account of Philip's negotiations with Frederick in 1446–7 with a view to the establishment of a kingdom of Burgundy. The English student will be curious to see what view M. Leroux takes of the motives which prompted Sigismund, who two years before had formed an alliance with Charles VI against the duke of Burgundy, to enter suddenly into the offensive treaty of Canterbury of August 1416 with Charles's foe and Burgundy's ally, Henry V of England. With M. Caro he rejects, and we think rightly, Lenz's theory of a long premeditation, but, unlike the former, he considers that Sigismund only signed the treaty as a means of smoothing the course of the council of Constance, whose success he had so much at heart, and had no intention of deviating from the policy he had already laid down for himself towards France and Burgundy—an explanation which the emperor's subsequent conduct renders very probable indeed. Many other interesting questions are raised in these pages, but to discuss them fully would require a volume. JAMES TAIT.

Expeditions to Prussia and the Holy Land made by Henry, Earl of Derby, 1390–1 *and* 1392–3; *being the Accounts of his Treasurer.* Edited from the Originals by LUCY TOULMIN SMITH; with Introduction, Notes, and Indices. (London: printed for the Camden Society. 1894.)

Rechnungen über Heinrich von Derby's Preussenfahrten, 1390–1 *und* 1392. Herausgegeben von Dr. HANS PRUTZ. (Publication des Vereins für die Geschichte der Provinzen Ost- und West-Preussen.) (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. 1893.)

THE accounts of Richard Kingston, archdeacon of Hereford and treasurer of Henry, earl of Derby, during the two 'crusading' expeditions which that adventurous earl undertook in the days of adversity that succeeded the fall of the rule of the lords appellant, have long been known and used by a limited number of historians. It is somewhat unjust to earlier writers, especially to Mrs. Everett Green, who made a most careful use of them in her admirable 'Lives of the Princesses,' published between 1849 and 1855, and also to those even earlier, like Endell Tyler (1838) and Beltz (1841), who utilised them to a more limited extent, to speak of these documents, as Professor Prutz does, as first 'discovered' in 1856 by the late Dr. Pauli. But our debt of gratitude to Dr. Pauli is very great in the matter, inasmuch as he not only projected an edition of the manuscript

but published several papers about these documents in German learned periodicals, and so made it easy for inquirers to acquaint themselves with the more important contents of the records without the labour of consulting the not too legible originals in the public record office. Moreover, although Dr. Pauli's projected edition of the accounts was never completed by him, he furnished the editors of the magnificent 'Scriptores Rerum Prussicarum' with the extracts which he had made relating to the adventures of Henry within the dominions of the Teutonic order. But it was necessary that the whole document should be published, and now, after long and tedious delays, all workers on the period will be able to give their most cordial thanks to Miss L. Toulmin Smith and Professor Prutz for the very careful editions of the manuscript which they have published almost simultaneously. The biographer of Henry IV will find a new and steady light thrown upon the details of his hero's history, which confutes the loose gossip of the chroniclers, who never spoke more at random than when speaking of Derby's foreign travels. How indispensable a light these accounts throw on this part of Henry's career can be gathered from the mistakes made even by so careful a writer as Mr. Wylie, writing in ignorance of their testimony. But this by no means exhausts the value of these records. To the historical geographer, to the social and economic historian, to the numismatist, to those interested in the household arrangements and the military and naval details of the period, to the historians of the Teutonic order and of the later pilgrimages to the Holy Land, the records afford most valuable information, and will henceforward prove of very great service to workers in extremely different fields.

At first sight it seems almost a pity, when there is still so much unprinted stuff in the world, for two editions of the same manuscript to be published, and this is especially the case since Dr. Prutz's text is entirely derived from that of Miss Smith and claims no original authority. But the Camden Society and the Society for the History of East and West Prussia have very diverse needs, and it was probably impossible to find an editor who could deal with equal competence with the English and Prussian sides of the documents. It should be remembered also that Dr. Prutz does not publish the full text, but only that part of special interest to Prussia, while the commentary of the two editors is naturally written from an entirely different point of view. The result is that one edition very usefully supplements the other, and that for those interested in the whole ground covered by the accounts the two books are equally indispensable. Miss Smith's edition of the whole manuscript is marked by the thoroughness, care, and minute accuracy which we have long been accustomed to find in her work. Her introduction is very well worked out, and the only fault that one is disposed to find with it is that she has set almost too severe limits on herself and has not enlarged on several tempting subjects on which she has no doubt a great deal to tell us. Her text, so far as one is able to check it, seems excellent. Her notes are elaborate, minute, and helpful, and her three indices, personal, topographical, and glossarial, are extremely valuable pieces of work. The social and economic historian will not fail to make a large use of the glossarial index. It is a matter of little importance that Miss Smith, in her haste to finish the book, has written 'Schonec' for 'Schöneck,' 'Goban' for 'Guben,' 'Triebul' for 'Triebel,' 'at Gorlitz'

for 'after passing Görlitz,' 'Leoban' for 'Leoben,' 'Meistre' for 'Mestre,' and a few other minute typographical errors of the same sort. Perhaps the only important weakness that occasionally we catch a glimpse of in Miss Smith's work is a certain unfamiliarity with continental history and historical geography. Whatever Capgrave may say, Lionel of Clarence did not die at Milan, but at Alba (p. lxviii). The reference (p. lxix) to M. Longnon's map of France in 1380 (after all the right authority to go to) shows a rather naïve surprise at what is really no subject of wonder—the fact, namely, that Savoy at this time included Bresse and other lands north of the Rhone. On p. lxxxii she should have added a reference to Tyler's 'Henry V,' i. 17, where we first find the evidence of the record utilised to establish the approximate date of the birth of Duke Humphrey of Gloucester. On the next page Lionel of Clarence is said to 'lay buried' at Milan. He was really buried first at Pavia and finally with the Austin friars at Clare, in Suffolk. That such minute corrections as these are all that can be gleaned from Miss Smith's introduction is the best tribute to her accuracy. And it must not be forgotten that, like all who take up work half done by somebody else, Miss Smith had special difficulties to contend against. She has very loyally worked up all Dr. Pauli's unfinished drafts that she could; but it is plain that Dr. Pauli's work was left in such a state that it would, perhaps, have been easier for Miss Smith not to have availed herself of it at all. The notes have the same qualities as the introduction. In one or the other more space might have been found for the biography of Kingston, the compiler of the accounts, than is given on p. 293. For this purpose Miss Smith would have found valuable references in Mr. Wylie's 'Henry IV,' vol. i. p. 347, vol. ii. p. 5. The note on Otto of Grandison (p. 319) would have been more complete had we been told a little more about the 'one Otto Granson' who was 'warden of the Channel Islands under Edward I.' But the same marks of painstaking accuracy run through the whole book.

Miss Smith has not hesitated to differ on points of detail from Professor Prutz. And it is precisely in points of careful detail that the German professor is not always quite so strong as the English lady. The real value of Dr. Prutz's edition must rather be found in the broader historical horizon included in his survey. The well-known professor at Königsberg speaks with special authority on the history of the Teutonic order. His account of the political position of Prussia at the time of Derby's visit, his summary of the economic and religious relations between the lands of the order and England, and his description of some of the chief English pilgrims to Prussia during the fourteenth century will be extremely useful to all future workers in these fields. Very clear and instructive is the distinction between the 'ordinary' and 'extraordinary' 'reys.' Only a dweller in Prussia could have identified so many of the little place names mentioned in Derby's Prussian wanderings as Dr. Prutz has done. And his analysis of the very complicated *Münzverhältnisse* (a point on which Miss Smith has also taken great pains) deserves commendation as a very elaborate piece of work. He has also printed some original letters from dignitaries of the Teutonic order to Henry from the Königsberg archives.

A few slight mistakes made by Dr. Prutz may here be collected.

Reference has been made already to the mistaken idea that Pauli 'discovered' these documents. Some slips in the details of English history have been corrected in time in the 'Nachträge und Berechtigungen,' largely with the help of Miss Smith. But, unluckily, there remains on p. xx a bad confusion between Henry of Bolingbroke's grandfather, Henry, called 'of Grosmont,' who was created duke of Lancaster in 1352, and the father of this latter, Henry, earl of Lancaster, the younger son of Earl Edmund. It was the first duke of Lancaster, and not his father, Henry the earl, as Dr. Prutz says, who undertook the previous crusade in 1351–52. Boroughbridge is not on the Ouse, but on the Ure, and it was not Earl Thomas who first united the earldoms of Leicester and Derby with that of Lancaster, but his father, Edmund, the first earl. Moreover the Derby earldom was not among *die Lehngüter der Montfort*, but a forfeiture from Montfort's ally, Earl Ferrers. The story of the quarrel of the earlier crusading Henry with the duke of Brunswick would have, perhaps, been more clearly put had Dr. Prutz used Geoffrey le Baker as well as Knighton among his English authorities. On p. xxv 'Thomas von Norfolk' should be corrected into 'Thomas von Woodstock;' 'Nyddisdale' should be 'Nithsdale' (p. xxvi). On p. xxvi a quarrel between Henry's followers and the Prussians is put at Königsberg, while on p. lxxix Dr. Prutz locates it at Danzig. On p. lvii 'Hug Waterton' is a printer's error, and 'William Lovely' is rightly corrected in the 'Nachträge' to 'William Loveney.' On p. lxxxv '7 Sept. 1393' is a misprint for '7 Sept. 1392.' On p. xc another printer's error makes the doge Antonio Venier die ten years too late. And had Dr. Prutz remembered about the crusade of Boucicault, Bourbon and John Beaufort to Barbary, of which so full an account is given by M. Delaville le Roulx in 'La France en Orient,'[1] he would not have still had doubts (p. 225) *ob Barbaria die Berberei, Barbareskenstaaten Nordafrika, bedeutet und nicht vielmehr Preussen u.s.w. als Barbarenland bezeichnet.* And on p. 226 Dr. Prutz, in volunteering too much information about Lynn, forgets that there was no 'King's Lynn' before the days of Henry VIII. And with a little more trouble Dr. Prutz might well have identified more of the Italian and French place-names in that part of the text which he prints in an abbreviated form at the end. But, as with Miss Smith's edition, it is very exceptional to find even such little slips as these; and though any defects, however small, are worth indicating for correction, they bear but a very trifling proportion to the mass of sound and scholarly matter which the labours of the two editors of a remarkable document have made easily accessible to all students of history. T. F. TOUT.

A Register of the Members of St. Mary Magdalen College, Oxford. New Series. Vol. I. Fellows, to the Year 1520. By WILLIAM DUNN MACRAY, M.A., F.S.A., Fellow, Rector of Ducklington, Oxon. (London: Henry Frowde. 1894.)

THIS work is a continuation of the well-known 'Register of Magdalen College,' to which the late Dr. Bloxam devoted the labour of a lifetime. Owing to the peculiar arrangement of the book, the list of fellows was left to the last and remained unaccomplished. The present volume in-

[1] *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole Française d'Athènes*, fascicule 44, i. 176.

cludes a list of fellows to 1520, with short notices containing in the case of the less famous characters all that is to be discovered about them. There is much interesting reading in these short biographies, and more in the copious extracts from the bursars' rolls and registers down to this date, which occupy the first part of the volume. The most amusing part of these pages is the detailed account of the visitation of 1506, when the president, Richard Mayew, bishop of Hereford, was deprived for non-residence by Bishop Fox's commissary; the vice-president, Stokesley (afterwards bishop of London), had to clear himself by compurgation on a charge of baptising a cat and other mysterious enormities, while the fellows very generally pleaded guilty to card-playing, dicing, misbehaviour in chapel, poaching, &c. One of them had gone so far as to absent himself from college and cook eggs at the 'Taberd' in the middle of the night. Mr. Macray's name is usually a sufficient guarantee for thoroughness, accuracy, and learning, but a few obvious errors of extension seem somehow or other to have escaped the experienced editor.

H. Rashdall.

Der Augustiner Bartholomäus Arnoldi von Usingen, Luthers Lehrer und Gegner: ein Lebensbild. Von Nicolaus Paulus, Priester des Bisthums Strassburg. (*Strassburger theologische Studien*, I. 3.) (Strassburg: B. Herder. 1893.)

This is a careful and interesting study of the life of Bartholomew Arnoldi of Usingen, one of the leaders at Erfurt in the days of Luther's youth. Born in 1465, he went to Erfurt late in 1484, and eventually became a famous philosophic teacher. His first work, a Natural Philosophy, passed through many editions, one of 2,000 copies; he received praise in Latin verse from Eobanus Hessus, and in German from Justus Jonas. He belonged to the 'modern' school of philosophy, taking Occam as his master; while he was thus a free critic of authority, yet in theological matters he reflected the scriptural studies of Erfurt, and accepted Scripture and tradition as decisive. Although a scholar he was not a humanist. In 1512 he joined the Augustinians, and eventually became prior. When Erfurt, under the guidance of Justus Jonas, passed through a time of change (1519–21), his position became awkward, and in 1521 he ceased to lecture. But his life henceforth became one of controversy from the pulpit and the press—with Luther (a former pupil), with the Erfurt preachers, especially Culsamer, and with Lang, his favourite pupil. At the same time he was a sharp critic of abuses on his own side. Of all these controversies a full account is given, and consequently the work has a special interest for students of the Reformation and of the history of Erfurt. His interest in affairs was wide and deep, and thus, oddly enough, he wrote a work on the Marburg conference, which has unhappily been lost. At the end of his life he found a refuge in Würzburg, where he became a visitor of the monasteries. There he died in Sept. 1532. The work is a trifle spoiled by Usingen's being (at times without need) so much contrasted with Luther.

J. P. Whitney.

Life and Letters of Erasmus. Lectures delivered at Oxford, 1893-4. By J. A. Froude, Regius Professor of Modern History. (London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1894.)

The late Mr. Froude, whose loss we all deplore, can never cease to be regarded as one of the most brilliant and fascinating writers of the present century. Nevertheless I know no one whose work presents greater difficulties to a critic honestly desiring to review it fairly. Mr. Froude's literary faculty was transcendent; it placed him almost above criticism, it won for him a place in the very foremost rank of English prose writers; but among those who demand from the historian sobriety of judgment, severe accuracy of statement, and the subordination of the functions of advocate to those of the philosophic thinker—one capable of taking a calm survey of conflicting testimony and arriving at conclusions from large induction unbiassed by prejudice or passion—he never can be accepted as a trustworthy guide or a safe teacher to follow.

Mr. Froude's lectures on the 'Life and Letters of Erasmus' offer to the reader some notable examples of his best manner and of his incorrigible defects. In point of style the book is almost perfect; but it continually reminds us of some great painter who should sacrifice fidelity in portraiture to effects of colour and finish of execution in detail, till the result is an idealised something like nobody in particular and least of all like the personage whose name it might happen to bear. Making all due allowances for the different times in which they lived and the very different accidents of their respective careers, Erasmus and Mr. Froude had a great deal in common. Both were men of letters and to a great extent free-lances; both were gifted with an almost incomparable literary faculty; both were by nature rhetoricians; both were good haters; and, it may be added, both were careless about accuracy of statement when anything was to be gained by rounding a period or adding picturesqueness to a narrative. It is not to be wondered at that Erasmus should have exercised an attraction amounting to fascination upon Mr. Froude. Nevertheless we can hardly accept these lectures as a serious study of the great Dutchman's life and labours. When it is remembered that in Le Clerc's edition of the works published in 1703 there are nearly 1,800 letters, and that some additions to this immense correspondence have been made since then, it is obvious that at most Mr. Froude can only have meant to offer his audience an attractive presentment of the impressions which a superficial study of Erasmus's career had left upon his own mind. Even so there was all the less excuse for such gratuitous perversions, unsupported conjectures, and reckless misstatements as those with which this volume abounds. Why should Mr. Froude have gone out of his way to suggest a doubt about the illegitimate birth of his hero? The fact has never been questioned. Why should he have insinuated, and something more than insinuated, that Erasmus's early schoolmaster was illiterate and a poor teacher? The fact is that Alexander Heg was a scholar of considerable renown in his day, and his school at Deventer had more than a local reputation. Erasmus tells us in one passage that Heg only taught the *younger* boys on feast days; his Form Master, as we should call him now, was Johann Sintheim, a kindly man who highly favoured his promising pupil and foretold his future celebrity. If the boys were beaten

for their mistakes in the 'butcherly way' which Ascham denounces, it was only what was done everywhere then and long afterwards. Melanchthon tells the same kind of stories of his teacher; yet the gentle and generous nature of the devout and amiable reformer could speak of his old master with grateful and loyal affection. Erasmus could not forget the snub to his vanity which Mr. Froude has alluded to, though to describe either Heg or Sintheim as illiterate is a perversion of facts. Again, to assert that there were no Greek grammars or dictionaries within reach of students at the beginning of the sixteenth century is an amazing statement. At least half a dozen of these helps to beginners were in vogue before the fifteenth century had closed. As early as 1506 Camerarius mentions that Reuchlin presented his great nephew—Melanchthon—with a Greek grammar and a Greek dictionary, and at the same time changed the boy's name of Schwarzerd into that by which he has ever since been known. If instances of this incorrigible carelessness were infrequent in these lectures, they might be considered as mere slips of the pen, to which we are all liable; unhappily they might be multiplied almost indefinitely. There are, indeed, more than one or two downright blunders in the translation of some of the letters, which are quite surprising. Many have been pointed out by reviewers, and such as I do not care to repeat here. Moreover there are serious mistakes of a different character which are even more inexcusable. It is difficult to understand how Mr. Froude should have quoted, without a word of dissent, such a ridiculous passage as that in which (p. 329) Erasmus says, 'I understand now how *Arius* and *Tertullian* and *Wickliffe* were driven into schism by malicious clergy and *wicked monks*,' or how he should have gone out of his way to tell us that the four hundred gold florins which he received by way of annual pension from the emperor, Archbishop Warham, and Lord Mountjoy 'were all on which Erasmus had to depend;' and this too on the very same page on which he shows how large an income came to him from the enormous sale of his books, as well as from the liberal supplies which his friends were at all times ready to furnish. It would be just as true to say that the annuity which was granted to Lord Tennyson as Poet Laureate was 'all that Tennyson had to depend upon.' The most extraordinary passage, however, in this volume, which may be said to be a very masterpiece of extravagant exaggeration, is that in which Mr. Froude describes the ignorance of the Scriptures prevailing among clergy and laity at the time of the publication of the Greek Testament. 'Of the Gospels and Epistles,' we are told, 'so much only was known by the laity as was read in the church services, and that *intoned* (!) as if to be purposely unintelligible to the understanding. *Of the rest of the Bible nothing was known at all*, because nothing was supposed to be necessary.' Had Mr. Froude quite forgotten Dr. Maitland's contemptuous handling of Aubigné when that once popular writer had been foolish enough to make a statement almost identical with this, some half-century ago? Maitland's pregnant question may be asked again: 'Was it not rather odd that they knew nothing of the psalms?' It is not pleasant to dwell upon defects so glaring as these. A critic would gladly escape that part of his duty which consists in pointing out an author's mistakes; but here the whole air is full of them.

There is one suggestion which I am tempted, before bringing this notice to an end, to offer to those who may have the will and the opportunity of entering upon a careful and scholarly study of Erasmus's letters. I m not certain how far Erasmus in his fierce diatribes against the 'monks' really meant to include all those who were bound by religious vows, including the canons at one end of the scale and the Barnabites at the other. Erasmus was himself an Augustinian canon. At Oxford he lived with Charnock, prior of the Augustinian house there; for many years he continued to wear the habit of his order, and on one occasion at some risk to his personal safety. When telling the story of his visit to Walsingham—which was a house of Augustinian canons—he describes the members of the community as 'of a middle sort between monks and those canons that are called seculars.' Mr. Froude and others know of no distinction between the two orders. I *suspect* that Erasmus, inheriting the old traditions of rivalry and jealousy which dated from many centuries back, and which made St. Norbert, while firmly refusing to become a monk, set himself to effect his famous reform of the canons regular in his time—I suspect, I say, that Erasmus, when he railed so violently and so bitterly against the *monks*, meant what he said and no more, and I commend to others an examination of a question which seems to me to be worth looking into. AUGUSTUS JESSOPP.

The Fourteen of Meaux. An Account of the Earliest Reformed Church within France proper, organised by Etienne Mangin and Pierre Le Clerc, who with twelve other persons suffered death by fire in 1546. By H. M. BOWER, M.A. (London : Longmans, Green, & Co. 1894.)

WE are glad to see a reprint of this little work, for its subject matter has unity of interest and event sufficient to merit treatment outside the pages of the Huguenot Society's *Proceedings*. It would have been well, indeed, if in reprinting the author had relinquished the epistolary form and had imparted to his work a less occasional or transitory aspect. The episode he treats is of no little interest, and the introduction, though far too wide and merely generalising, is a painstaking attempt to estimate the condition of the church and the prospects of reform in the diocese of Meaux under Francis I. The work of Briçonnet, bishop of Meaux, and its relationship to the beginnings of the reformed church there are analysed with some sympathy, though the derivation of the latter from the French church at Strassburg is too nakedly stated. The catholic historian Florimond de Raimond, in his 'Histoire de la Naisance, Progrez et Décadence de l'Hérésie,' 1623, p. 837, says of the Strassburg church, *Bref, c'est là où la première église française qu'ils appelent fut dressée pour servir de modelle et de patron des autres qu'on a veu depuis çà et là s'établir en la France.* Crespin also, in the passage from his 'Actiones et Munimenta' which Mr. Bower here translates, distinctly says that Mangin and Le Clerc, the founders of the reformed church at Meaux, visited the Strassburg church and carefully inquired into it. There can be little doubt as to the transmitted influence. But what form it assumed, or how nearly the Meaux church conformed to the Strassburg model, is not susceptible of statement. See Rodolphe Reuss's 'Notes pour servir à l'Histoire de

l'Eglise Française de Strasbourg,' Alfred Erichson's 'L'Eglise Française de Strasbourg au Seizième Siècle,' and Horning's 'Briefe der Strassburger Reformatoren.' The only light we have on the worship of the French church at Strassburg is contained in the few letters of a young unknown student who gave himself the name of Martin du Mont, printed by M. Erichson, while as to that of the Meaux Gospellers it has to be entirely inferred. Mr. Bower's introduction is followed by a translation of the chapter of Crespin's 'Actiones et Muninenta Martyrum,' which treats of this interesting episode, and also by a translation of the 'Arrêt de Meaux,' from a copy taken from the 'Registres Criminels du Parlement de Paris,' in the Paris archives, as also by a long series of interesting notes. W. A. Shaw.

Ein Ministerium unter Philipp II: Kardinal Granvella am spanischen Hofe, 1579-1586. Von Martin Philippson. (Berlin: Cronbach. 1895.)

As I have had an opportunity of showing elsewhere,[1] the inconsistency of the policy of Philip II, especially in foreign affairs, at different periods of his reign, mainly arose from the fact that his court was divided into two distinct schools of political thought—the party of action, severity, and main force, headed by Alba and Granvelle, to which Don Juan afterwards drifted, and that of intrigue, diplomacy, and peace, led successively by Ruy Gomez and Antonio Perez. By the influence of the latter party Alba and Granvelle were discredited and sent into semi-retirement; but when, in 1579, the crown of Portugal was to be had for the grasping, and strong arms and virile brains were needed for the task, then the tricky charlatan Perez, who had ruled Philip so long, sank to rise no more, and the two old heroes of the blood and iron policy were called once more to the king's council. During the next six years Antoine de Perennot, cardinal de Granvelle, remained prime minister of Spain, a considerable portion of which time Philip was absent from his Spanish capital. During these fateful years, under the guidance of Granvelle, with Alba's disciple Mendoza as the instrument in France and England, the foreign policy of Spain was changed. The invasion of Ireland, the formation of the League, the conception of the invincible armada, and the conspiracies with the Scottish nobles and their captive queen were all managed from Madrid by the great minister. The intrigues which ended in the election of Cardinal Montalto as Pope Sixtus V, and the dexterous chicanery by which pressure was continually brought to bear upon the pontiff to squeeze more ducats out of him, all received their impetus from the same master mind. The strings which led the greedy Guises to hunger for the French dominion when the last Valois should disappear, which moved the fanatic Babingtons, Somervilles, Sanderses, Allens, and even Mary Stuart herself, were all more or less directly pulled from Madrid, where the subtle old brain of Granvelle dominated the action of his 'leaden-footed' master. Herr Philippson reverts to the period and subject upon which he is the greatest living authority, and tells the story

[1] *Proceedings of the Royal Historical Society*, 1894, and *Nineteenth Century*, November 1894.

of Granvelle's last seven years of ministry and of life as he alone is capable of telling it. No period of history, perhaps, is so rich as this in documents of value, written by the moving hands of history. Granvelle's papers are almost a library in themselves; Simancas, London, Paris, Rome, and Brussels abound in *pièces justificatives* of the time, and the difficulty is rather one of selection and condensation than want of material. Herr Philippson has naturally availed himself to the full of all known sources of information, and displays a profoundness of learning, a reticence, and a sound judgment in the choice of material which it is impossible too highly to praise. His conclusions with regard to Mary Stuart's intrigues during the first planning of the armada, and the close connexion between the Scottish catholic nobles and Philip at the time, will be the most interesting as well as the newest point of his book to English readers. I have the best personal reason for entirely agreeing with him on these points, because much of the material upon which he depends is now passing through my hands, and will be printed for the first time in English in my forthcoming third volume of the 'Spanish State Papers of Elizabeth.' MARTIN A. S. HUME.

Die Katastrophe der spanischen Armada, 31. *Juli* — 8. *August* 1588. Von WILLIAM FREDERIC TILTON.[1] (Freiburg i. B.: Wagner. 1894.)

THIS essay, written for his degree of Doctor by a young American student at Freiburg, embodies the result of original research in the British Museum and Public Record Office. The Spanish papers are referred to at second hand, either from the printed versions given by Captain Fernandez Duro in 'La Armada Invencible' or from the transcripts made for the late Professor Froude, now in the British Museum. So far as his purpose went and his limits of space have allowed, Dr. Tilton has worked up his materials into a clear and connected account of the two fleets and of the several battles. The comparison between the English and Spanish narratives is extremely interesting, and more especially of that sent by Medina-Sidonia to the king of Spain with that which Dr. Tilton refers to as that of the *Engländer*, now known to be Howard's. Between the two the discrepancies are not many and are capable of easy explanation; the details, described from a different point of view, are naturally different, but they are in perfect agreement as to the hard fighting and the utter defeat of the Spaniards at Gravelines, and leave us to wonder as to the origin of the astounding falsehood implied in the motto, *Flavit Deus et dissipati sunt*, and its still persistent reproduction in many books which are called historical.

Into the commercial, political, and religious causes of the war Dr. Tilton does not enter, and he refers but slightly to the lack of victuals and ammunition which cut short the fighting. It would have been easy to join in the stock abuse of Queen Elizabeth's parsimony; but the author probably felt that it would be unjust and unscientific to do so

[1] It should be stated that Dr. Tilton's work was published before the appearance of Professor Laughton's collection of 'State Papers relating to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada,' which is reviewed *supra*, pp. 365-369.—ED. *E.H.R.*

without examining the subject for himself, which the time at his disposal did not permit him to do. Another point on which, having been unable to work it out for himself, he expresses himself doubtfully, is the part taken by the Dutch. He rightly thinks that Howard's expression, 'There is not one Flushinger nor Hollander at the seas,' does not carry any great weight; it is simply that Howard had not seen any, nor—writing on the evening of 29 July—had he heard of any. Dr. Tilton refers, at second hand, to letters of Burnham from Flushing and Kyllygrew from the Hague, as stating that the Dutch ships did not leave the Scheldt till after the battle. In fact, these letters do not say anything of the kind. Burnham's was written four days before the battle, and clearly could not; Kyllygrew's, though written two days after the battle, makes no mention of it, as if the news had not then reached the Hague; but it does say, 'I understand the admiral Justinus is gone out already with thirty sail from Flushing,' which, so far as it has any definite meaning, is the very opposite of what has been alleged. The states of Zealand, however, writing to the queen on 6 August, were definite and positive. 'Our fleet, under the charge of Count Justinus, being happily arrived and riding off of Dunkirk at the very time of the discovery of the Armada of Spain, the forces of the Prince of Parma, then ready to put to sea, were by the same closely locked in and stayed within the said Dunkirk.' This ought to settle the question; but a comparison with other letters, and notably one from Borlas to Walsyngham, dated 3 August, seems to leave it still doubtful, and to suggest that the Dutch ships had actually drawn back into the Scheldt to avoid the strong west wind, which made Dunkirk a very unsafe place to lie off, and effectually prevented Parma's boats putting to sea—if they had wanted to do so. But, in the presence of the English fleet, it is extremely improbable that they did.

The care and excellent judgment displayed in Dr. Tilton's 'inaugural dissertation' give a lively promise of more and more complete work in the future, and make us look forward with pleasant anticipations to the time when, with fuller leisure and more exhaustive research, he will publish the results of his labours in his mother tongue. J. K. Laughton.

Uittreksel uit Francisci Dusseldorpii Annales, 1566–1616. Uitgegeven door R. Fruin. ('s Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff. 1894.)

The 'Annals' of his own time written by Frans van Dusseldorp possess a real interest, and thanks are due to the Utrecht Historical Society for commissioning Professor Fruin to edit them, and to the able editor himself for the care he has bestowed upon his task, and especially for the admirable introduction, which for completeness leaves nothing to be desired. The irony of circumstances has decreed that a manuscript confided to the care of the authorities of the church of Rome [1] should at last be published by a protestant, after being lost for upwards of two centuries. The interest of these 'Annals' to us lies in the fact that Dusseldorp was an out-and-out adherent of Rome and of Spain, and that the

[1] Dusseldorp writes as to this, *Omnia penitus subiicio et submitto censurae Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae. Privatus vero manum abstineat* (p. 479).

narrative that he has left of the times of the great struggle reflects as no other contemporary work does to the same extent the spirit of that by no means insignificant portion of the Dutch people who clung to the faith of their fathers and regarded the revolt against Philip II with horror and detestation. In Dusseldorp's eyes there is only one method of dealing with heretics—the fire and the sword. Alva and his master erred only because they did not proceed against the enemies of God and the king with sufficient energy and firmness. In comparison with this writer all others are moderate. A fierce and unquenchable hatred against his fellow-countrymen and their leaders seemed to possess him, and he condemns them even in their defence of their national and popular rights and liberties. In reading these pages, therefore, the student can be in no doubt that he has the catholic side of the question uncompromisingly set forth. The original manuscript, rewritten from an earlier copy at Cologne in 1615–6, was by the writer expressly withheld from immediate publication (pp. 225, 226), and was placed by him in the hands of Archbishop Rovenius, the apostolic vicar. Now it happened that this Rovenius was in 1640 secretly staying at Utrecht with a well-known catholic lady. The number of persons frequenting the house roused the suspicion of the authorities, and an order was given to search the premises. The archbishop managed to escape in female attire, but his books and papers, among them Dusseldorp's manuscript, were seized. These were placed in the town library, in the choir of St. Janskerk, and here they lay, forgotten and neglected, until the year 1828, when the 'Annals' were discovered by Dodt van Flensburg, while engaged in cataloguing the library, which had been removed from the church to its present resting-place. Until the publication of the present volume the work has, however, remained unprinted[2] and practically unknown.

Professor Fruin (Intr. pp. vii–xxxi) gives an interesting sketch of the life of Frans van Dusseldorp, and it may be well here to note very briefly its salient features. The value of his contribution to the history of his times depends so largely upon the man's personal career and his opportunities for observation. He was born at Leyden, 23 Oct. 1567, of a family of high respectability on both sides. His father died a few months after marriage, and Frans was brought up under the care of his widowed mother, who was a staunch adherent of the old faith. The troubles of 1572 forced her and the boy, with a number of others who belonged to the Spanish party, to fly from the town. Utrecht was their first place of refuge, and afterwards Brabant. Frans completed his studies at Douay, but appears to have returned to Leyden shortly before the time when Leicester made his state entry in 1586. In 1589 he obtained his licentiate in law, and commenced to practise as an advocate before the courts at the Hague. Here, despite of his openly avowed opinions, no penalties were inflicted upon him, nor was it until 1597 that, on his refusal to forswear his allegiance to Spain, he was forbidden any longer to exercise his profession. Upon this he betook himself with his mother once more to Utrecht. It is clear, therefore, that, his outcries against his treatment

[2] A few excerpts are to be found in Flensburg's *Archief voor Kerkel. en Wereld. Geschiedenis*, Wensig's *Kerkel. Nederl. Jaarboek*, and Hofman's *Bijdragen voor de Geschied. van het Bisdom van Haarlem.*

notwithstanding, he met with no small leniency at the hands of the authorities, who, if they had carried out the edicts literally, would have visited him with a heavy fine and imprisonment. Henceforth Dusseldorp gave himself up entirely to theological studies and church affairs, and continued to reside in the old episcopal city, a large part of whose population had remained catholic, for seventeen years. The issue was what perhaps might have been expected. He became on the closest terms of friendship with Archbishop Vosmeer, the apostolic vicar, whom he entertained in his house, and was by him on 26 Nov. 1609 ordained to the priesthood. Naturally timid, he lived during the first years of the truce in continual dread of persecution, until at last, his fears obtaining the mastery of him, he fled in 1614 to Emmerich, and the following year to Cologne. At this point his 'Annals' cease, and though fifteen years of life still remained to him there is nothing further to record. He died in obscurity, 31 March 1630. The 'Annals' are divided into two volumes, the second of which, commencing in the year 1589, the year in which the writer finished his student life, is the more valuable, as being the work of a competent eye-witness of the events narrated. In the first volume the information is to a large extent hearsay, except in that portion dealing with the years 1566–72, where the editor shows (Int. pp. liii, liv) that Dusseldorp made use of a collection of documents made by a certain Jan Gerrits Stempelse, a burgomaster of Gouda, and carried by him to Cologne. This collection contained a copy of the 'Notulen' of the states of Holland, which were not as yet recorded in print.

From the critical point of view these 'Annals,' regarded as mere material for the historian, are far from being perfectly trustworthy. Dusseldorp was a singularly careless writer. He makes frequent and needless blunders in names, dates, and details, not because he did not know better, but from sheer slovenliness of mind. Moreover the whole tone of the narrative is bitterly partisan. Not even the mother and wife of William are safe from the rancorous spite which can speak of the countess of Nassau as *venenosa vipera* (p. 164) and of Charlotte of Bourbon as *eius scortum* (p. 191). It is difficult to realise nowadays the intensity of the religious passions of those terrible times. But when, after a description of the tortures and execution of Balthazar Gérard, our annalist proceeds (p. 202), *Statim ab eius morte coorta gravis tempestas cum multo fulmine et tonitru, ita ut turris Delfensis ignem conciperet, quae vix extingui potuit*; *deo testante eterno igni puniendos, qui iniustae tanti herois morti causam prebuissent*, a feeling of amazement comes upon the reader. That a man of Dusseldorp's upright and loyal temperament and undoubted piety could pen such a sentence throws no small light upon the gloomy intolerance and dark counsels which impelled Philip II on his disastrous career. Of this king our annalist, after a detailed account of the death-bed scene at the Escorial (pp. 257–66), writes: *Fuit sane Philippus princeps omnibus virtutibus longe ornatissimus, iustitiae severus cultor, usque adeo ut moriens confessus sit, non esse se conscium unquam illam a se negatam.*

Whatever may be their defects in other respects, the 'Annals' of Dusseldorp possess authentic value for the church history of the period, and would have been of considerable service to Dr. Knuttel in his

recently published work[3] on the condition of the Netherland catholics in the time of the republic. Especially would this have been the case in all that relates to the *propaganda* set on foot by the apostolic vicar, Sasbout Vosmeer, and the constant quarrels which arose between that active prelate and the Jesuits. The circumstances, too, which led to the appointment of Philip Rovenius as Vosmeer's successor in 1614 are told with all the circumstantiality of personal knowledge by one who was himself behind the scenes. The living interest which attaches to these sections of the 'Annals' led Professor Fruin to undertake the task of the present publication, and we may confidently trust his trained judgment when he says that in presenting the public with a selection of extracts instead of a complete edition of Dusseldorp's narrative he has weeded out 'not the necessary but the superfluous.' It was the editor's first intention to have written a discursive and continuous commentary upon the text, but he grew tired of so laborious an undertaking and has left it incomplete. What he had already written is, however, to be found at the end of the volume.

There are two indices, one drawn up by the editor himself, containing the chief references to the persons and events of the narrative, another by Heer Alblas, which gives without distinction page references to every name and person mentioned in the book. The student, therefore, has henceforth every facility placed before him for consulting this original authority for the history of the revolt of the Netherlands.

George Edmundson.

Cromwell's Soldiers' Bible; being a Reprint in Facsimile of 'The Souldiers Pocket Bible.' Compiled by Edmund Calamy, and issued for the Use of the Commonwealth Army in 1643; with a Bibliographical Introduction, and a Preface by Field Marshal the Rt. Hon. Viscount Wolseley, K.P., G.C.B. (London: Eliot Stock. 1895.)

This is a reprint of a little selection of martial texts put together in 1643 by some unknown person for the use of the puritan soldier. Lord Wolseley's preface consists of a single sentence to the effect that the private soldier who carries this in his knapsack possesses what is of more value than a marshal's *bâton*. The bibliographical introduction is not signed, and its author omits to point out that 'The Souldiers Pocket Bible' was reprinted in 1880 in Waylen's 'House of Cromwell,' pp. 300–307. There is no evidence to show that Cromwell had anything to do with its publication, and none is adduced in this introduction. The title-page contains an anachronism, in that it speaks of the Commonwealth as existing in 1643, and a serious blunder, in that it represents Calamy as the compiler of a book of which he was merely the licenser. The book itself was not officially issued for the use of the parliamentary army, but was the private speculation of a bookseller. The 'G. C.' mentioned on the title-page was probably the compiler, or possibly the initials denote simply the name of the bookseller for whom it was printed. Bibles were officially issued for the use of the army employed in the reconquest of

[3] See Engl. Hist. Rev. viii. 776–8.

Ireland, and at other times during the Commonwealth and Protectorate. We find Bibles issued on 3 Aug. 1652, by the commissary of stores to the several companies of foot and troops of horse within the precinct of Dublin, according to muster, one Bible to every file; and on the 17th 100 Bibles for the use of the forces within the precinct of Galway, for the propagation of the gospel; and the several commissaries of musters were to see the Bibles regularly mustered and accounted for by the officer commanding each troop and company.[1] In the same way the council of state ordered, on 9 June 1655, 'that 2,000 Bibles of a pattern shown be bought and sent to the soldiers in the West Indies.' The tradition mentioned in the introduction 'that every soldier in Cromwell's army was provided with a pocket Bible' is scarcely borne out by these facts, though they explain the existence of such a belief. Nor is there anything to show that the Bibles referred to in these orders were little collections of texts like this one now reprinted. Apart from these errors and exaggerations on the part of the editor and publisher, the little pamphlet well deserved reprinting.

C. H. FIRTH.

The Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow, Lieutenant-General of the Horse in the Army of the Commonwealth of England, 1625–1672. Edited, with Appendices of Letters and Illustrative Documents, by C. H. FIRTH. 2 vols. (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1894.)

'THE justification of the present edition' of the celebrated 'Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow' is, according to Mr. C. H. Firth, whose eminence as an historical scholar has never been displayed to more advantage than in his admirable performance of this laborious task, to be found in the two following facts. It is the first to restore a number of passages suppressed by the original editor of the 'Memoirs,' traditionally and, as Mr. Firth considers, correctly, identified with Isaac Littlebury, who in the crisis of 1699 stubbornly upheld, in opposition to the leaders of his party, the principle of abolishing, or at least reducing, the standing army. These passages, reflecting on the early tergiversations of Sir Anthony Ashley Cooper, afterwards Lord Shaftesbury, were first recovered by his biographer, the late Mr. W. D. Christie, and certainly demanded reinsertion in their proper places in Ludlow's 'Memoirs.' In Ludlow's opinion, the future whig leader, after beginning his career with the design of being 'a *boutefeu* between the parliament and the army,' helped Monk to wreck the last chance of bringing about a co-operation between both for the preservation of the Commonwealth. The other fact justifying the re-appearance in the present attractive edition of the 'Memoirs' consists, as modestly stated by Mr. Firth, in its being 'the first containing critical and explanatory notes, and adding the letters of Ludlow.' The criticism furnished in the notes is largely concerned with a rectification of errors, more especially in chronology, such as the text not unfrequently requires; but the present editor has likewise supplied a masterly introduction, which at once amplifies and points the summary winding up his excellent notice of Ludlow in the 'Dictionary of National Biography.' And his

[1] Prendergast, *The Cromwellian Settlement of Ireland*, p. 78, 2nd edit.

appendices contain, besides a considerable number of letters by Ludlow, referring to his services in Ireland in 1651–4 and to his brief command there from June 1659 to January 1660, much other valuable matter that has hitherto remained uncollected or undigested. In particular a lucid sketch is given of the civil war in Wiltshire, in the course of which Ludlow, by his defence of Wardour Castle, gained the greenest of his military laurels; and Mr. Firth prints a long series of letters from the English republican exiles in Switzerland, which first became known to students through the researches of that indefatigable inquirer in so many fields, Professor Alfred Stern.

Unlike the character and actions of Oliver Cromwell, which overshadow so many a page of this autobiography, those of Edmund Ludlow offer no difficult or insoluble problem to the interpreting powers of history. Indeed, as may be observed by the way, so simple and direct were the workings of Ludlow's mind that nothing could be more consistent and unhesitating than his interpretation of Cromwell's own conduct and motives. Although Ludlow was a modest man at bottom (see, for instance, his avowal of his unfitness for so great an office as membership of the council of state, and again his confession of his diffidence in assuming the military command in Ireland after Ireton's death), yet he had not a moment's doubt but that Cromwell's 'jealousy' of him was entirely due to the fear lest he should impede the 'plot' against the Commonwealth. Still, as he assured Cromwell in their interview after his forcible detention at Beaumaris, 'his dissatisfactions were not grounded upon any animosity' against the arch-plotter's person. 'If my own father were alive, and in his place, they would, I doubted not, be altogether as great.' Ludlow, although he refers to the anti-royalist sentiments of this very father, and shows in other ways how widely, though not universally, they were shared by other members of his family, does not waste much time in explaining how he came to choose his own side in the great civil conflict. 'I thought the justice of that cause I had engaged in to be so evident that I could not imagine it to be attended with much difficulty.' But deeply imbued though he was with every prejudice against the king and his dynasty, and 'against many of the clergy, who had been the principal authors of our miseries,' the resolve to which he adhered so steadfastly rested upon a broad basis of principle. For him monarchy meant irresponsible power—'a power which, though it destroys the people by thousands,' claimed to 'be accountable to none but God for so doing.' Thus the question as to the right way of dealing with King Charles I never presented any difficulties to his mind; when the London mob invaded the house of commons on 26 July 1647, and the speaker obsequiously put the question that the king should be invited to come to London 'with honour, freedom, and safety,' Ludlow gave a loud 'No' to the proposal; and he never seems to have entertained any doubt but that the office as well as the person of the king ought to be judged and condemned. In accordance with a habit to which he resorted as frequently as Cromwell himself, he had divers Old Testament texts at hand to prove the undesirableness of monarchy, just as the 'express words of God's law' in a passage in the Book of Numbers 'convinced' him that an accommodation with King Charles would have been unjust and wicked. Hence it was not with his hand only but

with his heart (to use his own expression) that he afterwards subscribed the engagement to be faithful to the Commonwealth of England, as it was established without a king or house of lords; and no consideration either of personal advantage or public expediency could turn him aside from his determination to uphold it in season or out of season.

Ludlow's republicanism was fostered by something besides an intellectual conviction which gradually grew into a formal dogmatism of which there are some illustrations in the later portions of his 'Memoirs.' (See, for instance, his wish, on arriving in Dublin as commander-in-chief of all the forces in Ireland, to waive all pretensions to precedence for himself over the commissioners of the parliament, on the ground that he had always declared it to be his opinion that the military ought to submit to the civil power.) The sentiment or creed, which was a second religion to him through a long career, disappointing enough in the failure of its chief purpose to have broken a meaner spirit, was sustained by some noble qualities that in his case proved compatible with an unmistakable stubbornness of disposition and a certain narrowness of mind. Above all he was distinguished by a simplicity which is justly associated with the political opinions maintained by him, and which he exhibits not only in his avowed contempt for the mere trains and trappings of high office, but also in an occasional outburst of masculine sentiment, such as the almost Thucydidean passage containing his reflexions on the funeral of Ireton. To this simplicity there was added in him a kind of moral courage which possibly cost him little effort, inasmuch as he knew himself to be by birth and breeding at least the equal of both the friends and the foes with whom he stood face to face in the political arena; so that (as the phrase runs) he could 'afford' to despise the scruples of Lord Warwick, who, while ready to ally his own with the Protector's family, could not bring himself to sit in the 'Other House' with Colonel Hewson and Colonel Pride. One of these senators had, as Ludlow states, been a shoemaker and the other a drayman; and, he adds, 'had they driven no worse trade I know not why any man should refuse to act with them.' Furthermore, the author of these 'Memoirs' may be set down as having been absolutely incorruptible by any consideration affecting his personal interests, down to the offer of a horse and saddle, tendered to him by Luke Toole, 'the head of a sept in the county of Wicklo;' and yet he spent of his private estate during his tenure of office in Ireland as freely as many a servant of the Tudor or the Stuart crown.

The qualities to which I have referred, if not exclusively republican virtues, at least sorted well with the political professions put forward by Ludlow from the days when he took up arms for the parliament to those when he vindicated the conduct of his public life in friendly discourse with the senators of Bern, and set down in his 'Memoirs' the satisfaction with which he had beheld the statue and become acquainted with the legend of the Swiss tyrannicide 'William Tel.' If it be further allowed that no exception can fairly be taken to the frankness and straightforwardness of Ludlow, either when helping to make or striving to write the history of his times, I think that the interest which has so long attached to his personality easily explains itself, and that the application of epithets emphasising the obstinacy of both opinions and charter without which

such an individuality is inconceivable seems no longer the most satisfactory method of impressing its significance upon posterity. Nothing therefore could be more gratifying in its way than to be enabled to verify, under the guidance of so scrupulously exact a commentator as Mr. Firth, the generous ejaculations of Carlyle, and to find mitigations possible even in an analysis so judicious and well-balanced as that of the late M. Guizot.

I have no space left either to illustrate from Mr. Firth's invaluable notes the large number of chronological and other inaccuracies pointed out by him in these 'Memoirs,' which are accounted for partly by the conditions of remoteness of time and place under which they must have been composed, partly, perhaps (and less excusably), by the fact that here and there the author followed other sources which he was unable to control. The reader has to be constantly on his guard against the drawback that much of Ludlow's narrative, though that of a deeply interested contemporary, is secondhand only; thus he was in Ireland during those transactions in which, after the 'crowning victory' of Worcester, he holds the 'evil intentions' of Cromwell to have first distinctly revealed themselves, and he is obliged *inter alia* to appeal to such hearsay evidence as what Hugh Peters afterwards told him he at the time told a friend. On the other hand he is occasionally obscure where clearness of explanation was alike called for and within his power; and I am unable to convince myself that he succeeds in showing why he left Irish affairs to take care of themselves in the autumn of 1659. His conduct in England, as the catastrophe of the Commonwealth drew near, was, on the other hand, characterised neither by want of insight nor by want of courage; and in the end he was even prepared to run the risk of a more or less formidable military revolt. The story of his exile, which lasted for more than thirty years (with a brief and in its details almost ludicrous interruption, viz. his visit to England in 1689, followed by his escape after proclamation by the new sovereigns), has a strange pathos of its own; but his 'Memoirs' come to an end with the year 1672, and contain little concerning himself for some years previously. Mr. Firth concludes that they were in all probability written between 1663 and 1673. Within these years falls his correspondence with friends in Holland, with whom he would have been willing to join in hostile operations against England. His republican fanaticism sufficiently accounts for this readiness; yet one is glad to think that in a passage of his 'Memoirs' he could forget himself sufficiently to dwell on the fact that success is wont to be on the side of those who fight in their country's cause. A. W. WARD.

Die Würzburger Hilfstruppen im Dienste Oesterreichs, 1756–1763. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des siebenjährigen Krieges. Nach archivalischen Quellen. Von L. FREIHERRN VON THÜNA. (Würzburg: A. Stuber. 1893.)

LIKE all authentic narratives which as a matter of course plunge the reader *in medias res*, this record of the fortunes, during the course of the seven years' war, of the imperial regiments blue and red Würzburg possesses much general interest of an incidental kind. The prince bishop of the day and his minister, Borié, were ardent imperialists; indeed, the former

broke off a subsidy treaty with Great Britain in order to place his two regiments at the disposal of the house of Austria, and appears to have been the first prince of the empire to take up a side in the conflict. (Seven years later, after four invasions of Franconia by the Prussian troops, peace was concluded over his head just as he was taking steps to issue a declaration of neutrality and was thus cutting himself off from the compensation which the councillors of the empress represented her as desirous to offer.) The two regiments saw a good deal of active service in the course of the war, and were, in fact, so hardly used (a whole battalion of the blue being in 1759 taken prisoners and transported to Magdeburg) that early in 1761 they were consolidated into a single regiment—the same which in later days became part of the Bavarian army and in our own day gained laurels at Beaumont, Sedan, and Orleans. Here they wiped out the share of the blue regiment in the humiliation of Rossbach, where, however, it had borne itself with exceptional gallantry.

The author of this book, one of whose ancestors held a commission in the blue Würzburg regiment, while another, a Prussian officer, may, in the attack upon Dresden in 1760, have fought against the red, was induced to collect his materials by motives of private piety and military enthusiasm; but he has conducted his inquiries with so much thoroughness that his contribution to the history of the seven years' war, slight as it is, will not be thrown away. He shows, among other things, how irregularity of pay and the absence of any settled system of provisioning obliged the imperialist soldiery to take what came to their hands, and to become an infliction to the territories occupied by them almost as unbearable as the French themselves, of whom one of their commanders wrote, *L'Allemagne est bien lasse de nous autres ; nous la saccageons de notre mieux : cela lui apprendra à faire la guerre.* It is distressing to read of the sufferings, for instance, of the duchy of Saxe-Weimar, whose capital, by the way, was occupied by the imperialists on the day of the birth of the hereditary prince—afterwards known to fame as Duke Karl August. At Mossbach, near Eisenach, the church was broken open and the communion plate looted; the bibles were torn into shreds, the pulpit and organ demolished, &c. &c., almost as if a religious zealotry had animated the bishop's soldiers. As to the orthodoxy of their commanders there can be no question. It was shown by the pressure put upon deserters from the blue regiment to profess themselves catholics before execution; for they were shot, whether they gave in, like one poor fellow 'who was of the French religion' (*sic*) 'and a native of the neighbourhood of Baireuth,' or whether they held out, like a more steadfast comrade of his, who asserted that he had learnt enough at school to give him solid comfort in his last hour. Such details as these add to our insight into the character of the war, the religious element in which should by no means be overlooked. It may, however, be worth remembering that the privates of these regiments were not recruited by their *Landesvater* exclusively or preferentially from his own subjects, any more than were the troops of the great Frederick himself. Of the value of these records for military history in the more limited sense of the term I am not competent to speak; but the statistical information seems remarkably full, and in any case Freiherr von Thüna's labours cannot fail to be their own reward. A. W. WARD.

Secret Memoirs of the Royal Family of France during the Revolution; published from the Journal, Letters, and Conversations of the Princess Lamballe. By a LADY OF RANK. 2 vols. (London: H. S. Nichols & Co. 1895.)

THE publication of a journal by the princesse de Lamballe, if genuine, would be an event of some literary and historical importance, as illustrating an interesting personality and throwing light on the most important period of French history. Many books have been written about her, but so far as we have been able to discover they contain no reference whatever to any journal written by her. Madame Guénard, who published four highly imaginative volumes of memoirs of the princesse in 1801; M. Lescure, whose book appeared in 1864; Madame de Lâge de Volude, maid of honour to the princesse, whose 'Souvenirs d'Emigration' were published in 1869; Mr. Austin Dobson in his 'Four Frenchwomen;' and M. Bertin, whose careful monograph appeared in 1888, are alike ignorant of it, and unanimous that the princesse had little taste for writing, and that her literary remains are of the scantiest description. Moreover the manuscript of this journal, which, presumably, must have been in the editor's possession in 1826, when this book was originally published, seems to have mysteriously disappeared, despite the value which would have been put on it even then, when single letters of the princesse were fetching thirty francs and more. It is, therefore, solely on the word of its anonymous editor, who wrote thirty-four years after the princesse de Lamballe's death, that the genuineness of this journal rests.

The anonymous 'Lady of Rank' was a person who called herself Catherine Hyde Broglio Solari, Marchioness Solari. She published various works between 1820 and 1827, including a thin volume on Wellington, two volumes of 'Private Anecdotes of Foreign Courts,' 'Venice under the Yoke of France and Austria,' and the present 'Journal.' At her death, on 7 Jan. 1844, she left a series of autobiographical letters, which were published in the following year. In these she gives an account of her birth, parentage, and life. Her grandfather, she says, was 'Lord Hyde Clarendon,' who was ambassador at Warsaw in 1745. Here he 'privately married' a Polish lady, whom, however, he managed to repudiate on his return to England. By her he had a son, George Augustus Hyde, who became a favourite of Count Brühl and Augustus III. He also 'privately married' a Polish lady, who procured a divorce from a former husband for the purpose. Their child, Catherine Hyde, was born at the house of one Moses Hyams, in Pall Mall, and her mother returned to Poland as soon as might be, to find that her husband had meanwhile been murdered. Mrs. Hyams had a child about the same time, which died, and Catherine Hyde was brought up as a substitute; it was not until 1796, forty years later, that Moses Hyams revealed to Catherine the true story of her birth. It is hardly necessary to point out that this is a fiction of the clumsiest construction: there never was a 'Lord Hyde Clarendon;' the ambassador referred to was Thomas Villiers, created some ten years after Baron Hyde and earl of Clarendon, and his children—illegitimate or other—could have borne no such name as George Augustus Hyde; moreover, a little attention to chronology

shows that George Augustus could have been but eleven years old when his supposed daughter was born. The rest of the story—her education at the expense of the duke of Norfolk, intimacy with the princesse de Lamballe, adventures on the stage—is equally incredible. The parts she attributes to herself at the Haymarket under Colman were taken by others, and no trace of performances can be found in Genest or elsewhere at the dates to which she assigns them. That she afterwards married Antonio, Marquis Solari, a Venetian official, is probably correct; but the interviews she says she had with Buonaparte and other sovereigns cannot be accepted without independent corroboration, and that we have scarcely been able to find for a single one of her statements.

Now let us turn to this supposed 'Journal' of the princesse de Lamballe. In the first place it is not a journal at all, but a series of reminiscences or memoirs compiled presumably during 1791 or 1792. The manuscript Madame Solari states to have been given to her, together with a quantity of letters, &c., by the princesse in August 1792. She admits that these needed a great deal of arrangement, but claims that the portion she has printed between inverted commas are the very words of the princesse, which she, as editor, has merely translated. But it will not be difficult to show that this journal is a forgery of no less clumsy construction than Madame Solari's account of her antecedents, and that not only is it a forgery, but that Madame Solari had but the flimsiest acquaintance with the princesse and her life.

For instance, in vol. ii. pp. 46–72, we have an elaborate account of the events at Versailles in the early days of October 1789. The princesse is made to say that she was present during that time, that she had frequent interviews with the queen, saw the royal party start for the theatre where the Flanders officers were banqueting, recognised Mirabeau urging on the mob on the night of 5–6 October, and accompanied the king and queen to Paris. Minor fabrications about the presence of Mirabeau and the doings of Lafayette do not call for notice in face of the fact that the princesse de Lamballe was nowhere near Versailles during the whole of this time. During August she was travelling with her intimate friend the comtesse de Lâge de Volude in Switzerland; on 2 Sept. she joined her father-in-law, the duc de Penthièvre, at Aumale, and there she remained until 7 Oct., when news of the events at Versailles was brought, and she joined the queen at the Tuileries on the following day. Madame Solari accentuates her mendacity by admitting that the 'Journal' does not contain an account of the journey from Versailles to Paris.

Again, in vol. ii. pp. 120 *et seqq.*, the princesse gives a fragmentary account of a visit to England after the Varennes affair; she spends some time in England on a mission of political importance, has interviews with the king and queen, Pitt, Burke, and other leading statesmen, visits Oxford, Blenheim, Bath, &c., and returns to Paris about July or August. Madame Solari also states that she accompanied the princesse during the whole of her visit. This also is a fabrication of amazing mendacity. There is no doubt that the princesse did once visit England, and the date has been the subject of considerable discussion; M. Bertin gives it as 1787, and this is undoubtedly right; it is supported by a reference in a letter from the princesse to a piece called 'Nina,' which was

translated from the French and acted at Covent Garden in April 1787; but the date is conclusively proved by a letter of Horace Walpole's of 28 July, 1787, in which he says, 'The duke of Queensberry has given a sumptuous dinner to the princesse de Lamballe.'[1] But the visit had nothing whatever to do with politics. In the suspicious state of French public opinion in 1791 her absence naturally gave rise to the report of a public mission to Pitt, and this rumour was repeated in Madame Guénard's 'Memoirs' in 1801, but was quickly refuted. The comtesse de Lâge de Volude, who was then in Paris, consulted with other friends of the princesse, and immediately published in the French papers a general warning against Madame Guénard's 'Memoirs,' and in particular a denial of the visit to England. As a matter of fact the princesse, who was at Passy on 20 June, when she heard of the projected flight to Varennes, went to Boulogne, crossed to Dover on the 23rd, took ship on the next day for Ostend, and arrived at Brussels on the 27th; and on 11 July she proceeded to Aix-la-Chapelle, where she remained until the middle of October. Various letters both from the princesse and Marie Antoinette, printed in the 'Souvenirs d'Emigration' by M. Lescure and M. Bertin, establish this account beyond doubt, and the will which the princesse made before re-entering France is dated 15 Oct. 1791, at Aix-la-Chapelle.[2] Nevertheless Madame Solari makes the princesse give details in her 'Journal' of her residence in Paris during August and September 1791.

There are numerous straws which point in the same direction, and some are quite conclusive by themselves. For instance, in vol. i. p. 223, she makes the princesse refer to 'the good Lady Spencer . . . from whom, as well as from her two daughters, the duchess of Devonshire and Lady Duncannon, since Lady Bessborough,' &c. Now this lady, Henrietta Frances Spencer, who married Lord Duncannon on 27 Nov. 1780, did not become Lady Bessborough until her husband succeeded to the title on his father's death, 11 March 1793, six months *after* the princesse de Lamballe's murder. This, however, coincides with a statement made elsewhere by Madame Solari to the effect that the princesse was assassinated on 3 Sept. 1793, instead of 1792. In vol. ii. p. 98, she speaks of meeting Lord Edward Fitzgerald in Paris during 1790, but Fitzgerald was then in the backwoods of America, and did not visit Paris till Oct. 1792. In vol. i. p. 123, the princesse makes her appointment as superintendent of the queen's household come immediately after the death of her husband, but he died in 1767, and the princesse's appointment dates from 1775. Once more, the princesse invariably speaks of Marie Antoinette in the past tense, which would be unnatural and almost impossible to one writing, as she must have done, while the queen was still alive. But there is no need to pile on these instances, which occur on almost every page of the book, and leave absolutely no doubt as to the authorship of this 'Journal,' quite apart from such circumstances as the omission of many of the most important events in the princesse's life, the identity of style between the 'Journal' and Madame Solari's comments on it, the tawdry sentiments and impossible speeches which disfigure both,

[1] *Letters*, ed. Cunningham, ix. 102. [2] Lescure, pp. 453–4.

and the innumerable startling assertions which, if well authenticated, would upset almost every known fact about the Revolution.

It is, however, with a distinct feeling of relief that we are able unhesitatingly to pronounce this 'Journal' a forgery: had it been genuine it would have necessitated a complete reversal of the reputation the princesse has enjoyed of being a better woman than most of those who surrounded Marie Antoinette; for the early pages of the 'Journal' consist of little but unclean scandals, atrocious innuendoes, and disgusting anecdotes, which no woman with the least pretence to decency could ever commit to writing. A. F. POLLARD.

La Révolution Française en Hollande: la République Batave. (Paris: Hachette. 1894.)

THE effects of the French revolution in Holland present a problem of peculiar interest. Here was a country which had won political and religious liberty for itself more than two hundred years ago, which had conquered and preserved a great empire beyond the seas, which had discovered the principles of banking and anticipated the prison reforms of Howard, and which was yet swept from end to end by the revolutionary propaganda from France, a country alien to it in race, culture, and religion; compelled to change its constitution five times that it might correspond with the latest Paris fashion; robbed of Ceylon, Java, and the Cape of Good Hope; twice invaded; twice beaten at sea; so crippled in its finances by taxation that after nine years of French occupation the deficit had amounted to forty million florins; then commercially ruined by the continental blockade, and finally fused by a European congress into a new state with a monarchical constitution. During this period of profound humiliation the people of the Batavian republic were sunk in lethargy, *le calme batave*, as one of their statesmen candidly expressed it. They were unable to produce more than one man—Peter Paulus—of even respectable fortitude, and he died in 1796, one year after the French invasion; and the only other Dutch statesman who deserves the name, the active, laborious, and sensible Schimmelpenninck, whose enlightened administration is the one bright spot in eleven gloomy years, accepts the insulting communications of Napoleon with the abasement of a courtier. *Incapables*, wrote Sémonville, *de trahison et de bassesse, mais aussi de résolutions fermes et loyales.* This is an accurate statement of the temper in which the Dutch people bore their troubles. But General Daendels, who has been represented by patriotic Dutchmen as a hero, does not deserve even this moderate encomium. He was, in fact, a *brouillon du premier ordre*, a past master in the art of making constitutions by the *coup d'état*.

The author of the very solid and scholarly book which we have before us has preferred to remain anonymous, but it seems clear that his work will have to be seriously reckoned with by all students of the period; for it is based not only upon the main sources of printed information, but also upon extensive researches among the archives of the Dutch and French foreign offices. It is, in fact, the first complete account of Dutch history from 1795 to 1806. The author writes with great candour and

impartiality. On the one hand he points out very clearly the defects of the old oligarchic constitution of the states; but, on the other hand, he does not spare the brutal and unsympathetic conduct of the French apostles of liberty, and he admits that Pichegru's sensational exploit on the ice is mere Jacobin legend. He is, however, fully alive to the benefits which the revolution did ultimately confer upon the country, when, during the administration of Schimmelpenninck, theories of man were converted into facts of administration. But perhaps the main impression left upon the mind by a very orderly and judicious book is that the price paid for constitutional symmetry was a good deal more than it was worth.

H. A. L. Fisher.

Mémoires du Chancelier Pasquier. Publiés par M. le Duc d'Audiffret-Pasquier. Vols. I.–II. (Paris: Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 1893.)

Etienne Denis Pasquier, whose interesting memoirs stand high among contributions to the history of the revolutionary period, belonged to an ancient family of the *noblesse de la robe.* Through his connexion with the parliament of Paris he had admirable opportunities for gaining a certain insight into the state of society in France on the eve of the revolution, while his knowledge of the *vie de province* owes its value and charm to the fact that the Pasquiers held possessions in the province of Maine, and usually spent their summers in Le Mans. Like many educated Frenchmen of his time he failed to understand the drift of things before 1789, though, like Talleyrand, he thoroughly appreciated the increase of the wealth of France, and the magnificence of Paris, and the delights of life under the old *régime. J'ai vu les magnificences impériales, je vois chaque jour, depuis la Restauration, de nouvelles fortunes s'établir et s'élever; rien n'a encore égalé à mes yeux la splendeur de Paris dans les années qui se sont écoulées depuis la paix de* 1783 *jusqu'à* 1789. Till the rise of Bonaparte Pasquier was regarded with suspicion by the directory. With the peace of Campo Formio his fortunes began to improve, and his memoirs become more important. He confirms the story that the directors attempted to poison Bonaparte, and asserts that the expedition to Egypt, while generally regarded as *une entreprise folle*, endangered Bonaparte's reputation as a general.

But from the moment of his return all was changed. *A partir de ce moment sa conduite fut un prodige d'habileté. Il sut d'abord tenir tous les partis dans une telle incertitude sur ce qu'il méditait que bien qu'un grand événement fût attendu, tout, jusqu'au dernier moment, resta ignoré.* Pasquier was no striking genius, but he always seems to have attempted to get at the truth, and after the establishment of Bonaparte in power his position enabled him to be, as a rule, well informed. The execution of the duc d'Enghien, whose case is carefully examined by Pasquier, was followed by the rise of the empire and the victories of Napoleon. After Austerlitz Pasquier became *maître des requêtes* in the council of state, and had ample opportunities of forming an estimate of the emperor and of his leading advisers. While his views of Napoleon inspire one with confidence in his impartiality, his

description of Talleyrand is the work of a partisan. A catholic royalist by birth, Pasquier could never forgive the renegade bishop, or see in any of his acts traces of statesmanship. Talleyrand, Pasquier asserts, was the author of the disastrous Spanish policy; Talleyrand certainly intrigued against Napoleon when the latter was in Spain, occupied in driving back Moore and his gallant army. During these years Napoleon's confidence in Pasquier increased, and in 1810 he was appointed to the office of prefect of the police in Paris—a most responsible post, the arduous duties of which he fulfilled to the complete satisfaction of the emperor. From the date of his appointment to 1814 Pasquier's memoirs give us an admirable account of the decline and fall of Napoleon. The quarrel between the emperor and Pius VII, one of the most disastrous of Napoleon's many mistakes, receives due notice, and Napoleon's pride and arrogance are justly criticised. Before the latter's departure for the Russian campaign Pasquier, who was keenly alive to the risks of an advance to Moscow, elicited a curious remark from his imperial master: *Oui, sans doute il y a du vrai dans ce que vous dites; c'est une difficulté de plus, ajoutée à toutes celles que je dois rencontrer dans l'entreprise la plus grande, la plus difficile que j'ai encore tentée; mais il faut bien achever ce qui est commencé.* Pasquier's forebodings were indeed realised; Napoleon's evil days began, and henceforward, with the renewal of plots in Paris against the emperor, the prefect's responsibilities increased.

He confirms the view, now generally held, that the series of reverses culminating in Leipzig were due in great measure to the ill-health of Napoleon, and he bears full testimony to the latter's firm resolve not to part with the Illyrian provinces. After the failure of the congress of Châtillon Pasquier strongly opposed the proposal to arm the mob with *piques*. Had this suggestion been carried out, it would have been, says Pasquier, *impossible de dire ce que serait devenue la ville de Paris.* After the capital had fallen Pasquier had an interesting conversation with Alexander I, in which the latter declared that all reconciliation with Napoleon was impossible after his outrageous invasion of Russia and his violation of all his sworn pledges. The second volume ends with the establishment of Louis XVIII on the throne, with Talleyrand as minister of foreign affairs, and with the French nation permeated by a profound hatred of England. Few men had such admirable opportunities as Pasquier for watching and taking a personal part in the events of those momentous times, and few writers have contributed memoirs more valuable for the historian and more interesting for the general reader.

A. HASSALL.

Geschichte Europas seit den Verträgen von 1815 *bis zum Frankfurter Frieden von* 1871. Von ALFRED STERN. Erster Band. (Berlin: Verlag von Wilhelm Hertz. 1894.)

THE material available for the historians of the nineteenth century is constantly increasing. The generosity with which the Prussian government has allowed access to its archives and the archives of the other states which have now been incorporated in Prussia, is well known. It has been

imitated in other countries. For the period from 1815 to 1830 at least the true course of European history is now ascertained. The motives and actions of the different cabinets can be followed from the official records. It may be anticipated that the time will shortly come when few governments will find any scruples about allowing the full use of public papers as far as the year 1848; in fact, when once a single state of the first importance, such as Prussia, allows free access to its records, the others are almost compelled to do the same in self-defence: as the author of the work before us says, statesmen rather gain than lose when a brighter light is turned on the motives of their action; on the other hand, they do not always gain when the light comes from the private correspondence of the ambassadors of rival and hostile countries. Hitherto this wealth of material has been made available by the historians of a single country, and for obvious reasons chiefly by the historians of Germany. Dr. Stern has undertaken the enormous task of using it to write the history of Europe from 1815 to 1871. The first volume, which is before us, contains the history of England, France, and Germany as far as the year 1820. Let me say at once, before proceeding to any criticism of details, that, so far as I am able to judge of it, the work is written with the greatest care; there is scrupulous accuracy and, what is rarer in modern German historians, great impartiality. The student will find in it a thoroughly satisfactory narrative of the events as they really happened. As an instance of this I may notice the chapters on England, which, though short, show an accurate knowledge and appreciation of the condition of England, such as is seldom found.

In the introduction the author explains that the plan of the book is not to write a complete history of each country, but to bring into prominence, 'within the history of the single peoples and states, the great common traits which underlay the history of the time.' The reader who turns from the introduction to the book with these words in his mind must be prepared for some disappointment. It is true that the book begins with a description of the romantic movement, but even this is less successful than the other parts of the work; there is a sound description of the chief romantic writers, but the difficult transition from individual writers to a general appreciation of the efforts of romanticism on political affairs is not made, and the situation cannot be rendered clear without a fuller contrast between romanticism and the rationalistic doctrines which were superseded than the author gives. We may say that he begins too suddenly: he does not trace the causes of the reaction sufficiently far back, and in consequence the introduction has no real connexion with the rest of the book. In the narrative itself he is not altogether successful in the attempt to put into prominence the main characteristics of the period, and the general history of Europe is lost in the histories of individual states. This characteristic will be best illustrated by a single instance. Down at least as far as the congress of Aix-la-Chapelle there was certainly a common European history, quite separate from that of the individual states; surely the natural method would be to give a full and connected account of the diplomatic history of the alliance to the time when it was broken up by the secession of England and France and the outbreak of trouble in the East. For this he has at

his disposal material much of which is quite new, but, with the exception of a chapter on the congress of Aix-la-Chapelle, he treats the diplomatic history of each country separately. This inevitably obscures some essential points in the judgment to be formed as to the chief statesmen; in the eyes of Metternich, and to some extent also of Castlereagh and Wellington, the maintenance of the alliance for its own sake, as a superior board for the regulation of all European affairs, was the chief object to be attained. This would be much more clearly brought forward if all the matters which occupied the diplomacy of the time—the Barbary pirates, the slave trade, Russia's disarmament, the surveillance over France, and the Spanish colonies—were treated in a continuous narrative, and not divided among the chapters which deal with the separate countries.

For the whole of the diplomatic history Dr. Stern has had the use of the Vienna and Paris archives; the former contains, among other things, the official protocols of the congress, drawn up by Gentz; they add little to our previous knowledge, except that it appears the dread of Napoleon's return was still very genuine, and that there was supposed to be a real possibility of his escape from St. Helena. There is in the whole account a tendency to exaggerate the solidarity of England and Austria, which is natural to one who has chiefly relied on the Austrian state papers. The private instructions of Castlereagh to English diplomatists would show a good deal of rather contemptuous criticism of Metternich, which he knew little of; this is especially the case with regard to the relations with Russia. Castlereagh did not share Metternich's constant jealousy and suspicion of the czar, and many matters, such as the proposals for a general disarmament, which occupy a good deal of the despatches, he probably did not take very seriously.

The greater part of the book is occupied with German affairs; they are treated with a fulness which leaves little to be desired: it might, indeed, be suggested, with a fulness out of proportion to their importance, were it not that the period is one of the most critical in German history. In this part he goes over the same ground as Treitschke; he does not attempt to rival the Prussian historian in his vigorous descriptions of public feeling, but his narrative is as full and is far superior in judgment and fairness. Here I cannot do more than notice a few points of interest on which new information is given. The king of Würtemberg is defended against the charge made by Treitschke that he offered 'to take back his over-hasty constitution if the emperor would give him the means to do so.' With regard to the attitude of the Czar towards the Carlsbad decrees, we find that he really—anticipating Napoleon III—had a double voice, one to which he gave expression in his personal intercourse with ambassadors and other sovereigns, one which found expression in the official despatches of the foreign office. We have some fresh information on Prussian history, a fuller account of the proposal of the king of Prussia either to join the confederacy with all his dominions or to take out of it Silesia and Lausitz, a proposal which Metternich, in a letter to the emperor, characterises as 'bordering on madness.' Of more importance is the copy of Hardenberg's scheme for the Prussian constitution, which was laid before the king in May 1819. This is much more generous than would appear from Treitschke's descriptions; it remains even more incompre-

hensible than before how Hardenberg could consent to continue in office after the king had consulted Metternich on the internal affairs of Prussia, and how he could bring himself to lay before the king three months later a fresh scheme, so altered and modified as to win Metternich's approval. There is a full description of the gradual victory of the reactionary party over the king; nothing can alter the judgment which has long been passed on this unfortunate change, which was completed by the resignation of Boyen and Humboldt; it appears especially to have been the influence of Duke Charles of Mecklenburg on military matters which led to the departure of the minister of war; the final responsibility rests with the king and the chancellor. The use of the archives adds new facts to the picture of the activity of the ministers of police, Sedlnitzky in Austria and Kamptz in Prussia; even Gentz was watched by the police, the conversations at his table reported, and his correspondence examined; it was stated at the time that Blücher himself was, within a year of the battle of Waterloo, regarded as a suspected person and was watched by the police. Boyen, when minister, knew he was constantly watched; Gneisenau would not send his letters through the post, where they would be opened. The rulers were often more sensible than the ministers; Karl August was not the only one who saw the folly of this policy. The duke of Oldenburg wrote to Metternich after the publication of the Carlsbad resolutions that, in his opinion, 'the best way of meeting this spread of revolutionary principles was to oppose to them contented subjects;' but, generally speaking, this is a chapter of history to which the principle does not apply that an increased knowledge will bring a more lenient judgment.

The book is on the whole the fullest and best history of the period which has yet appeared; it displays astonishing labour and care; in those parts which I have tested I have found unvarying accuracy; we shall look forward to the appearance of the succeeding volumes of what promises to be the permanent textbook for this period.

J. W. Headlam.

Die Begründung des deutschen Reiches durch Wilhelm I. Von Heinrich von Sybel. Band VI. (München: R. Oldenbourg. 1894.)

We must confess to some little disappointment after reading the sixth volume of Dr. von Sybel's great work upon the foundation of the German empire. Indeed, in his preface the author himself admits that he does not regard this portion of his undertaking with unqualified satisfaction. For some of its deficiencies he is certainly not to blame. It seems that a few months after Prince Bismarck's retirement in the spring of 1890 the historian was no longer permitted free access to the archives of the German foreign office. Reasons of state may have been alleged in support of this irksome prohibition; but it is well known that in very august circles there was a feeling that Dr. von Sybel had put the figure of the fallen chancellor too much in the foreground of his history. There is no doubt whatever that the author is a confirmed admirer of Prince Bismarck, but an imperial censorship of history is not a very edifying arrangement. In spite, however, of the restrictions imposed upon him Sybel went on with his labours. He found that, after all, the documents

of the foreign office were not indispensable to a clear understanding of the four years of 'the armed peace' between the close of the Austrian and the beginning of the Franco-German war. He had himself taken part in many of the events which he describes; he had known others who had been behind the scenes, and who freely communicated to him their reminiscences and their papers. So he has been enabled to give us an historical account, which, if not final, is at least full.

The present volume deals with the events of two years, and covers the period between the autumn of 1866 and the close of 1868. They were years of important parliamentary discussions at home and awkward diplomatic questions abroad. The deliberations on the constitution of the newly founded North German confederation, the relations with the southern states, the preparations for the *Zollparlament*, which was to pave the way for an imperial Reichstag, the Luxemburg question, and such side-issues as the Roman policy of Napoleon III, the elevation of a German prince to the Roumanian throne, and the Cretan insurrection—all these matters fall within the scope of the present volume. This portion of the work has, it is true, both the advantages and the defects which of necessity belong to the treatment of an epoch so very near our own time. The fact that many of the leading men of that period are still active politicians lends liveliness to the narrative; but this very circumstance tends to make this part of the book a clever political pamphlet rather than an impartial history. Sybel's forte, as we saw in the earlier volumes, is character-sketching, and if he has given us nothing quite so good as his famous portrait of Prince Bismarck in the second volume some of his sketches of the politicians of the North German Reichstag and of the southern states are very clever. Bennigsen, for instance, then, as now, the leader of the national liberal party, is happily described in a few incisive words, while Miquel, the present Prussian minister of finance, who even then enjoyed a great reputation for practical business ability, is drawn to the life. We have one or two glimpses of Bebel, at that time the only socialist in parliament, where he was shortly joined by Liebknecht, and we are treated to an excellent account of the first full-dress debate on socialism (p. 255) ever held in a German legislature. But to the politician of to-day perhaps the most interesting figure in these pages is that of Prince Hohenlohe. By a curious coincidence the preface was written in the same month in which he became chancellor, and a quotation from one of his speeches as Bavarian premier forms an appropriate motto to the volume. Sybel's description of him, as he was in 1867, deserves to be quoted. 'He was regarded,' writes the historian (p. 206), 'as the best friend Prussia possessed among the Bavarian statesmen, and it was to that fact that his appointment as a minister was due. He was thorough and systematical in the consideration of his plans, and careful and cautious in carrying them out, full of benevolence towards his fellow-men and of love for his country—in fact, a dutiful and trustworthy character in any position.' Convinced that the movement towards the unification of Germany was slow, if sure, he declared himself resolved to do nothing which should hinder it. The first speech which he delivered as Bavarian premier (19 Jan. 1867) amply justifies the estimate which Sybel has formed of him.

But in his criticisms of the politicians of the North German Reichstag the historian is apt to lose himself in the leader-writer. Sybel says (p. 284) that 'the years which immediately preceded and followed the Franco-German war were the golden age of German parliamentary life.' But he is very severe in his judgments of those who differed from his hero Bismarck. In the radicals of that period he can see little to praise; their policy he defines in one passage (p. 248) as 'the desire of the unattainable, the rejection of the attainable, and a scorn of all compromise.' He cannot describe a military debate in the French chamber without a significant hit at the politicians who were so misguided as to oppose the German army bill of 1893 (p. 337). A national liberal deputy himself, he does not take any pains to conceal his political opinions. But he certainly possesses a very clear conception of practical politics. There is nothing better in the volume than the masterly sketch of German parliamentary life, with its defects and its merits, which he gives us in one place (pp. 282–5). He points out the lack of party discipline, and the consequent formation of small 'fractions,' arising out of the inherent 'particularistic' tendencies of the German mind. Every proposal was buried in amendments, and even when every one approved the principles of a measure every one had some objections to its details. But, at the same time, he pays a warm tribute of admiration to the eloquence and debating powers of the leading politicians of that generation. He reminds us that, in those days, discussions were largely objective, measures were considered on their merits, and the personalities which had prevailed during the 'period of conflict,' and which were revived with the *Culturkampf*, were happily rare.

In his treatment of foreign politics the author's bias is as marked as in his criticisms of domestic affairs. He is a strong Prussian as well as a convinced national liberal. In reading his account of the state of feeling which then prevailed in the south, one cannot help feeling struck with the lack of consideration which he shows for the natural sentiments of kingdoms like Bavaria and Würtemberg. And when he goes still further afield, and writes of the policy of other governments towards Germany, he presents us with only one aspect of the question, and that the Prussian one. The story of Luxemburg, for instance, is not very creditable to the parties concerned, but Sybel does not seem to think that Bismarck had acted in any but the frankest manner from the first. He recognises that Napoleon III was not personally anxious for a quarrel with the great adversary whom he believed to have outwitted him, but was forced on by public opinion and the presumed interests of his dynasty.

Excellent as the book is as a history of politics and diplomacy, its great want is the complete lack of social and economic facts. In all Sybel's six long volumes we are told little or nothing about the condition of the people, the state of trade, the influence of literature and the universities upon the political movements of the time. The author throughout traverses the surface of things. Now and again he indulges in a clever retrospect of some particular question, but he shows no desire to penetrate deep into social affairs. He is careful to give us the exact figures of every important division in the Reichstag, but he lets us hear hardly anything of what was going on among the people, as distinct from the politicians, outside. Still the work is probably the best that has appeared

upon the subject, and is a mine of political information which no student of modern German history can afford to neglect. This volume, like its predecessors, is extremely well printed and remarkably free from typographical blunders.

W. MILLER.

Life and Letters of Edward A. Freeman. By W. R. W. STEPHENS, B.D., Dean of Winchester. 2 vols. (London: Macmillan & Co. 1895.)

IN the seventh volume of this REVIEW there appeared an obituary notice of the historian of the Norman Conquest and of Sicily, so full and so satisfactory in its delicate appreciation of his character that after the lapse of three years the publication of his life leaves the reviewer little to say, except to observe how remarkably the estimate of Freeman's character contained in that article is confirmed by the now published 'Life.'

The choice of Mr. Stephens (who has become dean of Winchester in the interval between the composition of this book and its publication) to be the biographer of Mr. Freeman was a very wise one, and has been abundantly justified by the result. He occupied just that position of a younger comrade and counsellor which best enables a man to understand the work of a master and interpret it to the generation following. It is curious that the very first letter addressed by Freeman to his future biographer strikes this note of mutual understanding.

> I find from the dean's account that you are the most discerning of mankind: that is, that you found out what a shy body I am. That is one of the things which Mr. Timbs ought to put into the next edition of 'Things not generally known.' I never can make people believe it, but so it is. I once began a speech with, 'I feel great diffidence,' and everybody burst out laughing; but 'twas true all the same.'

The biographer adds this explanation:

> I met Mr. Freeman for the first time in November of this year [1871] at the house of my father-in-law, Dean Hook, and I remarked to the dean not long afterwards that I thought Freeman's occasional roughness and shortness of manner to strangers was mainly the awkwardness of a shy man. That the dean should have repeated this remark to Freeman is a striking point of the freedom and candour which marked their intercourse.

Having myself for several years enjoyed the privilege of Freeman's friendship, having known him both as the guest and host, and, what is more to the purpose, as a companion in travel, I can give my emphatic attestation to the truth of this judgment of his biographer. He was essentially a shy, reserved, lonely-minded man. In this lay both his strength and his weakness. He thought his own thoughts out clearly, and he was able to express them forcibly; but he had little or no power of perceiving what was passing in the minds of others. Most of his friends who heard him speak on public platforms could add droll instances from their own recollection to those mentioned by Mr. Bryce [1] of his tendency to shoot over the heads of his audience and of his

[1] ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW, vii. 505.

entire unconsciousness that names and ideas which were the veriest commonplaces to him were quite out of their intellectual range. No doubt this quality of Freeman's mind somewhat lessened his usefulness as a teacher, and it would probably have prevented his taking high rank as a debater if he had ever succeeded in entering parliament. On the other hand, as I have already hinted, it was a limitation which had something to do with the very vigour and originality of his thought. Now that we read in the dean of Winchester's pages the story of Freeman's boyhood, some of us who knew him only in his maturity find therein the key to much which we scarcely understood before. This lonely little child, who never knew his father or his mother, being left an orphan in his second year, who from the age of three had but one sister, twelve years older than himself, and an aged and uncongenial grandmother for the inmates of his home, was inevitably thrown in upon himself, and had no practice in that unspoken language by which most men learn instinctively something of what is passing in the minds of their fellows. At school and college he still remained comparatively lonely. It says much for the real warmth of his nature and the genuine goodness of his heart that he was so intensely beloved in his family circle, and that he, who had been friendless in youth, made so many strong and true friendships in later life.

Excellent as are the narrative portions of Mr. Stephens's biography—and among these I would particularly refer to his sketch of Freeman's attitude on the eastern question (chap. viii.)—probably the pages which contain his own letters are those on which most readers will dwell the longest. Here the biographer's task has been a most difficult one, from the necessity of rejecting so large a part of the copious material which lay before him. I imagine that most of Freeman's correspondents kept his letters, and to most of them he wrote very generously. If the dean had published all even of the racy and interesting letters which were forwarded to him by the receivers, these two modest volumes would perhaps have been swollen to twelve. But those which are given are well selected, and bring before us in bold outline the character of the man, with his massive learning, his industry, his playful humour, and, it must be added, his tremendous and ineradicable prejudices. One used often to feel on receiving such a letter, full of recondite historical allusions, that it would be a good thing to set it as an examination paper in the schools, requiring a candidate to explain the jokes, as in old days one had to explain the jokes of Aristophanes. The difficulty, it is true, was then increased by the physical effort of mastering a handwriting which looked so neat, and which was sometimes so undecipherable. But even now that they appear before us in all the luxury of good type, and with some editorial annotations, there will be some passages left over which many readers will break their shins. The jokes, however, are generally pretty well worn, and the allusions, once mastered, graciously reappear. We get to understand that the verb 'to preach' forms a perfect 'praught,' after the analogy of 'teach.' We know that the French will be generally spoken of, in the language of the 'Chronicle,' as 'Gal-Welsh,' and that the Italians are by analogy 'Rum-Welsh,' that 'Dutch' means what ordinary speakers call German and 'Hollander'

Dutch. So too popes are always 'paips,' and S. Maria Maggiore is 'Mary Major.' [1] For one or two of these familiar jokes or allusions his correspondents always prepared themselves when they sat down to master the difficulties of the well-known handwriting. Alas that none of these riddles of the Sphinx will ever perplex them more!

As it is the Life of Freeman that I am here reviewing, I purposely dwell chiefly on his personal characteristics. There are probably but few men who are competent to pronounce judgment on the vast mass of historical material (the mere titles of which occupy ten pages in the dean's excellent bibliographical appendix) which Freeman has left behind him, and of these few certainly I am not one. No one surely can even glance through that list of histories, articles, essays, handbooks, without admiring the immense industry of the writer, who in every one of these productions had some distinct fragment of knowledge, which with all the energy that was in him he sought to convey to the world. Opinions will vary as to the gain or loss to historical science caused by the fact that his 'History of Federal Government' was left unfinished. My own conjecture is that, on the whole, the gain outweighs the loss. Over such an enormously wide field as Federal Government would have justified him in roving, it would have been exceptionally difficult for him to concentrate his forces and to condense his narrative. It seems to me that we might have thus gained a somewhat discursive history of various countries with little real relation to one another, and have lost those 'possessions for ever,' the histories of the Norman Conquest and of Sicily. Among his smaller books one belonging to his later period, the 'Six Lectures on the Chief Periods of European History,' seems to me one of the most valuable and one of the most characteristic. If one wished to give to a young student a summary of the foundation truths of Freeman's historical teaching, I do not think one could do better than put this book in his hands. Even the very name of the last lecture, 'The World Romeless,' shows how he, a Teuton of Teutons, who might be almost called a bigot in his Teutonism, felt the fascination of 'the great city' which once 'reigned over the kings of the earth.'

The readers of the dean of Winchester's book will, I think, receive a very vivid and truthful impression of what manner of man the historian of the Norman Conquest was in his strength and in his weakness, in the wide range of his reading and the somewhat restricted range of his sympathies. Even his opponents—and they are many, and he both dealt and received stout blows in battle with them—will recognise that he was a man of noble and generous nature, and that as a scientific historian he did truly hunger and thirst after accuracy, though he would have been the first to admit that he did not always attain it. As the seven wise men of Greece had each his favourite saying, so Freeman in my recollection

[1] On p. 413 of the second volume there is one of Freeman's favourite jokes, to which the biographer has not, I think, anywhere supplied the much-needed explanation. In a letter written from Tunis he says, 'H.H. the bug himself cannot be called the leading bug, seeing he is led by the nose by a French resident.' The allusion is to a printer's error, the recollection of which always gave Freeman food for mirth, by which 'three leading Spartan beys' were transformed into 'three leading Spartan bugs.'

will always be associated with a saying, so expressive of his own temper, so little expressive of the tendency of our age:—

I could never understand why any man should be ashamed to confess that he does know a subject which he has made his own, or that he does not know a subject of which he is ignorant.

THOS. HODGKIN.

Notes on the Churches of Cheshire. By the late SIR STEPHEN R. GLYNNE, Bart. Edited by the Rev. J. A. ATKINSON, M.A., D.C.L. (*Remains, Historical and Literary, connected with the Palatine Counties of Lancaster and Chester.* New Series. XXXII.) (Manchester: printed for the Chetham Society. 1894.)

THE Chetham Society has followed up its publication of Sir Stephen Glynne's 'Notes on the Churches of Lancashire' by a companion volume of notes by the same ecclesiologist on the churches of Cheshire—not, however, including the cathedral. Sir Stephen's observations range over the period from 1832 to 1869, and later information (under the date of 1893) is supplied by the editor. 'So many changes,' he truly observes, 'are from time to time being made in churches, that, after a few years, descriptions cease to be accurate.' One sad instance—though in this case it was accidental—is afforded by the historic church of St. John the Baptist at Chester, the fine western tower of which has fallen since Sir Stephen's time. The first church described in the volume is that of Nantwich (St. Mary and St. Nicholas), 'undoubtedly the largest and finest in the county.' It has had the good fortune to be the subject of what Sir Stephen considered to be 'one of the finest and most satisfactory restorations of a grand church that can be seen.' Another good church is that of Bunbury, interesting not only in itself, but also as containing the tomb of Sir Hugh Calverley. St. Chad's at Wybunbury is, or was, remarkable for its leaning tower, which, when it 'had declined no less than five feet six inches from the perpendicular,' was not only saved from falling in 1836, but was set nearly upright again 'by the scientific skill of Mr. James Trubshaw, architect,' and 'is standing to this day.' Another St. Chad's, at Over, can boast of a legend (of a type not uncommon in folk-lore) to account for its peculiar situation: the devil was flying away with the church, when the prayers of its rectors, the monks of Vale Royal, constrained him to drop it, and it came down in the hollow where it now stands. Gawsworth, which Sir Stephen qualifies as a 'neat' church, has risen of late into fame not exactly of an ecclesiastical kind, for it contains the effigy of the frail Mary Fitton, whom modern ingenuity has identified with the 'dark lady' of Shakespeare's sonnets. The editor, travelling a little outside his subject, records the motto of the first Sir Edward Fitton, knight, placed over the door of the old hall—*Fit onus leve et jugum suave unum quodque nihil omne totum.* 'The first two words are clearly a play on the family name, but the translation has puzzled the best Latin scholars.' Clear enough, as an indication of somebody's simple and uncompromising political and religious sentiments, are the lines written with a diamond on the glass of the north window of the chancel of St. Mary's Chapel or Church, Bruera, invoking eternal condemnation upon 'Popes, Prelates, Jacobitism, idolatry.'

The noting of this anonymous scrawl of the eighteenth century shows the care with which every detail that can possibly be of interest has been recorded. One other quotation may cause some perplexity. In the notes on St. John's, Chester, mention is made of the 'tombstone of John de Serjaun, with cross and sword;' no date assigned, but, as modern tombs are rarely undated, it may be presumed to be ancient. Then immediately follow the lines—

> 'Their bones are dust,
> And their good Swords rust.
> Their souls are with the Saints, we trust'

—a slight variation of Scott's variation (in 'Ivanhoe') of the concluding three lines of Coleridge's 'Knight's Tomb.' If they are here introduced as an ornamental quotation, they are hardly in place in a book of which the business is merely to record facts; if they are actually on the tomb of John de Serjaun, the inscription at least must be modern, unless, indeed, we suppose that Coleridge took the lines from St. John's at Chester.

EDITH THOMPSON.

Memorials of St. James's Palace. By EDGAR SHEPPARD, M.A. 2 vols. (London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1894.)

THE pages of these handsome volumes are singularly unequal in value, but perhaps this was necessitated by the nature of the subject. They include a number of royal portraits, pictures of plate, and reproductions of historical prints in the possession of her majesty the Queen, of great interest to the historian, together with several pages of facsimiles of the signatures made in the Chapel Royal Register on the day of the duke of York's wedding, not yet of historical interest. They contain a history of the palace, its architectural development and historical associations, together with much minute detail touching all the royal and other baptisms which have taken place in the Chapel Royal, including those of the present reign, not to speak of valuable contributions from specialists on the history of the drama, of armour, plate and tapestry. The historian will feel that the present day has received more than its share of the care lavished on this book, and the more so because the historical part, though professedly a compilation, is carefully written with full references to authorities. In a work of this kind it would not be reasonable to expect a complete concordance of all the historical references to St. James's Palace, interesting as such a collection would be; those which enter Mr. Sheppard's classification under special headings, such as births, baptisms, marriages, deaths, court functions and entertainments, are very fully treated, but the references of a general character given in the first two chapters might have been enriched. The history of St. James's Park will be found more fully told in Larwood's 'Story of the London Parks.' It is worth remembering that though in a sense we owe the park to Charles II, it was to the good taste of Le Nôtre that we owe its comparatively rural appearance. It was the man who had laid out the gardens of the Tuileries who persuaded Charles II to avoid the French example and keep that natural simplicity which 'had something more grand than he could impart to it.' It was urged at the beginning of the century that the

buildings of St. James's look unworthy of a royal palace, and Wyndham said, 'If it does not look like a palace it does not look like anything else.' The same may be said of these volumes, which if they do not look like a book for a royal palace do not look like anything else.

MARY BATESON.

John Russell Colvin, the last Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West under the Company. By SIR AUCKLAND COLVIN, K.C.S.I., K.C.M.G., C.I.E., lately Lieutenant-Governor of the North-Western Provinces. (*Rulers of India.*) (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1895.)

THIS concluding volume of the 'Rulers of India' series has a unique value of its own. It is a filial tribute to a very distinguished civil servant whose great services never received adequate recognition; it is an original contribution, based on hitherto unpublished material, to the history of British India; and, lastly, it is an important historical rectification of a view which since the time of Sir John Kaye had taken possession of the field. There is no need here to sketch the life which Sir Auckland Colvin records with charming literary taste and genuine historical appreciation. It will be read by all by whom Indian history is studied and to whom the Mutiny is still a tale of absorbing interest. I need only call attention to the important points in which Sir Auckland Colvin adds to our knowledge of the circumstances of the first Afghan war. He dwells upon the despatch from the board of control, dated 25 June, which decided Lord Auckland's subsequent policy and was the ultimate cause of the war. To this despatch Sir John Kaye makes no reference. In his sketch of the events which resulted in the war the author is able, by reference to documents which Sir John Kaye, at least in later life, could have consulted, but was content to ignore, to reverse entirely the common verdict against Lord Auckland and his advisers. Sir Auckland Colvin's conclusive demonstration renders a part of Captain Trotter's life of this governor-general in the same series palpably misleading. Passages in which the blame for the disastrous imbroglio appears to be laid upon Lord Auckland and, still more, upon Colvin and Torrens, must be modified in any future edition. This is the most important historical point in Sir Auckland's book, but every chapter has an interest and attraction of its own, and it is impossible to read the account of the noble self-sacrifice of the last few months without emotion.

W. H. HUTTON.

The History of the United States. By E. BENJAMIN ANDREWS, President of Brown University. (London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1895.)

MR. ANDREWS's book is clear and sensible, and is evidently based on a careful study of good authorities. But in a measure it falls between two stools. Its dimensions leave it beyond the sphere of manuals and text-books. A somewhat monotonous and unimpressive style, a lack of individuality and freshness in its conception of men and events, and a total absence of references keep it out of the category of high-class literary work. It fails, too, somewhat in the matter of proportion. In little more

than seven hundred pages Mr. Andrews covers the whole field of United States history, not even ignoring the mound-builders. In such a book a description of the Philadelphia exhibition, occupying eight pages and written in the style of an intelligent newspaper article, is hardly in place. There is, too, a conspicuous absence of any distinct and effective portraiture of individuals. The great men of the revolution are indeed paraded before one with somewhat conventional and undiscriminating analogies, but no salient features of character abide in the reader's memory. It would not be difficult to pick out a good many vulnerable points in the writer's style. In his description of the great battles of the war of secession he constantly uses the present tense with unpleasant effect. Leisler, the demagogue who headed a revolution in New York, 'assumed to function' in Nicholson's stead. To say that the Indian, 'sometimes brave, was oftener treacherous, cruel, revengeful,' seems rather an odd attempt at antithesis. It would be truer to say that he was always all of these. One event 'antedates' another, instead of preceding it, and Mr. Andrews does not tell, but 'details.' To say that 'not a few New England theologians and lawyers were peers to the ablest of their time' is a not very graceful expression of a rather doubtful view. One may say the same of Mr. Andrews's sketch of Washington at the outset of his career. 'At sixteen he became a land surveyor, leading a life of the roughest sort; beasts, savages, hardy frontiersmen his constant companions, sleeping under the sky and cooking his own coarse food.' Did the companionable beasts help to cook the food? And is it not at least a peculiar use of language to say that 'the future father of his country was of humble origin'? Where, too, did Mr. Andrews read of 'Sir' Edward Braddock? Yet with these remarks Mr. Andrews's book represents solid and intelligent historical study, and it is of no little interest as showing the strides which American history has made in advance of the practical optimism of Mr. Bancroft and the learned advocacy of Mr. Palfrey. J. A. DOYLE.

A Treatise on Ecclesiastical Heraldry. By JOHN WOODWARD, LL.D. (Edinburgh: W. and A. K. Johnston. 1894.)

THIS work displays the same sound and extensive learning as the general 'Treatise on Heraldry,' which the author completed from the materials of the late Dr. George Burnett, and which we noticed some time ago (vol. vii. p. 814). Many of its more attractive features, *e.g.* the handsome series of blazons of the arms of all the sees in the United Kingdom and its colonies, lie outside the strict province of this REVIEW, though we may observe that in some instances (as in the cases of the sees of Lincoln and Manchester) the tinctures on the shields do not in all points agree with those indicated in the descriptions. The criticisms which the author passes on several coats recently assumed or modified are conceived in the best taste and animated by a sober historical feeling. That which is of definite historical value is the fulness of illustration (assisted by admirable plates) by means of which he explains the diversity of usage in the bearing of arms and their various accompaniments in different countries and at different times. The lists of sees, chapters, and religious houses, with their arms—extending from the British islands to France and the imperial territories, and even further

into the eastern regions of modern Germany and Austria-Hungary—while not pretending to be complete, are within their limits extremely serviceable.

In the account given of the origin of the official arms adopted by bishops and other dignitaries Dr. Woodward brings together a large amount of material of various quality. He is too prone to look backward to the ages long before heraldry existed, and does not always show a clear perception of what is history and what legend. Thus the well-attested fact that Leo III sent the holy keys and a banner to Charles the Great should not be recorded (p. 153) with much the same air of incredulity as the fable of the coronet sent by the Frank Chlodovech to Rome (p. 151), nor should the legend that the father of Archbishop Willigis of Mentz was a 'millwright' be seemingly accepted as truth (p. 254). Moreover in travelling from heraldry into the field of history Dr. Woodward, we are sorry to say, falls into a large number of more or less serious errors. We read on p. 413 that the Benedictines were in England 'commonly known as *the Black Friars*,' and that this order included the monastery at Oxford which afterwards became a cathedral: St. Frideswide's was, in fact, an Augustinian priory. On p. 417 the priory of Carlisle is said to have been 'made' a cathedral by Henry VIII, whereas it had been one since the time of Henry I. The abbey of St. Werburg is called the 'priory' of Chester (p. 194). A far more weighty fault is committed when the university of Bologna is said to have been 'founded in 1088' (p. 456). The date, 1385, assigned to the 'united bishopric of Coventry and Lichfield' (p. 183) is quite wrong; and the phrase 'united bishopric' is misleading, since there were never two separate sees. On p. 186 the date 664 is a mistake for 644, and we do not understand why Dr. Woodward omits the bishops of Rochester before Ithamar. On p. 217 the expression 'the sees of the old foundation' is incorrectly used. The statement that 'both the archbishops' of Armagh and Dublin 'have the right to use the primatial cross over the whole of Ireland' (p. 111) should be guarded by a note that down to the fourteenth century there was the same dispute between them on this point as existed between the two English archbishops. The assertion that 'sovereign princes and nobles of high rank had sometimes the rank of honorary canons' (p. 50) requires qualification, since the title of honorary canon can claim no antiquity, and the dignitaries in question, though they exercised no functions, occupied actual stalls. The use of the amess was not, as Dr. Woodward leads us to infer (p. 46), confined to canons: it was occasionally allowed to monks, *e.g.* to those of Worcester by a privilege of Nicholas IV in 1289. To say that Mentz was 'originally suffragan to Trier' (p. 252) is extremely hazardous. Magdeburg is by a slip styled a 'prince-bishopric' on p. 299, though in the sequel its occupant is correctly given the title of archbishop. Matilda, abbess of Quedlinburg, was daughter, not sister, of Otto the Great, and her grandfather Henry I did not defeat the Huns, but the Hungarians (p. 347). Quedlinburg is variously spelled Quedlimburg and Quedlemburg, and indexed as two separate places, while the nuns of the Benedictine abbey are also called 'canonesses' (p. 481). This last mistake is not surprising, since elsewhere (pp. 418, 420) Franciscans and Carmelites are indifferently styled 'monks.' On p. 398 we are totally at a loss to understand what is meant by 'Interlacken [*sic*] or Lac de Joux.' Errors in dates are too common.

On p. 53 the year 1363—taken, we suppose, from Valentine Green—should be 1365. On p. 68 1271 is wrong, since Gregory X was not consecrated until 27 March 1272. On p. 153 the death of Clement IV is placed in 1271 instead of 1268. German names are very frequently misspelled or spelled in a French way, and the sign of vowel-modification is often inserted where it should not be (as in Frankfürt, p. 124, &c.; Hohenlöhe, p. 273; Grätz, p. 454). Misprints like Vienne for Vienna (p. 456) and Vienna for Vienne (p. 502, No. 3) are unlucky.

We do not call attention to these faults with the object of disparaging a book of which the great merits are unquestionable. Dr. Woodward breaks new ground in making a comparative study of the heraldic usage of the entire catholic church, including its Anglican descendant. He has collected a mass of valuable evidence, which it is extremely convenient to have put together in a single treatise. Our chief criticism is that in matters of detail—mainly non-heraldic detail—his statements are often wanting in accuracy. His book will assuredly be consulted as a standard authority, and we hope, therefore, that he will subject it to a careful revision before bringing out the second edition, which will no doubt soon be called for. It would be much to be regretted if the number of small mistakes in it, mostly easy to be corrected, should interfere with the due recognition of the author's long and arduous labours.

Reginald L. Poole.

Archery (Badminton Library Series). By C. J. Longman and Colonel H. Walrond. (London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1894.)

We have only to deal with the historical portion of this volume, whose contents are of very uneven merit, chapters full of information and research being strangely mixed with chronicles of local archery clubs. One excellent chapter on the 'Decline of Archery in the Sixteenth Century,' by Colonel Walrond, deserves warm praise. It contains a good deal of new matter, extracted from State Papers of the Elizabethan age, as well as four contemporary treatises on the art of war. The curious controversy between Sir John Smythe, Humphrey Barwick, *capitaine, soldat et encore plus aultre*, and Sir Roger Williams is well worth notice. Smythe, advocating the retention of the bow as the national weapon of the English army in his 'Certain Discourse' of 1590, was warmly opposed by Barwick, a vehement advocate of firearms. The point on which they practically join issue is the efficiency of bow as compared with harquebus as a weapon for general service. The pace of fire was allowed by both to be in the favour of the archer, but the certainty and penetrating power of the harquebus are disputed. Smythe says that musketeers habitually became so flurried in action that they forgot to put wadding between the powder and the ball, or even omitted it on the top of the ball, so that the bullet dropped out when they depressed the muzzle and before they had snapped the cock. Barwick, on the other hand, accuses the bowman of getting equally nervous and hurried, so that he would let off arrow after arrow without drawing to the head or taking exact aim. Sir Roger Williams, the most practised soldier of the three disputants, preferred 500 musketeers to 1,500 archers, because of the fact that 'not one in ten of them shootes

strong shootes after three months in the field;' hard living and cold weather put the archer out of form, for his strength depended on 'his three meals a day and his bed to keep his body warm at nights.'

Lord Dillon's chapters on the archæology of the bow are good, but that on early archery in England is much inferior. The president of the Society of Antiquaries seriously quotes Roger Ascham as an authority for the fact that the bow was unknown in Britain before the coming of the Saxons. Yet he must well remember hundreds of flint arrow-heads in a score of museums, and need not have forgotten the Roman auxiliaries, Moors and others, armed with the bow, who formed a considerable portion of the garrison of our island in the second, third, and fourth centuries. The notes on Crecy and Poictiers are also quite inadequate. This is a pity, as the rest of Lord Dillon's work is excellent. C. OMAN.

Les Grands Écrivains Français. Froissart. Par MARY DARMESTETER. (Paris: Hachette. 1894.)

The Chronicles of Froissart. Translated by LORD BERNERS. Edited and reduced into one volume by G. C. MACAULAY, M.A. (London: Macmillan & Co. 1895.)

IN the opinion of good judges, Madame Darmesteter, who may be better known to the readers of this REVIEW under her maiden name of A. Mary F. Robinson, writes French with a charming accent. We feel sure, however, that few but her adopted countrymen could detect it. For the rest she has caught the secret of that lightness and grace which is so much a matter of course in French literary *appréciations*, and alas, so often lacking in our own. In a few deft touches the lively, inquisitive, careless, unthrifty *ditteur* and canon is made to stand vividly before us, inditing history in the spirit of romance and reflecting every change of patron in a new *parti pris*.

> Son plus grand défaut—et son brevet de poète—c'est qu'en regardant le monde, il n'y voyait pas la seule vérité, et que ses *chroniques* reflètent le monde comme on le voit à vingt ans—plus vif, plus beau, plus laid, plus varié—moitié réalité et moitié rêve.

Froissart's sojourn at the court of Gaston Phoebus at Orthez, and his last visit to England with its tinge of sad disillusion, are charmingly told. Thanks to the good fortune and the generosity of M. Longnon, its rediscoverer, Madame Darmesteter, is enabled to sketch the plot of that portentous romance of Méliador which its author nightly declaimed to the wakeful count and his sleepy courtiers. We like the little book so well that we could wish it free of such blemishes as the statements that Hainault was held of the kings of France and that Richard of Arundel *disparaît assassiné*.

Messrs. Macmillan have been well advised in including a translation of Froissart in their useful Globe series. It is of necessity a volume of selections, but the compression is effected not by abridgment in the ordinary sense, but by the omission of the less important chapters and passages. The editor has very properly adopted Lord Berners's spirited translation in preference to the pedestrian, if more accurate, version of Johnes. But he is quite alive to the shortcomings of the former as a translator, and has spared no trouble to correct both his mistakes and

those of his printer. The selection omits nothing, as far as we can see, which ought to be included, and a careful introduction says all that need be said about Lord Berners and his work. JAMES TAIT.

The third and fourth volumes of Professor Pastor's important *History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages* in its English dress (London: Kegan Paul, 1894) represent vol. ii. of the original, which was noticed by us in 1890 (vol. v. p. 782), and comprises the pontificates of Pius II, Paul II, and Sixtus IV. We have now only to call attention to the translation, the text of which has had the advantage of the supervision of Father Antrobus and is fluent and generally to be depended upon. The notes and references are much more accurately printed than was the case in the preceding volumes; and the documents, which form a leading feature in the work, are happily given in their entirety. Excellent type, full tables of contents, and indexes add to the reader's convenience in making use of this fair-minded and learned work.

Mr. A. B. Hinds's work on *The Making of the England of Elizabeth* (London: Rivington, Percival, & Co. 1895) consists practically of three separate essays and a few pages of 'conclusion,' with hardly even a pretence of justifying the title of the book. The first essay, on the attempted Calvinistic schism in the English refugee church on the continent during the reign of Mary, is almost entirely taken from a tract called 'A Brief Discourse of the Troubles begun at Frankfort.' The second essay is concerned with the quarrels and intrigues of the English protestant refugees who had fled to France on the collapse of Wyatt's insurrection, though by no stretch of the imagination can these contemptible bickerings be said to have appreciably contributed to the 'making of Elizabethan England.' The third essay—a sort of summary of the parliaments during the reign of Mary—is decidedly the most valuable of the three. The greater prominence gradually assumed by the house of commons is dwelt upon, and the claim is made that Plowden and Kingston were the forerunners of a long line of heroes who subsequently struggled for the triumph of parliamentary government. This in a sense is true, but these parliaments of Mary were not especially epoch-making ones. Mr. Hinds is sometimes not too happy in his statements of fact. One instance of this will serve. Speaking of Philip's extending his protection and patronage to Elizabeth *before her accession*, Mr. Hinds says—

> He did this the more willingly because he might reasonably hope by this attitude to share some of Elizabeth's popularity. At the same time it looked as if Philip was going about to undermine Elizabeth's influence. In turn he proposed to marry her to the duke of Piedmont (*sic*), Don Carlos, the duke of Savoy, or one of his cousins the archdukes Frederick (*sic*) and Charles. Fully conscious as he must have been of the unpopularity incurred by his wife in marrying a foreigner, Philip surely had some ulterior motive in these propositions. May we not justly suppose that he hoped to deprive Elizabeth of her power by taking away her chief title to public esteem?

This seems inconsistent: if Philip's object was to share Elizabeth's popularity, he would hardly seek to deprive her of it. Mr. Hinds surely knows moreover that none of these proposals was seriously made before

Mary's death, except that of the duke of Savoy, who was the same person as the prince of Piedmont. Don Carlos was barely ten years old, and his name was only once unofficially mentioned as a feint, and the archdukes Ferdinand and Charles were not proposed until Philip's own suit had failed, and subsequent to Elizabeth's accession.

In the *Memoirs of Count Lavalette* (London: Gibbings & Co., 1894) we have a reprint of the translation published by Colburn and Bentley in 1833 of a work which appeared in French earlier in the same year. The author of the memoirs was for some time adjutant and private secretary to Napoleon, and held the office of postmaster-general under the empire.

Mr. Falconer Madan's work on *The Early Oxford Press: a Bibliography of Printing and Publishing at Oxford*, '1468'–1640 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895), comprises catalogues of books printed down to 1486 and from 1517 to 1519; of 'fictitious or lost Oxford books, 1459–1584;' and of the publications of the Oxford University Press from 1585 to 1640. After the first establishment of printing at Oxford, evidenced by fifteen books, there is an interval of thirty years with no publication to show. In another three years a longer break extends from 1519 to 1585. This gap is significant, but not without parallels; 'not only at Oxford,' says Mr. Madan (p. 263), 'but also at Cambridge, York, Tavistock, and Abingdon, in all of which there was an early sixteenth-century press, printing entirely ceases for nearly the central forty years of that century.' The bibliographical descriptions are extremely minute and serve to complete and correct the notices contained in existing general catalogues; and many of them, relating to single sheets, have previously eluded observation. The author has added frequent notes, helping to determine the authorship of anonymous works, throwing light upon the history of particular publications, and occasionally calling attention to points of interest in obscure works. The book falls but indirectly within our province, or we should take pleasure in dwelling at length upon its interesting contents, among which we must not omit to mention the careful list of persons occupied in the production of books at Oxford from the twelfth century onwards. We do not understand why 'Alexander de Hales'—'to be distinguished from Alexander de Ales or Alesius'—on p. 2 is at least eight times called 'Ales' on pp. 238–254; and we think the use of the name 'English' to indicate black letter as well as a particular size of type objectionable. The discussion (pp. 245–252) of the curious fact that the earliest book printed at Oxford probably bears a false date, MCCCCLXVIII. for MCCCCLXXVIII. (or may it not be MCCCCLXXIII.?), is a remarkably clear and judicial summing up of a difficult question. We observe that Mr. Madan does not include Avignon among the earliest seats of printing in Europe.

Periodical Notices

[Contributions to these Notices, whether regular or occasional, are invited. They should be drawn up on the pattern of those printed below, and addressed to Mr. R. L. Poole, at Oxford, by the first week in March, June, September, and December.]

The eighth book of the Apostolical Constitutions and related writings [the 'Constitutiones per Hippolytum,' the canons of Hippolytus, and the so-called Egyptian ordinance]. Hist. Jahrb. xvi. 1.

An attempt to reconstruct the church history of Philostorgios: by J. R. Asmus.—Byz. Zft. iv. 1. *Jan.*

The second letter of St. Paulinus of Nola to Crispinianus: printed from two manuscripts by C. Weyman.—Hist. Jahrb. xvi. 1.

Unpublished Carolingian charters [766–886]: printed from French manuscripts by A. Dopsch.—Mitth. Inst. Oesterreich. Gesch.-forsch. xvi. 2.

On the monk and presbyter Epiphanios: by J. Dräseke [fixing this writer's date early in the ninth century].—Byz. Zft. iv. 2. *April.*

Rheims forgeries concerning St. Remigius: by B. Krusch [who analyses archbishop Hincmar's Life of the saint, with the conclusion that it was concocted in order to magnify the pretensions of the see of Rheims, and that Remigius's shorter will contained in it is likewise a forgery. The longer will is maintained to have been fabricated by archbishop Gervase about the middle of the eleventh century. Hincmar is also charged with having forged documents among the archives of his church, which deceived Flodoard].—N. Arch. xx. 3.

On the manuscript transmission of Zonaras: by U. P. Boissevain [who prefers the text of cod. Vindobon. 16 & Paris. 1717].—Byz. Zft. iv. 2. *April.*

Manuscripts bequeathed to the Bibliothèque Nationale by Armand Durand [1894]: by L. Delisle [five in number. The most important is a twelfth-century copy of Sigebert's chronicle, formerly at Signy, which was known to Tissier, but disappeared during the eighteenth century and was therefore not made use of for the edition in the 'Monumenta Germaniae.' It includes the chronicle with the continuation by Anselm and that distinguished as the Gemblours continuation down to 1148; together with a thirteenth-century list of the abbats of Signy and a chronicle of the abbey, which are here printed, and other historical notices].—Bibl. École Chartes, lv. 6.

Epitaphs and epigrams of the twelfth century: edited from the Zürich MS. C. 58. 275 by J. Werner.—N. Arch. xx. 3.

Michael Glykas, the chronicler [a biography and an account of his works]: by K. Krumbacher [printing an unpublished poem and letter by him].—SB. Bayer. Akad., phil.-hist. Cl. 1894. 3.

On the works of the Bolognese 'dictatores' from Buoncompagno to Bene di Lucca [a contribution to the history of the Italian rhetorical school]: by A. Gaudenzi.—Bull. Ist. stor. Ital. 14.

The Troper and the Gradual.—Church Qu. Rev. 79. *April.*

A new fragment of Södermannalagen [fourteenth century]: printed by G. L. von Maurer.—SB. Bayer. Akad., phil.-hist. Cl. 1894. 3.

A modern Greek paraphrase of the chronicle of Konstantinos Manasses: by K. Praechter.—Byz. Zft. iv. 2. *April.*

On Byzantine miniature painting: by A. Kirpičnikov [with illustrations from early manuscripts].—Byz. Zft. iv. 1. *Jan.*

The law of nature [a sketch of the history of the doctrine]: by J. W. Salmond.—Law Qu. Rev. 42. *April.*

Alexander the Great and Hellenism: by J. Kaerst.—Hist. Zft. lxxiv. 1, 2.

The laws of Augustus relating to population: by A. Bouché-Leclercq.—Rev. hist. lvii. 2. *March.*

Landed estates among the Romans: by A. Schulten.—Zft. Soc.-Wirthsch.-gesch. iii. 2.

On the origin of the Daco-Roumanians: by the late P. Hunfalvy, with observations by A. D. Xénopol.—Rev. hist. lviii. 1. *May.*

On the legend of the finding of the cross by St. Helena: by E. Nestle [who maintains that the Greek and Latin texts are derived from the Syriac text, which presupposes the Protonike legend and is found in its earliest form in the 'Doctrina Addaei'].—Byz. Zft. iv. 2. *April.*

The papacy and the council of Ephesus [431]: by L. Rivington [who maintains the papal supremacy].—Dublin Rev. N. S. 14. *April.*

'Francia' and 'Francus' as political terms in the middle ages: by G. Kurth [tracing the fluctuations of the former name down to the tenth century, and maintaining that it is impossible to distinguish the barbarian Franks from the Gallo-Romans in the established Merovingian kingdom].—Rev. Quest. hist. lvii. 2. *April.*

The church of St. Sophia at Constantinople.—Edinb. Rev. 372. *April.*

On the history of Byzantine rule in Africa in relation to the native populations: by C. Diehl.—Byz. Zft. iv. 1. *Jan.*

On the life and teaching of bishop Claudius of Turin [*fl.* 815]: by E. Dümmler [adding to his edition of Claudius's letters ('Mon. Germ.,' Epistolae, iv. 586-613) an account of Claudius's other works and a discussion of his position as a church reformer].—K. Preuss. Akad. SB. 1895, 23.

On the supposed Bavarian synod of 870 *or* 871: by B. Bretholz [who argues that this cannot be deduced from the Pannonian legend of St. Methodius, cap. ix., and examines the question in detail].—Mitth. Inst. Oesterreich. Gesch.-forsch. xvi. 2.

The legend of the appearance of St. Mark in 1094: by G. Monticolo [giving the text of a manuscript by an anonymous author which is the main source for the narratives of Pietro da Chioggia and James de Voragine].—N. Arch. Ven. ix. 1.

The origin of medieval town constitutions: by H. Pirenne. III, concluded.—Rev. hist. lvii. 2. *March.*

The classical studies of Dante.—Edinb. Rev. 372. *April.*

Notes on the first expedition of Charles IV to Italy: by G Romano [on the emperor's relations to the Visconti, and his coronation in S. Ambrogio].—Arch. stor. Lomb. ser. iii. 3. *March.*

The condemnation and recantation of Matthaeus Grabow [a Dominican of Wismar, 1419]: printed by W. Wattenbach [correcting and supplementing Hardt, 'Conc. Constant.' iii. 106-120].—N. Arch. xx. 3.

The emperor Sigismund and Poland [1419-1436]: by J. Goll. III: The candidature of Sigismund Korybut. IV: The last years of Witold, Wladislaw, and Sigismund.—Mitth. Inst. Oesterreich. Gesch.-forsch. xvi. 2.

Claude de Seyssel [1450-1520], successively bishop of Laon and Marseilles and archbishop of Turin [treated with special reference to his 'Grand' Monarchie de France']: by A. Jacquet.—Rev. Quest. hist. lvii. 2. *April.*

Erasmus and the reformation in England.—Church Qu. Rev. 79. *April.*

On the life of Tetzel: by N. Paulus.—Hist. Jahrb. xvi. 1.

The materials for the history of Hadrian VI: by M. von Domarus.—Hist. Jahrb. xvi. 1.

Antonio Perez in exile [from 1591, with an account of his previous career and a severe judgment of his character]: by M. A. S. Hume.—Trans. R. Hist. Soc. N.S. viii.

Constantijn Huygens's diary on his journey to Venice in 1620 [in the suite of François van Aerssen]: printed by J. A. Worp. [The diary gives a full description of the country traversed, up the Rhine, through Switzerland, and on by way of Bergamo, Brescia, Verona, Vicenza, and Padua; of the reception given to the ambassador at the different places; of the stay at Venice; and of the return journey by the same route to Basel, Strassburg, and Spires].—Bijdr. en Mededeel. hist. Genootsch. Utrecht, xv.

The policy of Louis XIV towards Spain: by J. MALDONADO MACANAY.—Boletin R. Acad. Hist. xxvi. 4.

The siege of Charleroi in 1693: by C. PIOT [who supplements the French account of Vaultier and Beaurain by means of the journal of the commandant Juan de Castillo].—Bull. Comm. hist. Belg. 5th ser. iv. 3.

Klek and Soutorina [on the north and south of the republic of Ragusa]: by the baron A. D'AVRIL [dealing with their diplomatic treatment, 1699–1878].—Rev. Quest hist. lvii. 2. *April.*

Diplomatic correspondence about Russia in the eighteenth century [from the letters of the English and French ministers and others in the early part of the century].—Russk. Starina. *May.*

Ripperda: by G. SYVETON, third article, concluded.—Rev. Hist. diplom. viii. 4.

The embassy of Belle-isle to Frankfurt in 1742: by Dr. GROUCHY.—Rev. Hist. diplom. viii. 4.

Frederick the Great and the origin of the seven years' war: by M. LEHMANN [a reply to F. KOSER's criticism in the 'Hist. Zft.']. Götting. gel. Anz. 1895. 2. *Feb.*

The alliance of England and Prussia in 1576 *and its issues* [studied in connexion with the Newcastle papers in the British Museum]: by R. WADDINGTON. I.—Rev. hist. lviii. 1. *May.*

The question of the opening of the Scheld in 1781: by F. MAGNETTE.—Bull. Comm. hist. Belg. 5th ser. iv. 4.

Letter of the count of Artois to Frederick William II of Prussia [14 Feb. 1790].—Hist. Zft. lxxiv. 2.

The principal causes of the renewal of the war between England and France in 1803: by W. EKEDAHL.—Trans. R. Hist. Soc. N.S. viii.

Russia and England at the beginning of the nineteenth century: by F. DE MARTENS.—Rev. Hist. diplom. viii. 4.

The Walcheren expedition [1809]: by A. DU BOIS [with curious details].—Messager Sciences hist. Gand, lxvii. 3, 4.

Memoirs of Joseph Dubetski [describing the war in Turkey in 1828].—Russk. Starina. *April, May.*

The Servian constitution: by F. MOREL [tracing its development from 1868 to 1894, concluding in favour of a return to the constitution of 1888 as the sole way to preserve national independence and political liberty].—Ann. Sciences polit. x. 2. *March.*

Prince V. Cherkaski in Bulgaria [1877–1878]: by D. ANUCHIN.—Russk. Starina. *March, April, May.*

France

Giannino Baglioni, pretender to the French throne [claiming to be the son of Louis Hutin]: by the comte DE PUYMAIGRE [in connexion with L. Maccari's work on the subject].—Rev. Quest. hist. lvii. 2. *April.*

The household of Philip VI of Valois: by J. VIARD, continued [lists of wages and salaries of members of the households of the king and queen; regulations for the king's household and for that of the duke of Orleans].—Bibl. École Chartes, lv. 6.

The sale of the barony of Coucy [after the death of Enguerrand VII in 1397]: by H. LACAILLE [who prints documents relative to its acquisition by Louis, duke of Orleans, in 1400].—Bibl. École Chartes, lv. 6.

Jeanne d'Arc.—Quart. Rev. 360. *April.*

Italian notes upon French history: by L. G. PÉLISSIER [four letters of Louis of Orleans relating to the French invasion of 1494].—Arch. stor. Ital. 5th series, xv. 1.

The social condition of France at the beginning of the sixteenth century, illustrated from the sermons of Josse Clichtoue [1472–1543]: by H. CHÉROT.—Rev. Quest. hist. lvii. 2. *April.*

The trial of Guillaume Briçonnet, bishop of Meaux, by the parliament of Paris [1525]: by S. BERGER.—Bull. Soc. Hist. Protest. Franç. xliv. 1. *Jan.*

The reformed church at Tours: by A. DUPIN DE SAINT-ANDRÉ. I: The ministers [from 1556].—Bull. Soc. Hist. Protest. Franç. xliv. 2. *Feb.*

The protestants at Dreux and in the Drouais [1557–1603]: by P. DE FÉLICE and N. WEISS.—Bull. Soc. Hist. Protest. Franç. xliv. 1. *Jan.*

Jean de Gassion, marshal of France [1609–1647]: by C. L. FROISSARD.—Bull. Soc. Hist. Protest. franç. xliv. 4. *April.*

'*L'illustre président Jannin ressuscité*' [an appeal in favour of the Huguenots, 1699].—Bull. Comm. Hist. Églises Wallonnes, vi. 3.

Barthélemy Claris and his escape from the fortress of Alais, 1732: by N. WEISS and A. LODS [printing a contemporary narrative of his escape].—Bull. Soc. Hist. Protest. Franç. xliv. 2. *Feb.*

Memoir by Paul Rabaut on the state of the protestants in Languedoc [1752]: printed by N. WEISS.—Bull. Soc. Hist. Protest. Franç. xliv. 3. *March.*

General Lafayette: by E. CHARAVAY, concluded [with bibliography].—Révol. Franç. xiv. 9. *March.*

The early years of Carrier: by J. DELMAS.—Révol. Franç. xiv. 11. *May.*

Thiébault's memoirs, i.–iii.—Edinb. Rev. 372. *April.*

The conciergerie at Paris during the revolution.—Quart. Rev. 360. *April.*

The origins of the committee of general security: by A. MÉTIN.—Révol. Franç. xiv. 9, 10. *March, April.*

The charge against Cavaignac and Pinet in relation to Mademoiselle de Labarrère [1794]: by E. WELVERT [defending Cavaignac, and considering the charge against Pinet as unproved] —Rev. hist. lvii. 2. *March.*

The establishment of the life consulship: by F. A. AULARD.—Révol. Franç. xiv. 10. *April.*

The memoirs of a barrister at Perpignan [1800–1809, those of M. Jaume, recently published]: by P. TORREILLES.—Rev. Quest. hist. lvii. 2. *April.*

On the history of the Chouannerie [after the death of Cadoudal], *and its English support at Bordeaux*: by E. DAUDET.—Rev. hist. lvii. 1. *May.*

Letters of marshal Davout to Napoleon [16 Nov.–4 Dec. 1813] recently discovered at Aix-la-Chapelle [some in cipher]: printed by K. WACKER.—Hist. Jahrb. xvi. 1.

Germany and Austria-Hungary

On the sources for Hungarian history: by R. F. KAINDL [on the relation of Hartwich's 'Vita S. Stephani' to the 'Vita maior' and 'Vita minor,' with remarks on the Pest manuscript of the 'Vita' and its relation to the more original redaction of it contained in the Polish-Hungarian chronicle].—Arch. Oesterreich. Gesch. lxxxi. 1.

On the authorities for Thuringian history: by O. HOLDER-EGGER. II: The chronicle of Reinhardsbrunn and its lost sources.—N. Arch. xx. 3.

Calendar of sixteen unpublished documents of Charles IV [1347–1373]: by J. BECKER. N. Arch. xx. 3.

The communism of the Moravian anabaptists in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: by J. LOSERTH. I: Huter's community in Moravia from its origin to its expulsion in 1622. II: The life and teaching of the Moravian anabaptists [with particulars of their industrial regulations, &c.]; with documents.—Arch. Oesterreich. Gesch. lxxxi. 1.

Bondage and the enfranchisement of the peasants in Austria: by J. REDLICH.—Zft. Soc.-Wirthsch.-gesch. iii. 2.

The recognition of the pragmatic sanction of Charles VI [1713] *by Germany*: by H. von ZWIEDINECK-SÜDENHORST, with documents [5 June–14 Dec. 1731] and a bibliography.—Mitth. Inst. Oesterreich. Gesch.-forsch. xvi. 2.

Frederick the Great.—Edinb. Rev. 372. *April.*

The industrial policy of Austria under Maria Theresa: by A. BEER.—Arch. Oesterreich. Gesch. lxxxi. 1.

Wilhelm von Humboldt's retirement from the ministry in 1810: by B. GEBHART.—Hist. Zft. lxxiv. 1.

The acceptance of industrial freedom in Prussia in 1810 *and* 1811: by K. von ROHRSCHEIDT. II.—Zft. Soc.-Wirthsch.-gesch. iii. 2.

The Germanisation of Polish Prussia [1886–1891]: by B. AUERBACH.—Ann. Sciences polit. x. 2. *March.*

Obituary notices of Wilhelm Ferdinand Arndt [†10 Jan. 1895] *and Ludwig Weiland* [†5 Feb. 1895]: by E. D.—N. Arch. xx. 3.

Great Britain and Ireland

Foreign immigration into England in the twelfth century: by W. Cunningham.—Zft. Soc.-Wirthsch.-gesch. iii. 2.

The educational organisation of the mendicant friars in England: by A. G. Little. Trans. R. Hist. Soc. N.S. viii.

The earldoms under Edward I [an examination of their territorial influence, &c.]: by T. F. Tout.—Trans. R. Hist. Soc. N.S. viii.

The proceedings in Suffolk during the peasants' rising in 1381: by E. Powell [printing poll-tax lists for the hundreds of Thingo and Lackford].—Trans. R. Hist. Soc. N.S. viii.

The inquisition of 1517; *inclosures and evictions*: edited from the Lansdowne MS. I. 153 by I. S. Leadam. Part III.—Trans. R. Hist. Soc. N.S. viii.

Archbishop Laud. I.—Church Qu. Rev. 79. *April.*

The case of sir Charles Lucas and sir George Lisle: by J. H. Round [who maintains that their execution in 1648 after the surrender of Colchester took place without trial; that the charge brought against Fairfax was that he had them shot in cold blood; that his defence was the obstinacy of the siege; and that the victims were chosen as next in rank to the peers who were similarly situated, because Fairfax hesitated to shoot peers].—Trans. R. Hist. Soc. N.S. viii.

The representative peers of Scotland: by W. C. Macpherson.—Scott. Rev. 50. *April.*

Resolutions of the house of commons: by G. W. Prothero.—Nation. Rev. *April.*

The Rollright stones and their folk-lore: by A. J. Evans. I: Rowldrich in its relation to the Wychwood and Cotswold group of megalithic monuments (with plates). II: The folk-lore of Rollright. III: The Oxfordshire Roland and his continental compeers [taking the name to represent 'Rolland riht' the *Ius Rollandi.*—In discussing the German 'Weichbild' the writer appears unaware of recent investigations of the question].—Folk-Lore, vi. 1. *March.*

Somerset [antiquarian notices].—Edinb. Rev. 372. *April.*

The house of Gordon.—Scott. Rev. 50. *April.*

Sir William Fraser's 'Sutherland Book.'—Edinb. Rev. 372. *April.*

Italy

The sources of Landulf the elder [the historian of Milan]: by L. A. Ferrai.—Bull. Ist. stor. Ital. 14.

On the 'Brevis Historia Liberationis Messanae': by G. B. Siragusa [who had published the text from a manuscript at Messina in vol. xv. (1890), and has been subject to animadversions by V. di Giovanni in vol. xvii. (1891) on the grounds that the history was a mere compilation of the seventeenth century, and that the new text was inferior to that previously printed. Professor Siragusa maintains his opinion, particularly on the point that, so far from being a compilation from Maurolico and others, the 'Historia' was itself made use of by Maurolico].—Arch. stor. Sicil. N.S. xix. 3, 4.

The agricultural population of Lombardy in the barbaric period [the legal and economical position of the peasants; organisation and cultivation of the farm, and home life]: by G. Seregni.—Arch. stor. Lomb. ser. iii. 3. *March.*

On the walls and gates of the city of Alcamo: by P. M. Rocca, with documents.—Arch. stor. Sicil. N.S. xix. 3, 4.

An appeal of the city of Albenga to the emperor [printed as addressed to Lewis of Bavaria, 1316]: by G. Caro [who notices a manuscript of it assigning it to 1126, and shows that it actually was addressed to Frederick II in 1226].—N. Arch. xx. 3.

Notes on the conservation of the Greek rite in Calabria and the district of Otranto in the fourteenth century: by J. Gay.—Byz. Zft. iv. 1. *Jan.*

The relations between Florence and Venice in the fourteenth century: by G. Bolognini. N. Arch. Ven. ix. 1.

A brief chronicle of the Sforza [1369–1458]: printed by D.—Arch. stor. Napol. xix. 4.

The first years of Ferdinand of Aragon and the invasion of John of Anjou: by E. Nunziante. XI: [1459–1460].—Arch. stor. Napol. xix. 4.

A Florentine gazetteer at the Milanese court [the correspondence of Benedetto Dei, 1471–1492, with R. San Severino, Jacopo Antiquario, and others; with a specimen of his gazette]: by L. Frati.—Arch. stor. Lomb. ser. iii. 3. *March.*

Notices concerning Neapolitan writers and artists of the Aragonese period: by E. Pèrcopo. V: Giuniano Majo, Giuliano Perleoni, Galvano da Padova.—Arch. stor. Napol. xix. 4.

The movements of Piero Strozzi against Duke Cosimo de' Medici [1544]: by L. Staffetti.—Arch. stor. Ital. 5th ser. xv. 1.

Seditious manifestoes, &c., in Sicily in 1647: by F. Lionti.—Arch. stor. Sicil. N. S. xix. 3, 4.

The plague at Naples in 1656 [a narrative printed from a manuscript]: by A. Rubino.—Arch. stor. Napol. xix. 4.

The cavaliere Antonio Micheroux in the Neapolitan reaction of 1799: by B. Maresca. VI.—Arch. stor. Napol. xix. 4.

The university of Palermo in the nineteenth century: by L. Sampolo.—Arch. stor. Sicil. N.S. xix. 3, 4.

Obituary notices of Giovanni Battista de Rossi [†20 Sept. 1894]: by A. Pératé.—Rev. hist. lvii. 2. *March*; by J. Guiraud.—Vol. lviii. 1. *May*; and by E. G. Ledos.—Rev. Quest. hist. lvii. 2. *April.*

The Netherlands and Belgium

The materials for the medieval history of Flanders: by H. Pirenne [treating of the lives of saints, miracles, chronicles, and annals].—Ann. Cercle hist. Gand, i. 1.

Lambert le Bègue of Liège [illustrated from the Hunterian MS. Q. 9. 182 at Glasgow]: by P. Fredericq.—Bull. Acad. roy. Belg. 3rd ser. xxix. 1.

Summary of the form of government of the United Provinces drawn up in 1647: printed by A. Waddington.—Bijdr. en Mededeel. hist. Genootsch. Utrecht, xv.

French refugees at Groningen [from 1686]: by H. D. Guyot.—Bull. Comm. Hist. Églises Wallonnes, vi. 3.

Jean, baron de Béarn, d'Abère, et d'Usseau [a refugee officer in Holland, †1739]: by A. J. Enschedé.—Bull. Comm. Hist. Église Wallonnes, vi. 3.

Journal of Abraham Drolenvaux, Walloon deacon at Leyden [1689]: printed from the original at Göttingen.—Bull. Comm. Hist. Églises Wallonnes, vi. 3.

Letters of Coert Lambertus van Beijma to Joan Derk van der Capellen [1782–1784]: printed by W. W. van der Meulen.—Bijdr. en Mededeel. hist. Genootsch. Utrecht, xv.

Public opinion in Belgium during the French domination [1795–1814]: by P. Poullet [from the police reports].—Messager Sciences hist. Gand, lxvii. 4.

Journal of the raad-pensionaris Laurens Pieter van de Spiegel [during his detention by the revolutionary authorities, 29 January 1795–20 December 1798]: printed by L. Wichers.—Bijdr. en Mededeel. hist. Genootsch. Utrecht, xv.

Russia

Law proceedings according to the Russkaia Pravda [the old Russian legal code of the twelfth century]: by N. Rozhkov.—Zhur. Min. Narod. Prosv. *April.*

On the secularisation of the estates belonging to the monasteries in Russia in the sixteenth century: by S. Rozhdestvenski.—Zhur. Min. Narod. Prosv. *May.*

The polovniki [a species of métayers] *in the northern districts of Russia in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries*: by M. Drakonov.—Zhur. Min. Narod. Prosv. *May.*

An unpublished contemporary account of the murder of the false Demetrius [from the Lemberg archives]: by I. Linnichenko [the eye-witness was a certain Stanislaus Kolaczkowicz, an apothecary of Lemberg].—Istorich. Viestnik. *May.*

The Huguenot refugees in Russia: by H. Tollin [who prints a letter of 1728].—Bull. Soc. Hist. Protest. franç. xliv. 4. *April.*

Prince Paskevitch, the conqueror of Warsaw: by V. K. P.—Istorich. Viestnik. *April.*

Memoirs of M. Olshevski [a description of affairs in the Caucasus from 1841 to 1866]. Russk. Starina. *March, April.*

Recollections of the Polish insurrection of 1863: by N. Liubarski.—Istorich. Viestnik. *March, April, May.*

Some more anecdotes of Skobelev and Todleben: by prince D. Obolenski.—Istorich. Viestnik. *March.*

A Lithuanian legend about the foundation of the city of Vilno [taken down from oral tradition in 1870]: by N. Samoilo.—Russk. Starina. *April.*

Spain

Santa Maria la Real de Nájera: by F. Fita [printing the text of the charter of foundation, 1052, from a copy made for Don Garcia's widow in 1054, with a translation by Sandoval; and giving a history of the foundation].—Boletin R. Acad. Hist. xxvi. 3.

Eleven charters of the same church [1052–1152]: printed by F. Fita.—Boletin R. Acad. Hist. xxvi. 4.

The council of Lerida [1193]: by F. Fita [with documents relating to the donation of Santa María la Real de Nájera to Cluny, and the subsequent litigation from 1155 to 1227, and bulls hitherto unpublished of Celestine III, Innocent III, and Honorius III].—Boletin R. Acad. Hist. xxvi. 5.

The first minute book of the municipality of Palencia [of high interest, as relating to the earliest representation of the town in the Cortes, and the organisation of the municipal administration and its finances, 1421–3]: by F. Simón y Nieto.—Boletin R. Acad. Hist. xxvi. 3.

The trophies of D. Alvaro de Bazán: by C. P. Pastor [the marquis of St. Cruz included his trophies in the entail of his estates. Among them are presentations of spoil, especially ships' lanterns, resulting from his victories at Tercera, Lisbon, Sapienza, Lepanto, and the war in Granada].—Boletin R. Acad. Hist. xxvi. 5.

America and Colonies

The colonial empire of the Portuguese down to the death of Albuquerque: by C. R. Beazley.—Trans. R. Hist. Soc. N.S. viii.

Recent literature on Christopher Columbus: by K. Haebler.—Hist. Zft. lxxiv. 2.

The expedition of Sebastian Cabot to the Plate river: by C. Errera.—Arch. stor. Ital. 5th series, xv. 1.

The early relations between Maryland and Virginia [1629–1657]: by J. H. Latané [on the disputes caused by the question whether Kent island belonged to Virginia or Maryland, and by the treatment of the puritans in Virginia].—Johns Hopkins Univ. Stud. in polit. and hist. Sc. xiii. 3, 4.

The French influence in Madagascar from 1643 *to the present day*: by the commandant d'Equilly.—Rev. Quest. hist. lvii. 2. *April.*

The government of the colony of South Carolina from its foundation to 1775: by E. L. Whitney [dealing with the constitutional history of the colony in its relations to the mother country and the proprietary; the powers of governor, council, and assembly; the land system, local government, judiciary, and taxation. It is preceded by a detailed study of the sources of South Carolina history].—Johns Hopkins Univ. Stud. in polit. and hist. Sc. xiii. 1, 2

Memoirs of governor van de Graaff on the occurrences at the Cape of Good Hope from 1780 *to* 1806: printed by H. C. Vos Leibrandt & J. E. Heeres, with two maps.—Bijdr. en Mededeel. hist. Genootsch. Utrecht, xv.

The colony of the Isle of France in 1790: by A. Brette.—Révol. Franç. xiv. 12. *June.*

The rise and development of the bicameral system in America: by T. F Moran [tracing its origin and history in each particular colony from its beginnings in Massachusetts to its adoption in the federal constitution. The causes which led to the separation of the legislature into two branches were different in the different colonies, but the evolution of the system was greatly influenced by the English model].—Johns Hopkins Univ. Stud. in polit. and hist. Sc. xiii. 5.

List of Recent Historical Publications

I. GENERAL HISTORY

(Including works of miscellaneou contents)

Buys (J. T.) Studiën over staatkunde en staatsrecht. II, 2. Pp. 161–320. Arnhem.

Contuzzi. Trattato di diritto internazionale. Pp. 820. Turin.

Defoe (Daniel). Of royall educacion: a fragmentary treatise. Edited for the first time with notes by K. D. Bülbring. Pp. 72. London: Nutt.

Del Mar (A.) History of monetary standards. Pp. xxxix, 511. London: Effingham Wilson. 15/.

Geblesco (C. R.) Etude d'économie politique critique: La propriété rurale à Rome, en France, et en Roumanie. Paris: Pedone. 8 f.

Gimbel (K.) Tafeln zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der Schutz- und Trutzwaffen in Europa mit Ausschluss der Feuerwaffen vom achten bis zum siebzehnten Jahrhundert. Pp. 15. Baden-Baden: Spiess. 4to, with atlas of plates folio. 30 m.

Huet (G.) Catalogue des manuscrits allemands de la Bibliothèque nationale. Paris: Bouillon. 5 f.

James (M. R.) A descriptive catalogue of the manuscripts in the library of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge. Pp. 132. Cambridge: University Press. 5/.

Kautsky (K.) Die Vorläufer des neueren Sozialismus. I, 1: Von Plato bis zu den Wiedertäufern. Pp. 436. Stuttgart: Dietz. 3 m.

Lambros (S. P.) Catalogue of the Greek manuscripts on Mount Athos. I. Cambridge: University Press. 4to. 21/.

Menzies (A.) History of religion: a sketch of primitive religious beliefs and practices, and of the origin and character of the great systems. Pp. 426. London: Murray. 5/.

Paine (Thomas), The writings of. Ed. by M. D. Conway. III: 1791–1804. Pp. 436. London: Putnam. 12/6.

Peiffer (E.) Recherches sur l'origine et la signification des noms de lieux (France, Corse, Algérie). Paris: Lechevalier. 5 f.

Pohler (J.) Bibliotheca historico-militaris: systematische Übersicht der Erscheinungen aller Sprachen auf dem Gebiete der Geschichte der Kriege und Kriegswissenschaft seit Erfindung der Buchdruckerkunst bis zum Schluss des Jahres 1880. III, 5. Pp. 565–773. Cassel: Kessler. 4 m.

Schvarcz (J.) Elemente der Politik: Versuch einer Staatslehre auf Grund der vergleichenden Staatsrechtswissenschaft und Kulturgeschichte. Pp. 149. Berlin: Rosenbaum & Hart. 4 m.

Seeley (sir J. R.) Lectures and essays. Pp. 348. London: Macmillan. 5/.

Wachsmuth (C.) Einleitung in das Studium der alten Geschichte. Pp. 717. Leipzig: Hirzel. 16 m.

II. ORIENTAL HISTORY

Aegyptische und vorderasiatische Alterthümer, aus den königlichen Museen zu Berlin. Pp. 31, 87 plates. Berlin: Mertens. 150 m.

Bäck (S.) Die jüdischen Prediger, Sittenlehrer, und Apologeten in dem Zeitraum vom dreizehnten bis Ende des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts. Pp. 184. Trier: Mayer. 3·25 m.

Clermont-Ganneau (C.) Etudes d'archéologie orientale. I, 2. Pp. 85–148, ill. Paris: Bouillon. 4to. 4 f.

Dümichen (J.) Zur Geographie des alten Ägypten. Pp. 80, ill. Leipzig: Hinrichs. 4to. 22·50 m.

Griffis (W. E.) The religions of Japan, from the dawn of history to the era of Méiji. Pp. 476. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 7/6.

Holden (E. S.) The Mogul emperors of Hindostan. New York.

Innes (lieut.-general McL.) Lucknow and Oude in the mutiny. Pp. 340, maps, &c. London: Innes. 12/.

Kittel (R.) A history of the Hebrews. I: Sources of information and history of the period up to the death of Joshua. Tr. by J. Taylor. Pp. 308. London: Williams & Norgate. 10/6.

Maqrizi. Description topographique et historique de l'Egypte. Tr. par U. Bouriant. I. Paris: Leroux. 4to. 20f.

MOHAMMED en-Nesawi. Histoire du sultan Djélal ed-din Mankobirti, prince du Kharezm. Tr. par O. Houdas. Paris: Leroux. 15 f.

MONASCH (M.) Geschiedenis van het volk Israël. Pp. 351. Amsterdam.

NOER (Graf F. A. von). Kaiser Akbar: ein Versuch über die Geschichte Indiens im sechzehnten Jahrhundert. 2 vol. Pp. 516, 600, portr. Kiel: Haeseler. 15 m.

PHILO. About the contemplative life, edited by F. C. Conybeare. Pp. 403. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 14/.

RENDU (A.) The Jewish race in ancient and Roman history. Tr. by Theresa Crook. Pp. 439. London: Burns & Oates.

TUNIS, Correspondance des Beys de, et des consuls de France avec la cour [1577–1830]. II: 1700–1770. Paris.

WINCKLER (H.) Sammlung von Keilschrifttexten. III, 2. Pp. 41–80. Leipzig: Pfeiffer. 4to. 6 m.

III. GREEK AND ROMAN

GARDNER (Alice). Julian, philosopher and emperor, and the last struggle of paganism against Christianity. Pp. 364, ill. London: Putnam. 5/.

GILBERT (G.) The constitutional antiquities of Sparta and Athens. Tr. by E. J. Brooks & T. Nicklin. Pp. 512. London: Sonnenschein. 10/6.

LEVY (L.) & LUCKENBACH (H.) Das Forum Romanum der Kaiserzeit. Pp. 21, ill. Munich: Oldenbourg. 4to. 1 m.

INSCRIPTIONES Graecae insularum maris Aegaei. I. Pp. 241. Berlin: Reimer. Fol. 30 m.

MOMMSEN (T.) The history of Rome. Tr. by W. P. Dickson. New ed., revised throughout. III–V. London: Bentley. Each 7/6.

ÖSTBYE (P.) Die Zahl der Bürger von Athen im fünften Jahrhundert. Pp. 32. Christiania: Dybwad. (1 m.)

PETIT-DUTAILLIS (C.) De Lacedaemoniorum reipublicae supremis temporibus [222–146 a.C.] Pp. 102. Paris: impr. Noizette.

PROCOPIUS.—La guerra gotica di Procopio di Cesarea. Testo Greco emendato sui manoscritti con traduzione italiana, a cura di D. Comparetti. I. (Fonti per la storia d' Italia. Scrittori. Secolo VI.) Pp. xxxv, 215. Rome: Sede dell' Instituto storico Italiano.

IV. ECCLESIASTICAL AND MEDIEVAL HISTORY

ACTA martyrum et sanctorum (Syriace) edidit P. Bedjan. V. Pp. 705. Paris. (Leipzig: Harrassowitz. 24 m.)

AUGUSTINI (S. Aurelii) Hipponiensis episcopi epistulae. Rec. A. Goldacher. (Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. XXXIV.) I. Pp. 125. Vienna: Tempsky. 3·60 m.

BRANCACCIO DI CARPINO (F.) Nuova cronologia dei papi. Rome.

CONSTANTIENSIUM, Regesta episcoporum. I: 517–1293. Bearb. von P. Ladewig & T. Müller. V. Pp. 321–399. Innsbruck: Wagner. 4to. 4 m.

EGLI (E.) Die christlichen Inschriften der Schweiz vom vierten bis zum neunten Jahrhundert, gesammelt von. (Mittheilungen der antiquarischen Gesellschaft in Zürich. XXIV, 1.) Pp. 64, ill. Zürich: Fäsi & Beer. (4 m.)

GATRIO (A.) Die Abtei Murbach in Elsass, nach Quellen bearbeitet. 2 vol. Pp. 595, 752, ill. Strassburg: Le Roux. 15 m.

GEBHARDT (O. von) & HARNACK (A.) Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur. XII, 4: Urkunden aus dem antimontanistischen Kampfe des Abendlandes. Pp. 167, 28. Leipzig: Hinrichs. 6·50 m.

HARIULF. Chronique de l'abbaye de Saint-Riquier (Ve siècle–1104). Publ. par F. Lot. Pp. lxxiii, 362. Paris: Picard. 10 f.

HEFELE (C. J.) A history of the councils of the church from the original documents. IV: 451–680. Tr. by W. R. Clark. Pp. 500. Edinburgh: Clark. 12/.

MALNORY (A.) Saint Césaire, évêque d'Arles [503–543]. Pp. 318. Paris: Bouillon. 10 f.

MARIE DE FRANCE. L'espurgatoire seint Patriz. Publ. by T. A. Jenkins. Philadelphia, U.S.A.: Ferris.

MAR JABALAHA III, patriarche des Nestoriens [1281–1317], Histoire de, et du moine Rablan Cauma, ambassadeur du roi Argoun en Occident [1287]. Tr. par J. B. Chabot. Pp. 286, ill. Paris: Leroux. 10 f.

MULLER. Das Magnum Chronicon Belgicum und die in demselben enthaltenen Quellen: ein Beitrag zur Historiographie des fünfzehnten Jahrhunderts. Pp. 48. Berlin: Mayer. 2 f.

OLAF TRYGGWASON, The saga of. Transl. by J. Sephton. Pp. 500. London: Nutt. 4to. 18/.

RAABE (R.) Petrus der Iberer: ein Charakterbild zur Kirchen- und Sittengeschichte des fünften Jahrhunderts. Pp. 132, 146. Leipzig: Hinrichs. 15 m.

RÉVILLE (J.) Les origines de l'épiscopat: étude sur la formation du gouvernement ecclésiastique au sein de l'Eglise chrétienne dans l'empire romain. I. Pp. 538. Paris: Leroux. 7·50 f.

ROCQUAIN (F.) La cour de Rome et l'esprit de la réforme avant Luther.

II: Les abus; décadence de la papauté. Pp. 578. Paris: Thorin. 12 f.

SOMMERVOGEL (C.) Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus. VI: *Otazo–Rodriguez*. Pp. 991. Brussels: Schepens. 4to. 30 f.

VACANDARD (E.) Vie de saint Bernard, abbé de Clairvaux. 2 vol. Paris.

V. HISTORY OF MODERN EUROPE

BOUTRY (vicomte M.) Choiseul à Rome [1754–1757]: lettres et mémoires inédits, publiés par. Pp. 337. Paris: C. Lévy. 7·50 f.

BROGLIE (duc de). L'alliance autrichienne. Paris: C. Lévy. 7·50 f.

CARDINAL VON WIDDERN (G.) Deutsch-französischer Krieg 1870–1871. III, 1. Pp. 287, ill. Berlin: Eisenschmidt. 6 m.

EDÉN (N.) Die schwedisch-norwegische Union und der Kieler Friede. Pp. 156. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. 3·60 m.

GÉROME. Essai historique sur la tactique de l'infanterie depuis l'organisation des armées permanentes jusqu'à nos jours. Pp. 272, ill. Paris.

GRANVELLE (cardinal de). Correspondance, publiée par C. Piot. XI. Pp. lxxii, 770. Brussels: Hayez. 4to. 12 f.

GROOT (Pierre de), ambassadeur des Provinces-Unies. Lettres à Abraham de Wicquefort, résident des ducs de Brunswick [1668–1674]. Publiées par F. J. L. Krämer. (Werken uitgegeven door het Historisch Genootschap gevestigd te Utrecht. 3de ser. V.) Pp. xxvii, 429. The Hague: Nijhoff.

H[ARDEGG] (J. von) & TROSCHKE (T., Freiherr von). Anleitung zum Studium der Kriegsgeschichte. II: Beispiele aus dem deutsch-französischen Kriege von 1870–1871 und dem russisch-türkischen Kriege von 1877–1878, bearb. von K. Endres. 2. Pp. 155–250, map. Darmstadt: Zernin. 3·20 m.

INNES (A. D.) Britain and her rivals in the eighteenth century [1713–1789]. Pp. 419, maps. London: Innes. 7/6.

KUHLMANN (B.) Der heilige Bonifatius, Apostel der Deutschen. Pp. 504. Paderborn: Bonifacius-Druckerei. 3·60 m.

LA FERRIÈRE (H. de). Les deux cours de France et d'Angleterre: une duchesse d'Uzès du seizième siècle; la chasse à courre au seizième siècle; Marie Stuart; la cour et les favoris de Jacques Ier. Ollendorff. 7·50 f.

LANZAC DE LABORIE (L. de). La domination française en Belgique: Directoire, consulat, empire [1795–1814]. 2 vol. Pp. 465, 409. Paris: Plon. 16 f.

LAVISSE (E.) & RAMBAUD (A.) Histoire générale du quatrième siècle à nos jours. V: Les guerres de religion [1559–1648]. Paris.

MAGNIENVILLE (R. de). Claude de France, duchesse de Lorraine [1547–1575]. Pp. 236, ill. Lille: Taffin-Lefort. 2·50 f.

ROUSSET (commandant). La seconde campagne de France: histoire générale de la guerre franco-allemande [1870–1871]; l'armée impériale. I, II. Paris: Librairie illustrée. 15 f.

SÉGUR (général comte de). Mémoires. II: La campagne de Russie. Pp. 435. Paris: Firmin-Didot. 18mo. 3·50 f.

SPAIN.—Correspondencia de los príncipes de Alemania con Felipe II y de los embajadores de éste en la corte de Viena [1556–1598]. IV: Desde 12 de Enero de 1570 á 23 de Agosto de 1572. (Colección de documentos inéditos para la historia de España. CX.) Pp. 512. Madrid: Perales y Martinez. 4to.

STOERK (F.) Nouveau recueil général de traités et autres actes relatifs aux rapports de droit international. Continuation du grand recueil de G. F. de Martens. 2e série. XIX, 3. Pp. 761–1027. Göttingen: Dieterich. 11 m.

A. FRANCE

ALIS (R. L.) Histoire de la ville d'Aiguillon et de ses environs depuis l'époque gallo-romaine jusqu'à nos jours. Pp. 568, ill. Agen: Ferran. 7.50 f.

AMIENS, Documents pour servir à l'histoire de la révolution française dans la ville d'. II: Registres aux délibérations de l'administration municipale [1789]. Pp. 580. Paris: Picard. 8 f.

BABEAU (A.) Le Louvre et son histoire. Pp. 355, ill. Paris: Firmin-Didot. 4to. 8 f.

BARANTE (baron de), Souvenirs du, [1782–1866]; publiés par C. de Barante. V. Pp. 379. Paris: C. Lévy. 7·50 f.

BARRAS, membre du directoire. Mémoires; publiés avec introduction par G. Duruy. I: Ancien régime; révolution. II: Le directoire jusqu'au 18 fructidor. 2 vol. Paris: Hachette. 15 f.

BERGER (É.) Histoire de Blanche de Castille, reine de France. (Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome. LXX.) Pp. 428. Paris: Thorin. 12 f.

BÉZIERS (M.) Mémoires pour servir à l'état historique et géographique du diocèse de Bayeux; publiés par G. Le Hardy. III: Archidiaconés d'Hyesmes et de Caen. Pp. 575. Rouen: Lestringant. 12 f.

BREUILS (A.) La campagne de Charles

VII en Gascogne; une conspiration du dauphin en 1446, d'après des documents inédits. Pp. 36. Besançon: imp. Jacquin.

Buteau (H.) L'ordre des avocats, ses rapports avec la magistrature: histoire, législation, jurisprudence. Paris: Larose. 6 f.

Castellane (maréchal de). Journal. [1804-1862]. I: 1804-1823. Pp. 485, portr. Paris: Plon. 7·50 f.

Clerval (A.) Les écoles de Chartres au moyen âge. Pp. 572. Paris.

Coville (A.) Les états de Normandie; leurs origines et leur développement au quatorzième siècle. Pp. 423. Paris: impr. Nationale. 7·50 f.

Cruppi (J.) Un avocat journaliste au dix-huitième siècle; Linguet. Pp. 398. Paris: Hachette. 3·50 f.

Delaborde (H. F.) Jean de Joinville et les seigneurs de Joinville. Pp. 538. Paris: impr. Nationale. 10 f.

Ferry (Jules). Discours et opinions; publiés par P. Robiquet. III. Paris: Colin. 10 f.

Funck-Brentano (F.) Catalogue des manuscrits de la bibliothèque de l'Arsenal. IX, 3: Table générale des archives de la Bastille (*L–Z*). Pp. 641–983. Paris: Plon. 6 f.

Grandmaison (G. de). Napoléon et les cardinaux noirs [1810–1814]. Paris: Perrin. 12mo. 3·50 f.

Gibbs (M. B.) Military career of Napoleon the Great. Chicago.

Glasson (É.) Histoire du droit et des institutions de la France. VI: La féodalité (*suite*); les finances et la justice du roi. Paris: Pichon. Pp. xxxi, 708. 10 f.

Guibert (L.) Nouveau recueil de registres domestiques limousins et marchois. I. Paris: Picard. 7 f.

Holst (H. E. von). The French revolution tested by Mirabeau's career. 2 vol. Pp. 258, 264. Chicago: Callaghan. (London: Paul.)

Labande (L. H.) Inventaire sommaire des archives hospitalières de la ville de Verdun antérieures à 1790. Pp. xcviii, 302. Verdun: Laurent. 10 f.

La Borderie (A. de). La Bretagne aux temps modernes [1491–1789]. Pp. 288. Rennes: Plihon & Hervé. 16mo. 4 f.

Lacordaire (H.) Lettres nouvelles, publiées par madame V. Ladey & P. de Vyré. Pp. 315. Paris: Delhomme & Briguet. 6 f.

Lacroix (A.) Inventaire sommaire des archives hospitalières de la ville de Romans antérieures à 1790. Pp. 142. Valence: impr. Céas. 4to.

La Rocheterie (M. de) et Beaucourt (marquis de). Lettres de Marie-Antoinette: recueil des lettres authentiques de la reine. I. Pp. cxxvi, 248. Paris: Picard. 10 f.

Le Paulmier (Julien), docteur-régent de la faculté de médecine de Paris, médecin du roi Henri III et de François, duc d'Anjou. Pp. 48. Nogent-le-Rotrou: Daupeley-Gouverneur.

Luce (S.) Histoire de la jacquerie, d'après des documents inédits. Nouv. éd. Pp. 368. Paris: Champion. 10 f.

Paroy (comte de). Mémoires; souvenirs d'un défenseur de la famille royale pendant la révolution [1789–1797]; publiés par E. Charavay. Ill. Paris: Plon. 7·50 f.

Petit-Dutaillis (C.) Étude sur la vie et le règne de Louis VIII [1187–1226]. Paris: Bouillon. 16 f.

Quesvers (P.) & Stein (H.) Pouillé de l'ancien diocèse de Sens, publié d'après des manuscrits et des documents inédits. Paris: Picard. 4to. 20 f.

Reuss (R.) L'Alsace pendant la révolution française. II: Correspondance de François Étienne Schwendt [1790–1793]. Paris: Fischbacher. 8 f.

Saurel (F.) Histoire religieuse du département de l'Hérault pendant la révolution. II. Pp. 346. Paris: Champion. 5 f.

Stephens (W. W.) The life and writings of Turgot, comptroller-general of France [1774–1776]. Pp. 331. London: Longmans. 12/6.

Thiébault (général baron). Mémoires publiés d'après le manuscrit original par F. Calmettes. IV: 1806–1813. Pp. 598, portr. Paris: Plon. 7·50 f.

Weil (G. D.) Les élections législatives depuis 1789; histoire de la législation et des mœurs. Paris: Alcan. 12mo. 3·50 f.

Wolseley (field-marshal viscount). The decline and fall of Napoleon. Pp. 203, ill. London: Low. 3/6.

B. GERMANY AND AUSTRIA-HUNGARY

Beer (A.) Die Staatsschulden und die Ordnung des Staatshaushalts unter Maria Theresia. I. Pp. 135. Leipzig: Freytag. 3 m.

Bürgel, Urkundenbuch von Stadt und Kloster. I: 1133–1454. (Thüringisch-sächsische Geschichtsbibliothek. III.) Bearbeitet von P. Mitzschke. Pp. xxxviii, 569. Gotha: Perthes. 12 m.

Hassenpflug (R.) Die erste Kammergerichtsordnung Kurbrandenburgs. Pp. 76. Breslau: Koebner. 2 m.

Hinschius (P.) Das Kirchenrecht der Katholiken und Protestanten in Deutschland. V, 2. Pp. 493–978. Berlin: Guttentag. 16 m.

Hopfen (O. H.) Kaiser Maximilian II und der Kompromisskatholizismus. Pp. 439. Munich: Rieger. 12 m.

Hübsch (G.) Das Hochstift Bamberg

und seine Politik unmittelbar vor dem ersten Einfalle der Schweden [1631]. Pp. 154. Bamberg: Buchner. 2·50 m.

JÜLICH-BERG, Landtagsakten von, [1400–1610], herausgegeben von G. von Below. (Publikationen der Gesellschaft für rheinische Geschichtskunde. XI.) I: 1400–1562. Pp. 824. Düsseldorf: Voss. 15 m.

KAUFMANN (D.) Die Erstürmung Ofens und ihre Vorgeschichte, nach dem Berichte Isak Schulhofs [1650–1732] (Megillath Ofen) herausgegeben. Pp. 62, 32. Trier: Mayer. 2·25 m.

LEHMANN (M.) Friedrich der Grosse und der Ursprung des siebenjährigen Krieges. Pp. 140. Leipzig: Hirzel.

PERLBACH (M.) Prussia scholastica: die Ost- und Westpreussen auf den mittelalterlichen Universitäten. I. Pp. 160. Leipzig: Spirgatis. 6 m.

RITTER (M.) Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Gegenreformation und des dreissigjährigen Krieges [1555–1648]. II: [1586–1618]. Pp. 482. Stuttgart: Cotta. 6 m.

SCHAUENBURG (L.) Hundert Jahre oldenburgischer Kirchengeschichte von Hamelmann bis auf Cadovius [1573–1667]: ein Beitrag zur Kirchen- und Culturgeschichte des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts. I. Pp. 487. Oldenburg: Stalling. 9 m.

SCHNEIDER (J.) Die alten Heer- und Handelswege der Germanem, Römer, und Franken im deutschen Reiche. X. Pp. 22, map. Frankfurt: Jaeger. 2 m.

SEPP (J.) Religionsgeschichte von Oberbayern in der Heidenzeit, Periode der Reformation, und Epoche der Klosteraufhebung. Pp. 309. Munich: Huttler. 5 m.

SILESIACARUM, Scriptores rerum. XV: Akten des Kriegsgerichts von 1758 wegen der Kapitulation von Breslau am 24. Nov. 1757. Herausgegeben von C. Grünhagen & F. Wachter. Pp. 168. 4to. 4 m.

STIEVE (F.) Briefe und Acten zur Geschichte des dreissigjährigen Krieges in den Zeiten des vorwiegenden Einflusses der Wittelsbacher. VI: Vom Reichstag 1608 bis zur Gründung der Liga. Pp. 780. Munich: Rieger. 20 m.

THURINGIAE, Regesta diplomatica necnon epistolaria historiae. I: [c. 500–1120]. Bearbeitet von O. Dobenecker. Pp. 240. Jena: Fischer. 4to. 15 m.

ULLRICH (P. W.) Die Anfänge der Universität Leipzig. I: Personalverzeichnis [1409–1419] aus den ältesten Matrikeln der Universität zusammengestellt. Pp. 118. Leipzig: Spirgatis. 4to. 10 m.

WENCK (K.) Eine mailändisch-thüringische Heiratsgeschichte aus der Zeit König Wenzels. Pp. 42. Dresden: Baensch.

WIELANDT (F.) Das Staatsrecht des Grossherzogthums Baden. Pp. 345. Freiburg: Mohr. 9 m.

WIEN, Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt. Red. von A. Meyer. I: Regesten aus in- und ausländischen Archiven. I. Pp. 363. Vienna: Konegen. 4to. 20 m.

ZOELLNER (A.) Chronik der Stadt Havelberg. Pp. 425, 473, ill. Havelberg: Zoellner. 8 m.

C. GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

ALLIES (Mary H.) History of the church in England [1509–1603]. Pp. 255. London: Burns & Oates. 3/6.

BAILDON (W. P.) Notes on the religious and secular houses of Yorkshire. I. (Yorkshire Archæological Society. Record series. XVII.) Pp. 252. Printed for the Society.

BIOGRAPHY, Dictionary of National. Ed. by S. Lee. XLIII: *Owens—Passelewe*. Pp. 451. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 15/.

BOYLE, (J. R.) The early history of the town and port of Hedon, in the east riding of the county of York. Pp. 227, ccl, ill. Hull: Brown. 21/.

BRASSINGTON (W. S.) Historic Worcestershire. Pp. 328, ill. Birmingham: Midland Education Company. 4to. 10/.

BUSCH (W.) England under the Tudors. I: King Henry VII. Tr. by Alice M. Todd. Pp. 445. London: Innes. 16/.

CUTTS (E. L.) Augustine of Canterbury. Pp. 206. London: Methuen. 3/6.

DENNY (E.) & LACEY (T. A.) De hierarchia Anglicana dissertatio apologetica. Pp. 265. London: Clay. 2/6.

FORBES (A.) Colin Campbell, lord Clyde. Pp. 222. London: Macmillan. 2/6.

FROUDE (J. A.) English seamen in the sixteenth century. Pp. 241. London: Longmans. 10/6.

GEORGE (H. B.) Battles of English history. Pp. 334, maps. London: Methuen. 6/.

GILLOW (J.) A literary and biographical history or bibliographical dictionary of the English catholics from 1534 to the present time. IV: *Kemeys—Metham*. Pp. 572. London: Burns & Oates. 15/.

HERVEY (John), first earl of Bristol. Letter books; with sir Thomas Hervey's letters and poems [1651–1750]. 3 vol. Portr. Wells: Jackson. 31/6.

——— Diary, with extracts from his book of expenses. Pp. 314, ill. Wells: Jackson. 4to. 10/6.

JOLLY (the rev. Thomas). Note book [1671–1693]; Extracts from the church book of Altham and Wymondhouses [1649–1725]; and an account of the

Jolly family. Ed. by H. Fishwick. (Remains historical and literary connected with the palatine counties of Lancaster and Chester. N.S., XXXIII.) Pp. xxxii, 161. Manchester: Printed for the Chetham Society. 4to.

Kitchin (G. W.) Edward Harold Browne, bishop of Winchester: a memoir. Pp. 544. London: Murray. 18/.

Mackintosh (J.) The history of civilisation in Scotland. New ed., partly rewritten. III. Pp. 476. London: Gardner. 15/.

Metcalfe (W. M.) Ancient lives of Scottish saints. Transl. into English. London: Gardner. 15/.

Ormonde (marquis of), Manuscripts of the. I. (Historical Manuscripts Commission. 14th report. Part 7.) London: H. M. Stationery Office. 1/10.

Oxford, Registers of Wadham College. II: [1719-1871]. Ed. by R. B. Gardiner. London: Bell. 21/.

Privy council of England, Acts of the. New series. X: 1577-1578. Ed. by J. R. Dasent. Pp. xxxi, 501. London: H. M. Stationery Office. 10/.

Rae (J.) Life of Adam Smith. Pp. 464. London: Macmillan. 12/6.

Roberts (field-marshal lord). The rise of Wellington. Pp. 198, ill. London: Low. 3/6.

Round (J. H.) Feudal England: historical essays on the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Pp. 587. London: Sonnenschein. 12/6.

Rutland (duke of), Manuscripts of the. III. (Historical Manuscripts Commission. 14th report. Part 1.) London: H. M. Stationery Office. 1/11.

Rye (W.) Calendar of correspondence and documents relating to the family of Oliver le Neve, of Witchingham, Norfolk [1675-1743]. Norwich: Goose. 5/.

Schwabe (Mrs. Salis.) Reminiscences of Richard Cobden. Pp. 346. London: Unwin. 16/.

Scott (Mrs. M.) The tragedy of Fotheringay, founded on the journal of D. Bourgoing, physician to Mary, queen of Scots, and on unpublished manuscript documents. Pp. 271, ill. Edinburgh: Black. 4to. 12/6.

Seebohm (F.) The tribal system in Wales, being part of an inquiry into the structure and methods of tribal society. Pp. 238, 111. London: Longmans. 12/.

State papers, Calendar of. Domestic series, 1670; with addenda [1660-1670]. Ed. by M. A. Everett Green. Pp. 867. London: H. M. Stationery Office. 15/.

State trials, Reports of. New series. VI: 1842-1848. Ed. by J. E. P. Wallis. London: H. M. Stationery Office. 10/.

Stephens (W. R. W.) The life and letters of Edward A. Freeman. 2 vol. Pp. 435, 499, portr. London: Macmillan. 17/.

Traill (H. D.) Social England, ed. by. III: Henry VIII–Elizabeth. Pp. 591. London: Cassell. 15/.

D. ITALY

Borromeo (C.) Origine e libertà dei comuni (Borgoglio, Gaucondio, Marengo), che fondarono Alessandria, e origine e libertà di Alessandria. Pp. 179, 113. Alessandria: Jacquemoa. 3·50 l.

Butler (A. J.) Dante, his times and his work. Pp. 201. London: Innes. 3/6.

Cerena (E.) L' archivio comunale di Messina, il suo riordinamento e la sua tenuta. Pp. 112. Messina: tip. Filomena.

Cipolla (C.) Per la storia d' Italia e de' suoi conquistatori nel medio evo più antico. Pp. 691, ill. Bologna. 16mo.

Hodgkin (T.) Italy and her invaders. V: The Lombard invasion [553-600]. VI: The Lombard conquest [600-744]. Pp. 484, 635, maps and illustr. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 36/.

Maggiulli (P.) I difensori di Otranto nel 1480. Pp. 32. Maglie: Orzono de Vitis.

Manno (A.) Il patriziato subalpino. I Pp. 411. Florence: Civelli. 4to.

Mariotti (F.) Fano e la repubblica francese del secolo XVIII: curiosità storiche [1796-1799]. Pp. 78, 65, 56, 70. Fano: tip. Cooperativa. 16mo.

Medin (A.) & Frati (L.) Lamenti storici dei secoli XIV, XV, XVI, raccolti e ordinati. IV. Pp. xxxi, 228. Verona: Drucker. 16mo. 5 l.

Pinton (P.) Codice diplomatico saccense: raccolta di statuti, catasti, diplomi ed altri atti e regesti di Piove di Sacco. Pp. 324, ill. Rome: tip. G. Balbi. 4to. 25 l.

Stevenson (E.) Statuti delle arti dei merciai della lana di Roma. Pp. 264. Rome: tip. de propaganda fide. 4to.

Trevisani (C.) Storia di Roma nel medio evo. Turin: Roux. 16mo. 3 l.

E. OTHER COUNTRIES

Argau, Die Rechtsquellen des Kantons. I: Die Rechtsquellen der Stadt Arau. I: 1283-1426. Von W. Merz. Pp. 245, ill. Aarau: Sauerländer.

Granlund (V.) Handlingar rörande Sveriges historia. Med understöd af statsmedel i tryck utgifna af Kongl. Riksarchivet. I serien: Konung Gustaf den förstes registratur. XIV: [1542]. Pp. 434, 45. Stockholm: Norstedt. 8·75 f.

Heus (A.) Histoire populaire de l'into-

lérance, de l'inquisition, et de la liberté en Belgique. Pp. 403. Paris.

JOURDAIN (A.), STALLE (L. VAN), & DE HEUSCH (E.) Dictionnaire encyclopédique de géographie historique du royaume de Belgique. I–VI. Pp. 288. Brussels : Bruylant. 9 f.

NIELSEN (O.) Harsyssels Diplomatarium: en Samling af hidtil utrykte Diplomer fra Tiden for Reformationen. Pp. 124. Copenhagen : Gad.

PEMBER (A.) Ivan the Terrible : his life and times. Pp. 262. London : Marsden. 3/6.

PLATTNER (W.) Die Entstehung des Freistaates der drei Bünde und sein Verhältnis zur alten Eidgenossenschaft. Pp. 327. Davos : Richter.

RAMPS (C.) Recherches bibliographiques concernant l'ancien pays de Liège ou additions à la Bibliographie liégeoise, du chevalier de Theux de Montjardin. I. Pp. 252. Liège : Lambotte. 4 f.

SCANDINAVIA.—Historika handlingar till trycket befordrade af Kongl. Samfundet för utgifvande af handskrifter rörande Skandinaviens historia. XIV. Pp. 404, Stockholm : Samson & Wallin.

SCHMIDT (O.) Rechtsgeschichte Liv-, Est-, und Curlands. Herausgegeben von E. von Nottbeck. Pp. 331. Jurjew : Karow. (5 m.)

SCHÖNHERR (G.) Corvin János [1473–1504]. Pp. 332. Budapest : Rath. 10 m.

SCHWARTZ Y LANA (F.) & CARRERAS Y CANELI (F.) Colecció de documents historichs inedits del Auxin municipal de la ciutad de Barcelona : manual de Novells Ardits, vulgarment apellat, Dietari del Antich Consell Barceloni. III. Pp. 488. Barcelona : Henrich. 4to.

SPAIN.—Colección de documentos inéditos para la historia de España. CXI. Pp. 520. Madrid : Murillo. 4to.

STAEHELIN (R.) Huldreich Zwingli. Sein Leben und Wirken, nach den Quellen dargestellt. II. Pp. 257–535. Basel : Schwabe. 4.80 m.

VALAIS, Documents relatifs à l'histoire du. VII : [1402–1431]. Par J. Gremaud. II. (Mémoires et documents publiés par la Société d'histoire de la Suisse romande. XXXVIII.) Pp. 647. Lausanne : Bridel. 8 f.

VI. AMERICAN AND COLONIAL HISTORY

BETTS (C. W.) American colonial history illustrated by contemporary medals. Pp. 332. New York : Scott Stamp & Coin Co.

BRYCE (J.) American commonwealth. 3rd ed. Revised, with additional chapters. 2 vol. II. Pp. 902. London : Macmillan. 12/6.

CAPPA (R.) Estudios críticos acerca de la dominación española en América. XI, 3 : Industria naval. Pp. 242. Madrid : Murillo.

CARVAJAL (G. de). Descubrimiento del río de las Amazonas. Pp. ccxxxix, 279. Seville : Rasco. 4to.

FASTENRATH (J.) Christoph Columbus : Studien zur spanischen vierten Centenarfeier der Entdeckung Americas. Pp. 636. Dresden : Reissner. 8 m.

KING (Rufus), The life and correspondence of ; letters, private and official, public documents, and speeches. I : [1755–1794]. Pp. 624. New York : Putnam.

KLERK DE REUS (G. C.) Geschichtlicher Ueberblick der administrativen, rechtlichen, und finanziellen Entwicklung der Niederländisch-Ostindischen Compagnie. Pp. 46, 323 ; plates. The Hague : Nijhoff.

MORRIS (E. E.) A memoir of George Higinbotham, chief justice of Victoria. Pp. 328. London : Macmillan. 9/.

ROUTIER (G.) L'histoire du Mexique : renseignements économiques et messages présidentiels. Pp. xlix, 198. Paris : Le Soudier. 12mo. 3·50 f.

SCHARF (J. T.) History of the confederate states navy. Pp. 824. Albany : McDonough.

THEAL (G. McC.) Primer of South African history, from the archives of Great Britain, the Netherlands, and the Cape Colony. 3rd ed., brought down to the year 1895. Pp. 139. London : Unwin. 1/6.

TOWER (C.) The marquis de La Fayette in the American revolution. 2 vol. Pp. 494, 537 ; map. Philadelphia : Lippincott. (42/.)

WHITNEY (J. D.) The United States. I. Pp. 324. Boston.

WILMOT (hon. A.) The story of the expansion of Southern Africa. Pp. 290. London : Unwin. 5/.

WIRGMANN (A. T.) The history of the English church and people in South Africa. Pp. 280. London : Longmans. 3/6.

Erratum.

Vol. x, page 340, line 43 : *for* Malabar *read* Malabari.

The English Historical Review

NO. XL.—OCTOBER 1895

The Office of Constable

THE officer who in later times has been generally known as petty constable or parish constable may be viewed in two lights. In the first place he may be regarded as the officer of a manor or a township, locally appointed for a special purpose, as the hay-ward, the ale-taster, or the beadle might be. In this capacity no special importance is attached to him by the investigators of early English village communities. Neither in Mr. Seebohm's 'English Village Community' nor in Professor Vinogradoff's 'Villainage in England' is the constable so much as mentioned, and in other writings of the same class few references to the office occur. In the 'Records of the Norwich Leets,' published by the Selden Society (p. 18), one Simon de Melton is said to have been amerced in 1287 for having refused to take oath of office as *sub-constabularius,* after having been chosen *per omnes juratores*; and at p. 1 of the same volume a *constabularius* is also mentioned, and a certain offender described as having been arrested and imprisoned at his suit. But here and elsewhere the references to the constable in connexion with early village history are quite incidental, and throw but little light on his status as an officer of law. In legal writings, on the other hand, the duties and privileges of the office have been considered worthy of much discussion and a considerable display of learning. In books like those of Serjeant Hawkins or Sir Matthew Hale on the history of the Pleas of the Crown the constable as an executive officer takes a very prominent place next to the sheriff and the justices of the peace. Blackstone, again, looks at him from a somewhat different point of view. High constables, he says (i. 356), were first appointed by the Statute of Winchester (13 Ed. I, stat. 2), and at some unknown period in the reign of Edward III petty constables were appointed to assist them.

In the office of parish constable are united, he continues, the ancient office of head-borough, or tithing man, and the office of constable, created by royal authority. This account is historically inaccurate, as we shall see that the office of constable, as it was known to the law in Blackstone's time, was not created either by the Statute of Winchester or by any other ordinance of parliament; and there is good reason to think that Blackstone's parish constable did not merely combine in his person two separate offices, but rather represented an office of remote antiquity, on which had been impressed in comparatively modern times a character that it could only have gained at a period when local custom was being superseded by the law of parliament and the royal courts. In other words, it is a reasonable hypothesis that parliament has merely recognised a pre-existing institution, and employed it for its own purposes. It is probable that a complete history of the parish constable would be a history of the gradual decay of local self-government in the rural districts. For such a history it is unlikely that any sufficient materials exist; at all events it could not be attempted without an intimate acquaintance with the manorial court rolls and other local records, of which a very large number still await examination and publication. At least those that have been published throw, as I have said, but little light on the functions and position of the constable. If, however, we turn to such readily accessible sources of information as the 'Statutes at Large,' we find indications of a very different view of the office from that presented by legal authors or that which would naturally be derived from the writings of those who have made the early organisation of our villages their special study. It must be remembered that the early acts of parliament embody the ideas of crown lawyers and officers of a semi-foreign court, who were not likely to be very familiar with the workings of our native local institutions, except in so far as they might come in contact with the central authority or form part of a system common in great measure to all Europe. If such a proposition regarding the authors of the English statute book of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries is not one that meets with universal assent, I think an examination of the history of the title of constable will furnish some good evidence that it is at any rate founded on strong probability.

In the first place it may be noted that the term is one of very wide application. The *comes stabuli* was originally a high official of the Frankish court. This dignity survived for long in France. There is to this day an hereditary constable of Scotland, though the office has ceased to exist in England except for special occasions such as coronations, and there have been constables of other European countries. Then the title was applied to military commanders of a lower rank. A French author of the thirteenth

century, quoted by Littré, speaks of constables of thousands and constables of hundreds. Instances occur in English from the thirteenth to the fifteenth century of the use of the word to denote any chief officer of an army or of a household, or even a merely subordinate military officer.[1] But the most characteristic use of the word in England cannot be paralleled in any foreign country. By us it has been comparatively seldom used, as it was used abroad, in the sense of a military commander, a governor of men, the head of an organised force, such as an army in the field; it has, on the contrary, been almost universally used to denote an officer of a peculiarly local character; it connotes, in fact, a local rather than a personal jurisdiction, and it is associated with what is, perhaps, the oldest area of local self-government in England. The intimate connexion between the parish and the constable is apt now to be overlooked, but in the last century it was of very great importance and formed the basis of numerous judicial decisions. Thus in the case of the village of Chorley (1 Salk. 175) it was laid down by Holt C.J. that a village and a constable are correlatives, while a hamlet has no constable; and that, further, if a warrant be directed to a constable by name, he may execute it beyond his precinct, but cannot be compelled to do so; while if it be directed to all constables generally, no constable can execute the same out of his constablewick. Again, in a case between the parishes of Denham and Dalham in 8 Geo. II it was held by the court of King's Bench that a place cannot be a township unless it consists *de pluribus mansionibus* and has a petty constable (2 Str. 1004). In fact, the existence of a constable came to be regarded in the many disputes under the poor law, which the court of King's Bench had to decide, as the most characteristic mark of the independent township. See, for example, the case of R. *v.* Sir Watts Horton (1 D. & E. 376), in which Buller J. stated in very positive terms that there is a township wherever there is a constable—there may be a constable for a larger district than a township, but not for a smaller. R. *v.* Inhabitants of Leigh (3 D. & E. 746), and R. *v.* Newell (4 D. & E. 270) furnish further authority on this point.

Another very striking feature of the constable's office will be found to suggest some interesting conclusions. In an act of 1827 (7 & 8 Geo. IV, cap. 38) it is recited that in some parts of England petty constables have 'from a very remote period' been required to appear at a petty session of the peace held before every quarter sessions and assizes, and there on oath make presentments of various matters connected with their respective parishes. These were of an extremely miscellaneous character. Such matters as the existence in a parish of 'Popish Recusants, Persons absenting themselves

[1] Numerous instances of the use of the word as signifying merely a captain or commander are given in Madox, *Hist. Exch.* i. 39, 40.

from their Parish Church or any other Place of Religious Worship,' forestallers and regraters, profane swearers and cursers, and servants out of place, may no doubt have been presented in pursuance of direct statutory enactment, and cannot in any case have been matters of presentment before the institution of a parliament at all. But there were other subjects on which the constables had been accustomed to make presentments, such as the condition of the highways in the parish, the commission of felonies and the arrest of the felons, which savour of a much higher antiquity, and at least suggest that the practice of making these presentments was a survival from a very early period. The practice was nearly or altogether abolished by the above-cited act, but a parliamentary return of 1827 (H. C. 398) shows that, though the custom was then for the most part a mere form, the form was in many places most scrupulously observed. In some counties constables did not hesitate to present on oath that all was well within their parishes, or more particularly that there were no popish recusants or 'no papists but what behave well,' no idle and disorderly persons, and no profane cursing or swearing, no tippling on the Sabbath day, not even any persons that absent themselves from church, nor any 'badgers of corn, malt, butter, cheese, &c.' But in practice the only matters they not unfrequently found reason to present were the insecurity of some bridge or the bad state of the highway within their constablewick. True or false as these presentments may have been, the persistence of local custom is strikingly illustrated by the fact that they continued to be made up to 1827; and even after 1827 it still apparently remained in strictness the duty of the constable to make presentments with regard to the efficiency of the village stocks, the condition of the roads, and some other matters of a similar kind.

The presentment of the petty constable was ordinarily verified on oath before two magistrates, and returned to the high constable of the hundred, for delivery by him at assizes or quarter sessions. Usually it took the form of answers to a long list of articles to be inquired into. The articles appear generally in practice to have been prepared beforehand ready for the constable to affix his signature to each in token that in his parish no subject of complaint had arisen during the period in question. They were much the same for assizes and quarter sessions, and did not differ very considerably in different counties. In Middlesex the grand jury for the court of King's Bench issued their precept to the high constables, requiring them to send notice to the petty constables that they should make due presentment as to each of the articles; and in the Parts of Holland a somewhat similar precept used to be issued by the under-sheriff on behalf of the judges of assize, but ordinarily the presentments were made as matter of course. Proceedings on them were

very rare, except when the presentment was put in the form of an indictment, but at least as late as 1825 in the county of Flint, the grand jury at the assizes having ignored a bill of indictment founded on a presentment made by the high constable of one division of Naylor hundred with regard to the insecurity of a certain bridge in the hundred, proceedings were afterwards taken on the original presentment by means of a *non omittas distringas*, and a sheriff's warrant was issued, which appears to have been effectual in securing the abatement of the nuisance complained of.

Now this procedure will be seen to be of great significance if the following considerations are taken into account. A 'presentment' is the ordinary technical term for a statement on oath by the inhabitants of a certain area that some offence against the law has been committed within their *venue* or neighbourhood. An inquisition found by a coroner's jury or an indictment found by a grand jury is the most typical instance of a presentment at the present day. In an indictment at county quarter sessions, for example, the inhabitants of the county, as represented by the grand jury, declare on oath that within their county a certain person or persons have committed a certain breach of the law, and on this presentment the trial follows. So if a coroner's jury present that a certain person has been guilty of homicide, he may without more ado be put on his trial.

Presentments there may be that do not exactly conform to this type: thus the presentment of a grand jury in favour of some change of the law involves no legal consequences, but, speaking generally, the characteristic marks of a presentment are that it is made jointly by the inhabitants of a definite locality, *visnetum* or *venue*, and that it may give rise to legal process against any individual therein named. The constables' presentments, it is true, were usually put in the form of a bill of indictment, and sent before the grand jury before legal action was taken on them, just as at the present time the common practice is not to try a prisoner on a coroner's inquisition, but to prefer a bill of indictment, which, if found by the grand jury, serves as the basis of the trial, no proceedings being taken, as a rule, on the inquisition if no true bill has been found by the grand jury. The same course appears to have been usually followed in the case of a constable's presentment, but the proceedings reported from the county of Flint show that the constable's presentment was nevertheless a true presentment—that is to say, it was not merely an information laid by an individual which might or might not lead to an indictment, but it was such an accusation as of itself to furnish sufficient ground for a trial at law. For this English law has ordinarily required that the accusation should be made by a body of men representing a definite area, and at first sight it is highly anomalous that the presentment made by a single constable should be treated as having this com-

munal character. The hypothesis that this article is intended to suggest is that the constable in the eye of the law was not merely the officer of the township, vill, or tithing for which he was appointed, but its true representative, exercising in his own person its communal rights, and subject to its communal responsibilities. If this hypothesis can be substantiated, the constable's presentment is quite normal and free from difficulty; it is, in truth, the presentment of the inhabitants of his township, as the indictment on which a prisoner is tried at county assizes is merely the presentment of the inhabitants of the county in which the venue is laid. A further consideration suggests itself. The subjects of presentment by the constables are much the same as the subjects of presentment at courts leet when courts leet were most flourishing. In the parliamentary return above mentioned it is stated that in the city of Lincoln presentments were not made by the constables, the matters with which they dealt being there noticed and corrected by an efficient court leet. If the conjecture I have hazarded be correct, the constables would represent at the courts held by the judges of assizes and by the justices at their quarter sessions the leet juries of the local courts.

I have dealt with this system of constables' presentments at considerable length, partly because the ordinary legal text-books have altogether omitted mention of this singular form of procedure, partly because it suggests the very theory which will, I think, be found to explain most fully and naturally the history of the constable's office. It would, of course, be rash to argue the origin of an office from the attributes attaching to it in modern times, or to regard its characteristic marks in the eighteenth century as safe indications of the character of the office five centuries before. All that we can do is to test by the available evidence, scanty as it is, touching the early history of the constable, the hypothesis on which his legal status, at a time when it is fully known to us, can be most naturally accounted for.

The first of the published documents in which the constable makes his appearance is the writ of 1252, published in Stubbs's 'Select Charters,' 7th ed. p. 371. There it is provided that in each township (*in singulis villatis*) one constable or two, according to its population, should be appointed (*constituatur*), and in each hundred one chief constable (*capitalis constabularius*), who were to have special care for the view of arms and for the preservation of the peace. They were given for this purpose equal authority with the mayors or the bailiffs or *praepositi* of boroughs, and were specially responsible for the proper carrying out of the hue and cry. The writ merely enforced and elaborated earlier provisions of the law. Thus the provisions for the hue and cry are similar to those indicated in

the Ordinance of the Hundred of Edgar's time,[2] in accordance with which the tithing men were to be summoned by the hundred men for the pursuit of a thief, and again in the edict of Richard I;[3] nor do the other provisions of the writ introduce new principles of administration. There seems, therefore, no need to suppose that the *constabularii* were wholly new officers. On the contrary, the absence of any directions respecting the mode of their appointment makes this somewhat improbable; and it appears at least equally probable that the duty of seeing that the liability attaching from a previous period to the individual township was properly discharged, would in natural course fall on its head man, whether he was styled reeve, tithing man, or head-borough. *Constabularius* would thus be his designation when his responsibility towards the central government was mainly regarded; this would be the title most familiar to the crown officials, and would be appropriate enough when he was looked on as the commander for police and military purposes of the inhabitants of the township. It is, in fact, the only title that is applied in the statutes of the realm to any representative of the unit of local government until a comparatively recent date.

Another argument may be urged against the view that the parish constable of later times had his origin in the writ of 1252. Had this been the case, we should expect to find two constables as normal an arrangement as a single constable, at all events in the larger parishes. As a matter of fact some parishes did appoint two constables, but this was exceptional, and the law has always regarded one constable, and one only, as a sufficient complement for the properly constituted parish. The double appointment, where it was the practice, may be due to the writ, or it may be due, on the other hand, to particular reasons varying in different localities; but while one constable was insisted on by the King's Bench as the necessary mark of the parish as a unit of local government, the appointment of an additional officer is merely a matter of usage, which may or may not be judicially recognised as binding.

Another consideration that bears on the question is the following. Many villages never did have a constable under that name. The person who discharged the duty of a constable might be a borsholder, head-borough, or tithing man. There does not appear to be any judicial decision recognising such an officer as distinct from a constable, though legal authorities have sometimes expressed a view that a distinction did exist. Thus Blackstone (i. 356) says: 'The antient head-boroughs, tithing men, and borsholders were made use of to serve as petty constables, though not so generally but that in many places they still continue distinct officers from the constables.' In Burn's 'Justice of the Peace' (ed. 1766, i. 349) it is said: 'The divers

[2] Stubbs, *S. C.* p. 70. [3] *Ibid.* p. 264.

names also of petty constables, tythingmen, borsholders, boroheads, headborows, chief pledges, and such other (if there be any) that bear office in towns, parishes, hamlets, tythings, or borows, are all in effect but two, that is to say, *constables & borsholders.*' But it appears from what follows that these are merely to be regarded as two names for the same kind of officer.

Again, from Lambard's 'Duties of Constables' (ed. 1633, 67, 69) it is to be gathered that though in his view a borsholder or other similar officer was not competent to discharge the duties of a constable in respect of a variety of matters in which the duty was imposed by statute, nevertheless, in such fundamental matters as the keeping of the peace or the conveyance of prisoners to gaol, his duties coincided with the constable's. In another place he explains this by saying that 'where there be many tything men in one parish, there only one of them is a constable for the king, and the rest do serve but as the ancient tything men did.' It follows that in Lambard's opinion the responsibility for the keeping of the peace or the arrest of an offender attached to a constable, not as a king's officer, but as the representative of his parish, and was created not by statute but by the ancient common law.

The most reasonable explanation of these facts seems to be that the writ of 1252 created no new office, but merely applied to an existing officer a designation which was specially appropriate in reference to the particular obligations enforced by the writ; that the royal courts of law similarly employed this designation to the exclusion of the older titles of native growth, and that consequently the latter generally fell into disuse. The writ of 1252 accordingly affords no conclusive argument against the hypothesis with which we started.

We have next to consider the evidence supplied by the statutes of parliament. There the first occurrence of the term is in Magna Charta, cap. 17, where the office is coupled with those of other royal officers. *Nullus vicecomes*, constabularius, *coronator, vel alii ballivi nostri teneant placita corone nostre.* Whatever is the exact meaning of the title here, it is evident that no question of the parish constable can arise. In two other early statutes the term is clearly, in like manner, applied to royal officers of high position. The Statutum de Scaccario, 51 Hen. III, stat. 5, associates constables with sheriffs and other bailiffs as having exacted outrageous charges, and in 2 Edw. III, cap. 3, the constable is associated with the sheriff or 'any other bailiff of fee which hath keeping of prisons.' This specialised use of the word survives to the present day in the case of the keepers of Windsor Castle, the Tower of London, and one or two other royal fortresses, but this appears to be the last occasion on which it occurs in the Statute Book with this signification.

Next we come to the Statute of Winchester, 13 Ed. I, stat. 2

By chapter 6 two constables were to be chosen in each hundred and franchise to enforce the ordinances for the keeping of arms. It is clear that here the word is used as an appropriate title for an official to be newly appointed of high standing and vested with authority derived from the crown. It is not improbable that one of the two constables was the officer afterwards known as high constable, but it is by no means probable that the first origin of the office is to be found in the statute. Analogy would suggest that the high constables represent the ancient chief officers of the hundreds, and it is a reasonable conjecture that these would be the officers naturally selected for enforcing the provisions of the act, but this question is not material for our present purpose.

In 2 Edw. III, cap. 3, we first come on the term in its more restricted sense. Sheriffs, lords of franchises and their bailiffs, mayors and bailiffs of cities and boroughs, 'burghaldres, *conestables* & gardeins de la pees deinz lour gardes,' are all empowered to take action for the suppression of armed routs, and the justices are authorised when they come down into the country to see that these officers have truly and faithfully exercised their office. If this statute stood alone we could hardly fail to see in the *conestable* the representative of the rural township or tithing, recognised by the draftsman of the act as ranking on a level with the mayors and bailiffs of urban districts; and this view is confirmed by a further examination of the Statute Book. In chapter 7 of the same year the constables appear after sheriffs, coroners, under-sheriffs, hundreders, and bailiffs in the list of officers of whom the justices thereby commissioned were to make inquiry; and in 4 Edw. III, cap. 10, constables are unmistakably designated as the representatives of townships. 'Whereas . . . sheriffs and gaolers of gaols would not receive thieves . . . taken and attached by the *constables and townships*, whereby the said *constables and townships* have been unwilling to take thieves and felons . . .' We shall find some reason later for supposing that the common-law duties and powers of the modern constable are nothing more than the duties and powers attaching from a very early period to the township or the tithing. Here it will be sufficient to note the significance of the collocation. For the purposes of police the township and the constable are at this date alternative authorities, and their liability for the suppression of crime is taken, as it were, for granted. The constables, it would seem, have only acquired this liability as representing their township and not by virtue of any express enactment. In 9 Edw. III, cap. 14, a difference is observable, which, however, may only be a difference in drafting and not a difference in the mode of regarding the local police organisation. After reciting the necessity for a more strict enforcement of the Statute of Winchester, the act goes on to require the constables of the towns (*conestables des villes*) to arrest

strangers of whom they have evil suspicion and deliver them to the sheriff, to await the coming of the justices. We may compare with this the provisions of the Statute of Winchester itself, whereby every township (*vile*) was obliged to appoint four or six night watchmen, corresponding to the twelve watchmen to be appointed for every borough and the six watchmen to be stationed at each gate of a city. This, it was declared, was the old practice; but plainly there was, even in 1285, some need to re-enforce it by royal authority, and by Edward III's time the transition from the communal responsibility of the township to the individual responsibility of its representative, the constable, had no doubt already begun. To the lawyers of the royal court the latter system would naturally commend itself, and in singling out an individual to be vested with police responsibility it would be obviously desirable to find for him some title that would savour of the royal authority rather than one having a purely local origin, such as would be more appropriate for the township meeting or the manorial court. In point of fact, as I have said, such terms as tithing man, head-borough, or chief pledge scarcely appear in the Statute Book till a comparatively late period.

So far were the framers of the early statutes carried by their desire to find a responsible authority in every place, whether urban or rural, that by 23 Edw. III, cap. 1, the constables of towns were given jurisdiction equally with the sheriffs and bailiffs of the king to commit to gaol any one refusing to enter service in accordance with the provisions of the act. So again the Statute of Labourers (25 Edw. III, stat. 1) conferred on constables the same powers for enforcing the law as on lords of franchises, bailiffs, and stewards. It was this act that first required every township to be provided with stocks, those 'prisons of the constable,' as they are called by an early legal historian. Till 1827 the condition of the village stocks was a matter of which the royal courts of justice took formal notice. In some of the later acts dealing with the question of labour the mayors and constables appear regularly as the local executive authorities (*e.g.* 12 Ric. II, cap. 3), till the time came when the ever-growing administrative importance of the justices of the peace enabled them to supersede officers of a merely local origin in this as well as in other matters.[4] But as soon as a determined attempt was made to establish the royal authority throughout the kingdom, the insufficiency of the township constables to secure good order in rural districts must have become apparent to the central government. For example, by cap. 6 of 2 Ric. II, stat. 1, special commissioners were to be appointed to exercise much the same functions for the suppression of routs and riots as devolved under

[4] For example, by 6 Hen. VI, cap. 3, it is already the justices of the peace who in country districts were to discharge the functions discharged in towns by mayors and bailiffs.

2 Edw. III, c. 3, on mayors, constables, and others; and by 7 Ric. II, cap. 6, it was expressly ordered that the Statute of Winchester should be proclaimed four times a year in every hundred and every market town—clearly for the purpose of bringing home to rural authorities the responsibilities with which the law had indued them. In fact, by the end of the fourteenth century the constables in the matter of keeping the peace were beginning to lose their initiative and becoming the mere subordinates of the local ministers of the crown. Such an inference may fairly be drawn from the omission of any mention of their office in the successive acts dealing with this matter, though the first positive trace in the Statute Book of the modern theory, by which the constable is the servant of the justice to execute his warrants, appears to be in 1 Hen. VII, cap. 7. This statute empowered a justice, on receiving information of any 'night hunting,' to 'make a warrant to the sheriff of such county or to any constable, bailiff, or other officer within the same county to take and arrest' the accused persons, and to 'have him or them afore the maker of any such warrant.' By the act for appointing for the first time justices of the peace in Chester and Wales (27 Hen. VIII, cap. 5, s. 8) both high and petty constables are expressly obliged (together with sheriffs, coroners, and other officers) to be *attendant* on them 'in like manner and form, and under like pains and penalties, as . . . in other shires of this realm of England;' and after this date the subordination of the constable to the justices in matters of police is always apparent.

After the constable had come to be regarded merely as a police officer attendant on the justices and other ministers of the crown, his position caused a good deal of difficulty to legal theorists. He possessed an undoubted though somewhat vague authority, but it was not derived from the sovereign; he was by common law a conservator of the peace, but he was no longer vested with any of those magisterial functions which justices, coroners, and other conservators exercised by virtue of their office; his person was surrounded with a good deal of traditional sanctity, but when the law was more closely examined it was found that his actual powers for the preservation of the peace differed very slightly from those of the lieges who were not indued with the dignity of office. Even the doctrine that a constable may arrest a suspected felon on mere suspicion that a felony has been committed, and a private person only if a felony has actually been committed, is of recent origin and is not recognised by Sir Matthew Hale, one of the first of the writers who have spent treasures of legal learning on the status of the constable. The law on this point, indeed, appears to have been judicially laid down for the first time in 1780 (Samuel *v.* Payne and others; see note to Hawkins's 'Pleas of the

Crown,' 7th ed. p. 162)! The legal anomaly of the constable's position is, however, explained if we regard him not merely as an officer appointed for the preservation of the king's peace, nor as the mere officer of the parish, but as the direct representative of the old vill or township. His responsibilities were always undoubted; his liability, for instance, for the escape of felons was unmistakably heavier than that of a private person, though in strict law his privileges for insuring their safe custody were somewhat shadowy; and in like manner in the earlier provisions for the maintenance of order the responsibility of the townships was always more clearly insisted on than their executive powers. But as the powers which might have grown by exercise more definite and more extensive generally passed away to the newly created local justices, the responsibilities remained and became inseparably attached to office. In later times the privileges of a constable have been enlarged by express enactment; an assault on a constable, for instance, is made a specially heinous offence; while it is every one's duty to arrest a felon, the obligation is more stringent when enforced by the summons of a constable, and a long series of statutes has given him the power of summary arrest in the case of a large number of petty offences. These and other powers have in the course of the last two centuries been assigned to the office by express legislation, but they evidently represent the attributes of a legal status existing from a very remote period, though perhaps not previously recognised by the courts of law. That status, though no doubt it is still not free from obscurity, has been made somewhat more definite by parliamentary enactment, and now, as from time to time it has proved necessary to create organised and permanent bodies of men for the maintenance of order—the county constabulary, the borough police, and the police of the metropolis—it has been sufficient to provide that every member of the newly established force shall possess 'all those powers, duties, privileges, rights, and liabilities that a constable by law now has or ought to have within his constablewick.' The modern policeman is a long way distant from the parish constable of even the last century, but the change is merely a development. While the police system of this country has during the present reign been placed on an entirely new footing, the materials of which it has been formed had been in existence from the first.

If we turn from the preservation of the peace to matters in which the royal prerogative is less intimately concerned, we find the constable longer maintaining his position as the chief administrative authority of the rural township. Under 36 Edw. III, cap. 2, disputes as to the price of victuals purveyed for royal or other privileged households were to be settled between the purveyors on the one hand and on the other the lords of franchises and their

bailiffs or the constables and four good men of every town. The act of 11 Henry IV, cap. 4, against the playing of games in lieu of the practice of archery was to be enforced by the mayors and sheriffs or the mayors and bailiffs of cities and boroughs 'and the constables in other towns,' the mayors and bailiffs or sheriffs being liable to a fine of 20*s*. for default, while the fine on constables was 6*s*. 8*d*. Under 22 Hen. VIII, cap. 5, for the better repairing of decayed bridges, all 'towns' or parishes were to be represented before the justices in the matter of assessing the rate either by their constables or, in the alternative, by two of their inhabitants.

It is in an act of 1540 (32 Hen. VIII, c. 13) that the constable is first identified with the 'bailiff, head-borough, bursholder, or tythingman' of the township. This was an act for improving the breed of horses, and for preventing stallions 'of small stature and of little value' being allowed free range on forests, chases, commons, and other waste grounds, 'whereof cometh in manner no profit or commodity.' The responsible authorities were the keepers of the forests or commons, or the 'constable, bailiff, head borough, bursholder, or tythingman of any township next adjoining unto the said place.' The use of such names as interchangeable with the appellation more familiar to the parliamentary draftsman of that age suggests that the offices were really identical; but a similar instance does not appear to occur again till 1605, when, in an act providing for the payment of the costs of conveying prisoners to gaol, the 'tything man or constable' is designated as the responsible local authority. An act of 1604 (1 Jac. I, cap. 31) gave the constable very extraordinary powers. Persons believed to be infected with the plague might be ordered to keep their houses by justices, or by mayors, bailiffs, and other head officers of towns, and disobedience to such an injunction by a person found actually to be infected was made a felony punishable by death. Outside cities, boroughs, towns corporate, privileged places, and market towns a similar authority was vested in the 'constable, head-borough, or other officer of the county.' The statute, however, was only to remain one year in force.

It will be observed that in the two statutes last mentioned it was not considered necessary to recite all the titles by which the head officer of a township might then be known. We must not expect to find the different elements of local self-government clearly distinguished in the acts of the central legislature. Tithings and townships are not separately defined: the organisation of the manor and the organisation of the vill tended, in fact, to coalesce; the parish came to be treated as an administrative district for civil as well as for ecclesiastical purposes, and if the closest examination of local records by legal antiquaries of to-day fails to afford a clear or continuous history of the relations between the primitive social system and the feudal system imposed on it, we cannot be sur-

prised if the authors of the Statute Book are found to confuse the two. All that we are justified in saying is that in the acts of parliament the units of local self-government, by whatever name they were called, appear for long to have been primarily represented by officers ordinarily styled constables. The 'governors' of hamlets and parishes mentioned in 27 Hen. VIII, cap. 25, along with governors of shires, cities, and towns, can scarcely be other than these constables. They were, in conjunction with the churchwardens, given fresh duties with regard to highways by 2 & 3 Philip & Mary, cap. 8, and in the matter of vagrancy by 14 Eliz. cap. 5. Again, in the special matter of assessment they were empowered under 27 Eliz. cap. 13, to apportion among the inhabitants of their parish the rate imposed on it by way of fine for default in making pursuit of felons after hue and cry raised.

The institution of overseers by the poor law of Elizabeth (43 Eliz. cap. 2) tended in some degree to oust the constable from his position in the parish, but certainly did not do this altogether. Even under that act he was associated with the churchwardens in assessing the rate, and in subsequent acts he was still recognised as at all events a co-ordinate authority. Till some way into the seventeenth century he still appears in the Statute Book not merely as the officer but as the representative of the parish. His position as peace officer was doubtless the most important side of the office. The first interest of the central government in its dealings with the far more ancient units of local government was, of course, the maintenance of the king's peace, and consequently, when it recognised such a local unit, it recognised it primarily as an agent of police. The first powers, or rather the first liabilities, expressly recognised by parliament as belonging to the township related to the pursuit of felons and the prevention of crime, and thus the representative of the township would be likely, in the eyes of a court lawyer, to assume almost entirely the character of a peace officer.

The office of constable has been recognised, defined, sometimes amplified, and sometimes limited by statute, but it is rooted not in ordinances of parliament, but in the far more ancient administrative organisation of our race. Parliament did not create the office, and it was not till the seventeenth century that it began to interest itself in the machinery by which it should be filled, but the recognition of the local constable by the central government has transformed by slow degrees the character of his office. The process by which the constable from being the representative of the local self-governing body came to be the officer of the comparatively modern ministers of royal authority is somewhat obscure. The orthodox mode of appointment down to the Parish Constables Act of 1842 was election in court leet. The power of appointment was given by statute to the justices for the first time by 13 & 14 Car. II, cap. 12, which is

also the foundation of the subsequent legislation for the appointment of *special* constables, *i.e.* constables appointed not, as in the ordinary course, for a specified term, but for a special emergency. Under that act the power was only to be exercised by the justices when the court leet had failed to elect a constable; and for long afterwards the appointment by justices seems to have been considered an exceptional measure, though, on the other hand, appointments by such authority appear to have been made for some time before the statute of Charles II gave express sanction to the practice, and there need be no doubt that constables, however chosen, had been sworn in by justices for long before. Perhaps the administration of the oath to constables by justices of the peace may be fairly considered as the characteristic mark of the final subordination of local to central government in rural districts, of the conversion of a local administrative officer into a ministerial officer of the crown; for, though the justices of the peace are local officers, they are independent of any of the more ancient administrative divisions of the country, such as the township or the hundred, and they derive their authority from the crown alone; so that when, for the due execution of the constables' duties, it became necessary for them to receive the oath from the justices, it may be said that the local origin of their office had passed out of sight. Some oath of office may have been customary when the constable was merely the village officer, but the date when the oath came first to be administered by justices is matter of conjecture: it may be that the act of 27 Eliz. cap. 12, which required under-sheriffs, bailiffs of franchises, and all other minor functionaries concerned in the empanelling of juries to be duly sworn in, imposed this condition also on constables for the first time; it may be that the practice had been introduced long before. A study of local records might throw light on the subject, and any information on the point could not fail to be of value in the history of the decay of local self-government outside the incorporated cities and boroughs. In the last century high constables were always appointed by justices, and usually at quarter sessions, and they were generally, but apparently not invariably, sworn in.[5] The history of the high constable in the hundred is probably similar to that of the petty constable of the smaller district, but the materials for it are even more scanty, the importance of the hundred having steadily diminished from a very early period.

The form of oath given by Dalton (p. 608) for petty constables does not appear to be of any very great antiquity, for, among other matters, it recites the duties falling on them in respect of the practice of archery and the suppression of popish recusancy. This would point to an origin in the sixteenth century; but, as the oath is clearly given as a model, and is not said to follow with precision

[5] Dalton's *Justice of the Peace*, ed. 1727, p. 84.

any ancient precedent, no inference can be drawn from the terms of it. It starts with a recital of the police duties which were the first to be laid by parliamentary enactment on the constable, and goes on to the other functions, most of which were by the beginning of the eighteenth century discharged by him in co-operation with the churchwardens and other overseers of the parish.

Before concluding this somewhat conjectural contribution to the history of local government in England it may be worth noticing that the institutions of the Channel Islands as they were described in the reports of the royal commissioners of 1846 and 1861, and as they have for the most part remained down to the present time, supply some curious and interesting features which may fairly be used in support of the foregoing argument.

In none of the islands has any municipal organisation arisen to supersede or modify the primitive institutions of the township, which accordingly remains the most important, if not the only important, district for local government. In the larger islands there are no local justices of the peace, and the constable (*connétable*) is to this day the principal officer of the parish. In Jersey his functions are, as the royal commissioners of 1861 reported, analogous to those of the *maire* of the French *commune* so far as the administration of parochial matters is concerned. He is elected by the ratepayers for a period of three years. Moreover in the legislative council of the island, which is presided over by a royal bailiff and appears to correspond to the old English hundred court, each of the twelve parishes is represented by its constable in conjunction with the rector, just as the township was represented at the hundred court by the parson, the reeve, and four villagers. In the absence of the constable his place may be taken by the *centeniers*, of whom there are two for every parish, and six for the parish of St. Helier, elected in the same way as the constables, and for the same period. It is impossible to avoid the surmise that at the insular states the constable has succeeded to the communal rights of the parish.[6] In Guernsey each of the ten civil parishes has two constables, and is represented by them at the insular states, when assembled for the purposes of election, in association with the rectors and the *douzeniers*. The latter are elected for life from the ratepayers who have served the office of constable. These local officers do not, however, appear in the states when they are called together as a legislative body. In the island of Alderney, which consists of one parish only, the constables appear to be no more than peace officers; and the same is the case in Sark.

[6] The constitutional history of Jersey is still very obscure, and it would be unsafe to deduce any positive argument from the composition of the states as they at present exist. As a political body they are probably not of very great antiquity, and certainly of later origin than the royal court.

A study of the constitutional history of these islands would probably throw much light on the question how far the early system of local government in England is of purely native growth and how far it was due to the institutions of Norman and Angevin times. It is sufficient here to remark that the nature of the office of constable as it at present exists in Jersey and Guernsey lends some support to the conclusion that in England the name was one given by court lawyers to a pre-existing local official, not necessarily in his character as peace officer, but in his general character as representative of the unit of rural self-government, whether it was organised as a township, a parish, or a manor, and whether he was locally styled reeve, chief pledge, head-borough, or tithing man.[7]

H. B. Simpson.

[7] Since this article has been in type Sir F. Pollock and Professor Maitland's great 'History of English Law' has been published. In the first volume, pp. 547–554, is a very clear account of the vill or township as a legal entity before the time of Edward I. It is there pointed out that while the duties and responsibilities falling on it are clear, its rights are shadowy and it scarcely can be found to possess any organisation beyond that of the manor. This would of course render more natural the process by which the township's individuality gradually merged in that of its representative. It is clear that a corporation sole—if a legal term may be used in a loose and inexact manner—can be more easily dealt with than a corporation aggregate, and it is likely that some difficulty may have frequently been found in enforcing the communal responsibilities of the township. These, as summarised by the learned authors, correspond with curious exactness to the functions of the constable of later times. Its presentments at the courts of the justices in eyre and in the hundred and county courts, its liability for the arrest of malefactors, and for following out a hue and cry, and its duties towards the coroner—the neglect of any of these might put the township 'in mercy,' just as in later times it would render a constable liable to a fine.

Erasmus in Italy

IN his recent sketch of the life of Erasmus Mr. Froude has devoted so much space to the relations of his hero with the Reformation movement as to neglect almost entirely[1] other not less important episodes in his career. It is proposed here to show, partly from the works of Erasmus and partly from the biography by his friend and contemporary Beatus Rhenanus, that the information which we possess of his three years in Italy (1506–1509) is as full and interesting as is furnished by any other period of his life.

At the time of the Renaissance no northern scholar considered his education as 'finished' until he had spent some months at least in Italy. Especially was this the case in those first golden years of the sixteenth century, when Greek was studied with all the fervour of a new discovery, and when the universities of Bologna and Padua provided advantages for the student at that time unrivalled. Erasmus, as he tells us himself, had cherished the plan of his Italian tour for more than twenty years, and had thrice been disappointed for lack of means when he seemed on the eve of success. At length the long-looked-for opportunity came when he was in London in the spring of 1506. The king's physician, Dr. G. Battista Boerio,[2] of Genoa, wished to send his sons to study in Italy under the guidance of some literary man; and Erasmus willingly undertook the charge. What his remuneration was we are not told—perhaps not more than his expenses, for he tells us that he was not to be their guardian, but simply to take a general oversight of their studies. The lads were accompanied by a royal

[1] Mr. Froude's conjecture (pp. 78, 84) that there were two visits to Italy—the first in 1502 or 1503, and the second in or after 1507—may be easily disproved. Further evidence against it has been recently supplied by a French savant, M. Pierre de Nolhac, who has printed at Paris (Klincksieck, 1888), together with an admirable sketch of this part of Erasmus's life, four hitherto unpublished letters of this period from Erasmus to Aldus, of which the first, from Bologna, is endorsed by Aldus himself with the date of 28 Oct. 1507. With eight others of later date they were found at Rome in the Vatican and Barberini libraries.

[2] Mr. Froude follows the error of Mr. Seebohm and others in depriving the doctor of his surname—the only ground for this being that Erasmus, familiarly to his own friends, speaks of him as 'Baptista.'

courier and by an attendant, named Clyston, who was personally responsible for them; and Erasmus could not contain his disgust alike at the quarrels and the boon companionship of this person with the courier.

The party set out about the end of May, and even at that season they had such bad weather that they were four days in the Channel. Just after their arrival in Paris, Erasmus writes to his friend Linacre, the scholar-physician, that he longs for his skill to free him from a torturing headache—the effect of sea-sickness.

> The glands of my neck are swollen, my temples throb, both my ears are still singing; such a price my Italian bargain has already cost me.

But he had his compensations.

> France seems to smile on me all the more sweetly for the freedom, the old associations, and a kind of indulgent affection shown towards me.

Yet most of his conversation with her sons, as with Englishmen, must have been in Latin, for he never mastered French; he even calls it somewhere 'that barbarous and irregular language, which is not written as it is pronounced, with its peculiar hissings that sound scarcely human.' From the literary point of view his loss was not great, for French literature could then hardly be said to exist. Comines, indeed, was finishing his memoirs at the château of Argenton, but Rabelais was still immured in the convent of Fontenay, and Marot was bird's-nesting in his native Guienne. The acquaintance of Erasmus with that Herculean student, Budé, his rival in after days, seems to have begun ten years later; it was no easy matter to know a man who grumbled at getting only six hours' work on his wedding-day. However, if Erasmus's friends were so numerous, and were urging him, as he tells us, to take the degree of D.D., it is strange that he did not do so at the university of Paris, the home of his early studies. Perhaps the expense was too great; perhaps, with his new duties, the requirements were too arduous. At any rate he confined himself during his stay at Paris, which must have lasted some weeks, to his Greek studies and to the superintendence of his young charges. In a letter to Colet, dated 12 June, he praises their modesty, obedience, and devotion to their work, and prophesies that their future will bring lustre to their native country. He also expresses much regret at his separation from his English friends; 'the whole world,' he says, 'has not gained me so many learned, obliging, virtuous, and sincere friends as the single city of London.'[3] Before leaving Paris he made arrangements with Badius, the printer, to bring out, at an early date,

[3] This special reference to London, together with the shortness of his time in England in 1506, makes a visit to Cambridge in the same few months very improbable. His first lectures there were in 1510.

some prose translations of Lucian, and two plays of Euripides in Latin verse. A copy of the latter work was sent to him in Italy about six weeks later.

At length, before the end of July, he set out for Turin. It was a long ride of some four hundred miles; but, except a few nights at Orleans and Lyons, there was no further delay; and early in August the party crossed the Alps. A few months later Erasmus published, with his Lucian translations, the short poem on old age, which he composed in the course of the journey. Its title, 'An Equestrian, or rather Alpine Song,' hardly prepares us for its quasi-religious character. The wandering poet, he tells us, is warned by his increasing grey hairs to forsake profane literature for sacred—a warning that was to be strangely neglected in the three following years.

We do not know how long he stayed at Turin; but it was here, and not at Bologna, that he took the degree of D.D. on 4 Sept., moved, perhaps, by the courtesy of the people, with which he was 'marvellously delighted.' We can understand that a university, which had but just completed its centenary and was overshadowed in importance by its more southern Italian rivals, was proud to reckon among its doctors the rising Transalpine scholar. Nineteen years ago the event was commemorated, on its three hundred and seventieth anniversary, by the placing of an inscription under the entrance gate of the university. But Erasmus and his young charges were bound for Bologna, and they could not afford to linger at a less famous school. And so another ride of 200 miles through the fertile country at the base of the Apennines brought them by Pavia and Piacenza to Bologna about the end of September. On their way they certainly visited the grand church of the Carthusians near Pavia, which was not yet completed; and as Erasmus gazed at the splendid pile of white marble, he asked himself why so much money should be spent on a building intended only for a few solitary monks. He says that they were infested with guests, so that it was only an expense to them, but he does not add whether he himself, the arch-foe of monks, had accepted their hospitality.

It was a most unfavourable moment for the arrival in Italy of one who sought only a studious repose. The army of Louis XII was still in the Milanese; and Pope Julius II was already on his way to depose Bentivoglio, the despot of Bologna, and restore the city to the Holy See. He fulminated a bull against him from Cesena on 10 Oct., calling on all good Christians to plunder his goods and reduce his partisans to slavery. Bentivoglio was between two fires; for the French, after promising him their support, went over to the enemy and threatened the city with pillage; and his only resource was to escape to their camp: while the citizens, with the pope's leave, dislodged the French army by closing the sluices

of their canal and flooding the neighbourhood. It is not surprising that Erasmus, a few days after his arrival, decided that Bologna was hardly a safe place of residence, and retreated across the Apennines to Florence.

Later visitors might well envy his good fortune in entering the great city at such a time. The Medici were in exile, and most of the literary circle of Lorenzo were dead; but the memory of Savonarola—of his high aims and his terrible fall—was still fresh; and the second secretary of the republic, though he was then absent on a mission to the pope, was Machiavelli. Michael Angelo and Lionardo were putting the finishing touches to their rival cartoons; and Raphael was perfecting his wonderful powers for his later work at Rome. But there is no sign that Erasmus knew, or could appreciate, his opportunities. His stay at Florence was brief—perhaps not more than a month; and he busied himself chiefly with his translations of Lucian, as he tells us in the prefatory letter of dedication. One graphic reminiscence he has left us in a letter written twenty years later. He was studying with his pupils in a retired villa close to the walls, when, in the midst of a violent thunderstorm, there was a terrific explosion. The lightning had struck a tower on the ramparts, which was stored with gunpowder; and the force of the explosion demolished the tower, blowing part of it a distance of two hundred yards: many houses were destroyed, and several lives lost.

> The noise was so sudden and so tremendous that all the neighbours thought the sky had burst and the end of the world had come. . . . I was warned to keep within doors, for the town was in arms. In Florence, it seems, when a fire breaks out, they rush to guard the gates and the walls; and it is then hardly prudent to meet any of the people: their weapons render them fierce, especially when there is any danger.

At the beginning of November he writes: 'News has come that Bentivoglio, who fled with his sons, has been slain by the French;[4] and we shall profit by the peace to retrace our steps to Bologna, as the pope and cardinals will spend the winter there.' Accordingly, Erasmus returned in time to be present on the 11th at their triumphal entry into the town.[5] The streets were gaily decorated with flags and with arches of greenery, through which the pope marched in arms under a silken canopy, surrounded by his cardinals, while maidens scattered flowers in his path. We can fancy Erasmus with his keen eyes watching the procession from one of the low arcades of the quaint old town. Whether or not he was the author of the satire 'Julius Exclusus,' where it is vividly

[4] This news afterwards proved false.

[5] Several of his biographers are in error in supposing from his own words that he also witnessed the entry into Rome on 28 March, 1507. His expression is a careless one; but it need not bear that meaning, and such a visit is highly improbable.

described, we know what his feelings were on witnessing the scene. 'I could not but contrast with a quiet sigh such triumphs as these with the majesty of the apostles, who trusted to their heavenly teaching to convert the world.' At this moment his future looked dark indeed. There was much talk among the victors of an alliance with the emperor, and of carrying the war into the territory of Venice. The next week he writes almost in despair of perfecting his Greek—the one object of his visit: 'Here there is a strange frost upon study, while war is at boiling-point. I shall do my utmost to flit back all the sooner.'

It is not certain whether he had an interview with the warlike pontiff during the latter's three months' stay at Bologna; but an incident, which Erasmus was fond of relating in after years, makes it not improbable. The attack, due in the first instance to his ignorance of Italian, which was twice made upon him in the streets of Bologna,[6] because his white scapulary was mistaken for the band worn by the plague-physicians, made it necessary for him to apply to the pope for leave to discontinue his religious habit; and the dispensation was readily granted. The reconciliation of Julius with Michael Angelo—so graphically described by Vasari—certainly took place at this time. The famous sculptor was in Bologna during the whole year of Erasmus's stay, engaged upon the great bronze statue of the pope, which stood for three years in the square before the cathedral, and was then melted down into a cannon by the French.

In one of his later letters Erasmus speaks of this year at Bologna, perhaps with some exaggeration, as one of the most unpleasant of his life. It is true that the summer of 1507 was exceptionally hot, and that the climate of the city, never too healthy, drove him for a time into the country; it is probable, too, that his relations with his pupils, and especially with their attendant, proved irksome to him, and were abruptly closed by a quarrel with the father before the end of the year. But, in spite of his first forebodings, it was a year of peace, and also of intense application and great progress in his classical studies. The university was not, perhaps, then so brilliant a centre of learning as it had been in the previous generation; but the memory of two celebrated professors, Beroaldo and Urceo—both friends and correspondents of Politian—was still fresh; and the learned society must have been much to the taste of Erasmus. Among the professors were Beroaldo the younger, afterwards librarian to Leo X, and Battista Pio, whose eccentric affectation of archaism made him a great mark for satire.[7]

[6] Mr. Froude strangely places *in Erasmus's mouth* a statement that this incident occurred at Paris; but he has certainly misunderstood the passage. See the letter to Grunnius.

[7] On leaving a lecture by this scholar, Erasmus, being pressed for his opinion of

With another professor, however, Paolo Bombasio, Erasmus contracted a lifelong friendship. Bombasio had been appointed, only a few months before, to the chair of Greek. He sympathised with Bentivoglio; and, being a man of spirit who never cared to conceal his opinions, he seems to have been persecuted by the victorious party. Erasmus speaks of him as 'a golden-hearted man, the truest friend that ever lived'—and with good reason, for he opened his house to the wandering scholar, and gave him all the time that he could spare. Erasmus was asked to give public lectures himself, but he refused, probably from the fear that his northern pronunciation of Latin would expose him to ridicule. During these months he seems to have been partly occupied on a treatise upon monasticism and on the letters called 'Antibarbari,' which were afterwards lost through the carelessness of his English friend Pace; but he was also amassing a vast store of knowledge for a new edition of his 'Adagia.'

His relations with Aldus, however, began on the subject of a much smaller work. The Latin verse translations of Euripides—the 'Hecuba' and 'Iphigenia in Aulis'—which were printed for him at Paris soon after his departure, had caused Erasmus much dissatisfaction; the pages swarmed with errors, for which the printer was mainly responsible; and though the latter was anxious to bring out another edition, revised and corrected, the author feared, as he says, that he would only correct one fault by another, and looked out for more capable assistance. This was the occasion of an interesting letter to Aldus, first published by M. de Nolhac, which Erasmus despatched from Bologna on 28 Oct. 1507. One cannot but admire the tact with which he began a correspondence so important to himself; and I quote his opening compliments only because they are as true in fact as they were doubtless sincere.

The wish that I have often formed for you, most learned Manutius, is, that as you have shed abundant light upon Greek and Latin literature by your genius and uncommon learning no less than by your art and the splendid types which you use, so, too, you might derive from them an equal profit to yourself. No one can doubt that the name of Aldus Manutius will be in the mouths of all, to the latest posterity, who shall be initiated into the mysteries of letters; and you will meet not merely with fame, but with warm affection for the zeal which you have displayed in restoring and extending the study of good writers. As with Hercules of old, the care which you give to your glorious labours will one day gain you immortality, but in the meantime it is more profitable to others than to yourself.

After expressing his delight, together with the rest of the learned world, at the promised edition of Plato, and his surprise that the

him, replied, 'I always thought him a fool, but now I am sure that he is quite mad.' Melchior Adam, *Vitae Germanorum*, t. i. 90.

New Testament had not yet issued from so famous a press, Erasmus comes to the subject of his letter.

I send you two tragedies which I have translated—boldly enough, but whether happily or not I leave you to judge. Linacre, Grocyn, Latimer, and Tonstall—your friends as well as mine—have given their high approval—men whom you know to be too learned to fail in their judgment, and too sincere to wish to flatter a friend, unless they are blinded by their affection for me; and the Italians who have seen the work do not condemn it. . . . I should regard my effusions as sure of immortality if they should issue from your press, and, above all, in that splendid minute type [8] of yours. Thus the volume would be very small and could be completed at a trifling expense.

He goes on to explain that he asks no personal profit for the edition, except a few presentation copies for his friends.

But if you positively require me to take 100 or 200 copies, though the god of gain is not generally very propitious to me, and it would be an awkward addition to my baggage, I will make no difficulty about it, if you will kindly fix a fair price.

Aldus accepted the offer with enthusiasm; and in the next letter Erasmus courteously declines a pressing invitation to visit Venice on the score of his health, which had suffered from the climate of Bologna. He receives the printer's criticisms in the most friendly spirit. 'If you meet with a manifest error, do a friend's kind office by correcting it; and any doubtful point, on which my opinion seems to differ from yours, either leave, or make what change you please: what would I not trust to such a friend as Aldus?' After discussing some questions of text and metre, he begs for the utmost expedition in the printing, because he is proposing to set out for Rome after Christmas, and wants twenty or thirty copies on the best paper as a New Year's gift to his friends at Bologna, 'for I am acquainted,' he adds, 'with all here who make a study or profession of polite learning.' His wishes seem to have been gratified; for the small volume, which is now extremely rare, bears the date of December 1507. It contains a long letter of dedication to Archbishop Warham, with an ode to the same prelate and another in honour of England and her royal family. Aldus himself prefixed a short advertisement 'to the studious reader,' in which he speaks of Erasmus as his excellent friend; it is a commendatory introduction to the learned world, congratulating Italy that northern students are now plentiful, and that even Iceland is sending for professors.

It is difficult to rate too highly the value of this small publication in spreading the fame of Erasmus. The press of Aldus had now been established nearly twenty years; and between the years 1494 and 1505 its activity had been so prodigious as to astonish

[8] He refers to the type which we call 'Italic,' from its invention by Aldus in 1501, who is said to have copied it from the handwriting of Petrarch.

Europe. Its publications were awaited in Italy as eagerly as the Waverley novels in England some seventy years ago; and the improvements made by Aldus in his art—especially the issue of cheap octavos and quartos instead of the ponderous folio—made good literature popular in a new stratum of society. His main object was to print the Greek classics, but he did not confine himself to this; for before his death in 1515 he had published some of the fathers and the best Latin and Italian writers. Erasmus himself, in his remarks on the Aldine motto, 'Festina lente,' predicts that, if the life of Aldus were spared, he would cover the whole field of literature—Greek, Latin, Hebrew, and Syriac. His device of the dolphin and anchor was intended as a symbol to express this motto—the dolphin denoting speed, the anchor firmness and constancy. It occurs on some of the coins of the Roman empire, and this suggests to Erasmus the reflexion that, as a literary token, its influence was more useful and its circulation wider, than when it was a medium of mercantile exchange. He tells us that manuscripts used to come in from all parts of Europe, even Hungary and Poland; and the printer's advice was sought by learned men in all parts of the world. The expenses of his establishment were 200 ducats a month; though he was aided by the munificence of the princely families of Carpi and Mantua, the strain was too great upon his own fortune, and he died poor. He was not free from the troubles of a modern employer, for he was four times interrupted by strikes among his workpeople. His chief difficulty, however, was the unsettled state of Italy consequent on the wars with France. This cause, together with his frequent absence from home, will explain why, for two whole years before this little publication, the Aldine press had been idle. We can fancy the enthusiasm which would hail its return to work; nor can we wonder that Erasmus, giving up his journey to Rome, decided, at Bombasio's suggestion, to repair to Venice and offer his 'Adagia' to Aldus.

Early in January 1508 Erasmus paused before a sombre-looking house, still standing on one of the smaller canals near the Rialto, where he would see the following inscription to callers over the door:—

> Whoever you are, Aldus earnestly begs you to state your business in the fewest possible words and be gone—unless, like Hercules to weary Atlas, you would lend a helping hand. There will always be work enough for you, and all who come this way.

When he had summoned a servant and asked to see the master of the house, he was told that he was engaged. On his sending in his name, however, Aldus gave him the most cordial welcome, would not hear of his going to an inn, and prepared a room for him in the house.[9]

[9] The anecdote is told by Rhenanus.

At this moment Venice was at the height of her power, though the league of Cambray, a few months later, was the beginning of her decline. While Erasmus was busy upon his 'Adagia,' news was brought of a great victory of the Venetian general Alviano over the troops of the emperor at Cadore, which compelled the latter to sue for peace. The commerce of the republic was never more flourishing. Her silks, her glass, her leather were conveyed to all parts of Europe, and the discoveries of Columbus and Vasco da Gama, though they had aroused her jealousy, had not as yet injured her trade. It was the era of the erection of the splendid court of the doge's palace, while Titian and Giorgione were rising to fame. In literature Venice had not hitherto taken a high place; but the labours of Aldus and his band of scholars had now given her an unwonted pre-eminence. Well might Comines write that she was the most triumphant city in the world, governed with the greatest wisdom, and serving God with the most solemnity.

It is unfortunate that we have no letters of Erasmus to record his impressions of so memorable a time. During his nine months' residence he must have seemed almost lost to his northern friends. The fact is sufficiently explained by his intense labours upon his 'Adagia.' He had brought to Venice a vast mass of new material, noted upon the margins of his books; but the printing-house supplied him with many unpublished works that he had never seen. He gratefully acknowledges the zealous help ungrudgingly given by famous scholars like John Lascaris and Musurus, the chief coadjutors of Aldus.

> I say from experience that there is not the same friendliness among men of learning with us that there is in Italy. Aldus laid before me all his treasures . . . so, too, did some with whom I had no acquaintance by sight or even by name. I was rash enough to propose that we should begin together—I to write and Aldus to print. In about nine months the work was completed, and during that time I contracted my fresh complaint of the stone. You may well believe how much less useful the book would have been but for the manuscripts supplied by men of learning.

The speed with which the work was executed is astonishing; Erasmus says that they used to print six folio pages a day. The first proof was corrected by Serafino, a hired reader; this was revised by the author, who made any necessary additions; but the last proof was always read by the head of the house.

> When I asked Aldus why he took the trouble, his answer was, 'I am getting instruction myself.' He was astonished that I could compose so fast in the midst of the distracting noise made by the compositors.

It is now time to say something of the inner arrangements of this busy household. In 1505 Aldus had married the daughter of Andrea d'Asola, who had acquired a press at Venice by purchase

as early as 1479. No partnership had at first existed between Andrea and his son-in-law, though the former had sometimes given help when required; but in 1508 there was a more formal union, and the two families seem to have lived under one roof. This was naturally the cause of some discomfort; for no fewer than thirty-three persons, including servants and workmen on the premises, composed the household. The females and children lived almost entirely apart, though Erasmus used to give some of his spare moments to playing with little Manuzio, the eldest son of Aldus. There was, indeed, much playful gaiety among the elders when they unbent after the heavy labours of the day. Erasmus recalls that Aldus once held an imaginary dialogue between them in their old age, asking after his health with a trembling, toothless lisp, and replying to his own query in a yet shriller key. He adds sadly that Aldus was taken from his friends long before the toothless age.

There was one point, however, in the household arrangements which was a cruel torment to Erasmus. The meals were irregular, and, when they arrived, they were frugal to the verge of parsimony. In one of his latest Colloquies, the 'Opulentia Sordida,' we have a most amusing, if somewhat malicious, picture—of course under feigned names—of the table of Andrea, who acted as master of the household. Granting that the recital is in the main a caricature, we cannot doubt that some of the details are real, for it is full of touches of Venetian manners. There were only two meals in the day, dinner at one, and supper—whenever Andrea came home—sometimes as late at ten, in spite of the loud murmurs of Erasmus, who sat half-starved at his work. When at length they sat down, a party of eight or nine, the *pièce de résistance* was, once at least, a bowl of vinegar, with seven small lettuce leaves floating in it, winding up with a stony cheese. Yet the meal often lasted more than an hour, while they amused themselves with telling stories, and soaking their chalky bread—a necessary operation, for it was only baked twice a month—in a dreggy wine, largely diluted with water. When Andrea was in a generous mood, he would bring home three bunches of grapes as a special dainty; or, if grapes were out of season, a farthing's worth of shellfish; and then 'you would have thought there was to be a wedding in the family, for there had to be a fire, though they were very quickly cooked.' At other times the chief dish was a soup, made of skimmed-milk cheese, followed by stale tripe; and on fish days they had three small whiting for eight people. All these dishes were rapidly taken away, as the ladies made their meal upon the remains. At length Erasmus begged for the fourth part of a boiled fowl at each meal; even this came up 'as dry as a chip, for the women lapped up all the gravy;' but his host only allowed two starved

pullets a week, and on the odd meat-day he would pretend that he forgot to go to market. On fast-days a friend was privately employed to smuggle in three new-laid eggs; but these were whisked off by the servants, who put rotten ones in their place. The unkindest cut of all was when Aldus took Erasmus gently to task for his large eating, warning him of the dangers of indulging a northern appetite in a southern clime; and at last, having one day found him furtively munching some confectionery, he privately begged a physician who was the friend of both to remonstrate with him on the subject. The doctor, however, had no better success; for his prescription was that he should leave off suppers altogether, and mix half water with his wine. Erasmus tells us, in one of his later works, that he soon came to the best solution of the difficulty, viz. to keep his own table in a private room. He allows, however, at the end of this lively colloquy, that his hosts throve on their slender fare, and concludes that the quantity of food and drink is more a matter of custom than of nature.

It has been said by some that the freedom of this satire, disguised though it was, caused an estrangement between Erasmus and the family of Aldus.[10] Yet it was probably not written till 1531—after the deaths both of Aldus and his father-in-law—and we find Erasmus in friendly correspondence with the son of Andrea [11] more than twenty years after his visit. In his defence it must be said that, just before its publication, he was brutally attacked by J. C. Scaliger—the fiercest literary gladiator of his time—in his first pamphlet against the 'Ciceronianus;' and that the latter professed to have private information from Venice as to the conduct of Erasmus during his stay. He represents that he acted as a kind of hired parasite to Aldus, and that his hosts were disgusted with the sloth and inebriety of one who 'drank like a three-mouthed Geryon.' Much of this coarse slander refutes itself, and only recoils upon his accuser; but it is doubtless based upon the fact that Erasmus did not conform to Italian ideas of temperance.

We know from scattered notices in his works that he was not debarred on this account from the most brilliant society in Venice. He was invited to supper with the victorious general D'Alviano, but was compelled to decline. He was introduced to Bernardo Ruccellai, a relative of the Medici, and a writer of elegant contemporary histories in Latin,[12] but could not induce him to use

[10] The suppression of the name of Erasmus in some later Aldine editions, and the substitution of 'Batavus quidam homo,' was due, not to this cause, as is sometimes stated, but to a fear of his enemies, the monks.

[11] M. de Nolhac prints four hitherto unpublished letters to Francesco d'Asola.

[12] Erasmus himself compares his works to Sallust.

that language in conversation. 'You speak to deaf ears, most noble sir,' said Erasmus. 'I am as ignorant of your vulgar tongue as I am of Hindoo.' He often dined with the learned Greek, John Lascaris, once an intimate friend of Lorenzo, who now occupied the high post of French ambassador to the republic. Perhaps it was at the suggestion of Lascaris that he was admitted a member of the New Academy, which was founded by Aldus about 1500 for the promotion of Greek studies. This learned body met once a week in the evenings to collate manuscripts, choose works for the press, and discuss general questions of scholarship. The members bound themselves always to speak in Greek on penalty of a small fine; the fines were saved up, and spent in an occasional banquet. Here he met Ducas, John of Crete, and other Greeks, whom Aldus had gathered round him as copyists and correctors; here he met also several learned Italians, who became his fast friends. He speaks of one of the founders, Paolo Canale, who died of consumption during his stay, as 'a young noble of the utmost promise, born for great things if death had not envied men his talents.' A more mature scholar, Fra Urbano Bolzani, who had been Greek tutor to the sons of Lorenzo, and had travelled on foot through many Eastern countries, assisted him in the preparation of his 'Adagia.' So, too, did Battista Egnazio—once a pupil of Politian—'a sound and true friend,' as Erasmus calls him, who was afterwards sent to Paris to represent the republic on the accession of Francis I. With the last-named, and with the doctor Leoni, the wittiest member of the circle, Erasmus maintained a correspondence to the end of his life. How affectionately he was himself remembered may be judged from the hearty reception given by his friends at Venice, nine years later, to Ulrich von Hutten, when he presented letters of introduction from Erasmus. Another friend, of whom he saw much during the first months of his stay, was Jerome Aleander, afterwards famous as papal nuncio at Worms. Aleander, who was not yet thirty, had a great reputation as a scholar, and gave Aldus valuable help in several of his publications. He was at this time living in the house, and, according to one account, shared a room with Erasmus. Soon after Easter he was summoned by the French king to occupy the Greek chair at Paris, and his subsequent rise was rapid. Erasmus greatly admired his abilities, which he thought were thrown away on politics; but he had no respect for the man. Hard words often passed between them in the first storm of the Reformation; but they met more than once on guarded terms of friendship; and they must have looked back with pleasure to those quiet weeks at Venice, when Aleander supplied materials for the 'Adagia,' and Erasmus gratefully gave him letters of introduction to his friends at Paris.

At length, in September 1508, the 'Adagia' were issued in folio.

They are a notable monument of the learning of the age, and immensely increased the author's fame, though they were not yet adorned with his bold digressions on abuses in church and state. They were received with enthusiasm all over the continent, and were reprinted eleven times in the next twelve years by one publisher at Strassburg. In the preface, addressed to his friend Mountjoy, Erasmus expresses his warmest thanks to Aldus for his generous help. The latter would gladly have kept him longer at Venice, and even proposed receiving lessons from him in rhetoric. He did employ him for some days in deciphering some manuscripts of Plautus and Terence, for which he gave him twenty crowns. But an engagement, probably procured for Erasmus by his friends in England, called him away to Padua about the beginning of October. Alexander, a natural son of James IV of Scotland, and already, at eighteen, archbishop of St. Andrews, was studying law at the university; and Erasmus had agreed, at the king's request, to instruct him in rhetoric. His new pupil was gentle and amiable, and soon won the affection of his teacher. At Padua Erasmus was still in the territory of the republic, and in constant communication with his old friends. And here, as was his wont in all his travels, he soon made new friends, among whom were Texeira, afterwards tutor to the able Portuguese king, John III, and Germain Brice, with each of whom he afterwards corresponded. He found at Padua, as professor of Greek, Marcus Musurus, another light of the Aldine academy, with whom he had been intimate at Venice. This Cretan scholar had been brought over to teach Greek in Italy by John Lascaris, who had himself given him Latin lessons. He was now in the prime of life, and in himself a perfect encyclopædia of classical knowledge. His lectures were attended by crowds of students—'like chickens under a hen,' as Leoni described them in after days. We get a bright glimpse of the renaissance enthusiasm for learning when we hear from Erasmus that Raphael Reggio, the professor of Latin, who was over seventy years of age, used to attend these lectures regularly at seven in the morning, in all the rigours of an exceptionally cold winter. Erasmus had the highest esteem for the character of Musurus; he calls his teaching 'the richest and best mart of study in the world;' and in later days he sent him more than one promising scholar. We can fancy the assistance he would himself derive from such a teacher in the work on which he was now engaged, of collating some Greek manuscripts which he had borrowed from Aldus. He tried to borrow others from the monks of Padua, and was told that when money and entreaties were useless, the only resource was theft.

Erasmus was not unaware that many Italian scholars of the time, in their enthusiasm for antiquity, almost lost sight of the Christian faith. But he expressly says that at Padua there was a

higher religious tone than elsewhere. The witness is surprising;[13] for one of the professors at this very time was the well-known Pomponazzo, who, in a work published in 1516, denied the immortality of the soul. It is true that, when threatened with the censure of the church, he explained that he only denied it on grounds of natural reason, and accepted it as a Christian.[14] Yet there is no doubt about the infidel tendency of his teaching; though his influence may have been partly counteracted by Tomeo, another professor, deeply read in Plato, who was a man of the highest character. Erasmus must have often seen the diminutive figure of Pomponazzo in the streets of Padua; and the high opinion which the professor entertained of his own talents would make it difficult for him to be hid.

We have two short letters of Erasmus to Aldus, written at the close of his stay at Padua. From these we learn that he left the city, with his pupil, about the middle of December, alarmed, like the other students, by the rumours of impending war. On 10 Dec. 1508 was formed the celebrated league of Cambray, in which France, Spain, the emperor, the pope, and most of the minor states of Italy allied themselves against the republic of Venice. No wonder that so formidable a combination spread terror in her dominions. Erasmus, 'detained,' he says, 'by the spells of Germain Brice,' stayed as long as he could; but the second letter announces his immediate departure. 'Accursed wars!' he writes, 'they prevent my enjoying a part of Italy which delights me more every day. Farewell, my best of friends! I will give Bombasio your message and kind regards in person.'

Their first resting-place was Ferrara, where they remained a day or two. Different, indeed, is the Ferrara of to-day from the prosperous city visited by Erasmus. Now, as then, the dark-red square tower of the castle of Este, gloomy and massive, frowns down upon the approaching traveller. But now the streets are grass-grown and almost deserted; and the windows of many of the houses are boarded up, as if in despair of the advent of a tenant. Then, though the city had been largely extended by its sagacious princes, no houses were to be let; and a thriving population of 100,000—nearly four times its present number—cheerfully supported an immense weight of taxation. The reigning duke Alfonso, and his wife, the amiable and accomplished Lucrezia Borgia, were ardent patrons of learning; and the university was one of the most famous in Europe. Ferrara, like so many Italian towns, could boast of a knot of scholars whose researches shed lustre upon her name.

[13] The passage is in a letter to Hermann Frisius. Yet Hallam, following Tiraboschi, says of this time that the university was for more than a century the focus of atheism in Italy (*Lit. of Europe*, i. 321).

[14] Boccalini (*Ragguagli da Parnaso*, Cent. i. Rag. 90) makes Apollo decide after this defence that Pomponazzo should be exculpated as a man, and burnt only as a philosopher.

Erasmus and his party were received into the house of his old friend Richard Pace, afterwards English ambassador at Rome; and the literary chiefs of the town assembled there to do honour to the author of the 'Adagia.' Among them were Leoniceno, the physician and first translator of Galen, still hale though over eighty, and destined to live to be ninety-six; Richeri (he preferred to call himself Rhodiginus), who was compiling a work on antiquities—the marvel of after times; and Calcagnini, the professor of *belles-lettres*, a young poet and orator of no mean order. The last-named made an harangue of welcome to Erasmus in such elegant Latin that the latter says his tongue failed him in reply. They then sat down and discussed some of the 'Adagia,' Erasmus pulling a copy out of his trunk in order to explain them with more effect.[15] Such a circle of admirers might well have tempted him to prolong his stay; but Ferrara was too near the expected theatre of war, and Erasmus pushed on to Siena, which he reached about New Year's Day, 1509.

This city was now governed by the despot Pandolfo Petrucci, whose wary diplomacy had kept him free from the political embroilments of the moment; and it proved a haven of rest to Erasmus. The bracing air of its hills seems to have improved his health, which had suffered much during the past two years. He gives us a pleasing picture of the course of study which he now pursued with his pupil. He used to give him some subject for rhetorical composition, on which they talked together the next day; and every morning Alexander translated a passage from some Greek author. The afternoons were given by the prince to singing, learning the flute, and other music, of which he was passionately fond; and in his leisure hours he read Roman history. During meals passages of the fathers were read aloud by a priest. Erasmus spent some of his time in writing short moral themes for his pupil, one of which, a declamation on death, still survives. Nor were amusements despised. They threaded the crooked streets on 21 Feb. to the carnival fêtes in the Piazza del Campo; and there witnessed a strange entertainment,[16] in which a bull was placed in the arena to face a huge wooden tortoise, whose creaks and contortions, produced by ropes and pulleys, terrified it into flight. But Erasmus was now impatient to see Rome, which was within three or four days' journey; so he left his pupil to prosecute his studies at the university of Siena, and entered the Eternal City about the beginning of Lent.

Those who search the works of so ardent a lover of antiquity for any particular notices of the monuments of ancient Rome will

[15] These reminiscences are taken from a correspondence between Calcagnini and Erasmus in 1525.

[16] Described in Erasmus's *Supputatio errorum Bedae.*

find nothing to reward them. Perhaps Erasmus himself was disappointed that so little remained to be seen; at least he writes in later years, 'Old Rome does not exist, except in ruins and rubble, the traces and scars of her old disasters; take away the pope and cardinals, and what would Rome be?' Yet in the time of Erasmus far more of old Rome remained than is the case to-day. The Baths of Constantine were in existence; the Coliseum was more perfect; the Aventine, the Cælian, and the Esquiline were covered with ruined palaces. It seems clear that Erasmus's love of antiquity was exclusively literary; he had no sentimental feeling about ruins, and could not sympathise with the archæological enthusiasm that had lately arisen in Roman circles. It was an age with a passion for antiques; gems, cameos, and coins had acquired a value hitherto unknown. Only a few months before the grand sculptured group of the Laocoon had been found in the Baths of Titus, and had made the fortune of the lucky discoverer; while the poetasters vied with each other in producing verses on the event. Erasmus was certainly introduced to Angelo Colocci, the virtuoso of the day, whose villa and gardens were richly adorned with the remains of ancient art. To the lovers of modern art what more glorious era could there be for a visit to Rome than the later years of the pontificate of Julius? Bramante was just beginning his colossal plan for the rebuilding of St. Peter's; Michael Angelo had been summoned to decorate the Sistine chapel; and Raphael was already painting in the chambers of the Vatican. Erasmus had a strong taste for art, as is proved by his remarks on Holbein and Albert Dürer; he once speaks of sculpture and painting as 'a silent poetry.' He most probably visited Raphael's studio, though we need not believe the story that he showed him some of the works of Holbein.

The short weeks which he spent at Rome in the spring of 1509 were given almost entirely to the observation of manners and the pleasures of friendship. He was fortunate enough to find in Rome a friend whom he had known at Bologna, Scipio Carteromachus, an eminent scholar and one of the earliest members of the Aldine academy. Scipio left Rome about ten days after Erasmus arrived, but he devoted that time to him almost entirely, living in the same house, and introducing him into the best literary circles. In this way he may have met Sadolet, as he certainly met Egidius of Viterbo, one of the ablest as well as one of the most saintly men of the time. He tells us that he sometimes shared a bed with Giulio Camillo, an eccentric genius of the day, who spent forty years in constructing a strange machine, called a theatre, for tabulating all the operations of the mind under the signs of astrology. The academy of Leti was still in existence; and at its meetings Erasmus met old Marso, one of its earliest members, and two former Bologna friends, Beroaldo and

Spherula. He also attended the receptions of a countryman of his own, John Goritz, who held an office at the papal court, and kept almost an open house for men of learning at his palace on the Quirinal. Our traveller was also introduced to Inghirami, librarian of the Vatican, called from his preaching abilities the Cicero of the day. This accomplished prelate had acquired the nickname of Phedro from his excellent acting as Phaedra in Seneca's play of 'Hippolytus;' and he was particularly friendly to Erasmus, who always speaks of him by that name. Inghirami did the honours of the Vatican library for his new friend, and doubtless gave him access to some of the conventual libraries, far richer then than they were after the sack of Rome in 1527. Nothing made Erasmus look back more regretfully to Rome than the splendid libraries which he had visited; he longed to consult their wealth of manuscripts for his own works on the Bible and the Greek fathers.

Now, however, his chief aim was to see all that he could; and his writings show the keenness of his observation—particularly the 'Praise of Folly,' which he wrote only a few weeks afterwards. He tells us that he was persuaded by his friends, much against his will, to attend a bull-fight at the Vatican; and though he detested the cruelty of such a relic of old paganism, he describes, with evident relish, the drolleries of a masked buffoon, who, in the intervals, like the sham strong man at a circus, mimicked the actions of the real fighters. We can fancy him, too, taking the air in the Campagna, or watching the feats of the jugglers in the Campo de' Fiori, or reading with a contemptuous curl of the lip the vulgar lampoons that were affixed every night to the base of Pasquino's statue.[17] He notices the satirical vein of the populace, and ridicules the unhistorical pride which led them to suppose they were descended from the ancient Romans.

Meantime he heard from his pupil that he had been ordered to return to Scotland, and that he wished, before doing so, to pay a visit to Rome; Erasmus therefore returned to Siena, and brought him to Rome in the course of Holy Week. On Good Friday, 6 April, in the pope's chapel, they heard a sermon[18] from one of the great preachers of the Curia before his holiness and the cardinals which strikingly illustrates the paganism of the period. The orator began with a eulogy of the pope, whom he compared to Jove poising in his right hand the deadly lightning, and regulating the world with his nod. In speaking of the Passion he recalled the devotion of Cecrops and Iphigenia, the Decii and Curtius in ancient history;

[17] Pasquino was a Roman tailor of caustic wit, who lived shortly before this time. Soon after his death the statue of a gladiator was dug up and placed near his shop, and was popularly called by his name. Erasmus more than once mentions the 'pasquinades' on this statue.

[18] Erasmus gives the heads of this sermon in the *Ciceronianus.*

and compared the ingratitude of the Jews towards the Saviour to the treatment which Socrates and Aristotle, Epaminondas and Scipio, experienced at the hands of their countrymen. It is hard to say whether the pedantry or the irreligion of this discourse is the more remarkable; there was assuredly an abundance of both qualities at the papal court. It was not uncommon for literary men to speak of the mass as *sacra deorùm* and of the cardinals as *patres conscripti*; and even ecclesiastics made it a fashion to treat religious subjects entirely in the language of the classics. Erasmus speaks sadly of the unbelief which came under his own notice; he one day spent some time in confuting a philosopher, who relied on the authority of Pliny the Elder against the immortality of the soul. But he testifies to worse things than these—to a promiscuous hunt after benefices, to men in society interlarding their conversation with blasphemy, and to priests of bad life parading their impiety at the mass. He was amazed at the tolerance shown to such persons by the authorities; like Luther, who was at Rome for a fortnight in the following year, he must have sometimes thought—'the nearer to Rome the further from Christianity.' It is plain, too, from the 'Praise of Folly,' that his Dutch simplicity was offended at the pomp and splendour of ecclesiastical life; he enumerates all the parasites of the Curia—'that crowd of scribes, copyists, notaries, advocates, secretaries, valets, grooms, bankers, agents, so onerous—(what did I say?) honourable to the Roman see.' Nor could he have been blind to the darker side of the picture—the heavy debts incurred by many of the cardinals to keep up their position, and the scandalous mismanagement of the papal finances.

Yet he met with much personal kindness, as he often confesses, at the hands of the princes of the church. He was on terms of intimacy with the cardinals of Nantes and of Bologna, and was sometimes invited to the table of the more famous cardinal de' Medici, who afterwards, as Leo X, wrote to him that he had pleasant recollections of their friendly talks together. His chief patron, however, was Raphael Riario, cardinal of St. George, great-nephew of Sixtus IV, who was already one of the senior members of the college, though he lived to conspire against Leo, as he had joined in a conspiracy against his father Lorenzo. This wealthy prelate resided in a noble palace built for him by Bramante, now the papal chancery, the erection of which necessitated—a strange vandalism for those days—the destruction of the Arch of Gordian. The cardinal desired Erasmus to write a memorandum on the war with Venice, which was then being discussed in the consistory. Erasmus, who had so many friends at Venice, wrote a strong diatribe against the war, which he called 'Antipolemus; but his patron, who knew that this would be useless, seems to have persuaded

him to soften it down into expressions of regret at the necessity. There is an unlikely story that Julius, displeased at its moderation, sent for Erasmus, and ordered him not to meddle in the affairs of princes. Unfortunately the pamphlet has perished; and so we cannot tell how far Erasmus sacrificed his principles at the shrine of friendship. The cardinal remained much attached to him, and afterwards wrote, promising, if he would return to Rome, to procure him a position worthy of his merit.

Before leaving Italy, the young prince Alexander, with Erasmus, made a hasty trip to Naples—a kind of pilgrimage to the tomb of Virgil and the cave of the Sibyl.[19] There is but one allusion to this journey in the works of Erasmus, and that is to the well-known grotto of Pausilippo—a tunnel of unknown age, about a mile long and some fifty feet high, under the hill to the north of Naples. 'As you go,' he says, 'from Naples to Cumæ by the subterranean passage under the mountain, you can see, through the thick gloom, a little speck of light like a star, which seems to promise an exit.' On the hill above the grotto is the so-called tomb of Virgil, at which our travellers paid their tribute of veneration, and then returned to Rome by the Appian Way. Here the prince bade adieu to his tutor, to whom he gave, as a mark of his regard, an antique ring with an inscribed stone. One can imagine with what grief Erasmus would hear, four years later, of his death by his father's side on Flodden Field.

The third visit of Erasmus to Rome could hardly have lasted more than a month—perhaps less; for in the early days of June he received two letters from England which were the cause of his leaving Italy almost immediately. One was from his friend Mountjoy, dated Greenwich, 27 May, announcing the accession of Henry VIII, and begging Erasmus to return at once; the other was from the new king himself, adding his own entreaties to Mountjoy's and making liberal promises for the future. Mr. Froude has translated both these letters, and it is needless to recapitulate them. The first enclosed 10*l.* from Mountjoy and Warham for the expenses of his journey. We can hardly wonder that he instantly decided to accept so flattering an invitation. The king's letter seemed to promise not only pecuniary support, but a post of honour near his person; and Erasmus, though he was free from vulgar ambition, was conscious of talent worthy of high station. It is clear, too, from his own admissions, that he did not like the religious atmosphere of Rome; the position in England promised more independence; and his weak health, which had suffered from the malaria of Italy, warned him to seek a more northern clime. His Roman friends, nevertheless, did their utmost to retain him; he was told that he could at once be made one of the pope's penitentiaries;

[19] Probably the lake of Averno, near Naples.

and some hinted at the prospect of higher dignities. His own resolution wavered for a moment after paying a long-promised visit to the Cardinal Grimani of S. Mark, in his palace now called the Palazzo di Venezia. He has himself vividly described the interview.

It was afternoon, and the porch and courtyard were empty. I left my horse with my servant and went in alone; in the first three rooms not a soul was to be seen, yet all the doors were open. At last I found a little Greek doctor, as I supposed, who told me that the cardinal was conversing with several nobles. As I was looking out of the window, the Greek came up and asked my name. When I had given it, he disappeared; but returned at once, and ushered me in. The cardinal received me, not as such a prelate might be expected to receive so insignificant a personage, but like one of his own colleagues. They placed a chair, and we talked for more than two hours without his allowing me to uncover. He begged me not to leave Rome—the nurse of high talent—and invited me to become his guest and share his life: he added that his part of the town would especially suit my health. After much talk he sent for his nephew—a clever young man, already an archbishop; and when he came in, would not suffer me to rise, declaring that the scholar should stand in the presence of the master. He then showed me over his magnificent library, which contained books in many languages. If I had known that man earlier I should never have left a city where I had met with a welcome so much above my deserts. But my departure was so far fixed that I could not honourably remain at Rome. The cardinal made me promise to see him again before I left.

He did not, however, keep this promise.

'I have fled without seeing you,' he wrote to the cardinal; 'my tottering resolution would have yielded; your eloquence and kindness would have made me stay. I already felt a strong love of Rome; and if I had not violently torn myself away I should not have been able to leave it.'

He promised himself, however, a speedy return; and in later years he every winter formed some plan for another visit, till at length his health and, perhaps, the course of political events rendered it impossible.

In the middle of June he left Rome, as it proved, for the last time; and giving only one night to Bombasio at Bologna, with whom he left a kind message to Aldus, he crossed the Alps by the Splügen to Constance, and passing through the forest of Breisgau to Strassburg, he embarked on the Rhine, which carried him swiftly to Holland. During the journey he whiled away his time, on horseback and by boat, in composing his powerful satire, the 'Praise of Folly,' writing down his thoughts each evening at the inn. In one of the liveliest of his Colloquies, called 'Diversoria,'[20] he has described for us his uncomfortable experiences at these German

[20] Mr. Seebohm and other biographers place the lively experiences of the *Diversoria* on the road to Italy; yet Erasmus did not then enter Germany. The route in the text is given by Rhenanus.

inns; and the magic touch of Scott has popularised the description in one of the most charming chapters of Anne of Geierstein. By the middle of July Erasmus was once more in England, in the hospitable home of his friend More.

Mr. Seebohm, in his 'Oxford Reformers,' has spoken of this sojourn in Italy as if it brought to Erasmus nothing but disappointments and discomforts. There are certainly expressions in his letters which accord with this view; he says, for instance, in a moment of ill-humour, that he learnt very little in Italy. But in his better moods he paid a juster tribute to the variety of his new experiences and to the kindness of his many learned friends. He says, elsewhere: 'I left Italy with regret and in my own despite; no nation in the world pleases me so well as the Italians.' And in his old age he writes: 'My heart is in Rome, nor would I willingly lay my bones elsewhere.' The last eighteen months, at any rate, of his stay had been a time of happiness and of renown. Reviewing his career after the lapse of four centuries, we can see that the whole time was of the utmost value to him. His views of life had been enlarged by watching the manners and customs of the south; his scholarship had ripened by contact with the 'New Learning' in its first home; and he had been fitly prepared to play his high part as one of the leaders of mankind along the path of progress and reform.

EDWARD H. R. TATHAM.

An Irish Absentee and his Tenants: 1768–1792

ONE would not have expected to find in the French national archives a large collection of the papers of an Irish landlord of the eighteenth century. That landlord was frightened away from Paris by the slaughter of the Swiss guards on 10 Aug. 1792, and by the wholesale arrests which preceded the massacres of the following month. A stampede naturally set in among the wealthy visitors. Till then many had remained, believing that the storms of the Revolution were over, or that foreigners could be in no danger of molestation; but they now perceived that Paris was not a safe place to dwell in. To leave, however, was no easy matter. The municipality and the sections, or district committees, had usurped the prerogative of issuing passports, and these were not obtainable without extreme difficulty. There could scarcely have been an actual desire of detaining foreigners, but there was a suspicion, not always unfounded, that they were doing a good turn to their French aristocratic friends by taking charge of valuables, or even by smuggling their owners in disguise as servants.

The earl of Kerry, whose papers I am about to analyse, had applied for a passport, but, as he wrote on 1 Sept. to William Lindsay, the embassy secretary,[1] 'I now receive for answer that I must *prove* that we and our servants are foreigners. In order to facilitate my departure from this state of imprisonment I have given up the thought of taking French servants.' He contemplated asking for a passport for the provinces, so as to get to Calais and wait for a chance of slipping across the Channel; but he feared that his property would be confiscated. Lindsay, enclosing the letter in a despatch to his government, said: 'I have only to observe on it that there are many English here at present who are in a situation similar to that of his lordship.' Alarmed doubtless by the prison

[1] Lindsay, left behind by Gower to wind up affairs, was dining with the duke of Orleans on 3 Sept., when the princess de Lamballe's head was carried past the windows by a howling mob. He obtained a passport only by threatening to start without one, and to hold the government responsible if he was stopped or insulted.

massacres, which commenced the next day, Lord Kerry started probably either with a passport for the provinces or with none at all, for we next hear of him in Belgium. He left all his plate, pictures, furniture, and papers. Seals were placed on them by the section, and on 13 April 1793 he was declared an *émigré*. He tried, indeed, to safeguard his property, and two of his old servants, unluckily for themselves, also endeavoured to preserve it. On 21 May 1794 Pierre François Nicolas and Capret Brunel were guillotined at Paris, the former for writing to Lord Kerry at Brussels respecting the fate of his house, the latter for receiving a letter from him telling him to consider himself free to seek another situation. They had apparently remained for a time in charge of the house. On 17 July, moreover, Louise Blaiseau, whose husband, cook at the embassy, had accompanied Lord Gower to England, was executed because she had applied for the removal of the seals on the Kerry property. Lord Kerry's heirs in 1820 were awarded 145,000 fr. out of the lump sum paid over by France to the British government for compensation to its subjects.

The award probably did not take into account the only thing which interests us, viz. the correspondence and business papers from 1768 to 1792, which he had carried about with him during his continental wanderings. These papers, which include the tradesmen's bills down to 5 Aug. 1792, fill a dozen of the numberless bandboxes at the national archives labelled *Papiers séquestrés, émigrés et condamnés*. They had probably lain untouched for close on a century when I glanced at them a few years ago, and in my 'Englishmen in the French Revolution,' 1889, I mentioned the letters of the Irish agent as showing that 'the collection of rents was almost as difficult then as now.' I had not at that time inclination or leisure to scrutinise the documents; but the hint I threw out to persons more closely interested in Irish land problems not having been taken up, I have again examined the papers, which give a vivid picture of the relations of landlord and tenant in the latter part of the eighteenth century. A more exhaustive scrutiny would be amply repaid, and a French historian might from the tradesmen's bills tabulate Paris prices prior to and during the Revolution.

Francis Thomas Fitzmaurice, twenty-third baron and third earl of Kerry, was born at Dublin on 9 Sept. 1740, six months before the death of his grandfather, the first earl.[2] Of the latter another grandson, the statesman known first as Lord Shelburne and afterwards as Lord Lansdowne, says—

> I spent the four first years of my life in the remotest part of the south of Ireland, under the government of an old grandfather, who reigned, or

[2] Whose own grandfather was taken away from his catholic and rebel father to be educated as a protestant at Trinity College.

rather terrorised, equally over his own family and the neighbouring country as if it was his family, in the same manner as I suppose his ancestors, lords of Kerry, had done for generations since the time of Henry II, who granted to our family 100,000 acres in those remote parts in consideration of our services against the Irish. . . . My grandfather had ceased all intercourse with his eldest son, who was gentlemanlike and high-spirited, but weak and debauched, and married into a very weak family, the earl of Cavan's. As soon as he heard that a son was born of this marriage he exclaimed, 'The house of Lixnaw is no more!' and so it literally proved.

That eldest son's rupture with his father can, however, scarcely have been so complete or prolonged as Shelburne represents, for his first child, a girl, was born under the ancestral roof at Lixnaw, where, on the old man's death, the second earl installed himself. But he survived his octogenarian father only six years, dying, like him, at Lixnaw. Thus at six years of age the third earl was an orphan, his mother having died before her husband. I continue the quotation.

And so it literally proved, for the present Lord Kerry, after being educated under the direction of the lord chancellor of Ireland [*i.e.* he was a ward in chancery], and being left a good deal to himself, fell in love with a married lady twenty years older than himself, the daughter of an eminent Roman catholic lawyer, and [the husband] obtaining a divorce, married her, an extraordinary vain woman.

The lady thus stigmatised was Anne Anastasia, the second of the three daughters of Peter Daly, a large landowner at Quansbury, county Galway, probably a kinsman of the first Lord Dunsandle. Her first husband was a cousin, Charles Daly, of Callow, and we may assume it to have been a marriage of acres, not of hearts. The divorce[3] and the remarriage both took place in March 1768. Whether a divorce was obtained from Rome as well as from parliament does not appear, and perhaps it may be inferred from her ultimate burial in Westminster Abbey that she renounced not only husband but creed for Kerry's sake. One of her sisters married the earl of Louth, and the other Viscount Kingsland—both apparently protestants.

The old grandfather had graduated at Trinity College, Dublin, in 1698, and the third earl was sent thither in 1758. In 1746 he had been described in Smith's 'History of Kerry' as 'a young nobleman of great hopes and happy accomplishments;' yet he must soon have left Lixnaw, which was allowed to fall into ruin, and on his marriage he took up his abode at Prior Park House, near Bath, a modern ornamental structure, so named from the site having

[3] The *Annual Register* for 1766 mentions an action for *crim. con.* in the London court of common pleas by an Irishman against an Irish peer. 5,000*l.* damages were awarded. This apparently refers to Kerry.

formerly belonged to Bath Abbey. Since 1829 it has been a Roman catholic college. Lady Kerry, who had no children by either marriage, was in delicate health, and in 1772 Kerry sold off his furniture and farming stock and took her to the continent. They visited Spa and Montpellier, and made long sojourns in Paris, hiring expensive houses—the Auteuil mansion of Madame de Boufflers, for instance, in the winter of 1790—and keeping eleven servants, for in 1789 we hear of the latter making a patriotic gift of 117 fr. All but the housemaid, a Mrs. Spyer, were French. The butler had 1,200 fr. a year, and the aggregate wages amounted to 5,000 fr., while the monthly washing bill came to 150 fr. Wages were paid quarterly, and the servants had to sign their names in a tabular form. We may be sure that Lord Kerry closely scrutinised his tradesmen's bills before settling and docketing them, and hundreds, if not thousands, of them remain to testify to his businesslike habits. Henry Sykes, ancestor of the late M. Waddington, who kept a jeweller's shop opposite the newly rebuilt Palais Royal, supplied him not only with cosmetics and fancy articles, but with blankets, for a bill of 1790 has an item of 50*l.* on this score. Kerry's estates had probably been mismanaged during his long minority, for he had litigation with his dismissed agent, Rice, as also with his sister, Lady Anne Morris, and with Lord Glendore and other neighbours. Possibly he had sown his wild oats, for he had raised considerable sums on condition of annuities payable not during the recipients' lives, but during his own. These liabilities, however, he must have redeemed, otherwise the bonds, discharged, would not have come back into his possession. He was apparently anxious, both from necessity and temperament, to turn his Kerry estates—the manors of Ardfert, Lixnaw, and Listowel—to the best advantage; and, considering the multitude of small holdings, the post of agent would have been no sinecure even had the rents been punctually paid, the very reverse of which was the fact. Irish tenants were then, as now, some dreadfully poor, some wholly unmanageable. Some, in short, could not pay, and others would not. Kerry had, however, a jewel of an agent—the Rev. Christopher Julian, a clergyman, and a pluralist to boot; but Irish livings were very lean. Julian, who had graduated at Trinity College, Dublin, in 1756, was rector of Tullamore, a village near Listowel, which, on a fanciful etymology, he uniformly spelt 'Listow Hill,' and up to forty years ago his descendants were the squireens of Tullamore. Indeed, there is still a Julian on the commission of the peace for Kerry. He was a Kerry man, highly conscientious, anxious to send vouchers for all his outgoings. His long, closely written letters to Kerry give the minutest information, and evidently the most judicious advice, not disdaining, moreover, to communicate the gossip of the neighbourhood. He was manifestly desirous of

making the largest remittances, but was often prevented by humanity from resorting to distress warrants or evictions. He was sometimes nervously afraid of not giving satisfaction, for on 8 Feb. 1779, while litigation was going on with Rice, he says—

> Though I am not conscious that your lordship ever suffered in any instance by any neglect or inattention of mine, on the contrary that I have been to the utmost of my power careful of your business, even to the saving you sixpence when I could do it, and that in the suit I am now referring to no inconvenience has been hitherto brought on you by me yet, being unused to law, especially to the difficulties of a suit contested as this is, my mind is kept in a continual fever for fear that there should, by any apprehensions, mistake, or inability of mine, any inconvenience arise to you.

Julian was anxious for Lord Kerry to reside on his estate. Kerry was the first absentee of his race;[4] his ancestors, sometimes courtiers or political intriguers at Dublin, sometimes rebels, standing siege at Lixnaw, had lived in Ireland. In this very year, 1779, he had serious thoughts of building a mansion, for Lixnaw was in ruins. Arthur Young, in 1777, speaks of it as 'deserted for ten years past, and now presenting so melancholy a scene of desolation that it shocked me to see it. Everything around lies in ruin, and the house itself is going fast off by thieving depredations of the neighbourhood.' As for Listowel, it was not habitable even for the law agent, for when Kerry wished the latter, who bore the not inappropriate name of Furlong, to reside on the estate, Julian reported—

> There is not on the farm a habitation fit for a decent family to go into. The castle is up, and the walls, I believe, good, but the roof, floors, doors, and windows are all old and rotten and admit the rain through every part.

Failing an outlay of 500*l.* to make it tenantable, he urged that something should be done to stop the decay, for 'it would be a pity that such an object in the country should be suffered to go to ruin.' Kerry thought of building on Beale Hill, but this proved a castle in the air, and perhaps his wife's health necessitated a drier climate. The hotel and other bills show that he was at Paris in 1779, at Spa in 1780, at Paris in 1782–83, at Nice, Montpellier, and Toulouse in 1783–84, at Lyons and Spa in 1786, and at Paris from 1789 to 1792. A projected 'new town' at Listowel also fell through. The idea was to build a large number of houses and invite settlers, to whom, it is to be presumed, the castle lands would have been leased. This would have cost 2,000*l.*, which Kerry would have had to

[4] Absenteeism, indeed, was just beginning to afflict Ireland. Arthur Young, however, on his tour in 1777 was entertained by several Irish peers and by numerous untitled landowners; yet London gaieties possessed an irresistible attraction.

borrow. Julian might well advise that advertising for settlers should be deferred till the houses were begun, for he remembered a case in which an advertisement had brought a throng of people, who, finding nothing ready, had to disperse, only a few vagabonds remaining. He significantly adds—

An undertaker, a man of approved knowledge in building, &c., honest and capable of keeping accounts, should be employed to conduct the works. I fear such a person cannot easily be had in Ireland, and therefore should be sought in England.

Although the scheme came to nothing, it shows that Irish landlords were not devoid of enterprise, and the Kerry historian, Smith, speaks in 1796 of the great expense incurred by them in making roads through what had been an almost inaccessible region. Young, moreover,

was told a curious anecdote of his [Lord Kerry's] estate, which shows wonderfully the improvement of Ireland. The present earl of Kerry's grandfather, Thomas, agreed to lease the whole estate for 1,500*l.* a year to a Mr. Collis [there was a Collis vicar of Tralee in 1729] for ever, but the bargain went off upon a dispute whether the money should be paid at Cork or Dublin. These very lands are now let at 20,000*l.* a year.

Shelburne, in 1800, also says the estates 'would now have been worth 20,000*l.*, a year;' but, unless some of the rent rolls have disappeared or have been overlooked by me, this figure was a great exaggeration. A rent roll of 1774 gives 5,124*l.*, of which only 1,034*l.* had been paid. Another of 1777 gives 6,590*l.* of which 3,664*l.* had been paid. Kerry distributed 200*l.* a year in prizes for the best crops, the best spinning, and so on. The tenancies were of every variety of size, the rents varying from a few shillings to 1,180*l.* Many leases were granted not merely for the life of the tenant but the lives of members of his family. There were also fixed leases of from twelve months to thirty-one years. That under-letting, the 'middleman' so loudly denounced at a later date, was already a great evil is shown by the frequent stipulation 'tenant not to alien.' The adjoining Petty estates, bequeathed by Sir Wm. Petty's son in 1751 to his nephew John Fitzmaurice, Kerry's uncle, had for years been in the hands of middlemen, who were sometimes 'six deep.'

The accounts have a column reserved for 'observations,' and we meet with such entries as these :—

'No means of recovery has been furnished for the whole or any part of the rent, and besides Mr. Collins appears to be in distressed circumstances.'

'Served with an ejectment.'

'The money not being to be had from him by repeated applications, though sufficiently solvent, the law agent was written to to sue for the contents.'

'Covenants not performed,'

'Banks made, but it is apprehended they do not, neither can be made so as to prevent the overflowing of the highest tides and floods in the present state of the other banks about Lixnaw.'

'The law agent has been repeatedly applied to to sue, but nothing has been done towards it.'

'At that time this arrear might have been recovered, but the tenant's circumstances are so much altered since as to make it now a desperate debt.'

'This is one of the two tenants who have taken advantage of the fall of the lease, and quitted the lands to evade the payment of Gale's rent. She would have continued to hold the two last, which were some bargain; but because I would not consent to her relinquishing the first, which she held at an extended rent, she withdrew from the whole. It was too gross an imposition to be submitted to, be the profits whose they may. Some poor under-tenant of hers has assumed the annexed rent for the two last holdings, which is more than she was to have paid for them, but it is probable it will not be all collected. And it is also probable that there will be further loss on the remainder of the assumed rents, for from the low condition of the under-tenants in general the representatives never were without arrears.'

'Has a long time lived on part of his tenement on charity, without payment of rent.'

'This holding is made up of a number of poor cabins without gardens.'

'Just as much as can be made of it without a lease in its present state, covered with water, old trees, &c.'

'No tenant to be had, and therefore these parts remain unlet, and must be for this year under your lordship's stock.'

'Two of these lives are dead; James Gorham, the only surviving life, a hale old man, but turned of 70. The farm lies near the town of Ardfert, convenient to manure from the sea, and will sell for more than double the present rent.'

'This farm will let for 500*l.* a year more than the present rent [1,180*l.*] The situation is most beautiful and convenient to trade. The land lies very high on the banks of the Shannon, just at the mouth of that river.'

'The present tenants have upwards of 300*l.* a year profit rent on this farm, and they might have a great deal more could they make new leases for any certain term to their under-tenants. [Rent, 1,071*l.*]'

'Would sell for more than double the present rent.'

'Several great improvements have been made on this land, which will make it let to great advantage when the two surviving lives are extinct.'

'Will sell for more than double the rent when this life falls.'

Here are some passages from Julian's letters:—

In that part of your lordship's letter which speaks of the letter of indemnity sent with it, you have not said whether or no you are willing to have the tenants released from the costs. I take it for granted that by accepting the rents they will, of course, be released, and, from your lordship's silence with respect to costs, that it is your intention it should be so. I also think it prudent not to make that a stumbling-block, because I fear you will never recover them by any law proceeding. . . . The

rest of the number ejected are persons who would not yield to distraining or ejecting when they supposed themselves in danger, men not to be misled by my tears, if I had betrayed any, nor to be intimidated by my threats. It is at the same time my opinion that the most of them are such as would not avail themselves of any pretence to withhold their rents, if they thought themselves safe in paying them. The opposition is solely to be imputed to the notices they had from Mr. Rice. . . . I mentioned some time ago the ejectments served on the lands of Coolmane for non-payment of rent. The tenants of this farm, in conjunction with the inhabitants of Ballynageragh, had rescued their cattle when distrained. Being informed of this proceeding of theirs that they were become insufficient for the rent, I thought it better to cut the matter short by an ejectment, which will either recover the rent or the possession of the farm and prevent a further loss. At the same time I am to inform your lordship that, from the situation and quality of the land, and from past experience, I fear it will be a heavy incumbrance on us; but it could serve no other end to leave these men in possession but to return you at last a long arrear, if otherwise they will take care to redeem it. (26 April 1779.)

I have settled with the tenants of Coolmane by taking a year's rent on account, and their notes for the costs, amounting to 8*l.* 5*s.* 10*d.*, payable by four instalments, and as things have turned out since the ejectment was served I think I have made a very good composition. It was more than I ever expected to get from them by the service. (21 Sept. 1779.)

The whole country to-day, and I suppose the whole kingdom, is at present covered with snow, attended with a very severe frost. . . . I should hope as soon as ever cattle could be distrained to be able to send your lordship a remittance of some sort. . . . Severe, however, as the weather is, I have sent the driver abroad with menaces to the tenants in arrear if they do not come in immediately; to distrain them while it holds thus is not in his power. (26 Dec. 1779.)

All the late fairs have been extremely indifferent, and the tenants are and cannot but therefore be very backward. They have nevertheless been distrained, and your lordship may depend on it that everything shall be done that I can with humanity do for you. (9 Nov. 1781.)

I wish to discourage all expectation of abatement, looking upon it that too much had been already lost by the horrid condition of the estate when I became agent to it. (14 Nov. 1791.)

Thus far everything relates to Kerry, but in 1779 Julian was reluctantly induced to become agent also for Lady Kerry's estate in Galway. He had vainly pleaded distance and other objections. A letter of 27 April 1784 will give an idea of his difficulties.

I have infinitely greater trouble with Lady Kerry's estate than with Mr. Hare's, though considerably more than double the value. At this I should not repine if I could do her service in proportion, or in proportion to what she pays me for it; but the difficulties are so great that neither is possible, and especially to a person living at so great a distance from it. Still your lordship seems to think that I can do better than any other, and all

I can say in reply is that while you think so and I can bear it out I will not relax, but for thorough satisfaction under all the circumstances against me I cannot answer.

Again, on 2 Feb. 1789 he says--

I mentioned to your lordship in my last letter an intention of remarks on some of the tenants of Lady Kerry's estate, by whom I meant some who have heretofore kept up a sort of credit, and who may still continue to do so, but with whom for the most part I have had great trouble and difficulties from the beginning, who are now more backward than usual, and I fear blunted by continual threats, and whom your lordship may therefore think it prudent to look to by something more than I can do. Among them I do not mean to mention any of those who owe desperate or other arrears, of which your lordship already knows the cause, or rents of which I have more immediate hopes that they will fall in of course.

Mrs. Cowan, for Abbeygormagan, owes the year's rent to and ended May last; excused herself by writing to me when at Loughrea last October that she had made a representation of her distress and of the dearness of her farm to Lady Kerry, and requesting my indulgence. Since my return here Mr. Prendergast has been requested to apply to her, and answered that she was under an inflammatory liver, which it was apprehended would fall on her lungs; promised to apply to her, but has given no further answer. She never could be prevailed on to execute a lease.

Mr. Burke, for Cloncha, &c., comes under the before-mentioned description. I cannot ascertain his arrear, because I find bills for 70*l.*, not yet in cash, acknowledged by Messrs. Latouche, which I do not yet know whether they are to be placed to his credit or to account of Mr. Burke, of Foxhall; but supposing them to be to his account, he nevertheless owes to and for May last upwards of 161*l.* His son, who takes upon him the payment of the rent, is, I think, a very fair dealer, but very much distressed, and from that cause alone obliged to give continual disappointments. It is above a year since he assured me that he would before the following May be on as good a footing as the best tenants of the estate; but this promise was not made good, and I fear he will be as backward next May as he was the last. Your lordship knows the cause, for his lease has not been executed.

Lady Anne Talbot, for Cosenemuck, owes to and for May last 62*l.* 8*s.* 11*d.* It is with the utmost difficulty and by continual threatening letters that the rent has been extorted since the death of old Mr. Talbot. I suppose your lordship knows that the younger Mr. Talbot is also dead. I have heard and believe that she has been very much embarrassed. I suppose there is a lien, but I don't know who has it.

Mr. Kelly, for Drimna, owes the year's rent to and ended May last; is the same as bankrupt, all his goods being sold by execution. The lease never perfected.

The representatives of Mr. Edmund Kelly, for Killine and Clonlide, owe to and for May last 43*l.* 8*s.* 3*d.*, and for Loughancrow, upon an account for corn rent, and bonds and interest to 10 Oct. last, 104*l.* 17*s.* 8*d.* He was killed by a fall from his horse, which I believe I did not

mention to your lordship when I mentioned his death. His leases are executed; an ejectment may therefore be brought for non-payment of rent; but Mr. Prendergast having promised me to do for Lady Kerry as he should for Lady Louth what he could do by distraining, I think it best to wait the issue of his promise for a while. As to his bond debts, I fear they will certainly be lost.

Mr. Bloomfield, for Linnishes Park, owes the year's rent to and ended May last. Has let the holding, is very inattentive to the payment of the rent, and has never appeared himself for that purpose or to execute his lease.

Mr. Armstrong, for his part of Quansbury, after a note acknowledged by Messrs. Latouche for 100*l.* not yet in cash, owes to and for May last 65*l.* 8*s.* 6*d.* Has been from time to time ever since my commencement promising that he would shortly put himself on a level with the best tenants; but all his payments have been extracted from him by hard pressing or severe threats, and he still appears distressed. Has not executed his lease. Your lordship knows that where there are no leases I can neither distrain or bring ejectments for non-payment of rent, and how far it may be prudent to bring ejectments upon the title, with an almost certain loss of the rents and arrears, as in the case of Mr. John Daly, for Killiane and Lissinishy, is what I must submit to your lordship's and Lady Kerry's consideration. In his case I had no doubt, knowing to a certainty that to delay it longer would only bring the greater loss, but in those which I have here mentioned I cannot be sure that such would be the consequence. I only entertain apprehensions that in the end it may prove so, as to some if not the whole of them. . . .

After repeated letters to those herein mentioned and others of the tenants I am now again writing to them, and I have made Lady Kerry acquainted with the defaults and difficulties I have so long laboured under with some of them, and that I will make the like communication of others if not immediately attended to. The truth is that I am almost worn out by ineffectual letter-writing to and about them. I threatened a representation of them before I left Loughrea, and with it a surrender of the agency, and no very great notice has been taken of either.

This is a vivid picture of the troubles of an Irish agent, and some of these Galway tenants, signing no leases, in order not to facilitate legal processes, evidently took advantage of the 'long cry' from Loughrea to Tullamore. But what is most noticeable in the entire correspondence is the absence of any hint of disturbances or of resistance to distraint or ejectment. There is no mention even of smuggling or wrecking, which, according to Froude, were then rife in Kerry, and 'rapparees' are conspicuous by their absence. Had this lawlessness suddenly disappeared, or has Froude mistaken the exception for the rule? Julian assuredly would not have been silent on such disorders; for though he seldom touches on politics, evidently leaving this to newspapers, he gives the gossip of the district, and sends friendly messages from Dr. Crosbie, dean of Limerick, and other neighbours. Here is a political passage which shows that as early as 1779 a union with England was in prospect:—

Addresses from both houses of parliament are gone up to the throne for a free trade, so that I think we shall have at least a great extension of trade, and that must in time raise the value of our lands. It is hard to say what would be the consequence of a free trade with a union. I fear—I speak only my own apprehensions; I have very little opportunity of knowing the sentiments of those who are better informed—that the good effects would only be local, and that the ill effects throughout the kingdom at large would infinitely more than counterbalance them.

A passage dated 22 Nov. 1776 seems to show that the term 'chapel' had not yet come into use, for Julian was not the man to use an opprobrious equivalent:—

On the Listowel rental is a tenement called the mass-house, which pays 40*s.* per annum. Your lordship probably does not know that land is generally given for such uses rent-free, a circumstance I should long ago have acquainted you with but that I waited your final determination about the new town, intending to mention some private place for that purpose, and not expecting so long a delay about it. The rent it now pays was first assumed to the representatives of my grandfather out of a tenement the small garden of which was afterwards let by the under-tenant to the popish inhabitants of the parish, who built their mass-house on it. The tenement has been some time in a state of ruin. Perhaps your lordship may think that rent should not be demanded for it.

The protestant church, though it had been repaired in 1746, was not an edifice to boast of, for Julian writes in 1779—

The church is in ruin, and if it should ever be put into repair by the parishioners it will be so poorly done as to be no object of beauty to your town, or half large enough for the inhabitants, on which account you may possibly think it advisable to contribute a handsome sum towards it, and in that case I think there were no objection to your changing the situation and placing it in your new town.

Lord Kerry probably made no long stay at Brussels, which the French invasion rendered little more secure than Paris, and repairing to London he took a house in Pall Mall and a villa at Hampton Court Green. Afterwards, at a date and under circumstances of which we are ignorant, he disposed of his Irish possessions. 'Having,' says his cousin Shelburne, 'their way to fight up to get into good company, and having no posterity, they sold every acre of land,[5] which had been in our family since Henry II's time, converting the remainder into life rents, to which she brought a very considerable addition of her own, which, for want of children, descended to her sister's children.' Lord E. Fitzmaurice, Shelburne's grandson and biographer, evidently repeating a family tradition, says, 'After dissipating the greater part of his inheritance Lord Kerry invested what remained in French *assignats*;' but this is manifestly

[5] According to the *Gentleman's Magazine* of 1818 the churchyard of Lixnaw, the family burial-ground, was reserved. The second earl, but for his early death, would probably have entailed the estates.

a confusion of the compensation claims with investments in the French funds, of which the manuscripts show no trace. Neither, indeed, do they indicate any intention of parting with the estates, and from Kerry's methodical habits we should not have expected him to squander his fortune. There is evidently here something unexplained. There seems to have been no intercourse between the two cousins, and Shelburne was probably so sore at the alienation of estates which had been seven centuries in the family as not to be quite just to Kerry. When making these autobiographical notes in 1800 Shelburne, moreover, could not foresee that his son would receive under Kerry's will 145,000 fr., the compensation from France, besides shares in Durham collieries and real estates in the diocese of Canterbury worth 18,000*l*.

Shelburne's remark implies that those acres were sold prior to Lady Kerry's death, which took place in 1799. She was buried in St. Andrew's chapel, Westminster Abbey, and the *Gentleman's Magazine*, evidently copying a newspaper of the time, says, 'Never did any woman carry with her to the grave more general regret or more universal and just esteem.' Her epitaph, which does not give her age, says—

> Her most afflicted husband, Francis Thomas, earl of Kerry, whom she rendered during 31 years the happiest of mankind, not only by an affection which was bounded only by her life, and to which there never was a single moment's interruption, but also by the practice of the purest religion . . . hoping that his merciful God will consider the severe blow which it has pleased his divine will to inflict upon him . . . as an expiation of his past offences.

Lord Kerry led a very secluded life, which helps to explain why he did not go over to Paris during the peace of Amiens to reclaim his papers, and on every anniversary of his wife's death he went to kneel and pray by her tomb. He died at Hampton Court in 1818, and was buried in the same tomb. He had taken steps, as we have seen, after 1815 to obtain compensation from France. He bequeathed his funded property, after deducting legacies to servants, to the Christian Knowledge Society, the residuary legatee and executrix being a cousin, Louisa, wife of the Rev. N. Hinde. Whatever the way in which the estates disappeared, the old grandfather's prediction on Kerry's birth, 'The house of Lixnaw is no more!' was certainly realised; but a younger branch of the family is still flourishing. The grandfather's fifth son, John, inherited the adjoining estates of his mother's brother, Henry Petty, earl of Shelburne, and his descendants are marquises of Lansdowne, while the descendants of John's younger son are earls of Orkney.

J. G. Alger.

The War of the Sonderbund [1]

FEDERATION is one of the questions of the day, and Switzerland furnishes the most striking lesson in this hemisphere of its success, but it is only of recent years that the history of Switzerland and its constitutional methods have attracted serious attention in this country. The gigantic career of the United States has absorbed our interest, and it is only through the appeal by a leading statesman to a Swiss example in the referendum that our gaze has been turned to the smaller, but hardly less instructive, confederation lying nearer home. The constitution under which the Swiss live has only existed for five-and-forty years (indeed, parts of it date from 1874), and it came to light in times as dark and stormy as those which heralded the birth of the United States. The convulsions of 1848 had their preliminary throes in Switzerland, but so little warning did these convey to the minds of European statesmen that they were preparing to set the house of Helvetia in order when their own came tumbling about their ears. When the earth opened her mouth and swallowed one throne after the other, men forgot the storm in the teacup which had absorbed attention in 1847, and the Swiss were allowed to work out their own salvation without the intervention of the great powers. Little credit has been done to Lord Palmerston and to British diplomacy for the part they played at that eventful time, but no Swiss who remembers the crisis has ever failed to express his gratitude; and there is some ground for believing that had we been less ably represented at Bern or less astutely guided in our foreign affairs, Switzerland might have been the battle-field of France and Germany, or an interesting reminiscence like the Venetian republic.

Few histories are more confusing than that of Switzerland. Legend has made us familiar with an imaginary Swiss nation that rose against their oppressors and established Swiss freedom; but though the forest cantons successfully shook off the Austrian yoke

[1] My best thanks are due to the Rt. Hon. Sir R. Peel, Bart., G.C.B., for kindly allowing me to quote passages from his letters to me on this subject, and also to my friend Mr. C. D. Cunningham for valuable assistance. [This article was sent to press before Sir Robert Peel's death took place.—Ed. *E. H. R.*]

early in the fourteenth century, the accretions which gathered round them were slow in growth, and the attachment of the various cantons to one another was of the slenderest kind. There was no uniformity of government in the states which made up the union. There were the primitive republics, like the forest cantons, where every citizen had his say in the popular assembly, as in a Greek democracy; there were aristocratic republics, like Bern and Zürich, which were oligarchies as strict as Venice or Genoa; the Vallais was democratic, while St. Gallen and Basel were ruled by prelates, as Treves and Cologne were by the spiritual electors. On the outskirts of this heterogeneous body politic lay the Rhætian leagues, which did not become the canton of the Grisons until 1803. Towards the close of the fifteenth century the power of France was consolidated by Louis XI, and from that time onwards French influence was supreme in Switzerland, nor did it lose its hold until the fall of Napoleon. Louis began the system of engaging Swiss mercenaries, and throughout Europe the Swiss stood sentries at the gates of kings, as they do now at the doors of our hotels. The Reformation added fiercer causes of dissension to those already latent in the confederacy, and the strife arising from religious differences widened the breach between its members and so crippled it that during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries Switzerland was nothing better than a dependency of France. The diet had few powers, and such as it had were wielded by the catholics. The formation of the Borromean league in 1586 finally broke up the confederation into two parties, and the seven catholic cantons, which composed it, were the forerunners of those which attempted to break up the union in 1847. For a hundred and fifty years religious quarrels raged furiously in the land, and in the large towns the power of the aristocracy grew steadily till a few burgher families absorbed into their own hands the complete control of public affairs. It is small wonder that the outbreak of the French Revolution found many sympathisers with the new order of things among the Swiss, and the appearance of the troops of the republic led to revolutions and counter-revolutions, when they were repulsed by the allied powers. The Helvetic republic was a pet child of Napoleon's, and by his 'Act of Mediation' in 1803 Switzerland, as a whole, enjoyed an era of prosperity and peace for eleven years such as she had never before known; but in 1815 the congress of Vienna opened a new chapter in her history, which found its close in the Sonderbund war and the establishment of the federal union of 1848.

It is impossible to understand the disputes which culminated in the Sonderbund without considering the arrangements made by the great powers for Switzerland in 1815. The memoirs of Metternich, published about ten years ago, leave no room for doubt that the aim of that statesman was to have a weak and aristo-

cratic Switzerland, for a compact and democratic Switzerland might be a menace to the Austrian rule on the east and south, and an encouragement to the radical elements in the German and Italian territories which bordered on her. Consequently a somewhat reactionary constitution was drawn up, less democratic than the Act of Mediation, which, again, had been made less democratic than the original arrangements for the Helvetic republic. A large share of the power of which they had been deprived by the Act of Mediation was restored to the cantons, which were now twenty-two in number, and while the federal pact was firmly maintained the diet for general affairs consisted of delegates from the various cantons, who had no initiative, and could only vote according to the instructions which were given to them. This obviously tended to make all the proceedings of the diet slow and cumbersome in the extreme, as the delegates had to await instructions on every fresh point of constitutional or international dispute which arose. Each canton was entitled to one vote; provision was made for a federal army, and no canton was permitted to make an alliance hostile to the interests of the others. Finally the congress of Vienna placed Switzerland under the guarantee of the great powers, and she thus found herself freed from the subservience to France which had been her fate for more than three hundred years. This state of things was better than that before the French Revolution, but it gave occasion for continuous political disturbance, which ended in civil war. The federation bond was still too weak, and local jealousies had still too wide a scope for their mischievous activity.

Throughout the earlier period town and country in each canton had been arrayed against one another, and immediately the new constitution began to work the old jealousies revived. In the assemblies the towns procured a preponderating representation, and the old aristocratic party was attempting to reassert itself. It was not likely that a population largely imbued with the ideas of 1789, and having grown up under the union brought about by Napoleon, would long be contented with such a state of affairs, nor did each canton live in the state of isolation to which the internecine strifes of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries had condemned them. The intrepid hunters of the Alps had long been famed for their unerring aim, and an association, at first formed for purposes of friendly rivalry among sportsmen, soon grew into a political association with reforming tendencies. The men from different cantons met one another and exchanged views on the political condition of the country, which bore fruit with startling rapidity after the outbreak in Paris in 1830.[2]

This revolution,[3] which drove from the throne of France the

[2] Grote, *Seven Letters on the Recent Politics of Switzerland* (London, 1847), letter 4, p. 93.

[3] Crétineau-Joly, *Histoire du Sonderbund*, vol. i. c. 3.

elder branch of the Bourbons, was the signal in Switzerland for the realisation of the hopes which the Helvetic Society and Marksmen's Association had formed.[4] Within a few months the governments of twelve cantons had become popularised; the new constitutions recognised the sovereignty of the people and the political equality of all.[5] Revolutions in Basel and Schwyz led to these cantons being divided into two districts, or rather separate cantons, town and country, which division still prevails in Basel. But when the cantonal governments had been subjected to much-needed reforms the federal pact itself began to occupy the attention of politicians, and indeed the relations between the diet and the cantons held within them the possibilities of most serious danger to the republic. The constitutions of the cantons had become popular, but the diet remained a relic of 1815. This political engine had never been intended by its authors to be very efficient, and it had admirably responded to their desires.[6] An attempt was made in 1832 to reform the central government, but though it was accepted by fourteen of the cantons the strenuous efforts of the small catholic cantons secured its rejection. After the changes brought about by the revolution in Paris and the failure to reform the federal pact the conflict steadily developed between the upholders of state rights and those who looked to a strong central authority as the only means of insuring the stability of the confederation.

There were other than political causes to excite apprehension. The catholic church, though she had seen her rivals triumph in the wealthier and more populous part of the country, still held sway undisputed among the simple and rugged people of the mountains. Driven from the larger towns, where the bustle of affairs and intellectual discussions enlarged or distracted men's minds, she found her influence unimpaired among those who spent their days in the solitudes of the Alps, while the town of Lucerne was the principal seat of her power in the lower lands. The monastic institutions, which had been suppressed in the protestant districts, still held their dignities and wealth in undiminished affluence among a poorer population. In the small canton of Aargau alone there were two monasteries and six convents, whose inmates had gained by their benevolence and assiduity a dangerous influence over the minds of the peasantry. The two monasteries were rich, and they devoted their goods as well as their efforts to the propagation of the most violent form of aggressive catholicism in the country round. This reached its height in the year 1840, when that canton was revising its constitution, and was only a more

[4] Haussonville, *Politique Extérieure du Gouvernement Français*, 1830, 1848, p. 301.

[5] Adams and Cunningham, *The Swiss Confederation*, p. 16. London, 1889.

[6] For the views of the Guizot party on this matter see Haussonville, p. 315.

open expression than usual of the religious strife which was then distracting many parts of the country. In Aargau and Soleure and the catholic parts of Bern catholic unions had been formed, and the press, the platform, and the pulpit had been put in force to impress on the people the obligation of subordinating the state to the church, and bestowing special privileges on the catholic as distinguished from the protestant population of the canton.[7] The direction which the ultramontane party desired revision to take was that of direct appeal to the people, a majority of whom they could control, in the form of the referendum. Their efforts failed, and in their exasperation the monks and their emissaries incited their partisans to revolt. The convents sent money to purchase arms, and devoted themselves to the more suitable office of tending the wounded. In both cantons the governments triumphed, and it is little to be wondered at if their members, catholic and protestant alike, desired to put an end to a state of things which seriously threatened the peace and order of the community. On the defeat of this insurrection the great council of the canton was called together, and by an almost unanimous voice decreed the suppression of the monastic houses within the borders of the canton. Full provision was made for existing interests, and the property of the religious houses was to be devoted to the material and spiritual advancement of the population living in their immediate neighbourhood. As might be expected, that population at the time consisted, for the most part, of mendicants and paupers, who existed on the charity of the convents. There was no spoliation proposed or approved for the benefit of the adverse party, and the fact that the measure was proposed by Dr. Keller,[8] the director of the seminary himself, is sufficient evidence of it. Now, however, the inherent defects in the federal pact came prominently into notice. The fanatical portion of the population of Lucerne[9] had been in sympathy with the insurgents of Soleure and Aargau, and had secretly lent them aid; they now intervened through their representative in the diet and called the attention of that body to the fact that the Argovians were violating clause 12 of the federal pact. This clause had been inserted at the instance of the papal nuncio against the wish of the majority of the Swiss catholics,[10] but they now showed no reluctance to avail themselves of its provisions, which enacted that no interference should be permitted with the religious houses then existing. The absurdity of such a provision was sufficiently clear. The convents in question had made themselves for some time centres of political intrigue, and finally of armed opposition to the government; their retainers and servants had themselves borne arms, and yet the government in self-defence was not to be allowed to put an

[7] Grote, p. 55.
[8] *Ibid.* p. 60.
[9] *Ibid.* p. 56.
[10] *Ibid.* p. 61.

end to institutions which were a continual menace to its own stability. This was to carry the authority of the central power to a point which even the most ardent supporter of federation could not desire. Every one felt that some compromise was necessary, and finally, after two years of angry discussion in the diet, it was agreed that four of the female conventual establishments should be restored, and the offending monasteries should remain suppressed.

These events, prolonged over some years by the interference of Lucerne in the diet, and bitterly agitating in themselves to the catholics and protestants throughout the confederation, were but the forerunners of events far more exasperating to both parties, and growing gradually more dangerous to the peace and order of the whole country. During the early years of these religious disturbances one of the most curious circumstances, and the most confusing in the tracing out of events, is the alliance that sometimes appears between the leaders of the different religions in various cantons. There was no definite attachment of aristocracy to established religious interests; on the contrary, we find the priests and ministers of the rival creeds bidding for the support of the populace and leading them in person to an attack on the existing order of things. The example of Calvin had never lost its attraction for the ecclesiastical mind, and the prospect of advancing religion by playing on popular prejudice appealed to the ministers of the protestant faith no less than the catholic. The course of affairs in Zürich affords a remarkable instance of this.

It is difficult in these days, when criticism has become a commonplace and hardly evokes a protest, to understand the rage and fury aroused among the orthodox by the publication of the 'Leben Jesu.' [11] The name of Strauss was anathema both in church and conventicle, and the Vatican and Geneva alike hurled their spiritual bolts on the head of the daring critic. But if Strauss had evoked by his work a host of bitter opponents, he also had arrayed on his side a large and increasing number of enthusiastic followers, whose zeal sometimes ran into indiscretion. The university of Zürich contained many admirers of Strauss, and in 1839 a radical government was in power. The government, looking less at the requirements of expediency than at the reputation of the heretic for learning, nominated Strauss to the chair of theology, then vacant. The opposition aroused was immediate and overwhelming; all classes joined in the outcry, and the hateful appointment was quickly cancelled. But the government had given too fair a chance to its opponents to expect that they would fail to profit by it. Every pulpit rang with denunciations of the men who would poison the wells of religious learning in the university by putting

[11] Crétineau-Joly, vol. i. c. 5.

them under the charge of the most notorious infidel teacher of modern times. Nor did the clergy stop at denunciation. Councils of religion were formed throughout the canton, and these 'committees of faith,' as they were called, became nothing better than insurrectionary organisations. The population of the country districts took up arms, and under the lead of a clergyman, by name Hirzel, they marched upon Zürich and drove out the members of the executive council, whose resistance was overpowered, one of its members being among those killed in the streets. These deplorable events occurred while the federal diet was actually assembled in Zürich, which happened that year to be the *Vorort*, or leading canton town, of the confederation. By the federal pact Zürich, Bern, and Lucerne had been appointed the leading cantons, and the diet met at each alternately, though their representatives had no more votes in the diet than those of the other cantons.

The insurrection in Zürich was closely followed by that in Aargau and Soleure, which has been already described, and the passions of all parties throughout the confederation were now in that state when a strong central authority, with power to employ force if required, was the crying necessity of the hour; but the Swiss were to experience still further the evils of disunion before the much-needed revision of the constitution could come about. The *Vorort*, or leading canton, under the constitution of 1815 held its proud position for two years in succession, and the years 1843 and 1844 were those of the presidency of Lucerne. During these years the catastrophe which had been threatening became imminent, and the disturbances in Zürich and Aargau, which had seemed serious indeed at the time, were almost effaced from memory by political and religious struggles so fierce and bloody as to recall to men's minds the savage feuds which followed on the Reformation. The canton of Vallais was the stage on which the opening scenes of the drama were enacted, and where they soon rose to tragic intensity.

The Vallais, though one of the largest, is one of the least thickly populated cantons. Agriculture is its staple industry, and culture of the vineyards which fringe the banks of the Rhone. In the valley of that river lie several small towns, the centre of agricultural districts, but having no industries of their own, and though the Rhone valley is fertile and spacious yet the rest of the canton is little fitted for the pursuit of agriculture on a large scale. North and south lateral valleys run deep into the hills, and the Vallais can boast the great mass of the Alps, which stretches nearly from Mont Blanc to the Simplon. A population, scattered for the most part in the districts, then far less accessible than now, of the Pennine chain, might be hardy and vigorous, but they could hardly be so enlightened as those who dwelt in the plains or cities of the northern

cantons. In fact, even now the level of the Vallàisan population is less high than that of the other cantons, and stories have been current during the last fifteen years of interdicts laid by episcopal authority on enterprising innkeepers who have given ground for the erection of heretical fanes, and of the consequent impossibility of obtaining eggs and butter from the neighbouring peasantry. If religious feeling still runs so high in these districts, it is not to be wondered at if fifty years ago the canton of Vallais was profoundly agitated by the controversy then raging in the confederation. In the time of the empire Napoleon had kept the Vallais closely under his own control, in order that he might command his communications with Italy, and especially with the great road which he had constructed over the Simplon; but after his fall the canton resumed its place in the confederation. Of all the cantonal constitutions that of the Vallais gave the most direct power to the church. The bishop of Sion had a preponderating influence in the assembly and the Upper Vallais; the least advanced and most bigoted portion of the canton had more than its share of representation. Still, in 1843 the government was in the hands of the radicals, who, led by two brothers, Maurice and Joseph Barmen, appear to have been pursuing a policy of temperate reform strictly within the bounds of law. Abuses flourished in all departments of the state, and the higher ecclesiastics enjoyed a position such as no secular authority could rival. Their property was exempt from taxation, and some of the larger religious houses, like those of St. Maurice and the Great St. Bernard, held lands of considerable extent. Conflicts between the civil authority and the church frequently arose, which carry us back to the time of Becket. A priest charged with the most heinous crime had to be handed over to the bishop, from whose benevolent custody he usually escaped without the infliction of any punishment. It is small wonder if such a condition of affairs as this had aroused sufficient indignation to seat a liberal government in power; but the popular will was not determined enough to keep it there, and the pulpit and the press, as in Aargau, were employed without intermission to make their position impossible. The bishop of Sion[12] excommunicated all members of the society of 'Young Switzerland' (the radical organisation), their relatives, and all readers of their newspaper, the *Echo of the Alps*. The referendum, which was in force in the canton, was also so far under the control of the clergy as to lead to the rejection of reform proposed by the government; and after the elections of 1843 there was a small clerical majority in the executive council, but too small to make the government reactionary. Meanwhile the catholic leaders of the Upper Vallais, unchecked by the government, had been drilling and organising their forces, and in

[12] Grote, p. 80.

May 1844 marched upon Sion, turned out the government, and placed their own friends in power. This aroused the people of the Lower Vallais, who, though strong catholics, were supporters of the ejected government, and several conflicts took place between the partisans of both sides. The government, being now in the hands of the reactionaries, proclaimed their opponents rebels, and when they had vanquished them treated them as such. The army of the Lower Vallais was completely defeated and crushed on the river Trient, and scenes of bloodshed and cruelty followed unmatched in Swiss history. To crown all, the bishop of Sion refused to allow his clergy to administer the sacraments to the dying partisans of the late government, an edict the refined inhumanity of which can only be fully comprehended by strict catholics, like the Vallaisans of both parties.

These events aroused the most lively indignation throughout Switzerland, and the conduct of Lucerne, which was at that time the *Vorort*, excited strong comment. The leaders of the Lucerne government had actually connived at and assisted the illegal warlike preparations in the Upper Vallais, and had managed to delay armed intervention on the part of the confederation until it was too late, and the presence in the protestant cantons of numerous exiles of the conquered party, men of position and wealth, who had been forced to abandon their homes and fly with their families, did not tend to allay the feeling against the catholic leaders in Lucerne and the Jesuits, to whose influence their calamities were attributed. Thus the ultramontane party triumphed in the Vallais, and that canton openly joined the league of Sarnen, an association which afterwards developed into the Sonderbund, and had been formed as long ago as 1832, to resist the radical tendencies of the age. The addition of the Vallais gave it seven members, and it now consisted of Uri, Schwyz, Unterwalden, Fribourg, Zug, Lucerne, and the Vallais. The deplorable events in the Vallais brought the feeling against the Jesuits throughout the confederacy to a head; they had been the most active agents of the catholic party, perambulating the country, making inflammatory harangues, and having already in their hands the control of popular education in the strongly catholic districts, it was feared that they might endeavour to extend their influence throughout the confederacy. At a meeting of the rifle-shooters held at Basel in the spring of 1844 the Vallaisan exiles were received with the utmost enthusiasm, and the conduct of Lucerne during the civil war in the Vallais was vehemently condemned. It may be imagined, therefore, how violent was the indignation when a popular decree of the canton of Lucerne was passed admitting the Jesuits, the majority in its favour being composed of the rural population, the inhabitants of the city itself taking strongly the opposite view. The catholic majority appear to have been afraid that the opposition would

resort to force, and arrested their leaders. In this condition of affairs the liberals throughout the confederacy proceeded to measures for which no sort of justification can be pleaded in public law, and the only excuse for which is to be found in the indignation excited by the partisan conduct of the Lucerne government during the troubles in the Vallais and the excesses committed by the catholics after their victory. Even these provocations could afford no reasonable ground for the course now taken by the sympathisers with the conquered cause. A *corps franc*, or body of free-lances, composed of volunteers from the neighbouring cantons, descended on Lucerne; but the enterprise was ill conceived and ill conducted. It met with ignominious failure. This first expedition against Lucerne took place in the month of December 1844, and it was followed by a second in April 1845. If there was little excuse for the first, there was still less for the second, which was carefully organised, drilled, and equipped, with the knowledge of the governments (of some of the cantons at all events) whose citizens took part in it. It was placed under the command of Colonel Ochsenbein, a political leader of some eminence in the canton of Bern. But the Lucerners were equally well prepared, and had entered into alliance with their neighbours of Zug, Uri, and Unterwalden, contingents from whom arrived at the same time as the *corps francs*, and enabled the defenders to inflict on their invaders a severe and most crushing defeat.

In considering the unhappy series of events we have narrated one is led, naturally enough, to inquire what the position of the federal diet was during these years. The mere fact that civil conflicts of such magnitude, and involving such serious results, should have been entered upon and carried out with no interference from the central authority, is sufficient condemnation of the federal pact as approved by the congress of Vienna. Metternich's plan of a weak federation and an almost independent cantonal authority was rapidly threatening to terminate in a complete and final break-up of the federal republic.

After the scenes which had disgraced the Vallais in 1844 a proposal had been made by the representative of Aargau, Dr. Keller, who has been alluded to before, to expel the Jesuits from the territory of the republic. That such a proposition should have come from a strong catholic shows the view now held by public men not bigots, on either side, of the dangers which were threatening the confederation from the unrestrained activity of religious fanaticism. This proposal only received the assent of one representative besides the mover of it, but after the attack of the *corps francs* on Lucerne, and the determination of that government to admit the Jesuits, the expression of opinion in the diet became more pronounced, and in 1845 a similar proposal received the support of the representa-

tives of eleven cantons. During the next few months the party of reform gained victories throughout the country; the constitutions of Vaud, Bern, Geneva, and Basel were all changed in a popular sense, and the general feeling of the desirability of a stricter federal bond and of hostility to the Jesuits, as representing the anti-progressive tendency and separatist policy of the catholic cantons, rapidly increased.[13] It was only natural that, in opposition to this agitation, these cantons should draw more closely together, and the league of Sarnen (under which they were already more or less loosely associated) became in 1846 the Sonderbund, a league closer than that of Sarnen, with provisions for an armed alliance and a central military authority. It was at once evident that here was taken the final step towards separation. The most elementary principle of a federation must be that the central authority, representing all the constituent parts, must control the military forces necessary to maintain order within and without, and that each state of the union should be able to use its own military forces for no purpose beyond the suppression of disorder strictly within its own limits. Any league of the members in opposition to other members or against the central power is a combination fatal to the continuance of any confederation; as such it was recognised by the United States, and as such it was recognised by the majority of the Swiss people in 1846, and they invoked the federal pact as recognising, even in its then imperfect state, that such a league was contrary to its principles. The sixth article of the pact ran thus: 'No alliances shall be formed by the cantons among each other prejudicial either to the general confederacy or to the rights of other cantons.' In 1846 the position of leading canton was with Zürich, and the federal diet met in that town. The question as to the legality of the Sonderbund was immediately raised, and it was proposed by the representative of Thurgau to declare it illegal. Ten cantons and two half-cantons (Basel-Land and Appenzell Ausser-Rhoden) voted for the proposal, the seven cantons of the Sonderbund and Appenzell Inner-Rhoden against it, while four remained neutral. No majority, therefore, of the full diet, either on this question or on that of the Jesuits, was obtained in that year, and thus two disputed points, of the gravest significance for the confederation, were left in a state of suspense; but the revolutions in Geneva and St. Gallen which followed shortly after gave the federalist and radical parties in the diet two more votes in 1847, and thus secured them an absolute majority.

At the beginning of the eventful year 1847 Switzerland, as was well pointed out by Grote in his 'Letters on Swiss Politics,'[14] was divided into three parties—the ultramontane or extreme clerical

[13] Haussonville, p. 326. [14] P. 162.

party, which was supreme in the cantons, forming the Sonderbund; the progressive party, consisting both of catholics and protestants—much more largely, of course, of the latter—which formed a powerful minority even in some of the Sonderbund cantons; and the conservative party, mostly consisting of protestants of the old aristocratic type and found chiefly in the large towns. The change of government which took place about this time in Basel Stadt, Bern, and Geneva deprived this party of their strongholds, and the attitude of the Sonderbund soon alienated their sympathies. Switzerland in this year consisted of 2,400,000 inhabitants, of whom less than a million were catholics, and of this million many were in strong opposition to the Jesuits and the Sonderbund. There can be no doubt that on the side of the union was not only the actual numerical majority of the republic's inhabitants, but an overwhelming majority of the cultivated, wealthy, and industrious part of the community. The seven cantons were much inferior in numbers, and immeasurably inferior in culture and intelligence. Even though this were so, it is true that it afforded no excuse for oppression or injustice on the part of the majority; but the conduct of the Sonderbund became daily more menacing, and even to the weak and divided councils of the diet it became more and more evident that some decided step forward must be taken if the existence of the confederation was to be preserved. While the diet was thus hesitating on the verge of a momentous decision an impulse from without helped to drive it in a direction whither no amount of provocation within its borders seemed able to impel it.

It must not be supposed that the course of events in Switzerland had passed unheeded by the European powers. As has been already pointed out, it was a deliberate reactionary policy, adopted by Austria and France at the congress of Vienna to establish aristocratic governments in the Swiss cantons, and to exalt the power of the cantonal governments at the expense of the central diet. But the first part of the scheme had long since fallen through, and was hardly to be found in existence in any of the cantons, while the second was developing in a most startling manner. The aim of Metternich[15] was to maintain the league of the seven cantons, thus rendering the diet powerless, without actually breaking up the confederation. He looked confidently for assistance from the French government, then directed by Guizot and reactionary in all its sympathies. There is no doubt that Guizot and Metternich were accomplices of the Sonderbund, and had it not been that the leaders of the clerical party[16] looked to Austria and France to prevent any active interference by the diet with their league, an arrangement would have been come to during the course of

[15] Metternich, *Mémoires*, vii. 451 *et seq.*
[16] *E.g.* despatch quoted by Crétineau-Joly, i. 354.

1847 by which the expulsion of the Jesuits from the territory of the republic would have been averted for a time, and the vexed question as to the powers of the federal authority would have stood over until the convulsions of 1848 had distracted the attention of the European courts to their own affairs. In that case similar outbreaks in Switzerland would probably have followed, leading to greater bloodshed and far worse disaster than actually happened. During the whole of the year 1847 the official press of France was doing its best to persuade the French people that the majority in Switzerland were endeavouring to extinguish the political rights of the cantons and oppress the catholics; but the people showed no disposition to support the government in any active measures in aid of the Sonderbund, and Palmerston, on behalf of England, would not consent to any intervention that was not purely pacific in its nature. So soon as the cantons of the Sonderbund grasped this fact they made proposals to treat with the majority of the diet, affairs having been at a dead-lock ever since the latter had voted the illegality of the Sonderbund. It was not until October 25 that Metternich intimated to the Sonderbund that in case of hostilities the Austrian minister would withdraw from Bern, but that there would be no armed intervention. Immediately the dissentient cantons proposed to the diet to refer to the pope the question of the Jesuits and the question of the re-establishment of the convents in Aargau. About this last matter there is an astonishing impertinence on the part of the Sonderbund in alluding to it at all; it had been finally settled by the diet so long ago as 1843, and the question was not now in dispute. It could only have been a profound impression of the impotence of the diet, and the improbability of its united action, which led them to make so ludicrous a proposal. The majority replied by a proposition which had about it a more genuine appearance of a desire to come to terms. They suggested that the Jesuits should be left undisturbed in Fribourg, Schwyz, and the Vallais, but dismissed from Lucerne, and the Sonderbund dissolved. This offer was contemptuously refused by the Sonderbund, and shortly after their leaders withdrew from the diet. The refusal of the compromise offered by the majority was the most fatally foolish mistake the confederates could have committed; by accepting it they would have formally broken up their league, it is true, but the governments would have still retained their full powers. The Jesuits would not have suffered at all, as their great strongholds were the three cantons they already occupied, and the power of the church in Lucerne would have been untouched. They preferred to risk the arbitrament of war, confident that France at all events would interfere before things had gone very far, buoyed up as they undoubtedly were by the assurances of Guizot, and secretly supported with money by Austria.

But the leaders of the Sonderbund had not reckoned with the strong body of sympathisers which the progressive party had in Paris and the provinces of France. Throughout the autumn of 1847 [17] banquets were held in the chief towns of France by the republican party, and along with denunciations of Guizot and his policy enthusiastic toasts were proposed and drunk to the success of the majority of the diet and the confusion of the ultramontane cantons. From another quarter also Guizot was to meet with an opposition which he had not anticipated, and to which was in great measure owing the failure of the powers to arrest the forward movement in Switzerland and the consolidation of the federal power. Palmerston was at this time foreign secretary, and his shrewd common-sense had long foreseen that the reactionary arrangements of 1815 could not long hold together; and with regard to Switzerland he was not likely to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for France and Austria, seeing that neither the sympathies nor the interests of England were enlisted on behalf of the revolting cantons.

Everything that could be done by England to bring about a peaceful solution was done, but the Foreign Office strictly abstained from taking any such steps as would be construed into an interference with the independent action of the federal authorities. In 1847 this country was represented at Bern by Mr. (afterwards Sir Robert) Peel, the eldest son of the great minister, whose party had recently hurled him from power in revenge for the abolition of the corn laws. Mr. Peel throughout the crisis did not conceal his sympathy with the federal party in Switzerland, as the ministers of the other powers took no pains to conceal theirs with the Sonderbund; but it does not appear that in any way he ever acted contrary to the wishes of the foreign secretary. In no juncture did he conduct himself in the high-handed and irritating manner which the representatives of the great powers adopted early in 1847 towards the majority of the states in the confederation. The post of *Vorort* passed to Bern in January of that year. The government of that canton was strongly liberal since the recent revolution, and Colonel Ochsenbein, who had been the leader of the *corps francs* in their second attempt on Lucerne, was at its head, thus being also in a certain limited sense the head of the confederation for the time being. The representatives of Austria, Russia, and Prussia had thought fit to remove their legations from Bern to Zürich, and announced their intention in a formal and almost public manner. M. Bois le Comte, the French ambassador, who had arrived at his post about the same time, did not follow the example of his colleagues in this respect, thinking it ill-advised, but on his reception by the federal authorities proceeded to read

[17] Haussonville, p. 356.

to Colonel Ochsenbein a lecture on his conduct and on that of the federation, which was, to say the least, singularly irritating and *maladroit*.[18] He then attempted to draw Mr. Peel into taking action along with him to check any interference of the diet with the Sonderbund, but with no success. Bois le Comte in his despatches to Guizot remarks that Peel is ostentatiously[19] making friends with the radical leaders, and intimating to them that the English government has no intention of preventing them from taking whatever steps they may think necessary for the safety of the confederation.[20] In the meanwhile Guizot instructed Broglie, the French ambassador in London, to see Palmerston, and endeavour to get from him an assurance of the intentions of the English government to side with France in any steps she might take in Switzerland. But all Broglie got from Palmerston was an expression of his sincere wish for an amicable settlement, and a strong statement of the determination of England to assist in no steps for the coercion of the majority in Switzerland.[21] This interview took place in July.[22] On 30 Oct. Palmerston sent Bunsen, the Prussian ambassador, to Broglie to try and stop the impending civil war by a concert of the powers; but, as the recognition of the Sonderbund was the only basis for negotiation the French government would admit, the effort failed. The French government then proposed that a conference should meet to settle the affairs of Switzerland, but Palmerston refused to be a party to it until the actual questions to be settled were laid down. There does not seem in this to have been any bad faith on the part of Palmerston; the English position all through had been that the political affairs of the Swiss must be settled by the Swiss, and that the Jesuit dispute might be a matter for arbitration, but that no interference was to be undertaken with their affairs except with their consent. This position had always been loyally taken up by Mr. Peel, but it is not a matter for surprise if both Palmerston and Peel saw with satisfaction affairs settled in Switzerland by the Swiss themselves while the powers were negotiating.

We must now turn to the course of events which followed on the rejection by the Sonderbund of the very moderate terms offered by the majority of the diet. The leaders of the Sonderbund had shortly after this left the diet, and took no further part in its deliberations. Negotiations were now at an end, and the two parties stood face to face; the expulsion of the Jesuits had been decreed, and the seven cantons had been declared in opposition to the federal pact in forming and adhering to the Sonderbund; and,

[18] Bois le Comte to Guizot, quoted by Haussonville, p. 342.

[19] Haussonville, p. 353.

[20] Peel to Palmerston, *Parliamentary Paper, Swiss Affairs*, August 1847, p. 164.

[21] Broglie to Guizot, 5 and 9 July 1847. [22] *Ibid.* 1 Nov. 1847.

as no compromise appeared possible, the majority had now, with great reluctance, to undertake the task of coercing the minority into obedience. The general belief of foreigners was that far greater reluctance to resort to arms existed among the federalists than as a matter of fact did. The information of Europe outside Switzerland was gathered, as a rule, from French sources, and they were all tainted by a strong preconceived opinion against the federalist party. The French government had been fiercely hostile throughout, and the organs of opinion inspired by it were also hostile; consequently even in England to meet with any one who had a just idea of the rights and wrongs of the disputes among the Swiss was a rare thing. The *Times* correspondent during the war and at its close did his best to put the federalists right in English opinion, but certainly at the beginning of the war public opinion was ill-informed on the grounds of the dispute, and the enlightened and far-seeing policy of Lord Palmerston is the more to be commended. The French papers at the breaking out of hostilities all assumed great hesitation on the part of the federal authorities, arising from a conviction on their part that their actions would not be unanimously supported by the populations of the cantons they represented, while on the other hand the Sonderbund is represented as smaller indeed in numbers, but as composed of men fired with zeal and enthusiasm and determined to fight to the death for their cause, if not destined to inflict a fatal check on their opponents.

Never were prophecies so rapidly and significantly falsified. The diet decreed the formation of an army of 50,000 men. Each canton sent up its contingent, properly equipped and provided with all the munitions of war, on the appointed days. General Wilhelm Heinrich Dufour was placed in supreme command. It had been invariably stated by the supporters of the Sonderbund that if offered the command he could refuse it, because he had always been a conservative and the enemy of extravagant change; consequently when he accepted the charge he was denounced as a weak and vacillating character, unable to resist the demands of the overbearing democrats among whom he found himself. But this very error with regard to Dufour shows how signally and strangely the Sonderbund and its supporters abroad misjudged the actual position of the Swiss question. It was no longer merely a dispute as to how many convents a canton should permit to be maintained in its territory, or how far the Jesuits should be allowed to direct its elementary education. It had now become a question whether or not the Swiss confederation should continue to exist as it had grown together after the trials and struggles of centuries, or whether it should be split into two hostile and mutually destructive portions, and whether or not a small minority, consisting of the least wealthy, least intelligent, and least progressive cantons, should be allowed to defy the remainder, raise

their own military forces, and act independently of the federal diet. To that Dufour, with his clear, impartial intelligence, saw but one answer, and was quite prepared to carry out his views into effectual action. A better man could not have been found for the purpose. An engineer officer trained in the school of Napoleon, he had all the simplicity of character which tradition demands of a republican leader, and all the passionate love of discipline and hatred of disorder which are necessary to make a successful general and a saviour of society. He had been the director of the engineering school at Thun, and, strangely enough, counted among his pupils Louis Napoleon, destined ere long to save society in his own way elsewhere. The orders of Dufour were to suppress disorder and to enforce the decrees of the government, and he at once proceeded to draw up his plans of campaign.

Meanwhile the action of the leaders of the Sonderbund was lacking in frankness towards their followers, and shows but too clearly that they relied on foreign intervention to assist them to maintain their position. On 4 Nov. the diet had issued a proclamation to the Swiss people pointing out the reasons for their action, which was most moderate and concilatory in its tone. This proclamation, and subsequent documents of a similar nature, the Lucerne government suppressed ; [23] in fact, the people of Lucerne never saw any of these declarations of the diet until they were posted on the walls after the federal troops became masters of Lucerne.[23] At the same time they were in constant communication with the Austrians. On 15 Nov. Siegwart Müller, the vice-president of Lucerne, writes to the Austrian ambassador, who had demanded his passports and was now living just over the borders of Switzerland, 'In consequence of the acknowledgment of our legal position by the powerful empire of Austria, she cannot avoid taking opportune measures to give us support.' This shows pretty clearly the view taken by the Sonderbund, and, however much we may feel disposed to blame fanatics, who were ready to plunge this country into civil war, we cannot entertain much respect for the diplomacy which led them into a false position and then abandoned them. But if the people were kept in the dark by their earthly leaders, their spiritual directors encouraged them by every device which ingenuity could devise and ignorance accept. As well as promises of direct interposition by divine beings, which were to be heard from the pulpit, a large business was done in the sale of amulets, to guard the fortunate wearers against the chances of battle. Tenpence purchased a badge which would keep the wearer safe from the bullets, and half a crown would give him protection even from the cannon-balls, of his enemies.[24] From a population thus inflamed by fanati-

[23] *Times* correspondence, November 1847.

[24] *Ibid.*

cism and a false patriotism, the vast majority not understanding the true grounds of the quarrel, and brave to rashness, the federal troops might well have expected a stubborn resistance; but disaffection was present among the members of the Sonderbund, and very early in the day the Lower Vallais refused to take part in the struggle. It is not to be wondered at that this portion of the population of the canton, comprising the larger part of those who had so grievously suffered at the hands of the extreme clerical party a few years earlier, should have shrunk from casting in their lot with their conquerors in opposition to the armies of the diet.

Dufour, once in command, acted with the energy and promptitude which might have been expected from an old soldier of the empire. So soon as the forces of the federal army had reached head-quarters in respectable numbers, he marched on Fribourg, on 9 Nov., with an army of 94,000 men, and encountered little resistance, with the exception of a slight skirmish with the local militia, who quickly disbanded after the exchange of a few shots. The federalists, however, found in the canton many sympathisers. On the 12th they completely occupied the heights round Fribourg and invested the town, at the same time summoning it to surrender. Resistance was useless, and the citizens were but half-hearted in the struggle; they had expected hesitation and inaction on the part of the diet, now they found themselves surrounded and outnumbered by an active and determined opponent. The aid from without, which had been expected, did not arrive, and there was no alternative but to submit. Dufour at once occupied the town, a provisional government was installed in power, and there seems to have been little disorder or outrage to complain of. The Jesuits were expelled, but no interference took place with the catholic clergy or communities of the place. A sufficient garrison was left in charge of the district, and Dufour with the bulk of his forces moved off towards Lucerne, where it was anticipated that the most obstinate struggle would take place. Meanwhile both parties had not been inactive in other districts, divisions of the federal army had been despatched to the east and the south, and the Landsturm, or third reserve, was under arms in each canton. Skirmishes took place in Zürich and Aargau, in which the federalists were successful, but more serious encounters took place further south.[25] Before the actual commencement of hostilities the authorities of Uri had commenced to throw up earthworks in the St. Gothard, and from this shelter their troops descended on the Ticino, which adhered to the federal cause. In the first skirmish they were repulsed, but subsequently, on 17 Nov., a considerable force attacked Airolo and drove out the troops of Ticino. It was impossible for the latter to assume the offensive, at all events till

[25] Crétineau-Joly, vol. ii. c. 16.

they were reinforced, cut off as they were by the Alps and by a hostile force from their friends in the north. The Grisons had, however, promised two regiments, and while they were on the march the men of Ticino held their own at Faido. The troops of the Sonderbund did not penetrate beyond Airolo, and in fact contented themselves with holding the summit of the St. Gothard.

It was on the issue of the impending fight at Lucerne that the fate of Switzerland depended. It is true that the federal army had vastly the excess of numbers (it was at least four times as numerous as the troops of the Sonderbund), but the latter were strongly posted and filled with fanatical zeal, and, had they been ably commanded, and had their government shown firmness and determination, there is no doubt that the struggle might have been prolonged for some days, and involved so much bloodshed and consequent exasperation as to have rendered the task of those called upon to make a satisfactory settlement after the conclusion of the war extremely difficult.[26] On the Sunday before the attack the churches in the city resounded with assurances that the Virgin, who had twice repulsed the invaders in previous years, would not allow them to succeed on a third attempt; nor were the country clergy behindhand. One curé, however, who had been particularly emphatic in his promises of celestial succour, was the first to welcome the invaders with a present of fifty bottles of champagne. The government was in the hands of M. Siegwart Müller, who had been one of the chief promoters of the Sonderbund and the most active of its members; the army was under the command of Salis-Soglio, who was the commander-in-chief of the forces of the Sonderbund. The vanquished party generally accused their leaders of incompetence, treachery, or both; and the charge of incompetence is also freely levelled at Salis-Soglio by Crétineau-Joly,[27] the historian of the Sonderbund, but it is not easy to see in what way they would have been better off had they been directed by Siegwart Müller as dictator. In fact, while nothing but praise can be given to the conduct of the troops, no words can be strong enough to stigmatise the conduct of the Lucerne government. Before the federal troops actually appeared at the gates of the city the executive took a hurried departure in three steamboats, carrying with them to Uri the state chest of the canton, containing the popular contributions, and the federal chest.[28] These were subsequently restored, with a loss of 220,000 francs.

On 22 Nov. Lucerne was surrounded by the federal army. Approach to the town is prevented on the south by the lake, and on the west by the fierce and impetuous torrent of the Reuss, which flows out of it; on the north lies a range of hills, any

[26] *Times* correspondence during November.

[27] Vol. ii. p. 443.

[28] *Times* correspondence.

force occupying which would, if properly supplied with artillery, hold the town at its mercy. The eastern side is the most vulnerable, but here Dufour expressly abstained from attacking, knowing that a fierce combat at the very gates of the town would inflame the passions of the soldiery and make a peaceful occupation almost impossible. The forces of the Sonderbund were posted at the bridge of Gislikon, and extended to the junction of the cantons of Lucerne and Zug, about a mile and a half away; their artillery occupied the heights of Rothenberg, but was very inferior to that of the federalists in calibre and handling.

On the 23rd Dufour despatched a detachment to the rear of the enemy, and commenced the attack on the bridge of Gislikon, supported by his artillery. The fight raged for six hours with the utmost bravery on both sides, but the numbers and discipline of the assailants prevailed; the bridge was carried at the point of the bayonet, and then the heights of Rothenberg by the help of the troops which had been sent earlier in the day to take the defending force in the rear, and the forces of the Sonderbund dispersed in all directions, never to be reunited. The federalists now had the town in their power, and all further resistance was hopeless. A capitulation was proposed, but Dufour pointed out that it was too late to demand terms, and called for an immediate and unconditional surrender, which took place. A military occupation followed, and there seems to have been a remarkable absence of anything like disorder or outrage. On the 24th the federal army entered Lucerne, and shortly afterwards a public meeting was held to elect a provisional government. It was presided over by Dr. Steinger, who had been condemned to death in 1845 for taking part with the *corps francs*. He had escaped from his prison and had lived in exile since that time. Followed by some of his fellow exiles, most of whom had purchased the right to live in banishment for many thousands of francs, and an excited crowd, he walked to the scene of his imprisonment, a miserable dungeon eight feet square and lighted by an aperture of twelve inches by three. Here he had been incarcerated for two months, awaiting execution, when he had the good luck to escape.[29]

It is only wonderful, if this was a specimen of the manner in which the ultramontane party had treated its vanquished rivals, that they, when their turn came, were contented with such moderate reprisals. But it was their moderation in victory that soon earned for the Swiss the admiration of Europe and established their right to control and settle their own concerns, social, political, and religious. The day after the federal troops entered Lucerne mass was being celebrated in the churches undisturbed, and the convents had a guard of troops set over them to prevent any outrage, should

[29] *Times* correspondence.

it be attempted. The principal measures of the provisional government were to decree the departure of the Jesuits from the canton within forty-eight hours and the grant of an amnesty to all those who had taken part in the expedition of the *corps francs*. A touching scene took place on the site of those disastrous conflicts. The survivors, with the relatives of the slain and the sympathisers with the cause, went in solemn procession to the spots where the bodies had been thrown into a common grave and reinterred them in the cemetery with religious rites.

The fall of Lucerne was quickly followed by the submission of Schwyz and Uri; Zug had surrendered earlier, and by the end of November the war was at an end. In three weeks what had threatened to be a terrible civil conflict had collapsed, and comparative quiet reigned throughout the confederation. There could not have been more conclusive evidence of the flimsy and unsubstantial nature of the pretences on which the Sonderbund had been founded, or of the good sense, energy, and determination of the majority. The greatest gratitude was felt by the Swiss towards Palmerston for the attitude he had taken up, and Peel was the most popular man in Bern. On 30 Nov. Palmerston had replied to a question in the House of Commons that England was ready to assist in the work of mediation, but would be no party to any forcible interference with Swiss affairs.[30] He shortly afterwards sent Sir Stratford Canning[31] to Bern, to convey to the chief of the federal diet the opinions and wishes of the English government. On 3 Dec. Dufour returned to Bern. A popular reception, with triumphal arches and every signs of rejoicing, had been prepared, but he refused it and entered the city in a close carriage. There can be no doubt that acts of moderation such as this, and the constant refusal of the federal authorities to adopt an attitude of ostentatious triumph towards their defeated fellow-countrymen, did more than anything else to convince right-feeling men throughout Europe of the justice of their cause.

Though the actual conflict was over, the task of the diet had only begun. Their first business was to restrain so far as possible any outbreak of popular feeling, which might mar the glory of their triumph. There is no doubt that excesses were committed in many laces, but the wonder is there were not more.[32] The Vallais had now submitted, and the exiled Barmen was in power, and it was

[30] With regard to this Sir R. Peel wrote: 'I am unaware that Lord Palmerston would have joined a conference of the powers on Swiss affairs. I think it very unlikely, although he did send Sir S. Canning in 1847 to inquire into the situation. But in the meantime the French Revolution of February 1848 turned attention to events which revolutionised Europe, and Switzerland was happily left to conduct its own affairs, with the best results, without any interference from any other quarter.'

[31] *Life of Stratford Canning*, by S. Lane-Poole, ii. 162.

[32] Crétineau-Joly, ii. 452.

difficult to believe that no revenge would be taken for all the cruelty and indignities endured by the vanquished party in 1844. The diet had decreed that the expenses of the war should be borne by the cantons which had brought it about, and there was a general attempt in the cantons themselves to saddle obnoxious individuals or corporations, rather than the communities in question, with the payments. This action of the provincial government in the cantons fell so heavily on the religious houses in the Vallais that the monastery of the Great St. Bernard was for a time deserted.[33] But wiser counsels prevailed, and in a few months affairs ran more smoothly. On 9 Dec. Sir Stratford Canning arrived at Bern, and pointed out to Ochsenbein the danger the federation was running in permitting anything like disorder or persecution in its territories. Nor was such a warning superfluous. Both Guizot and Metternich were furious at the turn events had taken in Switzerland; the former was hampered by the strong objections of the French chambers to take any active part in Swiss affairs, but the French official journals poured forth every day the most harrowing accounts of outrages committed by the victorious party on the catholic population, and it was to be feared that the French minister might find excuse enough to assist Austria should she decide on taking the initiative.

Metternich was now very old, and was day by day falling more and more under priestly influence, while his master, Ferdinand, was of weak intellect, and his bigotry was his only strong point. The heads of the Austrian clergy had taken much interest in Swiss affairs, and communications were already in progress between Austria and France for the formation of a European congress to put pressure on Switzerland. The despatches of Metternich,[34] written at this time to the Austrian ambassador in Paris, exhibit the greatest irritation against Palmerston. It is stated that Peel confessed to the French ambassador at Bern that he had told Dufour[35] 'to finish the thing off quickly.'[36] To leave matters as they were was, therefore, to give an easy triumph to Palmerston, who was hated as the representative of the reforming spirit. There was also the undoubted fact to be reckoned with that the triumph of liberal ideas in Switzerland might give encouragement to sympathisers in the

[33] *Times* of December 1847.

[34] *E.g.* Metternich, *Mémoires*, vii. 511, and *passim*.

[35] Haussonville, pp. 365, 367, 371, Bois le Comte to Guizot.

[36] With regard to this Sir R. Peel wrote: 'It is quite true that when Dufour was advancing upon Lucerne and the old cantons, being alive to the danger of protracted hostilities, with the French, the Austrian, and the Russian governments in a state of excessive irritation against Switzerland, so that the slightest reverse or hesitation in the conduct of the war might have led to interference on their part (and the French government was particularly anxious to interfere), I did venture to submit to the government of Bern and to General Dufour the expediency of finishing off the matter quickly. I acted on my own responsibility, which Lord Palmerston could easily have repudiated, whereas he favoured me with his support and approval.'

neighbouring states. In fact on 9 Dec. there had been a great popular demonstration in honour of the federal victory celebrated at Florence, and in the then disturbed condition of public feeling such sentiments might be fanned into a dangerous flame.

It was decided by 29 Dec.[37] to hold a conference on Swiss affairs, with or without the co-operation of England, and Switzerland was looking forward to a year even more critical and gloomy than that from which she was just emerging. But the ministers who were meditating interference soon had enough to occupy them at home. In February the revolution broke out in Paris; Guizot was a fugitive, and Metternich had resigned. The Swiss diet met undisturbed to draw up the constitution on which modern Switzerland is built, without any foreign interference and on lines suggested by their experience of the needs of the country.

W. B. Duffield.

Note.

Sir Robert Peel wrote as follows: 'The French government of that time took an active part in favour of the Sonderbund against the liberal tendencies of the other states of the confederation, and at the outbreak of hostilities the French ambassador, Count Bois le Comte, the Russian, Baron de Kindener, and the Austrian all retired from the seat of the federal government and withdrew to Bâle, or Soleure, or elsewhere; but the French ambassador failed to induce me to do likewise, and I remained at my post, with the subsequent approval of Lord Palmerston, then foreign secretary.

'The federal troops first attacked Freiburg, where there was a very large Jesuit college, and, as its destruction was imminent, I went to Freiburg and took away some twenty-seven young students, mostly French, and entertaining them at Bern forwarded them safely to Strasburg, receiving a personal letter of thanks from Mgr. the cardinal archbishop of Strasburg for what he was pleased to call my services in the matter. After the removal of the students the college buildings were set on fire and razed to the ground, the Jesuits being the great cause of offence at that time. The Bernese government, as a special favour, allowed me to have a war correspondent at head-quarters.

'The three leading men in Switzerland at that time were unquestionably

'*James Fazy*, of Geneva, who had just successfully revolutionised, with very little bloodshed, the cantonal government in favour of the radicals;

'*M. Drury, of Vaud*; and

'*General Ochsenbein, of Bern*, who under Dufour, commander-in-chief, led the Bernese contingent in the advance upon Lucerne and the old cantons.

'When the war was over the Bernese federal government gave me a dinner, and officially complimented me, in state ceremony, as an

[37] Metternich, vii. 529.

acknowledgment to the British government for remaining at my post, while the French, the Russian, and the Austrian envoys had abandoned theirs at the outbreak of hostilities.

'James Fazy and General Ochsenbein were personal and political friends of mine, the former particularly so, and some time after the war James Fazy asked me if I could receive anything from the state as an acknowledgment of the countenance of the British government during the revolutionary troubles. The British residents in Geneva were then raising funds for an English church, and I asked him to grant a site upon which to erect the building. He at once did so, and I had the satisfaction of conveying to him the thanks of Lord Palmerston for the generous gift of land, worth at least 20,000 to 30,000 francs, upon which our first English church now stands. I now proceed to the other matter to which you refer, and to the pleasant incident alluded to in your letter, but which has nothing to do with the events of 1847.

'In 1858 Louis Napoleon, emperor of the French, seized the Savoy provinces of Chablais and Faucigny, abutting on the confederation and the state of Geneva. These provinces were considered by the powers at the congress of Vienna to be essential for the maintenance of the neutrality and independence of Switzerland, and were handed over to Savoy under a guarantee not to fall under French occupation. Louis Napoleon disregarded these treaty obligations, and the British government feebly protested.

'In parliament I vehemently took the part of Switzerland, and particularly Geneva, on several occasions with my friend the late Mr. Kinglake, but to no effect. Geneva, however, was not unmindful of the attempts in the British parliament to rouse public attention to the flagrant outrage threatening their independence, and the government presented me with the diploma of Swiss citizen, and moreover, alive to the inconvenience of the highroad to Lausanne intersecting my little property at Sécheron, most generously diverted the road, so as to secure to the property complete immunity from public traffic, and also erected the wall which skirts the grounds along the new road.'

Notes and Documents

THE PASCHAL CANON OF 'ANATOLIUS OF LAODICEA.'

MR. ANSCOMBE has shown in his paper (*ante*, p. 515) that a computation bearing the name of Anatolius plays a prominent part in the dispute about the Celtic Easter in the seventh and eighth centuries, being quoted or referred to by Columban, Cummian, Colman, Wilfrid, and Bede from A.D. 600 onwards. Among these the testimony of Wilfrid—as reported by Bede in his account of the synod at Whitby in A.D. 664 ('H. E.' iii. 25)—has been examined, but, I think, to some extent misrepresented by Mr. Anscombe. Wilfrid, premising that it is not in dispute that Anatolius was a man of holiness, learning, and well-merited reputation, argues that the Scots had no right to appeal to him against the catholic custom, since in several essential respects Anatolius was a representative of catholic principles rejected by the Scots.

1. Anatolius assented to the primary principle of the then existing Roman and catholic method, that of a nineteen years' cycle. This the Scots either were ignorant of or ignored.

If I understand Mr. Anscombe aright, he denies that the British church from the fifth century onwards ever had any but a nineteen years' cycle. I am not sure that he makes this statement categorically, but it seems to result from what he says about the existence of the nineteen years' cycle in Britain in St. Cyril's time and the extent of the changes introduced under St. Leo. Apparently he throws over the categorical assertion of Wilfrid, who ought to have known the facts, in favour of the rhetorical flourish of St. Cyril that the lunar calculations of Alexandria were accepted throughout the Christian world—a statement proved to be untrue by the difficulties felt by many westerns in accepting the Alexandrian Easters some years later, in A.D. 444 and 455. Mr. Anscombe forgets how little the east and west really knew each of the remoter parts of the other.

2. While the Romans celebrated Easter Day from the 15th to the 21st of the moon—so that if the 14th or full moon fell on the Sunday Easter was put off for a week—the British churches

adhered to the older western rule, and kept it from the 14th to the 20th. Anatolius, says Wilfrid, adopted an intermediate position. It is true that he marked Easter Sunday in his cycle on *luna* xiiii., but then he admitted that the calendar day which was *luna* xiiii. in the morning was *luna* xv. in the evening, and in the same way that a day which was *luna* xx. in the morning was *luna* xxi. in the evening. He did, therefore, really include in a sense the 21st of the lunar month among his Easter Days. Wilfrid adds that the Egyptians made a similar distinction between the morning and evening. Mr. Anscombe points out with truth that what the Alexandrians did—which was to reckon from sunset to sunset, like the Jews—was not what Anatolius did, as explained in chapter iv. of the extant canon (quoted on p. 519), for he made his distinction not at sunset but at 12.30 P.M. But Wilfrid's statement remains perfectly correct as a rough parallel.

Mr. Anscombe, however, makes a much more serious error than Wilfrid. The latter asserts that Anatolius kept the calendar day which corresponded to *luna* xx.–xxi. as Easter Day, and implies that he rejected the calendar day a week earlier which corresponded to *luna* xiii.–xiiii. This statement Mr. Anscombe characterises as 'erroneous,' on the authority of the extant canon bearing Anatolius's name. I entirely agree with him that this canon is what the writer under discussion appealed to as Anatolius, and therefore he has a perfect right to make use of it as an authority to test the statements of Wilfrid. But any one who turns to the passage in the original Latin of the canon (quoted by Mr. Anscombe himself *ubi supra*) will see that it cannot possibly bear the construction put on it. It begins by saying (just as Wilfrid reports it to say) that every calendar day corresponds to one lunar day in the morning and a fresh lunar day in the evening:[1] the fourteenth day of the moon commences on a calendar day which corresponds in its earlier part with the thirteenth: *unde ergo et Pascha usque ad xxi. in vesperum extendi praecipitur, quae mane sine dubio, id est usque ad eum quem diximus horarum terminum* [12.30 P.M.], *xx. habebatur.* This Mr. Anscombe paraphrases to mean that Sunday, moon xx.–xxi., ought to be rejected, though the Latin can only mean that the Paschal limit is extended (*extendi*) to the calendar day which in the evening is equivalent to moon xxi. But Mr. Anscombe's view takes a further and even more startling development: 'It is clear that he [Anatolius] considered that the Paschal feast should be celebrated upon Sunday evening.' To me the exact contrary is clear, and Mr. Anscombe's allegation would ascribe to Anatolius not the ignorance of astronomy and mathematics which certainly characterises him, but

[1] Mr. Anscombe's elaborate note on *vesperum* seems to complicate matters unnecessarily. *Vesperum* as contrasted in this passage with *mane* can scarcely mean anything else than evening as contrasted with morning.

a quite incredible ignorance of the meaning of the Christian festival and even of the hour at which it was celebrated. Whatever disputes raged between individuals or churches as to the day on which the Πάσχα ἀναστάσιμον was to be celebrated, there was no dispute as to the hour. It was in the early morning that the Church commemorated the Lord's resurrection, and with the morning was connected not the following evening, that of Sunday, but the preceding one, that of Saturday. The νυχθήμερον of Easter can, I conceive, by no possibility have been other than that of Saturday–Sunday. Anatolius' *terminus ad quem* for Easter is, therefore, the Sunday whose early hours fall on *luna* xx.—in other words, the Sunday equivalent to *luna* xx.–xxi.—and his *terminus a quo*, in the same way, is the Sunday which corresponds to *luna* xiiii.–xv.[2] This fundamental error of Mr. Anscombe's vitiates some of his subsequent reasoning, and involves him in unnecessary complications.

Of course Wilfrid was only making the most of a rather weak case. It remained true that Anatolius was in substantial agreement with British rather than with catholic practice; for he would celebrate Easter with the Scots on *luna* xiiii. (xiiii.–xv.) and not with the Roman church on *luna* xxi. (xxi.–xxii.)

3. Wilfrid's third point of distinction between Anatolius and the Celtic custom is that the former never allotted Easter Sunday to *luna* xiii., while the latter sometimes did, 'manifestly' placing it before the full moon.

Mr. Anscombe does not deny the correctness of this statement, and it remains, therefore, to do what I think Mr. Anscombe has omitted to do, and ask for the reason of this divergence. Now it was Wilfrid's purpose to pass over those points in which Anatolius and the Scots agreed against the prevalent computation; he omits, therefore, to mention that while the ordinary system allowed of Easter as early as 22 March, both Anatolius and the Scots placed the equinox on 25 March (A.D. *viii. Kal. April.*) and allowed no Easter before it. At the other end of the term the Roman church had long before Wilfrid's time assented to the Alexandrine extension of Easter as late as 25 April (A.D. *vii. Kal. Mai.*); the Britons held to the now antiquated western term, and would not celebrate after 21 April (A.D. *xi. Kal. Mai.*);[3] in the table of Anatolius only one Easter falls in the disputed period 22–25 April—that of year 14 when it falls on *luna* xx., 23 April—but it is enough to show that he diverged either partially or wholly from British custom. In such a year what would the Britons have done? *Ex hypothesi*, Sunday fell on 26 March, 2 April, 9 April, 16 April, 23 April. If 23 April was *luna* xx., 16 April was *luna* xiii., 9 April *luna* vi.,

[2] Mr. Anscombe almost gives away his case when he first invents a theory for Anatolius and then admits that Anatolius did not carry it out (pp. 520, 521).

[3] I accept Mr. Anscombe's conclusions on this point, which seem justified by the statements of Bede.

2 April *luna* xxviii. or xxviiii. (according as the lunation was reckoned at 29 or 30 days), 26 March *luna* xxi. or xxii. Now if it was a fixed principle of the Britons never under any circumstances to celebrate on *luna* xxi. (and there no doubt Anatolius agreed with them), nor later than 21 April, they must have fixed on 16 April, *luna* xiii., and Wilfrid was justified in pointing to a real divergence, although the principle laid down in Anatolius' canon—the rejection of 22, 23, 24 March as possible Easter Sundays—might have involved him in practice, at least on some occasions, in a celebration of Easter on *luna* xiii.[4]

We have now established in sufficient outline the theory of Anatolius to enable us to turn with confidence to the examination of the table of 19 years found in the canon, and of Mr. Anscombe's treatment of it. I need not here reprint the table itself, which will be found at the head of Mr. Anscombe's paper, or in an emended form later on in this paper (p. 708); but I propose to examine each of the columns in turn, to suggest such emendations as seem necessary, and then to compare my results with Mr. Anscombe's.

1. The first column gives the *feria aequinoctii*, or day of the week upon which the equinox fell. That by the equinox is intended 25 March will not be disputed by any one who cares to compare this column with the others. Thus in year 2 the moon is in her 14th day (col. 4) on Easter Sunday, 1 April (col. 3), and in her 7th (col. 2), therefore, on 25 March. But it will be noticed at once that the day of the week of 25 March increases regularly by one for every year of the cycle—Saturday, year 1, Sunday, year 2, Monday, year 3, and so on—except that from 6 to 7 the days leap from Thursday to Saturday, and from 16 to 17 from Monday to Wednesday. Obviously this is imperfect, for, since with every leap-year the days of the week advance two, there ought to be in 19 years four or five occasions of this longer leap instead of only two, as in Anatolius. Mr. Anscombe has of course noticed this, and has set to work drastically to correct it. Making a commencement at the middle of the list at year 14, and altering the leap-year from year 16 to year 17, he makes between years 2 and 3 a change in the equinox from 25 March to 24 March (so that the advance of one day, Sunday to Monday, being on this hypothesis from Sunday,

[4] Since the Britons would not celebrate before 25 March or after 21 April, nor after *luna* xx., then, whenever Sunday, *luna* xiiii., fell on any day from 18 March to 24 March, the Britons must have kept Easter on Sunday, *luna* xiii., from 15 April to 21 April (that is, if they made the lunation preceding that of Easter, as no doubt they did—in agreement with Anatolius, on whom see below—one of 29 days; if it was of 30 days they would have been involved in worse difficulties). In some of these years Anatolius, even if with the Romans he celebrated as late as 25 April, would have been forced to agree with them; for if Sunday, *luna* xiiii., fell on 22, 23, or 24 March, he too must have kept Easter on *luna* xiii., 19, 20, or 21 April. As a matter of fact his cycle was so arranged, whether by fraud or more probably from mere stupidity, that it did not include any of these dangerous years, and Wilfrid's statement was so far correct.

25 March, to Monday, 24 March, implies the additional leap-year day), which makes the leap-year pass unnoticed. Then between years 6 and 7 the leap-year already exists in the table: between 10 and 11 there is no mark of one, and Mr. Anscombe boldly rewrites the first column for the years 11 to 13, and foists v., vi., vii. into the place of iiii., v., vi. It is abundantly clear that Anatolius wrote, as the manuscript represents, iiii., v., vi.; for as the year 14 goes on with vii. for the week day of the equinox, and it is the elementary idea of a cycle that it goes round and round again for ever, 25 March cannot be a Saturday, as Mr. Anscombe makes it out to be, in two successive years. Really, of course, what Anatolius was attempting was in the nature of things impossible—a cycle of 19 years, at the end of which the full moon would fall not only on the same day of the calendar month (which is the meaning of the 19 years' cycle, as discovered in the east and gradually introduced into the west), but also on the same day of the week, so that the Sundays after the full moon—the Easter, in fact—would recur also on the same day of the month every 19 years. In other words, Anatolius either believed, or wanted to make others believe, that what more accurate computators saw would only happen in a cycle of 532 years would happen in 19.[5] Consequently, as he had to make the days of the week recur after 19 years, while the days move on one every ordinary year, he could only afford to allow 2 more for leap-years; for the total, if over 21, would not have been an exact number of weeks, and the cycle would not have recommenced on the same week day.[6]

As regards the first column, then (with the possible exception of the change in year 17 from iiii. to iii., about which judgment may be reserved), Mr. Anscombe's alterations are to be rejected, and the manuscript to be accepted as a correct reproduction of Anatolius.

2. The second column of the table contains the age of the moon on the equinox, a fixed day of the solar year. Mr. Anscombe has not proposed, nor do I propose, any alterations in the manuscript reading of this column; but there is a feature in it, not, I think, noticed by Mr. Anscombe, which seems to challenge attention.

The object of each Paschal cycle was to find primarily the 'least

[5] Supposing the full moon to recur on the same day of the month every nineteen years, that may be any day of the week, so that to find the Sunday after the full moon falling on the same day we must multiply by seven. This would be enough (a cycle of 133 years) except for leap-years, which throw the days one out, and we must multiply again by four (532 years) to be certain that a cycle of Easter Sundays recurs the same from beginning to end. Even this only applies to the Julian calendar, and would be found inexact for our own.

[6] I do not know whether Mr. Anscombe means to imply this when he says that the leap at year 11 has been purposely ignored; if he does he is anticipating matters, for what we want is the table which Anatolius published, not the table which he ought to have published.

common denominator' of the solar year and lunar month—the shortest period of years after which a lunar month would recur again at the same exact epoch of the solar year, and the nineteen years' cycle was adopted because it gave the most satisfactory solution to this problem. The ordinary solar year consisted of 365 days: lunar months or lunations were ordinarily reckoned at 29 and 30 days alternately, so that a year of 12 lunar months fell short of the solar year by eleven days,[7] and every third, sometimes every second, year this difference necessitated the intercalation of a thirteenth lunar month, technically called 'embolismic,' before the spring equinox. In nineteen years the difference, if calculated at exactly eleven days a year, amounts to 209 days, or one day less than seven months of 30 days. An examination of the second column of Anatolius' canon will show that the embolismic months are there calculated at 30 days. Thus in year 1 the equinox is *luna* xxvi., and the lunation began, therefore, on 28 Feb.; in year 2 the equinox is on *luna* vii., and the month began on 19 March: the interval from 28 Feb. to 18 March of the next year is 384 days, or twelve lunations at 354 days, and an embolism of 30. But seven months of 30 days amount to 210 days, or one day more than the total reckoned above. To obviate this discrepancy, one of the lunar years of the cycle is calculated at 353 days only (*i.e.* seven months of 29 days and five only of 30), and the difference from the solar year becomes not 11 days but 12. Thus in Anatolius' canon the equinox is on *luna* viii. in year 13, but on *luna* xx. in year 14.

This column may well, I think, have been derived from some pre-existing nineteen years' cycle. It was the stock on which our pseudo-Anatolius grafted his errors. But it is not apparently consistent with his own views, for his pre-Paschal lunation in embolismic years is, as we shall see, one of 29 days, and it is almost necessary to assume that the embolismic lunation immediately preceded the Paschal one.[8]

3. The third column of Anatolius' table gives the calendar date of Easter Sunday, and the correctness of the figure can be checked by comparing it with the week day of 25 March in column 1. But it may be useful to state at starting on what principles emendation in such a list may be permitted. Nothing is more familiar to students of palæography than the ease with which a cypher is inserted or omitted: xiii. and xiiii., xviii. and xviiii. can be, and in fact often are

[7] In leap years it would have fallen short by 12 days, but apparently the February-March lunation must have been given in those years an extra day. Since 12 astronomical lunations appear to average fully 354¼ days, the bissextile day is as necessary to the lunar as to the solar calendar.

[8] Certainly the embolismic month of the Jewish law, Ve-adar, immediately preceded Nisan.

substituted one for the other.[9] As a less usual but perfectly intelligible form of error it may be added that the figure v is sometimes written in such a way as to make the confusion with vi very feasible, the second part of the v being a long straight downward stroke, very like the i. Where, therefore, comparison with the data of the other columns necessitates the addition or subtraction of a cypher in individual instances I shall not hesitate to correct the tradition of the manuscript. Mr. Anscombe's procedure is different and, as I think, quite inadmissible. As a rule he has not ventured on the tedious but necessary process of verifying the figures of the manuscript point by point, and emending sparingly here and there; but acting on his theory of inserting the leap-year—which, as I have shown, Anatolius was bound by the very idea of his cycle to omit in all but two cases—he has rewritten the Easter Days to suit them to a particular series he selects of nineteen real years. Thus, beginning with year 14, he retains the figures for eight years, 14–19, 1 and 2, nearly unchanged; from 3 to 10 he retains the figure in the third column, but supposes it to give not Easter Sunday but the *νυχθήμερον Paschae*, which he identifies practically—again, as I have said, a perfectly impossible hypothesis—with Easter Monday. The years 11 to 13 he rewrites in the third column just as he did in the first.

Bet let us turn to the table in the list and work through it figure by figure. In year 1 if 25 March was Saturday, Sunday cannot have fallen on *xv. Kal. Mai.* = 17 April, but we must write *xvi. Kal. Mai.* = 16 April.[10] The next years work smoothly until we come to year 7, where 25 March is Saturday again and Easter Sunday *vi. Kal. Apr.* = 27 March. It would be easy to change this into *vii. Kal. Apr.* = 26 March, but a comparison with the dates of Easter Sunday in the year before, 18 April, and in the year following, 1 April, shows that the corruption is more deeply rooted, for the only possible date between 18 April and 1 April is 9 April = *v. Id. Apr.* We must assume, therefore, a double change—*v.* has been corrupted into *vi.*, and *Id.* has been thoughtlessly assimilated to the *Kal.* of the years immediately before and after.[11] After this year 7 no difficulties arise until we reach year 17, where 25 March is a Wednesday according to the table, and Easter Sunday is *xiiii. Kal. Mai.* = 18 April, a day too early, and we must write *xiii. Kal. Mai.* = 19 April. Since the preceding year had its Easter on 31 March, 19 April will be correct if the leap-year day has intervened, and it is, in fact, placed at this point in the first

[9] It must be borne in mind that ancient manuscripts always write xiiii., not xiv., xviiii., not xix.

[10] This emendation is supported by the day of the moon in column 4 (see below), and is as necessary on Mr. Anscombe's view as on my own.

[11] This change, again, is borne out by the day of the moon in column 4, and has been made (as far as the change of *Kal.* into *Id.* goes) by Mr. Anscombe also.

column, for 25 March of the year 16 is Monday, of the year under discussion Wednesday.[12]

4. The fourth column contains the figure for the age of the moon on Easter Day, and, as the second column gave us the age of the moon at the equinox and the third the date of Easter Day, we can obviously use the results of a comparison of any two of these columns as a check on the third.

Mr. Anscombe's first change is in year 10, where he alters the figure for the moon's age, from xv. to xvii. As the moon was v. days old on 25 March (col. 2) and Easter was on 6 April (col. 3), the change is necessary; the xv. was repeated from the line immediately above either by a scribe or a printer at some point in the history of the canon. His other changes concern, again, the unfortunate years 11 to 13, where xx., xv., xvii. make way for xviiii., xiiii., xvi—the first two changes being transcriptionally most improbable—and the result is that for these three years Mr. Anscombe alters *every figure* in the first, third, and fourth columns. I presume that Mr. Anscombe intends his amended version for these years to be accepted as what Anatolius ought to have written, not what he did write; but it must be repeated that the first thing to do is to get rid of manuscript corruptions and restore the true text of Anatolius before any further step is taken.

To confine myself, then, to the latter object, I take first, as the simpler matter, those years where the figures of the second and fourth columns—the day of the moon at the equinox and on Easter Sunday—belong to the same lunation. This occurs in eleven cases, years 2, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19. In nine of these cases the manuscript reading makes the three columns consistent with themselves and with one another, so that no alteration is permissible; in one of the other two (year 7) an alteration has already been made in the third column from 27 March to 9 April, so that the second and fourth columns (*luna* ii.–xvii. = 25 March–9 April) are right as they stand, and in the remaining one, year 10, I have just remarked that Mr. Anscombe makes the necessary correction in col. 4 from xv. to xvii. himself. There remain the eight cases in which the moon of 25 March belongs to an earlier lunation than that of Easter Day, and the new question to be asked is whether the earlier lunation ends on *luna* xxviiii. or xxx.[13]

[12] Mr. Anscombe, as we have seen, transfers the leap-year from 17 to 18, and therefore rewrites in year 17 iii. for iiii. in col. 1 (Tuesday for Wednesday on 25 March) and *xii. Kal. Mai.* = 20 April in the third column; in other words, where I have altered the manuscript figure by one cypher (xiiii. to xiii.) he has altered it by two (xiiii. to xii.), and has a made a change in another column as well.

[13] I have shown already that the second column implies that the embolismic lunation, occurring seven times in the nineteen years, is calculated, for the purpose of that column, at 30 days; but then there is the probability that our Anatolius incorporated his second column from some older and more correct authority.

Now of these eight years seven are embolismic, when, owing to the intercalation of a thirteenth lunar month, Easter falls later than it did the year before; one—year 4—is non-embolismic (for Easter is on 13 April earlier than 21 April of the preceding year), and therefore can be treated apart from the complication which the embolism introduces. In this year 25 March falls on *luna* xxviiii., 13 April on *luna* xviiii.; it follows that the lunation of Easter began on 26 March, and the preceding one had, therefore, only twenty-nine days. For the non-embolismic year, then, the data all coincide, and may not be altered. The seven embolismic years are 1, 3, 6, 9, 12, 14, 17, and in six of these the text as it stands implies that the pre-Paschal lunation was one of 29 days: year 3, 25 March = *luna* xviii., 21 April = *luna* xvi.; year 6, 25 March = *luna* xxi., 18 April = *luna* xvi.; year 9, 25 March = *luna* xxiiii., 14 April = *luna* xv.; year 12, 25 March = *luna* xxvii., 11 April = *luna* xv.; year 14, 25 March = *luna* xx. 23 April = *luna* xx.; year 17, 25 March = *luna* xxiii., 19 April = *luna* xviiii. In each of these years a glance is enough to show that the lunation which ends between 25 March and Easter Day must be of 29 days; and the amount of agreement appears to me to be enough to warrant us in making the slight change which is all that is needed to bring the remaining case, that of year 1, into conformity with the same rule. Here 25 March = *luna* xxvi. and 16 April (which we saw was the true date for Easter[14]) = *luna* xviii., figures which would imply that the former lunation was one of 30 days. But if we alter the fourth column from xviii. to xviiii. we get the right equation, 25 March = *luna* xxvi., 16 April = *luna* xviiii., and the lunation ending between one of 29 days.

In this column, then, I make two changes, one with Mr. Anscombe (year 10) and one in year 1—a very easy alteration. I gain a result, as I believe, consistent in itself. Mr. Anscombe (apart from his changes in col. 4, years 11–13) does not seem to have thought of testing his own results by their consistency with one another in the eight years which admit of estimating the length of the lunations; I will therefore do it for him, and I find that in two cases (years 17 and 1) he assumes lunations of 30 days, in one case (year 14) of 29 days, and in five cases (years 3, 4, 6, 9, 12) of 28 days, or, if he means the age of the moon in col. 4 to apply to Easter Monday and not Easter Sunday, of 29 days. I venture, therefore, to commend my own results in contradistinction to his, and I print the list with some confidence as I believe that Anatolius wrote it, italicising all alterations from the text of Bucher.

Now if we want to know at what date later than Rufinus translation (*c.* A.D. 400) of the Church History of Eusebius, which

[14] If the manuscript reading *xv. Kal. Mai.* (= 17 April) be retained in col. 3, we are landed in worse difficulties, for the lunation implied by the manuscript reading of col. 4 would be one of 31 days.

Feria of 25 March		Age of Moon on 25 March	Easter Sunday		Age of Moon on Easter Sunday
1.	vii	xxvi	*xvi*	Kal. Mai. = 16 April	*xviiii*
2.	i	vii		Kal. Apr. = 1 April	xiiii
3.	ii	xviii	xi	Kal. Mai. = 21 April	xvi
4.	iii	xxviiii		Id. Apr. = 13 April	xviiii
5.	iiii	x	iiii	Kal. Apr. = 29 March	xiiii
6.	v	xxi	xiiii	Kal. Mai. = 18 April	xvi
[leap-year]					
7.	vii	ii	*v*	*Id.* Apr. = 9 April	xvii
8.	i	xiii		Kal. Apr. = 1 April	xx
9.	ii	xxiiii	xviii	Kal. Mai. = 14 April	xv
10.	iii	v	viii	Id. Apr. = 6 April	*xvii*
11.	iiii	xvi	iiii	Kal. Apr. = 29 March	xx
12.	v	xxvii	iii	Id. Apr. = 11 April	xv
13.	vi	viii	iii	Non. Apr. = 3 April	xvii
14.	vii	xx	viiii	Kal. Mai. = 23 April	xx
15.	i	i	vi	Id. Apr. = 8 April	xv
16.	ii	xii	ii	Kal. Apr. = 31 March	xviii
[leap-year]					
17.	iiii [15]	xxiii	*xiii*	Kal. Mai.[15] = 19 April	xviiii
18.	v	iiii	ii	Non. Apr. = 4 April	xiiii
19.	vi	xv	vi	Kal. Apr. = 27 March	xvii

is certainly the starting-point of the forgery,[16] Anatolius published this very erroneous Paschal list, the first question to ask is how many running of his Easters are actually correct; and, since he has only allowed for two leap-years in nineteen, and those two, years 7 and 17, are ten years apart from each other, it follows that no more than eight years running (with the leap-year in the fifth) can possibly represent the real facts. From year 3 to year 10, or from year 13 to year 1, are, then, the longest continuous series which admit of verification by comparison with Easter tables.

But if it is impossible to answer straight off the question of time we may derive some subsidiary assistance from a definite answer to the question of place. Mr. Anscombe has concluded on general grounds that the canon was written in Britain; I think that an investigation into the twelfth chapter of pseudo-Anatolius (Bucher, p. 448)—a chapter, so far as I have noticed, not mentioned by Mr. Anscombe—enables us to find reasons, amounting to a high probability, for ascribing to it an origin in the north, and rather in North than in South Britain. Anatolius' correspondent had asked for a particular account of the increase and decrease of the days during the solar year. The year is divided by Anatolius, in answer, into four quarters, commencing respectively on the eighth before the Kalends of January, April, July, and October (in other words, on 25 Dec.,

[15] If, with Mr. Anscombe, we make a further change to *feria* iii. in col. 1, *xii. Kal. Mai.* in col. 3, then, if our conclusion as to the pre-Paschal lunation of 29 days is correct, we must once more alter col. 4 from xviiii. to xx.—a change so violent that I think we may now definitely declare Mr. Anscombe's combination for this year to be very improbable.

[16] Pseudo-Anatolius borrows word for word from Rufinus' version of Eusebius' quotation from the genuine Anatolius of Laodicea (Rufinus, *H.E.* vii. 28, ed. Cacciari, p. 452).

25 March, 24 June, 24 Sept.), the first and third marking the solstices, the second and fourth the equinoxes. At the equinoxes the day and night are, of course, equal, with twelve hours to each; at midwinter the day has six hours, the night eighteen, and conversely the day eighteen and the night six at midsummer. Anatolius proceeds, with calculations in which his mathematical incapacity (if the text be correct) appears to involve him in hopeless error, to show the exact increase or decrease of the sun's course *per diem* during each of the four quarters. I need not, I think, follow him into these; but I cannot help thinking that the division of day and night into eighteen and six hours respectively at the solstices proves to demonstration that the writer lived somewhere in the north. I understand that this exact division occurs at about latitude 57 north—the latitude of Edinburgh and Copenhagen—and, though we need not tie our writer down to any exactitude in calculation, it seems unlikely that in a matter of this sort, admitting of ocular experience every year, this proportion between day and night could have been fixed anywhere in the then christianised portion of the continent, or anywhere even in the more southern portions of the British Isles.

It is true, indeed, that later writers on Paschal cycles adopted the same division without reference to the latitude in which they themselves were writing. Both the Missal of Robert of Jumièges and the calendar of the Leofric book, for instance—south English books of the later tenth century—append to the month of June the note that the day has eighteen hours, the night six, and the converse to the month of December; and I dare say these examples might be multiplied. But it seems to me most likely that these calendars drew on some source where the calculation was nearer the truth than it would be in Winchester or Exeter; and (since Robert of Jumièges' book at any rate refers to Anatolius more than once) I should be inclined to conjecture thas this source was no other than Anatolius himself.[17] However that may be, I think the probabilities are in favour of a northern origin in the British Isles for pseudo-Anatolius, and of all possible localities I am not sure that Iona is not the most likely. No doubt it would follow from this that Mr. Anscombe's date, *c.* A.D. 458, is much too early, since Iona was only founded a century later. But nothing that Mr. Anscombe urges in favour of a fifth-century date has any very definite weight; and the silence of the sixth century contrasted with the frequent allusions in the seventh and eighth suggests rather the half-century A.D. 550-600 as perhaps a more probable epoch. If so, a comparison with the Paschal tables in Mas Latrie's 'Trésor de Chronologie,'

[17] Bede too (*H. E.* i. 1) has this division into eighteen and six, and, though Bede himself was, of course, a north English writer, it is possible that it had become a commonplace.

p. 114, would suggest that the only groups of nineteen years which present even an approximation to the cycle of Anatolius are A.D. 545–563, 556–574, 572–590, 583–601. Of these I should be disposed to exclude the second, for the following reason. I have already said that Anatolius' second column, that of the age of the moon on 25 March, is probably borrowed from an earlier and sounder decemnovennal computation; and this second column presents less approximation to the correct 'Paschal terms' (or *luna* xiiii.) for A.D. 556–574 than for the other three. In the case of the first and fourth, the 'Paschal terms' of the first six years, in the case of the third those of the last two years, are exactly equal; and in the other years the difference is only that of a single cypher. Greater certainty I do not pretend to attain to; but I do not think that the soundness of the conclusion as a whole is affected by any doubt that still remains as to the details.

C. H. TURNER.

ENGLISH TOPOGRAPHICAL NOTES.

I. *Some Place-Names in Bede.*

BEDE, in the 'Historia Ecclesiastica,' mentions the Roman names of sixteen towns, &c., in England:—

Calcaria	Tadcaster	iv. 23
Campodonum	Slack, near Huddersfield	ii. 14
Cantia	Kent	often
Cataracto (-a)	Catterick	ii. 14, &c.
Dorubreuis	Rochester	ii. 3
Doruuernis	Canterbury	often
Doruuentio	the E. Yorkshire river Derwent	ii. 13
Eboracum	York	often
Lugubalia	Carlisle	iv. 29
Rutubi Portus	Richborough	i. 1
Sabrina	the Severn	v. 23
Tamensis	the Thames	often
Tanatos	Isle of Thanet	i. 25
Vecta	Isle of Wight	i. 3
Venta	Winchester	iii. 7
Verulamium	St. Albans	i. 7

These names are not contemporary names fitted into a Latin dress, like (I think) Lindocolinum or Lundonia; they are, with slight differences, the actual names used by the Romans three or four centuries before Bede. About half of them became known, or at least may have become known, to Bede through the Roman writers from whom he borrowed: the rest, notably Calcaria, Campodonum, Cataracto, Dorubreuis, Doruuernis, Lugubalia, cannot be thus accounted for. Bede could scarcely have learnt these obscure

Roman names from any Roman source, unless from some itinerary or description of Britain, and, so far as one can judge, he had no access to any such source. His ignorance of the real Roman names of Lincoln and London, Chester and Caerleon, is decisive proof that he used no such authority. It is, however, possible that he learnt the names Calcaria, Campodonum, and the rest from some post-Roman—British or English—source or sources. We do not know whence he derived the materials for the chapters in which these names occur ; for the most part his sources would naturally be English. But it is not difficult to show that the names might easily have been preserved. The Romanised Britons spoke Latin to a considerable extent, and presumably used the Roman place-names, and those now in question might have been learnt from them by the English with little difficulty. They belong mainly to (1) Kent and (2) Yorkshire. (1) Kent, the first land definitely occupied by the English, was, in the first instance, occupied by agreement, and the conquerors might hear and record Roman place-names. (2) In South and West Yorkshire the British kingdom of Elmet survived till about A.D. 625, and its conquest was seemingly preceded by intercourse between Britons and English. We do not know the exact limits of Elmet, but it seems certainly to have included the neighbourhood of Calcaria and Campodonum. Lugubalia, as a chief town of the Cumbrian Britons, retained its Roman name similarly.

II. *Bannavem Taberniae.*

The 'Confessio' attributed to St. Patrick and some lives of the saint say that his father, Calpurnius, lived *in uico Bannauem Taberniae, ubi ego* [*Patr.*] *capturam dedi.* The place has been identified in a great variety of ways, with the aid—usually—of more or less violent emendation or etymology. It may be worth while pointing out that Bannaventa is the name in the Antonine itinerary for a 'station' on Watling Street, probably three or four miles from Daventry, which itself lies west of the road, while Banna is the name of an unidentified spot in the north, probably a dozen miles east of Carlisle, near the Wall. I do not know what can be made of *berniae* or *uemtaberniae*, the two relics of the vulgate. It seems to be palæographically and otherwise impossible to explain *berniae* (as has been suggested) as a contraction of *Britanniae*, or (as has also been suggested) as a corruption of *Hiberniae*, as (*inter alia*) the name of Ireland in the 'Confessio' is Hyberio; but the fact that Bannauem Taberniae contains the whole of an actual place-name, Bannauenta, is a curious coincidence. Patrick's 'Confessio,' even if not by St. Patrick (Pflugk-Harttung, *Heidelberger Jahrb.* iii. 71), is, at any rate, old, and would naturally preserve the tradition of a Romano-British name. I should add that the coincidence of Ban-

nauem Taberniae and Bannauenta has been independently observed by three persons—by myself, by Mr. E. W. B. Nicholson, Bodley's librarian, and by a writer some time since in the *Dublin Review*. I am unfortunately unable to accept the inferences drawn from the coincidence by Mr. Nicholson and by the *Dublin* reviewer, and I have therefore ventured to state the case as I conceive it.

F. Haverfield.

A WORCESTER CATHEDRAL BOOK OF ECCLESIASTICAL COLLECTIONS, MADE C. 1000 A.D.

The Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS. 265,[1] which at one time belonged to Worcester Cathedral, contains a collection of theological and legal materials, written in an English hand of the late tenth or early eleventh century. The purpose of the writer in copying out a quantity of extracts, taken from various sources, seems to have been to make a kind of theological commonplace-book specially intended for a bishop's use. The sources of the passages are not always acknowledged; they are not methodically arranged, and vary greatly in length. Scrapbooks of this kind appear to have found peculiar favour with the monks of the early eleventh century, for similar collections, made about this time, which contain extracts on the subjects of church discipline, canon and capitulary law, penitential systems and liturgical rules, are found in the C.C.C.C. MS. 190, the Cotton MS. Nero A I, the Bodleian MS. 718 (Book I.) and the Bibl. Nat., Paris, MS. Fonds Latin 3182, to name only those which do not merely resemble C.C.C.C. 265 in general character, but are also closely similar in detail. In these manuscripts the same extracts show a tendency to recur in the same or closely similar sequence, a sequence which appears to be perfectly haphazard, if each manuscript be studied separately. Sometimes the same great theologian's name is chosen to give sanction to a set of laws which cannot have been in existence during his lifetime: sometimes the same slips of the pen are repeated: sometimes the scribes seem to agree to detach a couple of sentences from their context—sentences which appear to have no importance in themselves. All this is very unaccountable, if between these scribes there was no co-operation, and no common original from which they could draw. Yet it would be a hard matter to prove any connexion between these manuscripts; for though many points of similarity in detail are noticeable, the points of dissimilarity are no less striking. All that can be attempted here is to note some of the entries which can be traced to their original source, some entries

[1] Formerly K. 2. My best thanks are due to the librarian, Mr. Harmer, for his kindness in allowing me frequent access to the Corpus MSS.

which cannot yet be traced, and some which are found in more than one manuscript. In so doing we take a step towards answering the questions: who collected these manuscripts? where were they collected? what relation existed between the schools of learning in which these collections were made?

The late Lord Selborne made the interesting suggestion [2] that the writer of C.C.C.C. 265 was Oswald, nephew of the celebrated Oswald bishop of Worcester. He was sent by his uncle to Fleury, where he studied under the abbot Constantine, and travelling thence, he went to the monasteries of St. Bertin, St. Vaast, Corbey, St. Denis near Paris, and Lagny. In these monastic houses he had a good opportunity of making such a compilation as the manuscript in question. It appears, however, that the younger Oswald was a monk of his uncle's monastery at Ramsey, and not, so far as is known, of Worcester. He was one of the naughty boys who, in an idle moment, thought of ringing the monastery's bells, and contrived to break them. The chronicler, following his subsequent career with interest, speaks of a volume of his poetry in the Ramsey library, but of any other work, or of any connexion with Worcester, he has no record.[3]

I.

On f. 3 the MS. 265 begins with a passage under the rubric *Incipit ammonitio spiritalis doctrinę*, of which the first words are *Exalta in fortitudine vocem tuam* . . . and an *Admonitio episcopalis vitae* beginning *O karissime frater corde tenus* . . . ending *Amen. Vale.* Then, on f. 7, comes a letter of Alcuin to Ethelhard, and on f. 13 one of Alcuin to Eanbald. On f. 17 come three chapters, *De doctrina & exemplis prepositorum, De his qui bene docent & male vivunt, De exemplis pravorum sacerdotum.* These passages occur in this order in MS. 190, f. 169: *Incipit admonitio spiritalis doctrinę*, then the *Admonitio episcopalis vitae* under the title *Admonitio episcoporum utilis*, then the two letters and the three chapters about priests. The *Admonitio spiritualis doctrinae* I have not identified: it consists of short extracts from named sources and resembles 'Pseudo-Theodore,' cap. 2 (Thorpe). It is given in a slightly different form in Nero A I, f. 126 a, under the title *De pastore & predicatore.* Part of the *Admonitio episcopalis vitae* is repeated in 190, ff. 100–101, under the title *De electione sacerdotalium ordinum.* The two Alcuin letters in both manuscripts have been collated by Dümmler. The three chapters on a priest's life are from Isidore or Amalarius, caps. 20, 29, 30 of Book I. of the *Regula Canonicorum.*[4] In 265 there then come fifteen short extracts from the Canons of Carthage IV. on laws for bishops, under the title *De variis observantiis episcopi.*

The contents of the next two folios have made this manuscript famous in connexion with the name of Egbert, archbishop of York, and the

[2] *Ancient Facts and Fictions about Tithes*, p. 234.

[3] *Chron. Rames.* (Rolls Series), pp. 112, 159–120.

[4] Migne, *Patrol.* cv., or Isidor. iii. *Sentent.* caps. 35, 37, 38.

history of tithes. Little remains to add to Lord Selborne's work on the subject, as far as the MS. 265 is concerned. The sixth piece in the collection contains the *Jura quae sacerdotes debent habere*, in twenty-one chapters, long believed to be from the pen of Archbishop Egbert, and since shown by Lord Selborne to be identical with a group of sacerdotal laws to which he would ascribe a date not earlier than 813,[5] for, he says, no earlier canonical authority for the division of tithes before witnesses is known than the canon of Tours in that year. He has, however, overlooked the fact[6] that the three Gallican MSS. (one at Metz, in the monastery of St. Vincent, one in the Vatican library, and one at Andain in the Ardennes) are not the only early manuscripts of this capitulary, and an earlier date, probably 801 or 802, must be ascribed to the first 'division of tithes before witnesses.' Pertz[7] gives the twenty-one *capitula* as the capitulary of Aix-la-Chapelle, 801, and mentions as the oldest manuscript the 'Codex Bibliothecae regiae Monacensis, inter libros S. Emmerammi Ratisbonensis, F. 11 signatus, memb. saec. IX,' and the codex of the Paris Bibliothèque Nationale, Suppl. Lat., No. 75, of the tenth century, which agrees with the Metz codex. In the Paris codex it is referred to the first year of the empire, when, according to the 'Annales Juvavenses,' in the month of November Charles made a synod for the examination of bishops and clerics. Boretius[8] calls them *Capitula de Sacerdotibus Proposita*, and argues in favour of the date October 802.

In two manuscripts these 'capitula' are found to precede immediately what is now known as the genuine Latin Penitential of Egbert, *i.e.* in Bodl. 718, and in 'Egbert's Pontifical,' Bibl. Nat. Paris, Suppl. Lat., 138;[9] and in the two MSS. C.C.C.C. 265 and Nero A I, they immediately precede a large set of 'excerptions' with which they have been printed under the title *Excerptiones Egberti*—a title which has now been rejected. In Nero A I the capitulary is followed by seven other extracts, all without titles; the first four are in Ansegisus' collection of capitularies, i. 155, 84, ii. 34, i. 85; caps. 26 and 27 come from the council of Carthage, 436 A.D., and the first part of cap. 28 comes from the capitulary of 803, cap. 1. The last part I cannot trace. Then follow a quantity of excerpts taken from various sources.[10] A third version of a large number of these extracts lies, hitherto unnoticed, in C.C.C.C. 190. Wilkins and Thorpe printed their version from the Cotton MS. Nero A I. Johnson translated them and compared them with the collections in C.C.C.C. 265. Lord Selborne, in his 'Ancient Facts and Fictions about Tithes,' compared these two latter manuscripts in further detail. The MS. 190 forms an interesting link between the two. It appears to have escaped attention owing to the misleading nature of the table of contents written, at the

[5] *Ancient Facts and Fictions*, 2nd ed. p. 42.

[6] 'I am not aware that any others were then (in the seventeenth century) or are now known,' p. 37.

[7] *Mon. Ger. Hist.: Leges*, i. p. 87. Migne, *Patrol.* xcvii. col. 218, note *a*, noted that the 21 Capitula, which he ascribes to the year 801, are identical with the 21 'excerpts' he had printed in his vol. lxxxix. col. 379 as Egbert's. It is surprising that this clue remained so long unfollowed.

[8] *Mon. Ger. Hist.: Capit. Reg. Franc.* (Hanover, 1883), p. 105.

[9] Date about 950; printed by the Surtees Society.

[10] Cf. Wasserschleben, *Bussordnungen*, p. 45, and Johnson, *Canons* p. 216.

beginning of the book, in the same hand as the bulk of the manuscript—a hand of the early eleventh century.[11]

The first forty-three chapter-titles can be shortly dealt with, since, as the *Pœnitentiale Pseudo-Theodori*, they have received a full measure of notoriety. At the head of the list of chapter-titles stands in a sixteenth-century hand the entry *Liber pen. Theod. Arch. Cant. Eccles.* Then follows, in the same hand as the bulk of the manuscript, the rubric *Incipiunt capitula de initiis creaturę*, in red ink.

I. Qualiter apud orientales provincias Germanię atque Saxonię, pro diversis criminibus, penitentię observatur modus.

. . . . [12]

VII. Item de capitalibus criminibus.

Incipiunt capitula de penitentum [judiciis].

1. De inani gloria.

. . . . [13]

7. De luxuria.
8. De fornicatione laicorum.

. . . . [14]

43. De penitentiarum diversitate.
44. De reconciliatione. De eadem re.
45. De clericis sive ecclesiasticis ordinibus.
46. De diversitate ordinum.
47. De electione sacerdotalium ordinum.
48. Item de electione Gregorius dicit.
49. Item canones Sanctorum de electione Episcoporum.
50. Si Episcopus a Metropolitano admonitus pro synodo vel ordinatione episcopali venire distulerit, ex concilio Agatensi.
51. De ordinatione Archiepiscopi.
52. De electione indignorum, canon sanctorum.
53. Item ex concilio Calcedonensi titulo secundo, quod non debeant officia ecclesiastica per pecunias ordinari.
54. Item de lapsis graduum.

[11] An interesting copy of this manuscript is Harl. 438, which was made by John Retchford with Latin translations of the Anglo-Saxon passages for Mr. Cornelius Bec. f. 2 a, Jan. 27, 165⁶⁄₇.

	£	s.	d.
Rec. of Mr. Cor. Bee in part for transcribing a MS. taken out of Benet Coll. Library, Camb: five pound ten shillings	5	10	0
Rec. of Mr. Morden in chamb' uppon Mr. Bees account six pound tenne shillings. I say rec. by mee John Retchford . . .	6	10	0
Rec. of Mr. Cornelius Bee in whole for the transcribing a MS. out of Bennet Coll. Library Camb' the sume of three pounds nineteene shillings and sixpence. I say received Aung. [*sic*] 25th by me William Retchford, 1664 . . . . Witnes, Ric Davis.	03	19	06
Delivered unto Mr. Richard Richford for paines in translating the Saxon into Lattin.			
[Historiæ] Anglicanæ Scriptores: Matthei Paris' Historia; Lambert de Priscis Anglorum Legibus	4	0	0
Paid vnto a Scoller in Cambridg for helping Mr. John Richford . .	2	10	0

[12] See Wasserschleben, *Bussordnungen*, pp. 566–7.

[13] See *ibid.* [14] See *ibid.*

55. De accusationibus & excusationibus.
56. Gregorius Johanni defensori, qualiter de Episcopo Januario observandum sit, sive de aliis Episcopis injuste condempnatis.
57. De juramentis Episcoporum.
58. De vexatione Episcoporum.
59. De pastore & predicatore.
60. Verba Ezechielis Prophetae.
61. Item de pastore.
62. De Episcopis & Presbyteris.
63. De quotidianis operibus Episcoporum.
63. [*sic*] Augustinus [Incipiunt capitula de canonibus.
    Aureliensis [*sic* for Aurelius] Episcopus dicit.
    Incipiunt capitula de sacerdotali jure Egcberti Archiepiscopi.
1. Item Canones Sanctorum.

What follows will be discussed subsequently.

The numeration of the chapters in the manuscript has been followed. It differs from that of Spelman. The manuscript numbers only its list of chapter-titles; the chapters themselves have no numbers.

Concerning the contents of these chapters the following points may be noted. The first passage, under the rubric *Incipit de initio creaturę*, is chiefly taken from Genesis, followed by a list of the ten commandments. The next five rubrics have been omitted from the index. They are: *Item precepta legalia* (the tables of the Law of Moses),[15] *Incipiunt dogmata evangelica secundum Matheum* (the Beatitudes according to St. Matthew), together with three further chapters on the Beatitudes from St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. John. Chapters I. to VII. and 1 to 42, printed by Thorpe as Theodore's Penitential and by Wasserschleben as *Penitentiale Pseudo-Theodori* are not claimed by the writer of the manuscript as Theodore's work, and the real authorship is not known.

Thorpe printed as far as the forty-third chapter, *De Reconciliatione*; the manuscript has no break here, f. 94, but follows on with the next rubric, *Item de reconciliatione*, and a passage from a Nicene canon. Next come two long passages of which the index makes no mention: one, with the rubric *In Nomine Domini*, begins *Primo omnium admonemus omnes homines ut super omnia . . . percipere mereatur sempiternam. Amen.* The next has a blank space for a rubric, and begins *Ecclesia sponsa Christi est & omnium domina*, and is directed against the spoilers of the church; the cases of Pompey and Alaric are quoted. On f. 97 comes the 45th chapter, *Clerus grece, sors latine*: a similar passage occurs in Nero A I, f. 127 a, immediately before the so-called *Excerptiones Egberti*. The 46th chapter resembles Thorpe's Excerpt 161. Capp. 45–50

[15] Not identical with those found in several manuscripts in conjunction with the Hibernensis.

are concerned with the election and ordination of bishops and priests. Cap. 47 resembles closely the chapter in 265, ff. 4–7, headed *Admonitio episcopalis vitae.* Cap. 49 consists of excerpts from the first Nicene Council, and contains Thorpe's excerpts 98 and 99. Cap. 50 is from the council of Agde (544), cap. 35. Cap. 51 quotes Beda on the history of the archiepiscopal pall, '*Legimus in istoriis anglorum scribente Beda historiographo & laudabili doctore,*' with quotations from Pope Boniface's letter to Justus, and Pope Honorius' letter to Honorius, and the history of Paulinus' pall. Cap. 52 (f. 105) resembles Thorpe's Excerpt 44, to which is added a passage from Gregory. Cap. 53 is cap. 2 of the first council of Chalcedon, with Thorpe's excerpt 33. Cap. 54 begins *Quicunque dignitatem gradus non custodivit* . . . with long quotations from the Old Testament. Cap. 55 quotes Pope Alexander, saint and martyr, and Felix. Cap. 56 (f. 109) is a passage from Gregory's letter to Johannes Defensor about bishop Januarius.'[16] Cap. 57 begins '*Sunt quidam sanctę dei ecclesię inimici,*' and complains that some deny force to the clerical oath, '*sed penitus ignoramus quo sancto concilio vel cujus catholici & apostolici viri decreto hoc sancitum sit,*' with a quotation from Pope Pelagius. Cap. 58 runs: *Gregorius ait: scimus itaque quia vita presulum nulli* . . . where the manuscript breaks off abruptly; here a sixteenth-century hand has noted *Desunt sex alia capitula:* the writer clearly alludes to the chapters 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, noted in the index, and has included as a sixth chapter the passage *Augustinus Aurel. Ep. dicit,* which belongs, as will be shown, not to this set of chapters, but to the next. This mistake was probably due to the mistake in the index, which prefixes the number 63 to this extract as well as to the extract which precedes it. The contents of the lost chapters 59, 60, 61, 63, may be found, under the same rubrics as those of the index, in the MS. Nero A I, f. 126 a, 129 a, 165 b, but not in the same sequence.

On f. 111 and onwards there stand fifty-two chapters almost identical with the so-called *Excerptiones Egberti* of Nero A I. When a passage occurs which does not stand there it will be found to stand in C.C.C.C. 265, a manuscript which adopts another arrangement of the Nero A I passages and adds many fresh extracts. The collection in C.C.C.C. 190 begins at the top of f. 111 with a version of the latter half of Thorpe's Excerpt 60; it is imperfect at the beginning, and follows immediately on the unfinished passage from Gregory, *De vexatione episcoporum,* noted above. Between these sheets a piece of the manuscript must be lost. F. 111 proceeds regularly, like Nero A I, with excerpts 61–85. Of these chapters, 81–85 (in Thorpe's numeration) have rubric spaces not filled in. There then follow three sentences beginning *Si homo vexatus a diabolo* . . . which resemble the genuine Theodore, Book 2, x. § 1, 2, 3, passages found also

[16] Migne, *Patrol.* lxxvii. coll. 1294–5.

in 265, f. 71. Next come caps. 86–97 of Nero A I, without rubrication, and then a long passage on tithes, which is found in C.C.C.C. 265, headed *De jure sacerdotali,*[17] numbered in Lord Selborne's list 68. Then follow excerpts 101–127 [18] as in Nero A I. The rubrication begins again at cap. 104 (Thorpe). On f. 124 is a quotation from pope Leo's letter to Rusticus, bishop of Narbonne, not in the excerpts of Nero A I, or 265. Thereon follow excerpts 128–130, 146, 134 (entitled 'Can. Bonan.' for 'Roman.'), 135–140. Here a break occurs in the manuscript, four pages having been left blank and subsequently filled in.[19] On ff. 134–8 the excerpts continue as in Nero A I, Thorpe's numbers 132, 133, 147–160. On f. 138 come cap. 3 of the first Nicene council, more fully given than in excerpt 31 where it stands under the same rubric, and then excerpt 32. From this point there is no further resemblance to the excerpts.

What follows are passages with the rubric *Alia: Multis autem declaratur exemplis*, that clerics should not bear arms; *De militia & victoria christianorum; Boni igitur seculares & veri Christiani viriliter resistere debent inimicis sanctę dei ęcclesię . . . De exortatio-[ne]: Ambulemus igitur fratres dum lucem habemus;* a passage (f. 139) on the captivity of the Jews. A passage *De interitu Britonum* which is a sentence of one of Alcuin's letters to Ethelhard (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. p. 476); another *De Anglis* (cf. Jaffé, 'Monum. Alcuin.' p. 353); and then, f. 140, under the heading *De predatione Nordanimbrorum*, Alcuin's letter to Ethelred, king of Northumbria,[20] and a passage f. 142 *De tribulationibus* which reads like a work of Alcuin (see Appendix). At this point the nature of the contents of the MS. changes.

If we now compare these contents with the list of contents in the index, a considerable discrepancy appears—a discrepancy of much interest, since the index tells us that what is missing is that mysterious work '*Capitula de sacerdotali jure Egcberti Archiepiscopi.*' After cap. 63 *De cotidianis operibus Episcoporum* comes, says the index, cap. 63 (*sic*) *Augustinus [Incipiunt capitula de canonibus.*

Aureliensis Episcopus dicit.

Incipiunt capitula de sacerdotali jure Egcberti Archiepiscopi.

Here, after the analogy of Nero A I and C.C.C.C. 265, we expect that titles applicable to the Capitulary in twenty-one chapters will follow, but this does not happen. The list is:

1. Item canones sanctorum.

[17] Cf. Can. Hib. i. § 3 and ii. § 11.

[18] Caps. 98, 99 having already occurred in the earlier part of the manuscript.

[19] They contain a passage *Ex decretis S. Gelasii*, an Anglo-Saxon exorcism (see Wanley's *Catalogue*, p. 110), a passage *Ex decretis S. Leonis papae*, a passage, *Theodorus dicit: Si quis in seculari habitu vota voverit sine consensu episcopi, ipse habet potestatem solvendi si voluerit*, followed by Theod. II. ix. § 1, 2. Then, numbered xxix., Can. Hibern. xxi. 29 (Wasserschleben, *Irische Kanonensammlung*), and Can. Hibern. xxi. 12 in part. Last, Conc. Sardic., cap. 4, followed by a table of prohibited degrees.

[20] It begins in the manuscript *Alcuinus ad regem Merciorum.* Its variations from the printed form will be given by Dr. Dümmler in a forthcoming volume of the *Monumenta Germaniae.*

2. De regula canonicorum.[21]
3. De regula omnium Christianorum.
4. Item.
5. De quattuor principalibus synodis.
6. De synodali conventu.
7. De pȩnitentibus.
8. De episcoporum ministris.
9. De excommunicatis.
10. Item de synodis episcoporum.
11. De excommunicatis ex concilio Antioceno.
12. Item contra sanctȩ dei ȩcclesie inimicos.
13. De excommunicatione contra contemptores legis dei et inimicos sanctȩ dei ȩcclesiȩ.
14. De his qui post excommunicationem cum luctu penitentiæ ad reconciliationem veniunt.
15. De sceleratis vel publice contaminatis. Item.
16. Item exemplum levioris pȩnitentiæ.
17. Excerptiones de [MS. De excerptiones] libris canonicis.
18. De humilitate & dignitate pastorum.
19. De timore humano.
20. De institutione patrum.
    Carolus de restauratione ecclesiarum. [Unnumbered in MS.]
21. De Sabbato.
22. De his qui morientibus pȩnitentiam denegant.
23. De cȩna domini.
24. De consecratione crismatis.
25. Ut ab alterius ȩpiscopo nullus crisma accipiat.

The index proceeds, 26. *De conjugio*, and here the contents of the manuscript begin once more to answer the description of the index. This title may well cover the excerpts 113–120; the next title, 27. *Item de legitimo conjugio* tallies with the excerpts 121–5; 28. *De matrimonio servulorum* with excerpt 126; 29. *De concubinis* with excerpt 127.

30. *Leonis papȩ ad Rusticum Narbonensem episcopum, quod aliud sit uxor, aliud concubina, nec erret quisquis si filiam suam in matrimonium concubinam habenti tradiderit,*[22] is a chapter which stands in 190 and not in the excerpts of Nero A I.

31. *De incestis conjunctionis* covers excerpts 128–9.

32. *De thoro fratris defuncti* is excerpt 130.

33. *De conjugio antiquo* is excerpt 146.

34. *De scematibus* covers excerpts 134–140.

35. *De consanguineis* is excerpt 132–3. Here again the index breaks down, making no note of excerpts 147–151.

36. *De tonsura* covers excerpts 152–3. No note is made of excerpts 154–160. The rest of the titles tally with those of the manuscript.

[21] Perhaps this is the passage from Amalarius found in C.C.C.C. 265, f. 91 and 258, and Junius 121, f. 556. See below. The only titles which are approximately similar to the contents of the other allied manuscripts are cap. 20, which recalls Thorpe's 28, cap. 21, Thorpe's 26; the contents of cap. 22 may be the same as those of cap. 50 Thorpe) of the Pseudo-Theodore. Caps. 3–6 may be compared to A.S. passages printed in Thorpe, pp. 428, 437–8, and caps. 12 and 13 with the manuscript 265 ff. 156 and 211.

[22] Cf. Hinschius, *Decr. Ps.-Isidor*, p. 615, cap. 4.

37. *De militia & victoria Christianorum*, and the rest to cap. 43, *De tribulationibus* with the rubrics already cited.

f. 143. *Incipit expositio officium* [sic] *sacre misse*, and the nature of the contents of the manuscript changes.

The meaning of these discrepancies, and especially the relation of capp. 1–25 to the title which alleges them to be of Egbert's authorship, I cannot explain.[23] But no discussion of the authorship of the work *de Jure Sacerdotali* [24] is complete without a reference to this manuscript.

Lord Selborne and Johnson have compared the 'excerptions' of C.C.C.C. 265 with those of Nero A I, so far as they stand grouped as one set on ff. 20–37. It should be noted that many excerpts missing from this place are supplied in other parts of the MS. Thus, on f. 60 (after Theodulf's second letter to his clergy: see below), stand Thorpe's excerpts 113, 114,[25] 127,[26] 123, f. 61, then part of the tenth canon of the first Synod of Arles, followed by another sentence, Latin quotations from the 'Shepherd' of Hermas (Mandatum iv. cap. 1, Migne, 'Pat. Graeco-Latina,' ii. coll. 918–19 [27]), f. 62; Thorpe's excerpt 122, and the first sentence of 120, followed by a sermon on marriage, part of excerpt 121, and sermons of St. Paul and St. Augustine on the same subject, containing excerpt 119, then the last half of excerpt 120 with an added sentence, and excerpts 124, 125; on f. 66, the first part of excerpt 128, then passages identical with sentences of the *Penit. Pseudo-Theodori*, (Wasserschleben's cap. v. § 12, 11), a sentence of § 19. Ff. 66–68 contain a table of prohibited degrees. Then Thorpe's excerpt 132, 133 and an added sentence, 131, a sentence from 121, an Augustinian sentence on the story of Abraham and Hagar; on f. 69

[23] Retchford, the copyist of Harl. 438, noted the discrepancy.

[24] It is possible that a genuine work of Egbert *De Sacerdotali Jure* may yet be found in the collection made by Hucar the deacon, not now forthcoming. Leland says (*Comm. de Script. Brit.* i. 168) that Hucar made a collection of 108 homilies and prefixed a few '*constitutiones*' taken from the *Liber Constitutionum Ecclesiasticarum Ecberti Archiepiscopi Eboracensis.* This work was once at Canterbury, and was taken thence to Christchurch, Oxford. It is not given in Dean Kitchin's catalogue of manuscripts belonging to that house. Hucar is said to have belonged to St. German's, Cornwall, and to have lived about 1040. It is unlikely that Ware's testimony is independent. In his notes to the Synod of St. Patrick, he observes that canon 25 (*De Thoro fratris*) is the same as an excerpt *e Jure Sacerdotali Ecberti per Hucarium levitam.* Now this is the thirty-first chapter of C.C.C.C. 190 (see above), also the thirty-fifth chapter of Book xlvi. of the *Collectio Canonum Hibernensis* (ed. Wasserschleben). Ware's statement does not necessarily point to the fact that he had seen Hucar's collection, but rather that he had seen the MS. Nero A I, calling itself the work of Egbert *De Sacerdotali Jure*, and concluded that this must be Hucar's work referred to by Leland. But Leland does not call Egbert's work *De Sacerdotali Jure* but *Liber Constitutionum Ecclesiasticarum*, and the 108 sermons to which he says Hucar prefixed his excerpts are not extant in Nero A I, nor is there any reference to his name.

Spelman is supposed to have used the MS. Nero A I for his version of the excerpts, but for some reason unknown stopped at the 145th, and in this is followed by Labbe, *Concilia*, vi. 1586 (Mansi). There is no reason to suppose that he used another manuscript not known to us.

[25] Cf. Can. Hib. xlvi. 16. [26] Cf. *ibid.* xlvi. 17. [27] Cf. *ibid.* xlvi. 15.

a passage analogous to excerpts 131, 134, but giving 7, 10, and 14 years as alternatives for penance. On f. 70 come caps. 16, 17, 18, and 15 of the fourth book of Halitgar's Penitential. Then excerpt 126, and a passage of the genuine Theodore Penitential, x. § 1, 2, 3 (Wasserschleben, 211). On f. 71 stand caps. 10, 11, 12 of Louis' capitulary of 817 [28] (called in the MS. Laws of Charles) with cap. 34 of Ansegisus' Book II. Here this group ends, f. 72.

In the Corpus MS. 265, after 102 extracts from canons of councils and sayings of Fathers, which form the so-called *Excerptiones Egberti*, there follows, f. 37, the work known as the genuine Penitential of Egbert, which is found also in Bodl. MS. 718, in the Egbert Pontifical, described above, and in the Fécamp MS. now Bibl. Nat. 3182, ff. 351–355^{b}.

Johnson noticed that the MS. 265 gives none of the Irish canons in the group of excerpts which he analysed. They are, however, given in another place with some interesting fresh passages.

They stand in the manuscript after some penitential passages from diverse sources, which begin, f. 94, *Incipit qualiter sacerdos suscipere debeat penitentem*, with the opening sentences of the *Penitentiale Pseudo-Romanum* (Wasserschleben, pp. 360, 361), but changes from the word *statim*.[29] Then follows a passage *De penitent'* which closely resembles the *Penitentiale Cummeani*, on the means by which a powerful man may buy himself free from penance for crime.[30] Then follows Ps.-Theodore c. iv. with a slight change; a passage resembling the Latin of the so-called Anglo-Saxon Penitential of Egbert in four books, iv. 26, four passages not identified on penances for crimes, resembling excerpts 131, 134, and a passage resembling the genuine Theodore i. § 28, 29. Then f. 96, the *Hibernensis* excerpts begin.

The Irish canons on f. 96 sq. include Thorpe's Egbertine excerpts 74,[31] 79, two resembling 62,[32] and then follow others which, it appears, have never before been printed. Hereupon follow

Three unknown Irish Canons.

Si quis refugium crismalis alicujus sancti aut refugium baculis aut cymbalis fregerit aliquomodo, vel per rapinam predam abstraxerit, vel homini aliqua ratione nocuerit, septem-

[28] Pertz, *Mon. Ger. Hist.: Leges*, i. 207.

[29] F. 94. 'Statim juxta qualitatem delicti & institutionem canonum. Oportet itaque eum qui pro inlicitis veniam poscit a multis etiam licitis abstinere & indesinenter penitere. Qui enim inlicita commisit a licitis coercere se debet. Qui per corpus peccat, per corpus & peniteat. Hoc est in vigiliis, in jejuniis, in flectibus, in orationibus assiduis & elemosinis multis. Vetus namque proverbium est contraria contrariis sanantur. Cf. C.C.C.C. 190 f. 238 and Nero A I, f. 155 a.

[30] Wasserschleben, *Bussordnungen*, p. 464, first four sentences.

[31] Cf. Wasserschleben, *Irische Canonen-Sammlung*, xxix. 7.

[32] These three are not in the large *Collectio Canonum Hibernensis.*

pliciter restituet, & in dura penitentia in peregrinatione extranea per v annos permaneat. Et si laudabilis penitentia ejus fuerit, postea ad solam patriam [*sic*] perveniat. Sin vero, in exilio semper permaneat.

Si quis refugium evangelii fregerit, vel per rapinam aliquid abstulerit, septempliciter restituet, propter septiformem Christi gratiam & propter VII gradus ecclesiasticos, sed & per VII annos in dura penitentia permaneat in peregrinatione. Si vero non egerit penitentiam, excommunicandus est ab omni ecclesia catholica & a communione Christianorum omnium, nec sepultura illi in loco sancto tribuenda est.

Si quis tirannus [*glossed* rex] aliquem juxta episcopum ligaverit, sanum solvat & restituat, & III alios viros coęquales cum omni eorum substantia episcopo reddat, & ipse solus usque ad x annos in durę peregrinationis penitentia permaneat, & si contigerit ut eum vulneraverit, VII viros cum omni substantia episcopo reddat, & ipse solus per spatium XX annorum in peregrinatione permaneat. Si vero eum mortificaverit, omnem suam hereditatem & omnem substantiam cum hereditatibus & substantiis comitum deo reddat, & ipse in peregrinatione perhenni vel humanius in XXX annorum peregrinatione absque carne & muliere & equo in pane sicco vivat, & exiguo vestimento & per duas noctes in una mansione non maneat, nisi tantum sollempnitatibus precipuis aut si infirmitas eum preoccupaverit. Et si invitos comites habuerit, omnem substantiam eorum inter deum & hominem dividant, & sic ipsi per spatium VII annorum in penitentia probabili (*sic*) permaneant.

The Irish passages are then followed by a few short passages (ff. 98-9): the first, under the rubric *Synodus*, is Pseudo-Theodore iii. § 5-8 (Wasserschleben, p. 569), adding the prices of each homicide as alternatives to the penance, a bishop's price 1000*s*., a priest's 800*s*., a deacon's 400*s*., a subdeacon's 300*s*. Next, iii. § 1 to § 4 of the same writer, and then, with the rubric *Interrogat*, the first and second and twelfth questions of Egbert's Dialogue. (Haddan and Stubbs, III. 403.)

F. 100 gives a set of extracts from the *Canones Wallici* which have not been described. They stand under the title *Excerpta de libri* [sic] *Romanorum & Francorum*, as in that manuscript from which Martène printed them.[33] The Corpus MS. gives caps. 5–8, 10–15, 17, 19, 20, 26–34, 37–57.

Then follow the first half of Thorpe's Egbertine excerpt 152 and also of excerpt 153 (for both compare the Can. Hib. lii. 1, 2 in Wasserschle-

[33] *Nov. Thes.* col. 135 *sqq.* Knust gives them the title *Judicium Culparum.* Wasserschleben first recognised their Welsh origin, and prints them as *Canones Wallici* under the title *Incipit Judicium Culparum*, p. 124. On extracts from them in a Bodleian MS., unnumbered, where they stand with a copy of the Hibernensis, see p. 11 of Mr. Bradshaw's paper on *The Hibernensis*, Cambridge, 1893.

ben's edition), and a Roman canon which is the first part of the sixth canon attributed to St. Patrick, printed in Haddan and Stubbs, 'Councils,' II. pt. ii. p. 328. It ends, *& si non more Romano capillos & barbam tonderit excommunicetur.*

On f. 113 come a number of titles of chapters, applicable to passages that follow, whose source is not named. These prove to be selections from the collection of Rodolph, bishop of Bourges, who in his turn borrowed from Ansegisus' Capitularies.[34]

On ff. 83–91 stand passages which will all be found in caps. 58–76 of Ansegisus' Capitulary of 827.[35] They are followed by a passage, *Incipit de regula canonicorum*, which occurs again on f. 158, in A.S. in Junius 121, f. 55 b, with the end slightly curtailed. It is perhaps the lost passage of cap. 2 of the excerptions in C.C.C.C. 190. It is from the last chapter (Book I. 145) of the *Reg. Canon.* collected by Amalarius.[36] Then comes a passage *De militia seculari*, f. 93, which resembles the last half of Thorpe's excerpt 155, and the last sentence of excerpt 161.

On f. 199 stands a list of titles of canons in two columns, followed by the text of the same. They appear to have been taken from the collection of Dionysio-Hadriana.[37] The titles and the text do not coincide in all particulars. First come nine chapter-titles concluding *Expliciunt Capitula Nicene* (sic). The text shows these to be caps. 8, 17, 18, 20, 22, 25, 29, 42, 48, of Dionysius' 'Apostolical Canons' issued by Clement. In the chapter-titles follows the rubric *Incipit Concilium ejusdem*, then seven chapter-titles, of which the first is the title of the first chapter of the text and is the first of Dionysius' *Can. Niceni Concilii XX*.[38] In the text follow caps. 17 and 20 of the same, unrepresented in the titles. The next title is not the title of a Nicene canon, but of the eighth chapter of Silvester's *Conc. Rom.* (325 A.D.).[39] This is given in the text and is followed by part of the eleventh chapter, unrepresented in the list of chapter-titles. Five more titles follow, the first two not in the text, and they are from Dionysius' Ancyran collection, caps. 29, 30, and 40; the last two are his cap. 45 (Neo-Caesarea, 14), and his cap. 51, Nicene. The titles then have the rubric *Incipit Synodus Gangrensis* and the titles of Dionysius' caps. 71, 75. In the text these are preceded by his cap. 60 without any separate rubric; the titles proceed with a number taken from his African collection; these agree with the chapters and are those of his caps. 3, 4, 5, 7, 16, 17, 25, 32, 33, 70, 102, 109, 115. This ends the table of contents. In the text[40] follows the rubric *De capitulis beati Papę Adriani et Angilrammi episcopi*, and chapters 71, 72 from Angilram's spurious collec-

[34] Migne, *Patr.* cix. col. 703. Part of cap. 2 is omitted, also of cap. 5, all capp. 3, 4, 6, the first half of 7 and part of 9, all 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, the first half of 17, all 22, the first half of 23 and all 24 to the end. On the interest of Rodolph's decrees in the history of tithes, see Selborne, p. 87. He was abbot of Fleury.

[35] *Mon. Ger. Hist.: Leges*, i. 278.

[36] Migne, *Patr.* cv. 932–934, beginning at the words 'Legalibus institutis.'

[37] *Ibid.* lxvii. col. 141 *sqq.*

[38] The manuscript copy is slightly different and imperfect.

[39] Migne, viii. col. 835. These chapters are not the spurious *Excerpta quaedam* (Hinschius, *Dec. Pseudo-Isid*, p. 449).

[40] f. 207, with a slight change of hand.

tion, delivered to him, as he asserts, by Pope Hadrian, are here given.[41] Last comes a passage from a council of Toledo (iv. c. 28[42]). Here there comes a break in the manuscript and a change in the nature of the contents.

On f. 121 of 265 stands the Latin version of Theodulf's first letter to his clergy in forty-five chapters. The manuscript acknowledges his authorship.[43] In the Corpus MS. 201 the same is given without acknowledgment. C.C.C.C. 265, ff. 51–58 contain a number of Latin passages from his second letter to his clergy; the manuscript does not name him as their author. These passages are preceded by passages closely resembling the second paragraph of Ps.-Theod. cap. xxxv. *Item, de poenitentiarum diversitate*,[44] and then the preceding paragraph (save the last four lines). Both these letters are found in the Fécamp MS. Bibl. Nat. Paris, Fonds Latin, 3182. There, too, appear, with the *Collectio Canonum Hibernensis*, the *Canones Wallici*, or *Excerpta de libris Romanis et Francorum*; there, too, is a version of the *Dionysio-Hadriana*, with, as has already been said, an imperfect copy of the genuine Penitential of Egbert. Did the copyist of 265 extract from this collection as one of his sources?

II.

After the Canones Wallici, described above, p. 722, there follows on f. 105 a collection of excerpts, clearly from a continental source, which I fail to identify. It seems probable that they have a common origin with the passage which Thorpe prints as the first chapter of the Pseudo-Theodore: *Qualiter apud orientales provincias Germaniae atque Saxoniae, pro diversis criminibus poenitentiae observatur modus.* The collection is interesting because it mentions an ordeal which, so far as I can find, is not known to writers on that subject, *i.e.* the ordeal of burial. For sacrilege and homicide the ordeal is to tread barefoot over nine hot ploughshares placed in rows. If a man be suspected of parricide and denies the charge he may choose one of two ordeals, either to be buried nine, seven, or three feet deep till the third day, breathing through a reed placed in his mouth, or to pass through fire uninjured, wrapped in a waxed cloth.

F. 105. Exempla Saxonica ac castigationis hominum.
Germanię sane provincię mos est doctoribus ut omnium ordinatorum laicorumve delinquentium culpis[45] ęquales in publico rependant noxas. Quamvis enim nobiles ignobilesque simili modo peccant non uno tamen judicio artantur. Si quis vilium personarum publice

[41] Bishop of Metz, 768 to 791. Migne, xcvi. col. 1067.

[42] Isidore Hisp., Migne, lxxxiv. col. 374.

[43] Wilkins heads it *Liber Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, but knew it was Theodulf's, and Thorpe followed him in printing it with the misleading title 'Ecclesiastical Institutes,' and no mention of their source. Dietrich, *Zschr. f. d. hist. Theol.* xxv. p. 544, failed to identify them. That Ælfric translated them is possible. Wanley also, p. 158, did not recognise them.

[44] Wasserschleben, *Bussordn.* p. 622. De aegris . . . vel pro anno. In euuangelio. Mulier paupercula pro quadrante laudatur plus quam potentes pro pretio magno. Et ideo qui potest . . . et reliqua. Etsi aliquid defraudavi reddo quadruplum. Et qui potest . . . genuflexione.

[45] Culpis *for* culpę.

commiserit haud dubium quin publice arguatur. Nimirum cum ad penitentiam conversus fuerit, in die constituto qui est lune ante ęcclesiam veniat, cilicio indutus, nudis apparens pedibus, scopam vero & forpicem secum habeat, ibique commissum a preposito ęcclesię aut jejunio accepto aut verbera passus doleat. Attamen, si preposito videtur, ut hic penitens tanta non valeat ferre jejunia, palam omni clero scopis vapuletur, quin etiam tonsus depiletur coma. Nobilis si unius carinę hoc est XL^mo [46] jejunium redimere cupit, aut flagra CC sustineat aut CC solidos solvat.

Item. Si quis nobilium personarum nefas perpetraverit & emendare sponte noluerit aut fastu cordis elatus hoc agere spreverit, omni populo in derisum fiet, sicque excommunicatus ab episcopo invitus ad penitentiam veniet, & sic in carcerem missus peniteat, jejunio maceretur, luminisque absentia puniatur.

Exempla.—Quodam namque tempore audivimus quod quędam sanctimonialis deprehensa in adulterio publice arguebatur. Hujus etenim rei sic ordo fuerat. Illa vero concipiente prolem cum genuisset, fortasse hujuscemodi res acta episcopi pervenit ad aures. Qui mox precepit die dominico dum missam celebraret eam cum infante adduci statuique ipsum in matris collo, omnique adstanti ait populo : Hęc namque est fornicaria quę fornicata est peperitque filium iniquitatis. Porro ab omni plebe dum inluderetur ipsa meretrix jussa est flagellis cedi, & annorum XII penitentiam agere. Namque ipsum adulterum retrusum carcere IX diebus flagellis cedi jussit totque annorum illi penitentiam imposuit.[47]

Sepe etiam et nos vidimus ipsi parricidas jejuniis macerari vinclisque ferreis quantotiens coartari, ita ut proprio quis circumcinctus ense medius [48] cum quo iracundus perculit, trinisque vinclis adhibitis, uno vinciretur [49] brachio & numquam solvi aliquem nisi vera penitentia subveniente sacris solveretur in locis, sed hujus auctoritatis causa nostris latet paginis.

Quin etiam facinora sua refutantibus profiterique nolentibus gravia apponunt judicia. Si quis delatus fuerit furtum facere aut quidlibet levioris sceleris impetrasse, ferventis ferri se defendat examine. At vero sacrilegus & homicida qui retur esse, alio utatur judicio, id est novem calidis vomeribus ordinatim positis, nudis superambulet pedibus. Qui autem suspicatur esse parricida aut sui deceptor erit & rennuit verum esse, unum de duobus judicium eligat, aut sepeliatur IX vel VII vel III pedum profunditate usque in diem IIIIum ut tamen imposita ori ejus harundine tenuem emittat alitum, aut etiam cerato consepto [50] panno igne consumpto [51] innoxius adprobetur.

[46] XL^mo *for* XLme.

[47] Cf. Boniface's letter to Æthilbald, king of the Mercians (Haddan and Stubbs, ii. 353), and Tacitus, *Germania*, c. 19.

[48] Medius *perhaps for* medio.

[49] In MS. *vinceretur*.

[50] Consepto *for* conseptus.

[51] Consumpto *for* consumptus

Audivimus etiam & opinionem de quodam adulterante clerico quam gravi sit usus judicio. Nam cum ipse in nefario concubitu apud alterum virum nuptę uxoris deprehensus esset, ductus est ad episcopum, illo quoque precipiente dira verberum passus est supplicia, tandemque ejus collo ad portandum gravis affigitur trabes, & pro majoris adhuc causa dedecoris ei adcopulabatur licisca[52] & adnexus corrui[53] presulis, quocumque iter agendum esset, consecutus est eum & ad ultimum in suo fronte causa facti acu inpingitur: Hic est profanus adulter.

Nec[54] quoque reticendum est quod quidam presbyter furtum aggressus, et audivimus bovem detraxisse. Huic vero ne ad capitis duceretur periculum, ab episcopo decretum est ut restituto bove bovi conjugaretur, passimque per loca ductum vapulari & omni coma decalvari, nam et ipsius fronte nomen odibile ad ultimum prenotatum est, quod dicitur: Fur.

Quędam sanctimonialis adulterio deprehensa jubente episcopo flagellis cesa est & omni expectante plebe circa inguina ejus concidebantur vestimenta & sic[55] a suo depulsa est monasterio.

Sacerdotes obnoxios antequam degradentur laicis judicare nefas est, dicente scriptura: Laicus non dijudicet Christum domini id est sacerdotem. Quomodo sacerdos sit judicandus exemplo cujusdam presbyteri cum alterius viri conjuge adulterantis docetur. Qui deprehensus cum esset, in sinodali concilio papa residente episcopisque quam plurimis considentibus presentatus est, & de eo quid esset agendum inter se dum diu quererent, statutum est, ut sacerdotalia legerentur judicia, perlectisque, satisfacere papa decrevit. Quantum vero ad solum pertinet sacerdotem, primo perlecto judicio ipse medius statuitur, alba indutus & casula & omni veste quę ad sacerdotale ministerium contigit, duo aggredientes presbyteri accipiebant[56] ejus casulam, in limbo replicantes, eam detrahebant. Secundo perlecto judicio stola privatus est. Tertioque finito alba & omni sacerdotali vestimento expoliatus est. Novissime aut forpicibus tonsus turpiter decalvatus est. Nunc, inquid papa, quod ad judicium pertinebat complevimus, siquid vero residui sit vestras eum secundum leges judicate. Hoc audito sermone, laici eum accipientes extra ęcclesiam ducebant dirisque flagris affectum tamdiu per plateas trahebant usque dum diri lapides suas resecabant membratim carnes, & castratum atque truncatum una manu & una pede semivivum dimiserunt.

Sunt namque his temporibus judices qui pro modico commisso homines statim morti adjudicant, parvi pendentes monita apostoli dicentis, Castigate & non mortificate. Castigandi sunt enim rei diris flagris vel vinculis & in carcerem mittendi sunt & trabibus includendi & plumis[57] piceque perfusi ad spectaculum

[52] *Licisca*: cf. Germ. *Litze*, Fr. *lisse*.

[53] *Corrui*, i.e. *currui*.

[54] *Hęc* in MS.

[55] In MS. *se de* added.

[56] In MS. *accipiant*.

[57] In MS. *plum^{a}ati*.

publicum in cippum mitti debent & diversis penis cruciandi sunt ne animę pro quibus ipse dominus passus est in ęterna pena dispereant.[58] Diversis itaque modis rei puniendi sunt & non statim necandi sed per penas salvandi ne in eternas incidant, alii, ut diximus, catenis & flagellis, alii fame vel frigore constringendi sunt, alii pellem & pilos simul perdentes turpiter obprobia sustineant, & alii adhuc acrius constringantur membrum perdant, oculum videlicet, vel nasum, manum vel pedem seu aliud aliquid membrum.[59] Unusquisque autem prout gessit penas exsolvat. Verumtamen judices non sint inmemores evangelici sermonis, In quo enim judicio judicaveritis judicabimini. Jacobus quoque dicit: Judicium enim est sine misericordia illi qui non facit misericordiam.

Penances.

I. Quinque vel VII annis tibi N. penitentia nunc a nobis inponitur. Sed in isto primo anno arma depone, ad communionem noli accedere. Quando plebs ad ecclesiam convenerit ad hostium ęcclesię missarum sollempnia audi. II. Si vero populus ad ęcclesiam non conveniat, cum sacerdote intra ęcclesiam & ora. III. Ab uxoris carnali copulatione & ab omni fornicatione te omnimodis abstine. IV. In toto isto anno carnem ne comedas, exceptis diebus dominicis, & a natale domini usque epiphaniam & pascha & pentecosten & ascensum domini, vel sollempnitatibus Sanctę Marie & XII apostolorum & sancti Johannis baptiste & festivitatibus sanctorum in hac parrochia quiescentium. V. Vinum tribus diebus in ebdomada id est II^da^ IIII^ta^ & VI^ta^ bibere noli, aliis tribus feriis caute bibe cum biberis. VI. Paschę quoque unum pauperem omni die dona[60] refectionis tue. Et si quando manducaveritis aut biberitis vide ut ad crapulam aut ebrietatem non pervenias. VII. De balneatione corporis tui & rasione in providentia erit presbyteri. Si autem hoc anno hęc libenter sustinueris deinceps deo propitio mitius judicaberis.

Then follow, without a separate paragraph, but separated by a slight gap in the line, a number of formulae, entitled from Lupus, bishop of London,[61] from a pope John, probably XVIII,[62] to an unnamed bishop and

[58] This is Nero A I, f. 157 a, and in 190, f. 242, under the title *De Inproviso Judicio Secularium.* These manuscripts proceed differently after 'aliquid membrum.' Then 'Hieronimus dicit: Homicidas & sacrilegos punire non est effusio sanguinis sed legum ministerium. Nocet itaque bonis qui parcet (*sic*) malis. Unusquisque igitur prout gessit pęnas exsolvat ne in ęternas incidat pęnas. Melius est enim ad vitam ingredi & rel. Et melius est ut quisque parvo tempore donec vivit plangat & pęniteat & pro peccatis ad tempus verecundiam vel confusionem sustineat quam ut postea ad supplicia ęterna perveniat.'

[59] Cf. Johnson, *Canons*, p. 200.

[60] In MS. *omni dem.*

[61] Wulfstan I was bishop of London 951–953. No pope John existed in his time. Wulfstan, bishop of London, signs first 997; his last signature is 1003 (Stubbs, *Reg. Sacr. Angl.*). The date of his death is not known.

[62] Date 1003–1009.

to archbishop Wulfstan,[63] W. archbishop to an unnamed pope, and from pope Gregory, probably V, (date 996–999) to Ælfric, 'bishop of the Anglo-Saxons,'[64] probably Ælfric, archbishop of Canterbury, 990–1005.

Lupus lundoniensis episcopus cunctis fratribus atque conservis in Christo salutem. Notum vobis esse cupimus, quia homo iste diabolica fraude deceptus parricidii reatum incurrit; qua propter ad nostra concurrit pedum vestigia lacrimabili prece veniam petens, & sic a nobis ammonitus, loca sacra multaque corpora sanctorum atque apostolicum romanum causa tantę necessitatis adiit, & ad nos rediens litterarum reportavit textum quarum penitet judicio simul & nostro imperio. Ideoque petimus ut pro eo precum juvamina ad deum omnipotentem effundere dignemini, quatinus quandoque ei tanti sceleris offensam Christus dominus sua largiflua clementia indulgere dignetur. Valete.

In nomine domini lupus lundoniensis episcopus cunctis catholicis fratribus omnibusque Christianis utriusque ordinis perpetuam in domino salutem. Notum fraternę societati vestrę esse cupimus quia homo iste casu incidit in ingentem atque in lugubrem culpam, id est in proprię sobolis necem. Unde petimus ut ei adjuvamina precum ad deum effundere dignemini, quatinus vestris intercessionibus adjutus pervenire possit ad indulgentiam, prestante omnipotentis dei multimoda misericordia. Bene valete.

Lupus episcopus cunctis divine servitutis cultoribus perpetuam in domino salutem. Notum vobis esse cupimus quia iste homo diabolica fraude deceptus ita erat per iram commotus, ut proprii fratris sanguini non parceret sed ejus temporaneam vitam per nimium furorem propria manu funditus extinxit. Unde obnixe petimus ut vestris fiat intercessionibus adjutus quo omnipotentis domini misericordiam facilius pertingere possit. Valete.

Johannes episcopus servus servorum dei Domno archiepiscopo karissimam (*sic*) salutem & apostolicam benedictionem. Hujus igitur ostensorem cartule nomine N. a nobis circa suę vitę diebus penitentiam accepisse sciatis, ea igitur ratione, ut feriis II, IIII, & VI, jejunet in pane & aqua. Ecclesiam non ingrediatur usque triennium; a resurrectione domini usque ad pentecosten, & a natale domini usque in epiphaniam non jejunet. Carnem autem non comedat nisi dominicis diebus & precipuis festis; laneo utatur vestimento in ipsis tribus diebus quando ieiunat & nudis incedat pedibus; capillos incidat duabus vicibus per annum. Si aliquid remedii in illo vobis placet facere, licentiam damus.

Gregorius episcopus servus servorum dei Aelfrico anglosaxonum episcopo & compresbitero nostro karissimam (*sic*) salutem &

[63] Bishop of Worcester and archbishop of York, 1003–1023. Is it possible that he is identical with Wulfstan II, bishop of London?

[64] Compare Freeman, *Norm. Conq.* i. 597, &c. No pope Gregory was simultaneous with any other bishop Ælfric except Gregory VI with Ælfric, archbishop of York.

apostolicam benedictionem. Notum fieri volumus de istius cartule portitore qui proprium interemit filium, quamvis non sponte, tamen precipimus ut VII annos peniteat tribus diebus in pane & aqua exceptis paschalibus diebus. In ecclesia[m] non intret, pacem non accipiat & si in monasterio vult introire sub abbatis imperio militetur, si vero hoc facere rennuit in una domo duas noctes non faciat, excepto si preoccupatus fuerit infirmitate, pro qua ambulare non possit.

Johannes episcopus servus servorum dei venerabili N. episcopo salutem & apostolicam benedictionem. Dignum duximus dilectioni vestrę indicare istius viri penitentiam. Debet usque septennium persistere in penitentie luctu, ea videlicet ratione ut feriis II, IV, & VI jejunet in pane & aqua, a carne [abstineat], utatur lineo vestimento in ipsis tribus quando jejunat, & nudipes incedat ęcclesiam, non ingrediatur nisi in natale domini & in pascha non communicet nisi cum vestra licentia. Carnes non comedat nisi dominicis diebus & precipuis festis; incidat capillos bis per annum. Si aliquid remedii in eo vobis facere placet, licentiam damus.

Johannes episcopus servus servorum dei Ƿulfstano venerabili archiepiscopo karissimam (*sic*) salutem & apostolicam benedictionem. Iste vir pro fratricidio[65] perpetrato & pro aliis suis criminibus sanctorum apostolorum limina adiit fomentum penitentie a nobis requisivit. Injunximus ei penitentiam pro predicto fratricidio circa suę vitę dies, ea videlicet ratione ut feriis II, IIII, & VI, jejunet in pane & aqua, ęcclesiam ingrediatur in natale Domini & pascha, carnem comedat dominicis diebus & precipuis festis. In ipsis tribus diebus quando jejunat a carne, laneo utetur (*sic*) vestimento, & nudis incedat pedibus, pacem non donet, capillos non incidat, nisi tribus vicibus per annum, non communicet nisi pervenerit ad mortis exitum. Si aliquid remedii (&c. *as above*).

Johannes episcopus N. archiepiscopo dilecto confratri nostro salutem & apostolicam benedictionem. Visis apostolorum liminibus presentium latorem litterarum illic repperimus. Qui ante nostram presentiam lacrimabiliter fusis precibus penitentiam petiit dicens casu accidente ei evenisse ut proprii sobolis vitam extingueret, nos vero [ne] in desperationis vinculum incurrisset indiximus ei penitentiam XIIII annorum, ea videlicet ratione[66] ut per annum quemque dies[67] XL in pane & aqua perficiat. Iterum indiximus ei ut post annum ecclesiam introeat, quia apud deum non tam valet mensura temporis quam doloris. Interea dilectissime frater avida deposcimus intentione ut pro amore Christi hunc gerulum litterarum adjuvetis apud vestrum regem ut sua omnia restituat.

Domino pape N. cunctisque generaliter sanctę matris ęcclesię filiolis, Ƿ anglorum archiepiscopus. Notum fieri vobis cupimus de

[65] MS. *fratricido.* [66] *Ratione* not in MS. [67] MS. *quidque tres.*

portitore scedulę presentis, qui diabolico instinctu avunculi sui filium interimerat, unde a nobis penitentię fructum inquirentem in hujus vitę peregrinatione constituimus corporalique cruciatui damus, quo spiritus ejus in tremendi examinis die salvetur. Valete cuncti fideles vineę Domini cultores, ipsius inopiam benedictionum vestrarum copia reficere volentes in Christo.

On f. 269, after Ælfric's letter to the Eynsham monks, consisting of extracts from Æthelwold's *Concordia Regularis* and Amalarius' *De ecclesiasticis officiis*,[68] follow passages called *De discretione vestimentorum divinorum*, which are caps. 17, 18, 25, 22, 20, 21, 19, 23, 24, 26, of Amalarius' Book II. *De Eccles. Officiis*, and from Book III. caps. 5, part of 6, 7 to 22 27, 32, 34, 35. Ff. 298-329 I have not identified. On f. 329 stands *Incipiunt Aeglogae de ordine Romano.* This is from Amalarius (Migne, cv. col. 1315 sqq.).

In C.C.C.C. 190, on f. 229, under the rubric *Item. Aliqua institutio beati Amalarii de Ecclesiasticis Officiis*, stands a passage which appears to come from Book IV. cap. 30 sqq. but the source has been freely dealt with.

Ff. 201–203 of C.C.C.C. 190 contain passages on the seven ecclesiastical degrees which are also in C.C.C.C. 265, f. 188. The passages *De officio diurnalium sive nocturnalium* are the same in C.C.C.C. 190, f. 205, and 265, f. 194, save that the latter version is rather shorter.

In 190, f. 143, stands *Incipit Expositio Officium Sacrę Missę.* It begins *Missarum vero officium constat ex introitu*, and explanations of *Collecta*, *Lectio*, *Gradale*, *Alleluia*, etc. follow, with quotations from Gregory, which I have not succeeded in finding. On f. 147 stands Gregory's *Censuimus namque ut in circulo anni in die natalis domini primus scolę qui ipsa die officium facit, solidum unum accipiat*; the second receives 8*d.*, the third 6*d.*, the fourth 4*d.*, who reads the Epistle 6*d.*, the two who do the responsories 4*d.* each, those who sing the alleluia the same, the deacon who reads the Gospel one shilling. *Et dum offertorium cantatur, sacerdos qui missam cantaverit & qui missalem ante episcopum tenuerit, accipiat oblationes & diaconus accipiat unum oblatum.*

On f. 163 of 190 and f. 183 of 265 is the same passage *De officio & mysterio missæ.* In 190, f. 159, it is preceded by a favourite passage, found also in 265, f. 180, and in 201, f. 103, *Incipit de Baptismo. Primo necesse est ut paganus catecumenus sit. Accedensque . . . in aula celesti*, cf. the letter of Jesse, bishop of Amiens.[69] In 190 it is accompanied by an order for the reception of a catechumen.

These two manuscripts, besides containing the *Excerptiones Egberti* in common, have also a large number of penitential passages in common. These stand, in 190, on f. 238 sqq. and in Nero A I, on f. 155 a. sqq.

On f. 156 b of Nero A I stands a passage *De excommunicatis. Qui inviti ad penitentiam provocantur*, which in C.C.C.C. 190 is on f. 241.

[68] Hampshire Record Soc., *Obedientiary Rolls*, p. 171.
[69] Migne, *Patr.* cv. col. 791.

The excerpt *de improviso judicio*, which follows in Nero A I, has been noted above as standing in a rather different form on ff. 108–9 of C.C.C.C. 265; it is also on f. 242 of C.C.C.C. 190. The passages *Incipit Exemplum de Excommunicato pro capitali crimine*[70] and *De confessione et quadragesimali observatione* are common to Nero A I, f. 157 b. sqq. and C.C.C.C. 190, ff. 243–4 (compare also Bibl. Reg. 5 E XIX).

After these in Nero A I comes a sermon *De Reconciliatione post poenitentiam*, which proves to be Abbo of St. Germain's.[71] After this the resemblance of the manuscript with C.C.C.C. 190 is disturbed by excerpts from the Pseudo-Theodore, caps. 49, 50 (Thorpe, p. 305), and passages f. 164a, *De Medicamento Animarum* and *De cotidianis operibus Episcoporum*, see above. On f. 168 the similarity to C.C.C.C. 190, f. 247 continues. *Qualiter quarta feria in capite jejunii circa penitentem agatur.* This describes the ceremony of sprinkling a penitent's head with ashes on Ash Wednesday; then in both manuscripts follows as a lection in the service (C.C.C.C. 190, ff. 247–9), a *Sermo ad populum*, the source of which I have not found.[72]

After the order *Qualiter penitentes in Cena Domini in Ecclesia introducuntur*, in Nero A I, follows the hymn *O redemptor sume carmen* which in 190 has been written in a different hand on the first leaf, and then Pseudo-Theodore I.

MARY BATESON.

APPENDIX.

Alcuin? De tribulationibus. C.C.C.C. 190, *f.* 142.

Heu! heu! quam nimis amara quamque[73] mala tempora nostris diebus pro peccatis evenerunt,[74] quum non solum prescriptis perversitatibus sed aliis diversis criminibus pene omnis ordo gentis anglorum maculatus, Christum diu ad iracundiam provocans, jam quod meruit sustinet; Et quia legem & precepta domini omni modo neglexerat, & monita doctorum contempserat, ideo omnibus nationibus terrarum magis cladibus et depredationibus innumeris & inimicorum obseditionibus[75] angustatur. Neque vero post primum adventum anglorum patria eorum tot & tam inaudita pericula experta est quot nunc gemens sustinet. Sed tam infinitam pecuniam populus sępe pro libertate regni dederat ut vix aut nullo modo patria ad pristinam opulentiam perveniet (*sic*). Quid plura? quantis malis, quantisque perturbationibus, gens illa obpressa sit, bello videlicet, fame, igni cędibusque, quanta populorum milia absque numero trucidati sint, quanti captivi absque discretione per diversas regiones dispersi, non est lingua que modum vel numerum edicere possit. Quapropter ortamur & obsecramus eos qui residui sunt ut convertantur toto corde ad dominum deum omnipotentem. Benignus enim est & multum misericors & non vult mortem sed pęnitentiam desiderat peccatorum, ut per prophetam attestatus est, dicens: In quacumque die peccator conversus fuerit & ingemuerit salvus erit.

A passage follows from 2 Chron. xxv. 6, 7.

[70] Translated in Johnson (ed. Baron, p. 222).

[71] D'Achery, *Spicilegium*, i. 337. It is given in C.C.C.C. 190 on ff. 253–8, with an Anglo-Saxon translation on f. 354.

[72] Wanley, Index to Catalogue, calls it *forte Aelfrici*. Its Anglo-Saxon translation is given C.C.C.C. 190, f. 351.

[73] *Quamque*: MS. *q* (with *m* above) *quia*. [74] MS. *evenerant*. [75] Apparently for *obsessionibus*.

THE HUNDRED AND THE GELD.

SINCE the publication of my 'Feudal England' I have lighted upon evidence tending to confirm the views advanced in it as to the assessment of the hundred for geld. In the cartulary of St. John's Abbey, Colchester (in the possession of Earl Cowper), is an early charter of Henry II remitting for ever the 'geld' on thirty-eight hides and one carucate of land belonging to the abbey. The localities affected are all specified, and are classified according to hundreds, thus: *De hundredo de Tendringia, decem hidas in Brithlingseya et tres hidas in Wileya.* I believe that this classification by hundreds is due to the position of the hundred as the unit of geld collection.

In the same cartulary is found a grant of land with the notable clause—

> Nisi quod ipsi monachi defendent eam infra quatuor bancos hundredi per defensionem x et viii acrarum.

For the rare and curious archaism of 'the four benches' reference may be made to Pollock and Maitland's 'History of English Law' (i. 543). There is also a remarkable allusion to them in the Fordwich custumal lately published, where the *communitas* is described as electing the mayor in the parish church, *primo sedentes per quatuor bancos et postea omnes astantes.* The point that I wish to bring out is that the phrase *per defensionem x et viii acrarum* corresponds exactly with that *defensio x acrarum* which I have quoted in 'Feudal England' (p. 117) from a fine published by the Pipe Roll Society, and have claimed as a phrase representing assessment.[1] Now another document entered in this cartulary is a grant of two virgates at Wormingford, Essex, and contains an equally remarkable clause:—

> Liberam et quietam ab omnibus servitiis et scutagiis et expedicionibus et omnibus aliis scottis et lottis et halimottis et sectis scire, hundret' et omnibus querelis et exaccionibus nisi quod dimidiam hidam debent defendere predicti sockemanni inter quatuor bancos regis solummodo.

Here we have again 'the four benches' (but now '*bancos* regis'), used, I take it, to describe the hundred court; and the close association which these passages imply between assessment for geld and the actual court of the hundred suggests a novel train of thought. Do they imply that the 'defence' (*defendit se*) formula of Domesday refers to an actual proceeding in the hundred court?

J. H. ROUND.

[1] See also *defensionem de Swepestone*, which I have similarly quoted on p. 204.

THE ARCHERS AT CRECY.

The important question about Crecy is not what Froissart meant by a *herse*, but what tactics could have enabled Edward III to win his great victory. The word at a later date became a technical term, meaning a body of archers drawn up in a way that can be sufficiently discerned. Froissart, however, uses it merely by way of comparison, to describe something new, and the later use is not conclusive as to his meaning. We are on much firmer ground if we start from the known facts, and see what inferences can be deduced from them.

1. It is quite certain that Edward III dismounted his men-at-arms, in order to stand on the defensive: against great odds it was his best chance, and horsemen obviously cannot stand to await attack. 2. It is equally certain that the enormous losses of the French were inflicted by the archers, the effective range of whose weapon may be taken at 400 yards, though doubtless arrows could be sent further. 3. The charging French reached the dismounted men-at-arms, and engaged in hand-to-hand fighting. 4. Archers could not shoot properly if formed in solid bodies, large or small: those in rear could not see the enemy, and would run some risk of hitting their comrades. Hence the archers must have been drawn up in something like a line, either close together and at most three deep, or at wider intervals and perhaps eight deep, which latter was the formation of a later date, and probably of Crecy also. 5. The English loss was extremely small: there is no trace of the archers having suffered heavily, as they would have done if ridden down by the French knights. Moreover had they once been really defeated the battle would have taken a totally different turn: it is implied in every narrative that the archers continued effective to the last.

The only formation, so far as I can see, which answers to all these conditions is as follows: the dismounted men-at-arms drawn up in line to withstand the enemy's charge, having a line of archers on each flank, with their front thrown forward at an angle to the front of the men-at-arms.[1] In this position the archers could obviously shoot into the charging enemy from the moment they came within range until they retired out of range again, a very slight change of each man's attitude sufficing to change the direction of his shooting.

Combination of different arms is the basis of successful tactics, and this combination was both novel and successful. It cannot be doubted that it was suggested to Edward III by the experience of the Scottish wars—by Falkirk, where the Scottish clumps of spears, impervious to the men-at-arms, were broken by the archers

[1] This formation is that indicated by Baker of Swinbrook, whose words are quoted and discussed below.

and then cut to pieces by the horsemen; and by Bannockburn, where the English knights charged in vain on Bruce's line of spearmen, and the archers ranged behind the knights were helpless to retrieve the disaster. Köhler[2] indeed asserts that Edward III had thought it out long before Crecy, and adopted it as his permanent system; but his only reference is very far from precise, and I confess the statement seems to me impossible. The merit of the plan consists in enabling a very inferior force to stand on the defensive with a good prospect of beating off the enemy; but it is not suited for the offensive, and no one begins an aggressive campaign with the deliberate expectation of being always completely outnumbered. But however this may be, Edward III surprised the French with it at Crecy; his son used it under slightly different conditions at Poitiers with even greater success. Henry V had such trust in its efficacy, which he had himself augmented by causing the archers to carry stakes to be fixed before them as a protection, that he could move in this formation, instead of standing in a carefully chosen position: arriving within bowshot, he could force his enemy to attack or give way altogether, and again his victory was overwhelming.

The essential value of this combination depends on the archers being able to sweep the front of the spearmen. Hence it is necessary to calculate how far, with the numbers engaged at Crecy, the archers would have been able to do this. The numbers actually engaged are not known with accuracy; even the different manuscripts of Froissart do not agree. But they are known, assuming that credence can be given to any statements at all, within moderate limits. Edward III took with him 4,000 men-at-arms, 10,000 archers, and some thousands of other infantry, chiefly Irish and Welsh. He had had some fighting, but not on a large scale; he could have had no reinforcements, and we hear of no sickness. Hence his numbers at Crecy were less, but not very greatly less, than those he landed with. All accounts represent the prince of Wales's 'battle' as having been the largest of the three. Hence he had from 1,200 to 1,600 dismounted men-at-arms and 3,000 to 4,000 archers. Northampton and Arundel had in the second 'battle' perhaps two-thirds of these numbers.

We have no certain knowledge of the depth of the formation of the dismounted men-at-arms at Crecy. At Agincourt we are expressly told that they were drawn up four deep, and since the numbers on that occasion were very small relatively to the enemy—so small that not a man could be spared for a reserve—we may reasonably assume that no thinner line was deemed possible. On the other hand the spears of the hinder ranks in a deeper formation would have been hardly of any use. The space to be covered at

[2] *Entwickelung des Kriegswesens in der Ritterzeit*, ii. 362.

Crecy was also considerable, which would furnish a strong motive against unnecessary depth. Hence there is a fair presumption, though no more, that they were four deep. They would naturally stand, or sit, or kneel, as close together as was consistent with bringing all the spear points to the front, which would require about a yard for each man in the front rank. If so, the prince's front was from 300 to 400 yards long.

We do not know the formation of the archers with the precision of a modern drill book, but Sir John Smythe's[3] description, given in 1590, when *herse* had come to bear a technical meaning, is sufficiently distinct.

> The ancient order [he says] was into hearses—that is, broad in frunt and narrow in flanck, as, for example, if there were 25, 30, 35, or more or fewer archers in frunt, the flancks did consist but of seven or eight ranckes at the most. And the reason was this: that if they had placed anie more ranckes than seven or eight, the hinder ranckes of archers should have lost a great deale of ground in the volées of their arrowes at their enemies, considering the convenient and proportional distances between rancke and rancke, and the ranckes before them, as also that the sight of the hinder ranckes should have been taken away by so many former ranckes from directing their volées of arrowes towards the enemies' faces.

It is obvious from this that the archers stood some distance apart, like modern skirmishers, the men in the hinder ranks not being exactly behind those in front; this agrees with the vague indications of old prints, and is what we should expect *a priori*. Sir John Smythe does not say exactly how far apart the archers stood; and if he did it would prove little about Crecy, nearly two and a half centuries before, when the formation was tried for the first time. But in order that their hinder ranks should see the enemy at all, the men in the front rank cannot well have been less than two yards apart. On this calculation the prince's archers at Crecy would have formed a line of about 400 yards in length on each flank. If this was placed at an angle of 45 degrees to the men-at-arms, the distance from the outer end of one archer line to the outer end of the other would have been from 800 to 1,000 yards. That is to say, a small portion only of the charging enemy would have been out of effective range, and these would have come within it as they approached nearer. Assuming this formation for the English, it is easy to see that a very large proportion of the French would be liable to be struck down by arrows, but that the portion in the centre would be likely to run the gauntlet successfully, at least so far as to reach the English men-at-arms, though even these would be exposed incessantly to the archers nearest to the flanks of the men-at-arms. If it be asked

[3] *Discourse concerning the Force and Effect of divers Sorts of Weapons*, p. 60.

why the French should have charged on the men-at-arms at the bottom of the opening, instead of at the archers on the flanks, two reasons may be given—the notorious difficulty of getting horses directly to face arrow flights, and the equally notorious class pride of the French nobles, who deemed the plebeian archers unworthy of their steel.

The position at Crecy, so far as it can be identified, seems to have been about a mile long. It must have been fully occupied, whatever it was—that is to say, the flanks must have been covered in some way—for Edward had had ample time to choose it, and he was certainly a fairly competent tactician. That the French did not in the first assault attempt to turn it proves nothing, for they came on in a reckless, tumultuous fashion, obeying no general orders and expecting easy victory. But it is scarcely conceivable that attack after attack should have been made straight on the English front, if it was equally open to them to turn it. Now the prince's 'battle,' if drawn up on the above theory, would have covered something over half a mile. If the second 'battle,' drawn up in the same fashion, adjoined it on the left, as seems to be indicated by the authorities, the two would, on the above calculation, fairly occupy the space from the little river Maye, flowing through Crecy, to the village of Wadicourt, which is the only position that is pointed out by competent judgment as answering to the other known conditions. I assume that each 'battle' was separately drawn up in this fashion, so that if two were placed in line with each other the archers of the inner flanks would meet at the apex of a more or less rectangular wedge. In no other way could the whole front be even approximately covered by the archery, and it is certainly in accordance with medieval practice to treat each 'battle' as a separate organic unit. When, as at Agincourt, the 'battles' were small, the front would be still more effectually swept by the arrows. It is at least possible that the enormous slaughter on that occasion was partially due to the smallness of king Henry's 'battles.'

I have already put forward this theory, though in a more summary way, in my 'Battles of English History.' It rests on the known facts, but it does not controvert anything in the authorities. Froissart's phrase *ou fons de leur bataille* would be really more appropriate to the men-at-arms thus placed than to their suggested position as a second line in rear of the archers. And his words about the French knights on one occasion breaking through the archers may perfectly well mean that they succeeded in getting through their 'zone of fire' (to use a very modern phrase); it cannot mean that they rode over and defeated them. This view is also in accordance with the interpretation of the word *herse* most consonant to its later technical use, which would make it descrip-

tive of the actual formation of the archers, not of their position relatively to the men-at-arms. More important still, it is in full accord with the only precise tactical statement made by any of the authorities, that of Baker of Swinbrook:[4] *Sagittariis eciam sua loca designarunt, ut, non coram armatis, sed a lateribus regis exercitus quasi alae astarent, et sic non impedirent armatos neque inimicis occurrerent in fronte, sed in latera sagittas fulminarent.* That this is a deliberate statement is obvious on the face of the words; and confirmation is found in the fact that Baker, writing of Bannockburn, attributes the defeat in part to the uselessness of the archers there—*non habentium destinatum locum aptum, set prius armatorum a tergo stancium qui nunc a latere solent constare.*[5] I admit that my last point, the archers being thrown forward at an angle, is not actually stated by Baker, but it is perfectly consistent with his words, and seems to me essential to the effectiveness of the whole. Writing as he did before the treaty of Brétigny, he is the most thoroughly contemporary of all our authorities; and no one can read the military parts of his chronicle without being struck by the unusual precision of the language. He, or his informant, had paid intelligent attention to the tactics of the long bow, and would deserve respect even if he made improbable statements. In the case of Crecy his account of the formation adopted is far from being improbable; it is the only one, as I have attempted to show, which agrees with the known facts.

With regard to the word *herse* or *herce*, it is quite possible that there are really two words, one derived from *hirpex*, and meaning a harrow or a stand of candles, the other derived from *ericius*, and meaning some kind of *cheval de frise* or other military obstacle. What Froissart had in his mind we cannot possibly know, but the form of his phrase, *à mannière d'une herse*, implies that he was using the word by way of illustration and comparison, not as a technical term; and it may be meant to apply either to the formation of the archers themselves or to their relation to the men-at-arms. In the former sense it became a technical term, which is, so far as it goes, an argument in favour of this having been the meaning of Froissart, who, so far as can be traced, is the originator of the phrase. And the simile of a harrow is an apt one for a body of men drawn up as Sir John Smythe describes. Froissart's use of the same phrase at Poitiers, where certainly the archers were on the flanks of Salisbury's men-at-arms, tells also against his having meant a *cheval de frise* at Crecy. It is possible too, though rather forced, to regard the harrow as a simile for the outline of the whole front, the alternating pointed wedges of archers and straight lines of men-at-arms. By Sir John Smythe's time a

[4] *Chronicon Galfridi le Baker de Swynebroke* (ed. E. M. Thompson), p. 84.
[5] *Ibid.* p. 16.

herse of archers had become, as we have seen, a body of 200 to 300 men, drawn up in the manner described, and forming a recognised tactical unit. 'Our ancestours,' he says,[6] 'placed their hearses of archers either before the frunt of their armed footmen, or ells in wings upon the corners of their battailes, and sometymes both in frunt and wings.' But this is no reason for asserting that at Crecy in particular the archers were placed in front, or even that they were divided into specific bodies. Unless Baker is entirely wrong, they were placed on the wings. But it is quite easy to see how convenience might lead to their being divided then or later into companies, for which Froissart's simile offered an apt title. And it is easy also to understand how, as experience showed more and more clearly the extraordinary power of the archers, they may have been placed in small bodies in front of the men-at-arms, perhaps ready to retire through their line, or to position on the flanks, whenever a charge was pressed home. HEREFORD B. GEORGE.

A SIXTEENTH-CENTURY SCHOOL.

THE manuscript given below is written on two blank leaves at the end of a book in the Bodleian Library. The volume into which it is bound (D. 7. 4. Linc.) consists of a number of early sixteenth-century books, most of them from the press of Albert Paffraet at Deventer, the latest bearing date 1516. The particular book which contains this manuscript is the 'Farrago' (s. l. et a. 4°) of Alexander Hegius, the famous rector of the school at Deventer, who died in December 1498. The same handwriting is found throughout the volume in marginal notes and glosses, which are written at great length and display a laborious erudition. Palæographically it has been assigned to the first half of the sixteenth century; and on other grounds it is probably not much later than the date of the bound volume, since in the early days of printing books soon became rare, and were regarded as treasures too sacred to be written on before they had been many years issued from the press.

In this manuscript are contained the rules of a school, prescribing the duties of pupils and teachers alike. The calligraphy is faulty and in places illegible, and the Latinity is debased, many words being used with such extended senses that some portions of the code cannot be interpreted except by free conjecture. The comparison of the fines imposed is extremely difficult, owing to the confusion of monetary systems then prevailing in Europe. A stufer, or stiver, seems to be the largest coin mentioned. It is the price imposed for the graver offences—for producing a knife in a quarrel, and refusing to pay fines; and for breaking the copy of the rules,

[6] *Discourses, &c.*, p. 61.

which probably hung on the school wall, two stufers are exacted. A stufer contains eight deuts, or doits, and is equivalent to six or seven obols, or pfennige. The value of the denarius is more puzzling, since it varied considerably in different systems. The calculation of twelve denarii as equivalent to a schilling, which contains six stufers, makes one denarius equal to half a stufer, a ratio which is improbable, since both terms are used frequently throughout the code. Rule 3 implies that two obols are greater than half a denarius; and the denarius is, therefore, probably something between two obols and half a stufer. The scale thus produced seems to accord fairly well with the character of the offences, and is in the following order:—

(1) deuta $= \frac{1}{8}$ st.; (2) obol $= \frac{1}{6}$ or $\frac{1}{7}$ st.; (3) medius denarius; (4) quarta pars stuferi; (5) diobol $= \frac{1}{3}$ or $\frac{2}{7}$ st.; (6) denarius; (7) medius stuferus; (8) stuferus.

From an examination of the rules there can be little doubt that the school in question was an elementary establishment for boys, and was attached to some larger institution. The whole *régime* implies that the boys lived in the house with which the school was connected, and the schoolroom (*gymnasium*, No. 13) was probably in a separate building. They were in charge of a warden (*custos*), who lived amongst them; and from the narrow limitation with which his duties are laid down he was apparently not a person of trust or high standing. The rector (No. 13) was probably a higher authority to whom he was subordinate, perhaps the head master of the school. The rules against fighting, pulling the hair, taunting, and giving nicknames suggest that the pupils were quite young. But the liberty allowed them in walking alone without supervision (No. 12), their implied ability to speak habitually in Latin, and their competence to pay fines, small though these were, show that they were not mere children, but probably boys between the ages of ten and fifteen. Of the daily routine not much is to be gathered. It seems that the day began at 4 A.M. (No. ii.), and that at 6 in the evening a sort of 'lock-up' and 'call-over' was held (No. 5). From the expression *angelica salutatione lecta* (No. iv.), 'when the "Ave Maria" has been read,' we may conclude that after morning prayers the warden held an inquiry as to the conduct of his pupils, at which time he received confessions of their misdeeds (No. viii.), entered his marks formally in a register (No. iv.), and also asked what they proposed to do for the day (*facienda*, 25 and viii.); unless, allowing for the laxity of the Latin, we may translate *facienda* as *facta*, and transfer the inquiry to the evening 'call-over.' It is curious to notice how elaborately a 'thief is set to catch a thief.' The boys were in strictness bound to confess their misdeeds, and if the delinquent himself kept silence any one of his companions might lay information against him. Moreover, to keep silence when

cognisant of another's fault was to become an accomplice equally liable to punishment if the affair came to the warden's ears by any other channel, so that concealment was a dangerous policy. The warden himself, too, was under a sort of supervision from the boys, who were allowed to check his marks and see that he made the entries fairly in his book.

The instruction given does not seem to have been very advanced. On alternate days grammatical exercises were set in the declension and comparison of nouns and in conjugating verbs. Letter-writing, a highly valued accomplishment, was to be practised once a week, and a certain quantity of 'repetition' was daily prescribed. Yet at the same time Latin was spoken on all occasions, the use of the vernacular being strictly forbidden. Fines were imposed for blunders not corrected *inter angelicae salutationis spatium*, 'in the time one could say an Ave,' and to pass another's blunder uncorrected was as punishable as to err oneself. The rudimentary character of the instruction and the childish nature of many of the regulations preclude the supposition that these rules could have belonged to a college in a university town, such as Louvain, young as was the age of many university students in the sixteenth century. Elementary education at that time was largely in the hands of the religious orders. The town schools (*ludi litterarii, gymnasia, scholae publicae*) were for the benefit of children in the neighbourhood, who lived with their parents and not in the school; the masters were appointed by the municipal authorities,[1] but, as good learning was still thought to be the property of the church, they were naturally drawn mainly from its ranks. Boarding-schools were attached to many monasteries, and to all the houses of Groot's Brethren of the Common Life;[2] they were found too in bishops' houses, where they were maintained primarily for the support of cathedral choirs. In the conventual schools a distinction was drawn as early as 817 by the council of Aachen between *intranei* and *extranei*.[3] The former were children who were *oblati* by their parents as candidates for admission to the order, though under no irrevocable vows, and were domiciled in the monastery; the latter were those who were destined for secular clerks, and were established in a house close outside the monastery gates, where they were subjected to a rigid discipline. A similar distinction between *chorales, intranei*, and *extranei* occurs in Groot's school at Deventer,[4] which may be taken as typical of all schools belonging to his order. In cathedral schools also a difference was sometimes made between boys who were native

[1] Erasmus, *Antibarbari*, edit. Leyd., x. 1698.

[2] Aub. Miraeus, *Codex Regularum et Constitutionum Clericalium*. Antv. 1638.

[3] C. Joly, *Des Écoles Épiscopales et Ecclésiastiques* (Paris, 1678), p. 144.

[4] 'Leges Scholarum Daventriensium,' in G. Dumbar, *Kerkelijk en wereldlijk Deventer*, i. 304–6.

to the diocese and strangers. Stephen de Senlis, bishop of Paris 1124–1142, finding his school grow numerous and noisy, separated the two classes by removing the strangers to a building near his house, where they were still controlled by the same discipline as the others.[5] But this seems to have been an exceptional case rather than a general practice, and it is therefore improbable that the school now in question was one of this class.

Accordingly it may be inferred that these rules were drawn up for a boarding-house of 'externes' attached to a religious house either of one of the regular orders or on Groot's foundation. There is a considerable resemblance between this code and one preserved by D'Achéry,[6] which contains rules for the governance of young boys in the school at Cluny. They were under the control of an inferior officer with the title of magister, who slept with his charges and was responsible for their behaviour, though he was not a person of trust, and his pupils were set to act as a check upon him. But at Cluny, and as it seems likely at other monasteries also, punishment was inflicted by beating and by a diet of bread and water instead of by fines. In Groot's schools, on the contrary, fines were imposed for speaking in the vernacular instead of Latin.[7] Yet there is no mention of a custos among the regular officials of the order in the constitution detailed by Miræus;[8] and there is certainly no resemblance between our code and the 'Leges' in Dumbar referred to above, in which the rector and lectores are the only officials named. In language too there is little coincidence, except for a few words, such as *notare* and *cedulam* [*sic*]. This dissimilarity, however, may perhaps be explained by the fact that the 'Leges' are concerned chiefly with the management of the church and choir of the house; and on the whole the rules seem to accord better with the character of Groot's foundations than with any other kind of school. For this view a slight corroboration may be drawn from the position of the manuscript at the end of Hegius' 'Farrago,' in a volume mainly, and perhaps entirely, composed of books published at Deventer.

As to the situation of the school, we have also few indications. Schmidt describes the stiver and doit as being primarily Dutch coins; and *Germanice* and *Teutonice* could be used loosely for the vernaculars of the Netherlands during the sixteenth century. The *lectiones extraordinariae* (No. 5), if they be not merely a confirmation of the conjecture about houses of 'internes' and 'externes,' may be a sign that there were other educational institutions in the same town. If the school is rightly placed amongst those of Groot's

[5] Léon Maître, *Écoles Épiscopales et Monastiques de l'Occident* (Paris, 1866), p. 199.
[6] *Spicilegium*, i. 687, edit. 1723.
[7] G. H. M. Delprat, *Verh. over de Broederschap van Geert Groote*, p. 201.
[8] Miræus, *op. cit.*

brethren, it may perhaps be localised at Brussels, where the house of the order (Domus Nazarethana) was dedicated to the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin;[9] though more probably the praise of the Mother of God is only such as would occur in any similar composition, by whatever house and order drawn up.

The manuscript is not easy to interpret, and the dictionaries afford little help with the obscure words. Some passages, 8, 13, 15, 18, vii, are partially or wholly unintelligible.[10] *Si autem nihil* (*habuerit*?) in 9 and 11 may possibly be a provision for those who were not rich enough to pay the whole fine; but the explanation seems unlikely. *Illatinam* (2) is unheard of, but *illatiuam*, 'calumnious,' gives poor sense. *Notare*, from comparison of the various passages, seems usually to mean, 'give a bad mark to, mark for a fine;' but in 22 it has the more ordinary sense 'to copy.' In vii *Idus facere* may possibly have some reference to Hor. Sat. i. 6, 75, *referentes Idibus aera*, but this does not clear up the meaning. *Etiam iure an* in 10, *teutonice* in 12, and *schedulam* in 22 are conjectural restorations.

P. S. Allen.

In laude*m* et honore*m* dei o*m*nipote*n*tis et m*at*ris eius marie o*m*nib*us* co*n*tu|bernalib*us* otiu*m* i*n* litteris collocare vole*n*tib*us* haec subscripta sedulo| su*n*t obserua*n*da.|

Speaking in the vernacular.

1) Si aliquis nostroru*m* vernaculo sermone locut*us* fuerit, denario mulc|ta*ndus*, ni custos illi copia*m* fecerit.|

Bad Latin (?)

2) Si aliquis n*ostroru*m illatina*m* p*ro*tulerit oratio*nem* et ea*m* inter angelicae salutatio|nis spaciu*m* no*n* repurgauerit, mediu*m* denariu*m* dabit.|

Swearing.

3) Si aliquis n*ostroru*m p*er* deu*m* aut p*er* animu*m* iurauerit, mediu*m* denariu*m* dabit; | si aut*em* male, diobulo mulctabit*ur*.|

Non-attendance at service.

4) Si aliquis die marcurij (*sic*) et veneris seruatisq*ue* o*mn*ibus dieb*us* insup*er* et domi|nicis re*m* diuina*m* co*n*cione*m*que no*n* audiuerit, deuta*m* luet et p*re*cipue eua*n*geliu*m*.|

Failure in repetition.

5) Si quis vesp*er*tino t*empo*re hora sexta o*mn*ia a custode i*m*posita et i*n*sup*er* quatuor v*ersus* alicui*us* p*ro*bati auctoris memoriter recitare nesciuerit, de quolibet v*er*bo| mediu*m* datur*us* e*st*. Preterea et si quis eade*m* hora pomeridia|na no*n* adfuerit, denariu*m* dabit, et cu*m* venerit sol*us* recitabit; exceptis illis| qui illa hora lectio*n*es audiu*n*t extraordinarias. Et illi sexta hora pulsata| stati*m* venie*nt* aut eade*m* de illis sumet*ur* poena.|

Absence from 'roll-call.'

Fighting.

6) Si aliquis n*ostroru*m irato a*nim*o man*us* suas i*n* alterius capillu*m* i*n*volauerit aut pug|no aut quolibet alijo (*sic*) instrume*n*to petijerit, quarte*m* (*sic*) stuferi p*ar*te*m* dabit.| Sed si quis cultru*m* exemerit, st[*uferum*] luet.|

[9] Miræus, *op. cit.*

[10] In the transcription the principle followed is this: letters actually written in the manuscript are printed in ordinary type; letters expressed by regular abbreviations and contractions are printed in italics, and those merely designated by a rough sign of contraction are in italics within brackets.

Talking.

7) Si aliquis sile*n*tio imposito locut*us* fuerit, obulo mulcta*n*d*us* e*st*.|

Unseemly conduct.

8) Si aliquis n*ostrorum* i*n* co*n*spectu co*n*sociorum crepitu*m* ve*n*tris emiserit, extorqueb|bitur obulo et illu*m* notari petierit.|

Refusal to say repetition.

9) (Written in the margin) Si aliquis cu*m* te*m*|p*us* dice*n*di fuerit| ad placitu*m* custo|dis v*ersus* recita|re noluerit,| denariu*m* dabit ;| si aut*em* nihil, quar|tam p*artem* st[*uferi*].|

Bad marks (?)

10) Si un*us* alio nota*m* dederit et[*iam*] iu[r]e an i*n*iuria, a*n*gelica salutatio*n*e lecta| notabit*ur*; si vero perpera*m*, ille q*ui* dedit soluet.|

Squabbles.

11) Si duo aut plures litigaueri*n*t et suas lites inter a*n*gelica (*sic*) salutatio*n*is spa|ciu*m* missas facere nolueri*n*t, denariu*m* dabit; si aut*em* nihil, q*uar*ta*m* st[*uferi*] p*ar*te*m*.|

Information on offences committed in private.

12) Si duo aut plures una a*m*bulaueri*n*t aut secretiori i*n* loco fueri*n*t et si tu*n*c un*us*| illoru*m* germanice locut*us* fuerit aut quid simile, q*uod* facere illicitu*m* e*st*, fece|rit, hoc alij ad custode*m* deferе*n*t. Si aute*m* no*n* detuleri*n*t et si tu*n*c ille q*ui* t[eutoni]ce[11]| locut*us* est custodi dixerit, ijde*m* solue*n*t. Preterea si o*mn*es legi dero|gaueri*n*t et eode*m* die custodi non dixeri*n*t, hoc ab alijs vel a custode audito| sive accepto quarta*m* st[*uferi*] p*ar*te*m* daturi su*n*t.|

Playing truant.

13) Si aliquis n*ostrorum* gymnasiu*m* no*n* frequentauerit siue[12] rectoris et siue custo|dis venia, singulis horis dena [?]|

Nicknaming, taunting, and cursing.

14) Si aliquis irato a*nim*o alio cognome*n* dederit aut ei pare*n*tes cognatosue| obiectauerit aut alicui aliquid mali i*mpre*cat*us* fuerit, diobulo| mulctabit*ur*.|

Contumacy (?)

15) Si aliquis n*ostrorum* malos mores qua*n*do un*us* in literis in|heret habuerit, obulu*m* dabit; sed si desistere nolueri*n*t [*sic*] duplicabit*ur*|, diobulo mulctabit*ur*.|

Playing.

16) Si aliquis n*ostrorum* cu*m* no*n* fuerit te*mpus* lude*n*di luse|rit, diobulo mulcta*n*d*us* e*st*.|

Loose talking.

17) Si aliquis n*ostrorum* i*n*honora i*n*honesta insup*er*| et scurrilia impudicaq*ue* v*er*ba p*ro*tulerit, diobulo plectet*ur*.|

Letting the hair loose.

18) Si aliquis sup*er* tabulatu*m* capillu*m* explicauerit suu*m*, diobulo plectet*ur*.|

Payment (of fines?)

19) Si aliquis cu*m* te*mpus* solutio*n*is fuerit soluere noluerit singulis dieb*us*| duplicabit*ur* et hoc die saturni fiet.|

Refusal to recognise Rule 19.

20) Si aliquis n*ostrorum* lege*m* ha*n*c abrogauerit, stufero mulcta*n*d*us* e*st*.|

Correction of the mistakes of others.

21) Si aliquis dictu*m* alicui*us* male emendauerit, mediu*m* dabit. S*ed* si bo|na*m* aut congrua*m* p*ro*tulerit oratio*nem*, et adhuc eu*m* carp*ere* voluerit,| denariu*m* datur*us* est. Cu*m* p*rimum* aliquis soluit, copia germanice loque*n*di| sibi admissa e*st*.|

German may be spoken at the first payment.

Injury to the copy of rules.

22) Si aliquis s[ch]edula*m* ha*n*c, duplici stufero, aut custodis fregerit, stufero| mulctabit*ur*. Et[*iam*] si custos sua*m* amiserit s[ch]edula*m*, medio mulcta*n*d*us* e*st* stufero| et iteru*m* nota|bit*ur* sicut ante| fuit.[13]|

[11] tfᶜᵉ. [12] ? *sine*; the whole line is obscure.

[13] *Et iterum* . . . . *fuit* added in the margin.

Charging the warden with giving wrong marks.

23) Si aliquis dixerit custode*m* male notasse et id testib*us* p*ro*bare nequiue|rit, diobulo mulcta*ndus*.|

Failure to correct others' mistakes.

24) Si aliquis i*n*co*n*grue loque*n*te*m* audiuerit et no*n* eme*n*dauerit, ide*m* soluet.|

Laying information.

25) Nihil defere*n*du*m* *est* antequa*m* custos facie*n*da| interrogat.|

Custodis officia.

Setting lessons.

i) Si custos una die nome*n* quodda*m* ad declina*n*du*m* et etia*m* no*men* ad co*m*para*n*|du*m* et altera luce v*er*bu*m* ad co*n*iuga*n*du*m* [non] i*m*posuerit, diobulo mulctabitur.|

Waking in the morning.

ii) Si custos ante quarta*m* hora*m* suos e somno no*n* excusserit co*n*tuberna|les, obulo plectetur.|

Omission of marks.

iii) Si custos no*n* notauerit q*uae* nota*n*da su*n*t, quotiescu*n*q*ue* p*re*termiserit| idem soluet.|

Marks to be made in public.

iv) Si custos stati*m* qua*n*do aliquis notat*us* *est* a*n*te consocioru*m* ora no*n* notauerit,| diobulo plecte*ndus* ; sed si ipsu*m* notare noluerit, a*n*gelica salutatio*n*e lecta duplicabit*ur*.

Imposing silence.

v) Si custos duob*us* pete*n*tib*us* sile*n*tiu*m* imponere noluerit, obulo mulcta*n*d*us* *est*.|

Setting a letter to be written during the week.

vi) Si custos die lune argume*n*tu*m* epistole conficiendas [*sic*] socijs suis no*n* dictaue|rit aut parieti affixerit, diobulo plecte*ndus* *est* cu*m* custos interrogat ;| et si quis illud die sabbati i*n* latinu*m* non tra*n*stulit et custodi dederis [*sic*], de|nario mulctabit*ur*.

Failure to collect exercises (?)

vii) Si custos die sabbato colligere noluerit aut id*us* fecerit, quarta*m* st[*uferi*]| p*ar*te*m* datur*us* *est*.

Asking an account of daily behaviour.

viii) Si custos e singulis no*n* quesiuerit facie*n*da, deuta mulcta*n*d*us* *est* ;| sed si aliquis legi derogauerit et no*n* fass*us* fuerit, alio custodi| dice*n*te dabit i*n* duplo.

AN ECCLESIASTICAL EXPERIMENT IN CAMBRIDGESHIRE, 1656–1658.

In 1653 Baxter, in view of the failure which had attended the attempt to establish a compulsory system of presbyterian discipline in England, proposed a scheme for a voluntary discipline, which he trusted would prove acceptable to ministers of all parties. This scheme is set forth in a pamphlet of which the copy in the British Museum bears the press mark $\frac{\text{T.759}}{2}$, 'Christian Concord, or the Agreement of the Associated Pastors and Churches of Worcestershire.' The account of the proceedings of the clergy in Cambridgeshire, herewith printed from the Lambeth MS. 637, *Gibson Papers*, appears to point to Baxter's influence rather than to that of presbyterianism as established in Lancashire and elsewhere. It

may profitably be compared with the 'Minutes of the Manchester Presbyterian Classis,' edited for the Chetham Society by Mr. W. A. Shaw.

H. W. P. Stevens.

The names of the ministers of the severall parishes in Cambridgeshire.

Minister	Parish
Ezekiell Cachpole	Ashley
Mr Pell .	Abington mag. Abington parva Arrington
,, King .	Abbington Shingas Bottesham
,, Willson	. Burwell
,, Sendall	. Brinkley
,, Stephenson	. Burrow greene
,, Templar	. Balsham
,, Carter .	. Baberham
,, Baynard	. Bartlow
,, Skott .	. Barrington
,, Holbrook	. Barton
,, Holcroft [1]	. Bassingbourne
,, Foster .	. Bowrne
,, Killingworth	Boxworth
,, Wright	. Cheauely
,, Par .	. Chippenham
,, Sendall	. Carleton
,, Ellis .	. Castle compe [2] (?)
,, Wignoll	. Cittie ,, (?)
,, Masters	. Cumberton
,, Fulwood	Coaton Cropton [3] Croyden
,, Smith .	. Caldecot
,, Ramsey	. Caxton
,, Brookes	. Croxton
,, John Nie	Cottenham Childerlie
,, Tatnall	. Chesterton
,, Whitfeild	. Connington
,, Milles .	. Puxford
,, Auger .	. Dry Draiton
,, Catharill	Pullingham Eversden mag.
,, Spering	Eversden parva Elseley
,, Dickons	Elsworth Fen Draiton Foxton

Minister	Parish
Mr Ezechias King	Fulmire
,, Fflood .	. Fordham
Dr Worthington	Fen Ditton
Mr John Masterson	Fulborne
,, Fage .	. Fulborne
,, Dobson	. Grancester
,, Jessop .	. Gransden parva
,, Jury .	. ,, magna
,, Roodes	Gamlingay Graveley
,, Pettit .	. Girton
,, Kennil [4]	. East Hatly
,, Chamberlaine	Hazelingfeild
,, Wallis .	. Haston
,, Allen .	. Harleton
,, Lindsey	. Hauxton
,, Wakefeild	. Horseheath
,, Smith .	. Hildersham
,, Conway	. Hinxton
,, Church	. Hinton
,, Ashley	Histon Horningsey
,, Fidoe .	. Hardwick
,, Pechee	. Isleham
,, Lunne .	. Ickleton
,, Wiborrow	. Impington
,, Stanton	Kingston Knapwell Kneswortli
,, Brian .	. Kennil
,, Livermore	. Lanwade
,, Pepin .	. Lorleworth
,, Gray .	. Long Stanton
Dr Rawley	. Land Beach
Mr Townly	. Littslington
,, Punter	Linton Morden Steeple
,, Simons	. Morden gilden
,, Cocket .	. Melbourne
,, Elton .	. Meldreth

[1] [In the congregational chapel at Great Eversden, Cambridgeshire, is a tablet to the memory of the Rev. Francis Holcraft, M.A., who was imprisoned for nearly nine years in 1663 for preaching to an independent congregation here.]

[2] [Camps.] [3] [Clopton.] [4] [Kennet ?]

Mr Rannew . Maddingley
" Low . . Milton
" Huson . . Newmarket
" Lindsey . Newton
" Willoughly West { Orwell / Ockington
" Wilson . Over
" Will Hayes { Papworth Snt Agnes / Papworth Everet
" Johnson . Pampisford
" Stubbins . Rampton
" Gardiner . Roiston
" Jon. Jephcot Swaffam prior
" Foote . . " Bulbeck
" Stephen Rant Stow Qui
" John Giles . Saham
" Rich. Howlet Snalewell
" Fleet . . Sawston
" Tailor . . Stapleford
" Patteson . Shelford magna
Cur. Mr Durham
" Wigmore . Shelford parva
" Benjamin Laryer } Sheprith
" Pavy . . Shingai

Mr John Stanton { Stow longa / St. George Hatly
" Sampson . Swasie
" Will. Sharpe Teversham
" Crosland . Trumpinton
" Pawlet. . Tadloe
Dr Cudworth { Toft / Wilberham magna
Mr Tho. Whitehand Wilberham parva
" Livet . . Wood Ditton
" Grimmer . Wicken
" Flack . . Westuratten
" Ballow . Westlie
" Swan . . Wittlesford
" Poole . . West Wickam
" Scarlet . Wimple
" Young . . Whaddon
" Pavy . . Wendie
" Sayer . . Water Beach
" Nath. Bradshaw } Willingham
" Haines . West Covill :

Jan. 20: 1656: At a meeting at Cambridge it was upon the question resolved:

1. That wee all meet monthlie, & every time wee will bee all present, unlesse a rationall account can bee given to the contrarie, & that wee will meet Feb. 3: 1656.

2. That in our meetinges wee will keepe our selves close to our proper busines, not medling with the civill affaires of the comonwealth.

3. That at every meeting one shall be chosen to moderate the debates of the present day, & shall begin & end the worke with prayer. & before the dissolution of the meetinge thinges to be debated at the next meeting shall bee propound.

4. That theise our resolves shall bee so published that all the Mrs of the countie who are willing may joyne with us:

5. That wee all will agree to the same order & method in administration of ordinances even in circumstances as far as possibly wee can.

6. That wee will yeeld our selves to brotherly exhortation, admonitions, & reproofes, according to the ghospell as all Christians ought to doe:

7. That our actings may bee manifest to bee done according to the resolves, wee determine that a Journall of every dayes proceedings shall bee kept by the moderator of the day, being subscribed by theyr hands that are present.

8. Resolved that theise articles shall bee subscribed.

Feb. 3 : 1656. Mr King of Fulmire moderator.

1. Resolved on the question that wee will all endeavour in our several places to instruct all under our charge in the fundamentall points of Christian relligion by all lawfull and requisite meanes.

2. That besides dilligent & constant preaching wee will use publike & frequent catechisinge.

3. That wee determine as neere as wee can to promote an uniformitie in catechisinge.

4. That the lesser catechisme set forth by the late assemblie of Divines shall by us generally bee used, & no other shall bee used unles it bee for a time, & upon such reasons as shall bee approved by the rest of the Association.

5. That wee approve the publike catechising of all sorts both elder & younger, & wee will indeavour to the uttermost of our power to perswade them unto it, & wee will take occasion to commend catechisinge unto our people in the congregations on the lords day.

6. That we will indeavour by frequent private conference, to instruct persons of all sorts, in the knowledge of Jesus Christ, & of theyr duty towards god & man :

March 3, 1656. Mr King Moderator.

1. Resolved upon the question : That as wee acknowledg it our dutie to preach the word, so doe wee likewise to administer the sacraments, & wee ingage our selues that our practise shall bee answerable thereunto.

2. As for the sacrament of the lords supper, whereas it hath in some places been forborne for a longe time, wee resolve for the future to set upon the due administration of the same, accordinge as our people may bee fitted to receave it.

3. That ignorant & scandalous persons are not fitt to bee admitted.

4. That wee will persuade our people to make known theyr intention of comming to the lords supper at the least a weeke before that the Mr may have opportunitie to confer with them, & that, in case they will refuse to submit to a thing so reasonable, wee shall forbeare to give them the sacrament at the present.

5. That as the case now standeth, wee esteeme it the best course for the Mr to judge who is ignorant & scandalous, except it bee in such congregations where Mr hath or can [have] some convenient assistance.

April 7 : 1657.

1. Whatsoever wee have doe or shall resolve upon wee agree to put in practice till publike authoritie shall settle some things more particularly.

2. And it is determined that against the next meeting the ordinance concerning ignorance & scandalls shall bee transcribed at large, & the rest of our resolves of this day shall bee put into a method.

The busines to bee debated the next day shall bee a further prosecution of the former argument viz. of things relating to the lords supper and Mr Bradshaw is chosen Moderator for that day

Ita testor fratribus suffragantibus.

Jon : Jephcot.

As to the further prosecution of the busines of the lords supper it is advised as followeth :—

1. That the rules prescribed in an ordinance of Parliament bearing date Aug. 29, 1648 bee observed in case of ignorance which rules follow in theise words: All such persons who shall be admitted to the lords supper ought to know that there is a god, that there is but one ever livinge & true god, maker of heaven & earth, & governour of all thinges, that this only true god is but one god, yet three distinct persons the father son & holy ghost all equally god;

That god created man after his owne image in knowledge, righteousnes & true holines, that by one man sin entred into the world, & death by sin, & so death passed upon all men for that all men have sinned, that thereby they are all dead in trespasses & sins & are by nature the children of wrath & so liable to eternall death, the wages of every sin.

That there is but one mediator betwixt god & man, the man Christ Jesus who is also over all god, blessed for ever, neyther is there salvation in any other.

That hee was conceaved by the holy ghost & borne of the Virgin Marie, that hee dyed upon the crosse to save his people from theyr sins, that he rose againe the third day from the dead, ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of god, & maketh continual intercession for us, of whose fulnes we receave all grace necessarie to salvation.

That Christ & his benefite are applied only by faith, that faith is the gift of god & wee have it not of our selves but it is wrought in us by the word & spirit of god.

That faith is that grace whereby wee beleive & trust in Christ for remission of sins & life everlasting, accordinge to the promises of the ghospell: that whosoever beleeveth not in the son of god shall not see life but shall perish eternally.

That they who truly repent of theyr sins, doe see them, sorrow for them & turne from them to the lord: & that except men repent they shall surely perish. That a godly life is conscionably ordered according to the word of god in holines & righteousness without which no man shall see god.

That the sacraments are seales of the covenant of grace in the blood of Christ that the sacraments of the new testament are baptisme & the supper of the lord. That the outward elements in the lords supper are bread & wine & doe signifie the bodie & blood of Christ crucified, which the worthy receivor by faith doth partake of in the sacrament which Christ hath ordained for the remembrance of his death, that whosoever eateth & drinketh unworthily is guiltie of the bodie & blood of Christ therefore that every one is to examine himselfe, lest hee eate & drinke judgment to himselfe not discerning the lord's bodie.

That the soules of the faithfull after death doe immediately live with Christ in blessednes, and that the soules of the wicked doe inmediately goe into hell torment; that there shall bee a resurrection of the bodies both of the just & unjust at the last day at which time all shall appeare before the judgment seat of Christ to receive according to what they have done in the bodie whether it bee good or evill, & that ye godly shall goe into life eternall & ye wicked into everlasting punishment.

2[ly]. And it is also advised that wee shall take the direction of the sayd ordinance for our rule in matter of scandall as it followeth in theise words:

All scandalous persons hereafter mentioned are to be suspended from ye sacrament of the lords supper that is to say

All persons that shall blasphemously speak or write any thing of god his holy word or sacraments, all renouncers of ye true protestant relligion professed in the church of England, & all persons who shall by preachinge or writinge maintaine any such errors as doe subvert any of those articles the ignorance whereof doth render any person excluded from ye sacrament of ye lords supper.

An incestuous person an adulterer a fornicator, a drunkard, a profaine swearer, or curser, or that hath taken away the life of any person maliciously, all worshippers of images crosses crucifixes or reliques, all that shall [make] images or pictures of the trinitie or of any person thereof: As relligious worshippers of Saint Angelles or any meere creatures, any person that shall professe himself not to bee in charitie with his neighbour.

All persons in whom malice appeareth & they refuse to bee reconciled [to] any person that shall challenge any other person by word message or writing to fight or that shall accept such challenge & agree thereto, any person that shall knowingly carry any such challenge by word message or writinge. Any person that shall upon the lords day use any dancing playing at dice or cards, or any other game, masking wakes shooting, bowling, playing at footeball stoole ball, wrestling, or that shall make any resort to playes, interludes, fencing, bull baiting, beare baiting, or that shall use hawking, huntinge, or coursing, fishing or fowlinge, or that publikely expose any wares to sale, otherwise then is provided by an ordinance of Parliament of the 6 : of April 1644. Any person that shall travell on the lords day without reasonable cause: Any person that shall keepe a knowen stewes or brothell house, or that shall sollicite the chastitie of any person for himselfe or any other. Any person, father or mother, that shall consent to the marriage of theyr child to a papist or any parson that shall marry a papist. Any person that shall repayre for any advice to any wiche wizard or fortune teller.

Any person that shall menace or assault his parents or any magistrate minister or elder in the execution of his office: any person that shall be legally attainted of barratrie, forgerie, extortion or briberie.

3. It is further advised that the proofe of any of the scandalls aforesaid bee by the confession of the partie offendinge or else by the testimonie of two credible witnesses at least.

4ly. It is advised that no person lawfully convict of any of the foresayd scandalls bee admitted to the lords supper without signification of sincere repentance.

May 5 : 1657: theise ordinances & rules weare read over & assented unto. Ita testor: JON JEPHCOT.

May 5: 1657.

1. As to the article in the ordinance for scandall relating to those that repaire to Wiches Wizard & fortune tellers &c. It was this day advised that wee shall account all those guiltie of that scandall who repaire to any that are famed to bee such, though not convict by law.

2. Also wee advise that they who use spelles or charmes, or pretend to use them thereby to deceave others, shall bee accounted guiltie of scandall.

3. That any that shall revile, reproch, or contemptuously speake against the publike or privat ordinances of god, or against any that professe godlines in the exercise of publike or private duties.

4. Wee advise that such who themselves commonly neglect to repaire to publike assemblies, or indeavour to partake of publike ordinances as reading ye word, preaching, prayer & sacraments, & such also as altogether neglect private family duties on the lords day & other dayes; as reading the word, praying in theyr families, relligious conference and instructing all under theyr charge in the principles of relligion bee adjudged scandalous.

5. If any in our congregations shall bee offended at the scandalous conversation of any who are admitted to the lords supper, Wee shall advise ye person so offended to deale with them according to our Saviours rule: Math: 18: 1. And in case the person offending shall appeare upon sufficient proofe to bee reprovable & yet to reject that rule, that wee will forbeare to admit such to the sacrament until further consideration or as the case may require consultation with our brethern of the Association.

The busines to bee debated the next day is the sacrament of baptisme, & Mr Bradshaw who was absent this day is appointed Moderator.

June 2: 1657.

1. Wee judge it requisite that the minister before the administration of the sacrament of Baptisme to any infant doe personally discourse with the parent to take an understanding profession of the Christian faith of him at the administration of that sacrament, that the parent doth publicly profess his assent to the articles of the fayth contained in the Creed commonly called the Apostles Creed, that hee will lead a godly life bringing up his child in this faith in the nurture & admonition of the lord.

2. Wee judge it most convenient that this sacrament bee administered on the lords day, or at such time when there is a publike congregation, that all may be minded of theyr baptismall covenant, & the whole congregation may joyne in prayers for gods presence in that ordinance.

3. Wee judge it most convenient that according to an ordinance of Parliament & the judgment of the Assemblie of divines that this sacrament bee not administered at the lower end of the church but at the Deske where the minister may bee conveniently heard in the administration of that holy ordinance.

4. Wee judge it may bee convenient that the agreement of the Ministers of this Countie touching Catechising, private instructions of our people, & administration of sacraments bee in some way made publikely knowen to our people.

Its agreed that wee meet June 30 to treat of ordination Mr Whitfeild to bee Moderator that day.

June: 30: 1657:

1. Wee judge it necessarie that every publike minister of the word bee solemnly set apart for that worke.

2. Wee judge that those who are to be ordained ought to be set apart by fasting & prayer & imposition of hands.

3. As the case now stands, wee judge that the worke of ordination bee performed by preaching presbiters.

4. Wee judge that the work of ordination bee performed by 5 ministers at the least, who are to bee chosen by the Association at a publike meetinge.

5. Wee judge it convenient that one bee chosen by the Association to bee president in that work that time.

6. Wee judge it fit that if any of this Countie or others, where it cannot conveniently bee had, have recourse to us for ordination, that then wee doe proceed accordingly to the performance of this businesse.

7. Wee judge it convenient that the partie that is to bee ordained, if hee bee of this Countie, bee thus ordained to that congregation to which hee is called.

8. Wee resolve that at the next meeting a Register bee chosen to record what is done, whose fees shall not exceed what the ordinance sets downe.

9. That the partie who is to bee ordained doe make application for this matter to the publike meeting of the Association, who are to select a number to judge of his Testimonialls, concerning his age & conversation, & to examine him of his knowledge of the tongues arts sciences & divinitie, & touching ye grace of god in him & of his ministeriall abilities.

10. Wee judge it convenient that hee preach before some of those who are appointed to ordain him.

11. As to the manner of performing the act of ordination wee shall as neere as we can follow the rules which are set downe by the Assembly of Divines. WILL : WHITFEILD.

It was concluded June : 30 : 1657 : that wee treat about the same point next day & Mr Wright is appointed Moderator.

Aug : 4 : 1657.

In consideration of the small appearance wee proceeded not to the election of a register according to our former order, but did referre it to the next meeting, & Mr King is to moderate the debates of the day which are to bee to consider in what manner wee shall proceed in our future meetings. ABRAM : WRIGHT.

Septemb : 1 : 1657.

At a meeting at Cambridge because few weare present wee determine againe to adjourne the further discussing of busines which may concerne the carrying on of this Association till the next meeting.

Octob : 6 : 1657 :

1. Its agreed that hereafter our generall meeting bee quarterly, namely the tuesday before the quarter Sessions at the red lion at Cambridge : Mr Hayes nominated Moderator.

2. As for monthlie meetings wee agree that they bee divided in manner following viz :

3. The first division to containe the hundreds of Staplee, Cheavely, Radfeild, Flendish, Chilford & Staine the place of the first meeting at Botsham at the house of Edward Salsebury.

The second division to containe ye hundreds of Papworth, Chesterton, North Stow & the Isle of Ely, at Willingham Parsonadge. The third division to containe the rest of the hundreds Thriploe, Wittesford, Stow

Weatherlie, the first meeting to bee at Fulmire at the signe of the Exchecher the second tuesday in November. In the monthlie meetings the discourse or debate to be such as shall bee thought fit an account to bee given at the general quarter meetings. Ita testor EZEKIAS KINGE.

January 5: 1657:

At a meeting at Cambridge there was present Mr King, Mr Rant, Mr Punter, Mr Bradshaw, Mr Nie, Mr Jephcot, Mr Giles, Mr Masterton; where in regard of the small appearance wee did only adjourn till the next generall meeting, which is appointed the tuesday next before the next quarter Sessions, & Mr Wright Moder:

April: 20: 1658.

At the quarterly meeting there being present Mr Rant, Mr Jephcot, Mr Wright, Mr Bradshaw, Mr Whitfeild, Mr Masters, Mr Shephenson, Mr Dickons, Mr Chambers, Because of the small meeting we determined that against ye next meeting notice shold bee given to persons absent that there being a fuller meeting wee may determine what wee shall doe for the future & Mr Rant is appointed Moderator:

The names of the subscribing Ministers.

Mr King .	. Fulmire	Mr Hunt .	. Sutton. not.
,, Jephcot	. Swaffhams	,, Gotobed	. Wickam not:
,, Wright	. Chevely	,, Cocket.	. Melbourne
,, Sharpe	. Teversham	,, Dickons	. Elsworth
,, Whitfeild	. Cunnington	,, Masters	. Cumberton
,, Bradshaw	. Willingham	,, Milles .	. Duxford +
,, Gray .	. Stantons	,, Ny .	. Cotnam. not:
,, Pettit .	. Girton	,, Low .	. Milton
,, Giles .	. Downham	,, Bagly .	. +
,, ,, .	. Soame	,, Ashly .	. Histon
,, Masterson	. Fulborne +	,, Leigh .	. not. +
,, Phage .	. ,,	,, Ramsey	. Caxton
,, Whitehand	. Wilbram	,, Townly	. Littlelington
,, Rant .	. Qui	,, Holcroft	. Bassingborn. not.
,, Carre .	. Stretham	,, Church	. Hinton
,, Folke .	. Hadnam	,, Allen .	. Harlton
,, Birchall	. Willigford not:	,, Hayes .	. Papworth

By the Easterne part of the Association of Cambridgeshire: June . 16: 1658: being a day set apart for publike prayer and fastinge in the place of publike worship in the towne of Swaffham Prior in the Countie of Cambridge, Jonathan Jephcot minister of Swaffham Prior, Abraham Wright minister of Cheavely, John Meadow minister of Ousden, James Illingworth fellow of Emmanuell Colledge in Cambridge, and William Burchall minister of Wringford in the Ile of Elie by prayer & imposition of hands did solemnly set apart to the worke of the Ministerie Mr Robert Scott master of arts & fellow of Trinitie Colledge Cams, Mr Lawrence Fog Mr of arts & fellow of Snt Johns College in Cambridge, Mr Martin Frances master of arts & fellow of Pembrooke hall in Cambridge Mr John Wildbore Mr of arts & fellow of Clare hall in Cambridge. They havinge

first given testimoniall of theyr godly life & conversation, & proofe of theyr abilities & call to that worke :

Signed by Stephen Rants appointed moderator for the next generall meeting & Register pro tempore.

July : 13 : 1658.

At the quarterly meeting there being present Mr Rant, Mr Allen, Mr Nye, Mr Bradshaw, Mr Wright, Mr Carre, Mr Whitehand, Mr Grey, Mr Sharpe & Mr Masters.

1. At the meeting then it was agreed that the next meeting shall bee the first tuesday in August beinge the 3 : day at the red lion in Cambridge and that every one give notice to theyr neighbour ministers to bee then present or to any that they know will bee ordained eyther to bee then present themselves or to send in theyr names by some freind.

2. It is agreed that notice bee given of an ordination intended upon the 16th day of September next in the towne of Streatham in the Ile of Ely :

3. That at the generall meeting August ye : 3 : wee doe consider how to manage this busines concerning ordination according to the rules formerly agreed upon & Mr Allen is appointed Moderator.

Aug : 3 : 1658.

1. Its agreed that besides those who give in theyr names this day, others also who give in theyr names in a convenient time to be approved of by those who are to see theyr testimonialls & judge of theyr abilities may bee admitted.

2. Its resolved that on tuesday the last day of this present august such as doe intend to bee ordained have recourse to Mr Bechinor the stationers howse in Cambridge, there to apply themselves to such as are appointed to approve them & that about two of the clocke afternoone.

3. Its resolved that for the ordination to bee held Septemb : 16 : Mr Gray minister of long Stanton bee register, and all to bee ordained at Streatham Sep : 16 next are to have recourse to him & give notice of theyr purpose to bee ordained.

4. Its resolved that Mr Folkes, Mr Carre, Mr Bradshaw, Mr Wright Mr Jephcot, Mr Nie, Mr Hayes, Mr Hunt, Mr Birchall, Mr Whitfeild Mr Tho : Giles, Mr Templar, Mr Wilson, or any three of them, wherof Mr Carre to bee one & president, examine & approve theyr testimonialls.

5. Its resolved that Mr Hayes preach at ye ordination, Mr Nie to begin with prayer, & Mr Barre to end with exhortation.

Ita testor JONATHAN ALLEN.
Moderator :

Reviews of Books

De l'Histoire considérée comme Science. Par P. Lacombe, Inspecteur Général des Bibliothèques et des Archives. (Paris: Hachette et Cie. 1894.)

This work would come under the German category of *Historik.* It might, perhaps, be fairly described as a criticism of some conceptions of historians and sociologists, with suggestions towards a philosophy of history. By 'history as a science' M. Lacombe means what might most properly claim the name of 'sociology,' had not the professed sociologists occupied themselves almost exclusively with uncivilised races (p. viii). He distinguishes 'history as a science,' which seeks to discover laws and causes, from the preliminary work of scholarship or antiquarian research (*l'érudition*), which is concerned with the discovery of facts, and also from history as a literary art, which seeks to revivify the past discovered by historical research. 'History as a science' cannot, of course, exist independently of 'erudition,' but its problems may be examined separately. In every human being may be distinguished what is 'general' or common to mankind as a whole, what is 'temporary' or characteristic of particular times and places, and what is peculiar or special to each individual as such. In the actions of individuals we must likewise distinguish between incidents (*événements*) and institutions. 'An institution is an incident which has succeeded' (p. 10). Causes, in the only sense in which science can deal with them, being antecedents that recur, and what is strictly individual being unique, it follows that 'history as science' can accept only 'general' or 'temporary' human nature as 'causes.' But as the purely individual element is always present in history, history contains elements which do not admit of 'scientific' methods of explanation. Attempted philosophies of history have generally failed through not taking account of these refractory elements. This, for instance, is the great error of Montesquieu (p. 11 ff.)

This brief account of the opening pages will show that the interest of this book is philosophical rather than historical, although the problems with which it deals are such that every historical student is consciously or unconsciously concerned with them. It would be out of place here to give any adequate account of a lengthy and closely reasoned book, which may be specially recommended to English readers, as M. Lacombe has evidently and confessedly been influenced largely by English writers, such as Mill and Spencer, and as he frequently chooses his illustrations from

English history. To refer to one special subject—M. Lacombe directs a vigorous criticism against those too facile explanations of institutions or events which account for everything by the 'genius' of the race or the 'genius' of the individual. 'To use the language of J. S. Mill, the hypothesis of genius is only demonstrable by the method of residues' (p. 326). But M. Lacombe does not fall into the opposite exaggeration of ignoring the 'contingent' element in human history—the element that to us remains incapable of complete explanation. His guiding principle is, we might say, expressed in the analysis of human nature to which we have already referred, and to which he recurs again and again. *L'individu n'est pas l'individuel* (p. 248) is a happy phrase, difficult to translate, the acceptance of which might help to obviate a good many philosophical and likewise some historical controversies.

> L'histoire n'a pour acteurs réels que des individus; mais chacun de ces acteurs agit à la fois comme homme général, comme homme temporaire et enfin comme caractère singulier. Ce que j'appelle l'homme individuel, c'est l'individu historique considéré dans les effets qui partent de son caractère singulier, et non plus du fond psychique qui lui est commun avec les hommes de son temps ou de tous les temps [pp. 248, 249].

M. Lacombe seems generally accurate in his references to non-French matters; but 'whergeld' (p. 91), 'whitenagemots' (p. 347), 'P. Schlegel' (p. vii) are unfortunate misprints. D. G. Ritchie.

The History of Marriage, Jewish and Christian, in relation to Divorce and certain Forbidden Degrees. By Herbert Mortimer Luckock, D.D., Dean of Lichfield. (London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1894.)

One of the penalties that a learned man must now and then pay for the fame that his learning has brought him is that his lightest words will seem serious to others, and that if, passing for a moment outside the province that he has made his own, he falls into mistakes, those mistakes will be pointed out by critics who are incompetent to judge the strong points of his work. Dr. Luckock's book on the 'History of Marriage' is so likely to become authoritative among a large class of readers and disputants, so likely to be regarded as an armoury of proved controversial weapons, that the ungracious task of pointing to passages in it that should either be amended or omitted is a task which some one, though he may be profoundly ignorant of biblical, patristic, and talmudic lore, ought to undertake; and it falls to me to say that, whatever may be his title to write a history of more ancient or more modern affairs, of the text of Leviticus or the text of Lyndhurst's Act, what he has written of the middle ages requires careful revision.

Though I think that he has made several mistakes, it will be sufficient if I single out two paragraphs. A reconsideration of them might lead him to a correction of other passages and a distrust of those writers who have been his guides. The error to which I shall refer lies, not in an overstatement, but in an understatement of what I take to be a part of his case, and therefore bears witness to his candour, for he has in the following words (so it seems to me) made unnecessary concessions to those whom he regards as his adversaries, besides needlessly tainting the fair names of a gallant earl, a faithful countess, and two august popes.

> From the Norman Conquest to the beginning of the seventeenth century no new Ecclesiastical Laws were made on this subject [the indissolubility of marriage]. Dispensations, however, for remarriage after separation were from time to time sought and obtained from the Pope. There were two famous instances in the highest rank of life. King John had married Hadwisa, daughter of William, earl of Gloucester, and lived with her for eleven years without any scruple on the score of consanguinity, but being captivated by the personal beauty of Isabella of Angoulême, he resolved to shelter himself under the plea of nearness of kin to obtain a divorce. The evil was aggravated by the fact that his second wife was already betrothed; but those were days when kings claimed to be a law to themselves, and a dispensation was readily granted for his adulterous union.
>
> His example was followed not long after, in the reign of Henry III, by Simon de Montfort, who appealed to Rome to obtain a ratification for a second marriage, while his lawful wife was still living. It was in direct opposition to the Canons and Constitutions of the Church, but again the dispensation was granted. (Morgan, *On the Law of Marriage*, ii. 218; Jebbs' [*corr.* Tebbs'] *Essay*, 204.)

Now as to Montfort's case, I cannot but think that, if the dean of Lichfield will look for a few minutes at the evidence, he will see the necessity of making honourable amends to Earl Simon and Pope Gregory, perhaps also to the countess Eleanor, or of revealing the name of that other wife. Surely he is not hinting at some hitherto undisclosed scandal about the dowager of Flanders, who, says M. Bémont, was old enough to be Simon's grandmother, and who swore that she had not married him. I fear that Dr. Luckock's informants were ignorant of her existence. The names of his informants he gives us in the fairest way. They are not quite the names that we should have expected in such a context, not Bémont nor Pauli, not Prothero nor Creighton nor Norgate, but Morgan and Tebbs; still any warrantors are better than none.

In the year 1822, the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge in the diocese of St. David's having offered a prize of fifty pounds, Mr. H. V. Tebbs, proctor in Doctors' Commons, set to work, and within a short space of time—two months, if I read him rightly—produced an essay on the 'Scripture Doctrine of Adultery and Divorce,' which wandered through many ages and lands, and promoted Christian knowledge within the aforesaid diocese in manner following, that is to say:—

> In 1199, King John being divorced from the duke of Gloucester's daughter was in the same year remarried to Isabell, the heiress of a noble family. And, indeed, king John's first wife had been, previously to her marriage with him, divorced from Henry de Leon, duke of Saxony.
>
> Matthew Paris makes mention of the case of Simon de Montford, in Henry III's time, in which the pope, in opposition to the laws and canons of the church, granted a dispensation, and then ratified his second marriage. (Matth. Paris, *Hist.*, p. 455.)

Now it is always dangerous to speculate about the origin of error, for error is manifold; still if we suppose that by p. 455 Mr. Tebbs meant p. 465 in Wats's edition, we shall come to a passage in which Matthew Paris speaks of a marriage contracted by Montfort and also of a papal dispensation. Had Mr. Tebbs been in less haste to earn a prize and promote Christian knowledge, he might have turned over a few pages and come upon another passage in which Paris says more of that marriage

and that dispensation. He would have come upon the well-worn story of the widowed girl's rash vow, and would have discovered that (to put the matter technically) the impediment to the marriage was not the *ligamen* of the husband, but the *votum* of the wife. I am inclined to think that, if he had carried his researches yet a little further, he would have found that no papal dispensation was necessary for the validation of this marriage; in other words, that Pope Gregory (who knew his canon law) decided, and was right in deciding, that a *votum castitatis*, however solemn, provided that it did not amount to a *professio* in some recognised religious order, was no *impedimentum dirimens.* Simon and Eleanor had sinned, but their marriage was a good marriage. As to that other wife, I fancy that the rapid Mr. Tebbs invented her. He saw the words *Et dispensavit dominus Papa cum ipsa, prout sermo sequens declarabit.* He had no mind or no time to look for the *sermo sequens*; he saw that the pope 'dispensed with' some woman, and took this to mean that Simon was suffered to put away wife No. 1 (whether she was Eleanor or no he does not tell us) and marry wife No. 2. The pope of Rome used to do such things—in England and the year 1822: Christian knowledge affirmed it.

In Dr. Luckock's index we may read, 'Cosin, bishop, his carelessness in quoting authorities—mischievous consequences of this—' I know not how careless Bishop Cosin was, or how much mischief his carelessness may have done, but I do not think that Mr. Tebbs was careful, and he seems to me to have done more mischief than I should have thought him capable of doing, so artless were his ways. However, he succeeded in deceiving the Rev. Hector Davies Morgan, who (so the 'Dictionary of National Biography' says) had gained another of these 50*l.* prizes by promoting Christian knowledge, and who in 1826 published a book on the doctrine and law of marriage. Morgan repeated what Tebbs had said, adding a generalising ornament of that kind which historical essayists used to think permissible and elegant. These sad cases of Simon and John he sets before us as mere examples of the sort of thing that your medieval pope would do. 'The facility with which such dispensations were granted is strikingly illustrated by the case of King John.' There are some marriages with which we who are not popes can dispense. One of Earl Simon's seems to have belonged to this class. I think that the dean of Lichfield will not be infringing any papal prerogatives if he dispenses with that marriage for the future.

Turning to King John, we feel almost angry with Dr. Luckock for suppressing that thrilling episode in these Morgano-Tebbsian *Gesta Pontificum* which introduces us to Henry de Leon, duke of Saxony. And I am not certain that something true might not be made of it, if we held that a count of Maurienne must be also count of Mortain (Mortain, Maurienne, Macedon, and Monmouth were much alike in the diocese of St. David's), or that Clementia of Zäringen was identical with her own daughter, though in the latter case we might also have to hold that a boy but five or six years old could be irrevocably bound by a marriage contract. That little John should marry the divorced wife (or, in strictness of law, discarded mistress) of his sister's husband, adds a spice of horror to the tale and sets us thinking about that inscrutable mystery the *affinitas*

secundi generis. Dr. Luckock saw that there was something wrong with Henry 'de Leon.' The pity is that when his scepticism had been once aroused it fell asleep again and left the accusation against Innocent III unretracted. The pope is still supposed to do something wrong and to enable our bad king to be 'a law to himself.'

John's matrimonial affairs are not so plain as might be wished. Contemporary Englishmen seem to have been somewhat uncertain as to what really happened. We start of course with this, that he went through the form of marriage with Isabella, otherwise Avice, of Gloucester; and that, if there was no dispensation in the case, this would-be marriage between two persons who stood to each other in the third degree of consanguinity was a nullity. John and Isabella are living together in incestuous concubinage; it is John's duty to put Isabella away, and if Pope Innocent commands him to do so, we need not be surprised. Thus we may understand the rumour which found credence in an English monastery to the effect that the pope issued such a command and that John obeyed it.[1] That is a consistent story. Nevertheless we may be fairly certain that it is not true. We learn from another and a trustier source that there had been some papal dispensation for the union between these second cousins, and we are told that the pope was vexed when certain French bishops pronounced a divorce, or, to use stricter language, declared that the marriage was null.[2] This they may well have done without questioning the pope's power of removing the impediment that lay between John and his kinswoman. For any one of twenty reasons they may have held that the document which John had obtained from the papal chancery did not meet the case. I am not defending them; I know not whether they need defence, but it seems quite possible that if an appeal to Rome had been made against their sentence it would have been reversed. Isabella, it may be, was not so anxious to retain the king of England as Ingeborg was to retain the king of France; we know that she tried two other husbands before she died. But, whichever story be true, the marriage with the Gloucester heiress was pronounced null by an ecclesiastical court. Indeed John seems to have been at pains to obtain a sentence from the Norman bishops[3] and another sentence from the bishops of his more southerly dominions.[4] John, then, if a wicked, was none the less an unmarried man. He required no dispensation if he wanted to marry.

One point, at all events, I should have said, was beyond all reasonable doubt, had not Dr. Luckock written the paragraph that I have transcribed, namely, that the pope gave John no help in getting rid of Isabella of Gloucester. Innocent himself told Philip of France that John's case had never come before the Roman see. Mistaken he can hardly have been. Why should we not believe him?[5]

Dr. Luckock, when he rejected the pretty tale about Henry de Leon's

[1] Coggeshall, 103. [2] Diceto, ii. 167; cf. *ibid.* 72.
[3] Diceto, ii. 167. [4] Hoveden, iv. 119.
[5] Innocentii III *Opera* (ed. Migne), i. 1015: *Licet autem praedictus Ludovicus quondam pater tuus et praesens etiam rex Anglorum ab his quas sibi iunxerant, praelatorum terrae suae iudicio fuerint separati, super divortio tamen non fuit ad sedem apostolicam querela delata. Unde quod a praelatis ipsis factum fuerat, cum nullus penitus reclamaret, noluit revocare.*

divorced wife, may have felt that he was depriving his readers of a harmless joy, and owed them some compensation. So John's crime and Innocent's complacency must be magnified. 'The evil was aggravated by the fact that his second wife was already betrothed.' Now no doubt John behaved scurvily to the Lusignans, and sorely was he punished for so doing; but we seem to have very good reason for believing that the contract between Hugh and Isabella was one which, according to the law of the church, she could avoid. We are told that when she said her *verba de praesenti* she was below the age at which a complete marriage was possible.[6] Hugh might be irrevocably bound, but she was free to avoid her contract, and if, when old enough to marry, she married John, her marriage with John would be valid without any dispensation. I have not come upon the authority which asserts that there was any dispensation at all relating to this bond (such as it was) between Hugh and Isabella, but I think that Dr. Luckock would have considerable difficulty in proving that about the year 1200 it was unlawful or scandalous for a pope to dispense with a marriage that had not been consummated. Not so very long before that time such a marriage would hardly have been treated by the church as more than an agreement to marry. It may be formally true that after 1066 (the date that Dr. Luckock chooses) 'no new ecclesiastical laws were made' touching the indissolubility of marriage, but he does not, I take it, doubt that about a century after that date there was a very large change in the canonical conception of the manner in which a perfect and indissoluble marriage comes into existence.

'These were days,' he says, 'when kings claimed to be a law to themselves, and a dispensation was readily granted for his adulterous union.' Yes, and these also were days when Innocent was laying France under an interdict in order that King Philip might be constrained to dismiss the German adulteress and take back the Danish wife. These popes were shamelessly inconsistent, were they not?

Unless Dr. Luckock is in possession of information which leads him to believe that John's union with his cousin of Gloucester and Earl Simon's union with that anonymous lady were not consummated unions, or were contracted between persons who had never been baptised, he is, if I understand him rightly, charging two popes with having done what canonists of the classical age said that the popes never did, and even that no pope could do; he is charging them with having dispensed with the impediment to marriage which consists in a lawful and consummate *ligamen* uniting two Christians. This charge he has brought not merely against two popes, but, to all appearance, against the two most illustrious of all ecclesiastical legislators. He will, I think, admit that his 'two famous instances in the highest rank of life' are mere illusions. He speaks of them, however, as if they were examples of what was done 'from time to time' by popes who lived after the middle of the eleventh century. If he has some other and some better attested instances to offer, he should give them to the world. I am too ignorant to say that there are none to be found, but any which can be found should certainly have a place in every history of marriage law, for they are conspicuously absent in some books which nowadays enjoy a higher repute than the works of Messrs. Morgan and Tebbs.

F. W. MAITLAND.

[6] Hoveden, iv. 119.

The History of English Law before the Time of Edward I. By Sir FREDERICK POLLOCK, Bart., and FREDERIC WM. MAITLAND. 2 vols. (Cambridge: University Press. 1895.)

THE joint labours of the Corpus Professor of Jurisprudence at Oxford and the Downing Professor of the Laws of England at Cambridge have produced a work of the greatest importance to the students both of law and of history. No work treating of such a subject can be considered as final; but for the present state of knowledge, the authors have probably done all that can be done. The mere fact that the work bears the names of two legal professors in our two ancient universities reminds us of the change which has come over these institutions in relation to the real study of English law; and if we in this country have no publications which can quite compare with the 'Monumenta Germaniae Historica,' and if we still owe much to the labours of foreign students—to Liebermann, to Vinogradoff, to Bigelow—yet the list of authorities reminds us how much has been done by the publication of the Rolls series, and how much also by societies like the Camden, the Surtees, and the Selden. Amongst the labourers in the field of original research in the sources of our law there is no one to whom more is due than to Professor Maitland himself; his edition of the note-book of Bracton, which the sagacity of the Russian professor Vinogradoff discovered in the British Museum, and his editorial labours for the Selden Society have placed him in the very foremost rank of such labourers, and have enabled him to bring to this work that firmness of hand which nothing but original research can give. It is needless to add with regard to Sir Frederick Pollock that, in like manner, his previous labours have been conducive to the successful undertaking of this great work. The collaboration of two such men is a most fortunate circumstance for the work they took in hand.

This book is admirably written; the style is clear and vigorous, and free from pedantry: the result of great labour is often compressed into a single sentence; the writers are careful to note the amount of confidence which they feel in the conclusions which they state; and the work is illuminated by lights drawn from all quarters of the heavens—from the pages of history as well as of the records of the courts—from the sober chronicles and the satirist Walter Mapes—from the laws of Germany and France as well as from the laws of Normandy and the Anglo-Saxons.

One noteworthy feature is the scrupulous care taken by our authors to describe a given institution at a given epoch from what we actually know of it at that date; they do not assume, as is so often done, that the same word means the same thing in all time, thus avoiding an error to which the practical and practising English lawyer is particularly prone. Another marked feature of these volumes is their liveliness and point. The book is full of little touches of life which remind one that lawyers are after all men, and that law is concerned with human affairs. The authors cite Bracton as telling us that wakeful nights were spent over the ordinance which is known as the Assize of Novel Disseisin. They illustrate the vast improvements introduced into the administration of the law by Henry II, by the conversation between two no less distinguished people than Ranulf Glanvil, the great Justiciar, and Walter

Mapes, the most renowned of satirists, who himself filled the office of an itinerant justice in this reign.

> Walter Map has told us [they say] how in the exchequer a poor man obtained an expeditious judgment against a rich antagonist. Of this as of a marvellous thing he spoke to Ranulf Glanvil. 'Yes,' said the Justiciar, 'we are quicker about our business than your bishops are.' 'Very true,' replied Map, 'but you would be as dilatory as we are if the king were as far away from you as the pope is from the bishops.' Glanvil smiled.

In like manner they have illustrated by a variety of lively stories the holy horror of intestacy which took possession of men's minds, as our authors say, for two centuries after the Norman Conquest. In one of them Abbot Samson of St. Edmondsbury figures. He refuses to receive the horse which had gone before the bier of the dead man who had died intestate, lest the church should be polluted by the gift of such a one: 'By the fear of God,' he swore, 'if anything of this sort happens again in my days, the delinquent shall not be buried in the churchyard.' Our authors speak of this horror as prevailing during the two centuries after the Norman Conquest; but something of the same feeling must have lasted much later, if it has not descended to our own days. Lawyers will remember Lord Coke's quaint thanksgiving on behalf of their calling—that 'it is observed for a special blessing of Almighty God that few or none of that profession die *intestatus et improles*, without will and without child.'

One of the curious things about the history of law is the number of things contrary to expectation which it affords. The law of self-help as described by our author is one of these; one would have expected that the right of self-help—the right, for instance, to distrain without legal process and without judicial authority—would have been more abundant in early than in later times. But our authors tell us that the contrary is the case. 'In our own day,' they say, 'our law allows an amount of quiet self-help that would have shocked Bracton. It can safely allow this, for it has mastered the sort of self-help that is lawless.' Again, the mind is apt to suppose that early institutions are simple, and that they have grown complicated with the increasing appliances and refinements of an old civilisation; but the history of law makes it at least extremely doubtful whether this is not an entirely unfounded belief. What our authors, using the fashionable phraseology, call the evolution of the law of contract is a striking instance of a stream of law which, starting in complexity and difficulty, gradually runs until it is clear. Contract in its origin is beset with religious conceptions, it is followed and embarrassed by essential forms (*i.e.* forms without which it is invalid), it is surrounded by guarantors and earnests; it was made by oaths and by pledges of faith. It was long before the simple legal concept that a binding contract could arise from the consent of two persons to the same terms communicated by the one to the other—from the simple consensual contract—was arrived at.

> Ideas [say our authors] assumed as fundamental of this branch of law in modern times, and so familiar to modern lawyers as apparently to need no explanation, had perished in the general breaking up of the Roman system, and had to be painfully reconstructed in the middle ages. Further, it is not free from doubt . . . how far the Romans themselves had attained to truly general

conceptions. In any case the German races, not only of the Carolingian period, but down to a much later time, had no general notion whatever of promise or agreement as a source of civil obligation.

In tracing the stream of law backward to its fountain heads our authors exhibit a wise caution. To show that a practice or principle of English law is found amongst the Danes, for instance, is not enough to prove that it owes its origin to the Danish invaders of our country. You must go further, and show that the same practice or principle was not found amongst the Saxons and the Normans, and that it did not spring up spontaneously in English jurisprudence itself: the humanity that is common to all these nations, the common circumstances and needs of social life may have given independent rise to the institution in question; or, again, it may be derived from a far-off fountain head, from which, by invisible channels, the springs alike of Saxon, Danish, and Norman jurisprudence have been fed.

As is natural, the volumes contain many instances of those vanished doctrines which render it often so difficult to understand the meaning of old laws; all laws have so much in common, repose so largely on the broad and abiding foundations of our human nature, that we are apt to overlook or to under-estimate the points of difference and the existence of lines of thought which are now not familiar either to ordinary life or to the discussions of the courts. The doctrine of possessory marriages is an illustration of what we have been saying, and the difficulty of understanding it was felt even in the highest of our tribunals—the house of lords. There were, as our authors point out, marriages of two kinds, *de iure* and *de facto*; a marriage at the church door was a marriage *de facto*, and was recognised, and alone recognised, by the lay courts for the purposes of a possessory action; the question whether there was or was not such a marriage was tried by the lay tribunal and by a jury, and none of the canonical objections to its validity could be urged or attended to. But there was also the *de iure* marriage; and this was so far different from the *de facto* one that there might be a *de facto* marriage where there was none *de iure*; or there might be a *de iure* marriage when there was none *de facto*; but if a man was to succeed in his claim by reason of such a marriage he must proceed to assert not a claim to possession, but a right to the property: his action must be droitural and not possessory; and the issue of whether or no there was such a marriage could not be tried by the lay court, but was sent to the ordinary for adjudication, and was determined by his certificate. The presence of doctrines of which the above may serve as an illustration, which lie latent to the eye of the stranger, makes the lawyer who strays from his own country or his own time feel that he is often treading on treacherous ground.

The work before us is arranged in a somewhat unusual manner: it is divided into two books, the first of which contains what our authors modestly call 'a slight sketch of the general outlines' of English legal history before Edward I; the second book deals with the doctrines and rules of English law under Henry II, his sons and grandson; the one book is arranged according to periods of time, the other according to branches of law. No doubt it follows inevitably from this arrangement that the same subject will often be mentioned in two places—once in the chrono-

logical sketch, once in its appropriate place as a subject of law—but the authors have shown themselves skilful in avoiding repetition, and the cross classification is not without its advantages. The first book is perhaps more adapted to students of history, the second to those of law.

Nothing in these volumes dealing with the history of English law is more satisfactory and impressive than the way in which our authors trace the main stream of the common law of England from the writs of the reign of Henry II downwards. But their whole historical sketch is of the highest value and interest. Our written laws may be said to begin with the laws and ordinances of Ethelbert, and we are reminded that he had been ruling the men of Kent some five years when Justinian died, so that for our early laws there is no possible question of the influence upon them of Justinian as a lawgiver. It is probably not a mere accident that the first Saxon king who was a Christian is the first who has left us any written laws, for we know how everywhere along the line of junction of the Roman and the Teutonic worlds, written laws seem to have arisen at the moment when the older civilisation, with its high value for legal institutions, came into contact with the German populations. In most if not all of these codes the voice is the voice of the Teuton, but the hand is the hand of the Roman; and it strikes one as a strong evidence of the consistency and firmness of the Teutonic legal institutions that they were able to resist to a great extent the attraction which the Roman law evidently possessed for the barbarians. These early Germanic laws have much in common, one point in which they agree being the reverence which they pay to possession, and their comparative neglect of the notion of property.

> What modern lawyers [say our authors] call ownership or property, the *dominium* of the Roman system, is not recognised in early Germanic ideas. Possession, not ownership, is the leading conception; it is possession that has to be defended or recovered; or to possess without dispute or by judicial award after dispute, real or feigned, is the only sure foundation of title and end of strife. A right to possess, distinct from actual possession, must be admitted if there is any rule of judicial redress at all; but it is only through the conception of this specific right that ownership finds any place in pure Germanic law.

One of the most curious points connected with the Anglo-Saxon law is the mystery which has hung over the meaning of the familiar words bocland and folcland. Every one who reads the history of our Anglo-Saxon ancestors reads that there were two kinds of land amongst them—bookland and folkland. The bookland has always been understood to mean land held by a book or written document of title. But what is folkland? *Praedia Saxones duplici titulo possidebant*, says Spelman, *vel scripti authoritate quod bocland vocabant, quasi terram librariam vel codicillarem: vel populi testimonio, quod folcland dixere, id est terram popularem.* This doctrine had been accepted with more or less variations of statement till Allen declared that 'folkland, as the word imports, was the land of the folk or people. It was the property of the community.' This view seems to have been accepted with little discussion. Mr. Hallam, in his supplemental notes to his 'Middle Ages,' published in 1848, said that it was 'impossible to support any longer the account of folcland given

in' his original work, in which he had more or less exactly followed Spelman; and so the concessions went on till, in 1893, Professor Vinogradoff, in this Review, reconsidered the whole subject, and maintained that Spelman was right and Allen was wrong, a conclusion in which our authors agree. This is a curious bit of literary history, and by showing us how much difference of opinion there has been amongst very learned people on an elementary question of ancient law may help us to keep our minds open to correction on other points also.

When the Norman confluent at the Conquest joins the Saxon main stream, it is interesting to find that its memorials are inferior in value and more recent in time than those of the Saxon race in England. The Norman duchy 'has nothing to set against Domesday Book or against those law books which we know as the Leges of the Confessor, the Conqueror, and Henry I. The oldest financial records, the oldest judicial records that it has transmitted to us are of much later date than the parallel English documents.' 'We have every reason to believe, add our authors, 'that the conquerors of England had little, if any, written law to bring with them.' But they certainly brought with them the ordeal of battle, previously unknown in England, and they probably brought with them an institution of far greater moment and worth, 'the sworn inquest, the germ of the jury.'

When two races come together in one country and each of them is possessed of laws of its own, there arises a conflict of laws of a very urgent kind. It may be that the laws of the conquerors will prevail; it may even be that the laws of the conquered will prevail; it may be that the country will be divided between the two races by a local boundary, or the boundary may be not local but personal; or, lastly, out of the fusion of the two systems a new one may arise. As the result of the Danish invasion and the wisdom of Alfred as exhibited in the treaty of Wedmore, and as the result, too, of tribal differences between the Teutonic invaders, which had not disappeared, England before the Conquest was divided into three parts, in one of which the laws of Wessex prevailed, in another the laws of Mercia, and in a third the Danish law; the conflict of the laws was settled by local boundaries. When upon this state of things there came the Normans, with their body of unwritten law, how was the matter to be adjusted? It was not likely that the Norman law, inferior as it was to the Saxon in many particulars, and not least in the number of its adherents, should prevail over the Saxon institutions to the extent of abolishing the latter. It looked at first as if a system of personal law would be established, like that which prevailed, for instance, in Italy under the Lombards, and a Frenchman would be judged by French law, and an Englishman by English law. The Conqueror had some leanings in that direction.

> He established a special protection for the lives of the Frenchmen: if the slayer of a Frenchman was not produced a heavy fine fell on the hundred in which he was slain. . . . He defined the procedural rules which were to prevail if a Frenchman accused an Englishman or an Englishman a Frenchman.

But these rules were the only ones in his legislation which drew a distinction between French and English. Moreover, in spite of great forfeitures and great changes in the *personnel* of the landowners, William

substantially maintained the old English land laws. The danegeld was too profitable an institution to be abandoned for a moment—nay, it was so much in favour that the great work of Domesday was undertaken to give effect to it. For the purposes of taxation the French baron stood in the place of the English landholder; what he succeeded to was in many cases a superiority over free tenants of the soil, with large rights of jurisdiction and other matters in which the king had an interest, an interest especially in seeing that the Norman lord did not receive more than the Saxon had received before him, and that he did not extend his jurisdiction beyond that which had existed in the time of the Confessor.

All this [say our authors] made English testimony and English tradition of great importance: the relative rights of the various Norman magnates were known only to Englishmen. Englishmen were mixed up with Frenchmen at the moots and often spoke the decisive word.

In the result, as we know, the system of personal law was never established in this country, but in lieu of it there grew up the common law of England, which was neither Saxon law nor Norman law, nor a mere fusion of the two laws, but a new product, a new body if not a new system of law. But in saying that England escaped the presence of personal law we are not quite accurate—for one very remarkable instance of such law arose and subsisted for some time in this country in the case of the law administered to the Jews, of which our authors give us some remarkable particulars. The Jews invaded this country in the wake of the Normans, and as the dependents—almost as the serfs—of the Norman kings. 'The Jew,' says Bracton, 'can have nothing of his own, for whatever he acquires he acquires not for himself, but for the king.' Though the Jew had no rights against the king, he had all the rights of a free man as against others; and as between Jew and Jew they were allowed to arrange their affairs and settle their disputes by the Hebrew law. Under this system the Jews throve and became great money-lenders, and lenders in a way in which it seemed likely that they would get but scant justice in the common court; so a department of the royal exchequer, the exchequer of the Jews, was organised for the supervision of this business, which, like the great exchequer, was both a financial bureau and a judicial tribunal. It had jurisdiction not only between Jew and Christian, and between king and Jew, but also between king and Gentile when, as often happened, the king had asserted his right to some debt due from a Christian to a Jew. As between Jew and Jew, when the king's interests were not concerned, Jewish tribunals administered the Jewish law, and in like manner in dealings between Jew and Jew the transaction was recorded in the Hebrew language in a document known as the 'Shetar,' or 'Starrum,' as the Latin word ran, from which it has been often suggested that the Star Chamber derived its name.

Our authors are inclined to trace the practice of preserving the feet of fines and the writ of elegit to customs which originally were in force in the king's Jewry; and if this should prove the case it will be an interesting illustration of the great variety of sources from which our laws have borrowed. But about this and many other matters relative to

the Jews and their law affairs we may hope to know more when the volume of selections from the Plea Rolls of the Jewish exchequer 1244 to 1272, announced as in contemplation by the Selden Society, shall have added to the curious particulars with regard to the exchequer of the Jews which the learning of Madox and of subsequent writers has got together.

If any single date is to be fixed upon as that of the commencement of our present legal system, the reign of Henry II would, I believe, be the birthday, according to our authors.

If we try to sum up [they say] those results of Henry's reign which are to be the most permanent and the most fruitful, we may say that the whole of English law is centralised and unified by the institution of a permanent court of professional judges, by the frequent mission of itinerant judges throughout the land, by the introduction of the 'inquest' or 'recognition' and the 'original writ' as Norman parts of the machinery of justice.

All these great features we still retain under certain modifications, and when we saw the abolition of the separate courts of chancery, of the queen's bench, the common pleas, and the exchequer, we were witnessing only an act of reversion to the older form of one supreme court which existed so far back as the reign of the second Henry, and the abolition of certain branchings and cleavages which had grown up in the interval and to some eyes obscured the original unity of the great institution.

The history of the jury as understood by our authors is substantially that accepted by the bishop of Oxford—that the jury has its origin in the *inquisitio*, a prerogative right of the Frankish kings, a royal means of investigation, a prerogative method of finding out the truth—in short, a royal commission. This practice the Norman invaders bring with them across the Channel; and its use is frequent, though exceptional, during the reign of the Norman kings; but under Henry II that which had been 'exceptional becomes normal. The king concedes to his subjects as a royal boon his own prerogative procedure.'

The account which our authors give of the origin of the two great branches of the legal profession is somewhat different from that previously and generally received, or at least it goes higher up the stream and finds division where the common history assumes unity. It is generally represented that originally there was a single class of practitioners in the courts, and that this subsequently divided itself into the two groups which we now know as barristers and solicitors. The count de Franqueville, in his admirable book 'Le Système Judiciaire de la Grande-Bretagne,' says that from the beginning of the fifteenth century the distinction between the two branches began to establish itself, and that the separation became definite in the middle of the sixteenth century; and it may tend to support this theory that attorneys seem to have originally frequented the Inns of Court in company with counsel, and that it was not till 1557 that they were excluded from these hostels. Our authors describe the origin of barristers as due to the permission which was accorded to the litigant to bring with him a party of friends, and to take counsel with them before he pleaded—very much as nowadays courts-martial, whilst not allowing advocates,

allow of the presence and the pleadings of the prisoner's friend. So by-and-by the courts conceded to those who were of counsel, as the expression still goes, with a litigant party the permission to speak and plead for him; and pleading by another seems, according to our authors, to have enjoyed one great benefit. 'What the litigant himself has said in court,' say they, 'he has said once and for all, and he is bound by it: but what a friend has said in his favour he may disavow. . . . Perhaps the main object of having a pleader is that one may have two chances of pleading correctly.' 'The formal records of litigation,' they further say, 'take no notice of them [the pleaders] unless they are disavowed.' The existence of counsel arose from the permission to a litigant to be assisted by his friends; the attorney arose from the permission to the litigant to appear not in person but through some one who answered for him as an *alter ego*. The power to appoint an attorney was originally a royal privilege, and this was from time to time, often under very strict conditions, granted by the king to his subjects. A royal writ was needed to give a man the general prospective power of appointing an attorney to act in his behalf in litigation—and in the old communal courts no one could appoint an attorney without a royal writ. The statute of Merton gave a power to every free man to make an attorney to do suit in the courts of the county, hundred, and wapentake, and of his lord. Gradually and naturally the persons who were skilled to act, either as of counsel with a litigant or as his attorney, gave themselves up more and more to the business. They became more and more professional, until at length these occupations, which were originally the occasional business of any 'free and lawful' person, became more and more the exclusive business of a select few, and thus the legal profession gradually appeared. It seems, further, as if for a time the two classes of counsel and of attorneys, however different their origins may have been, had a tendency to coalesce; they frequented the same societies; they had interest in the same topics; they had something of the same feeling of scorn for the ignorant litigants: 'Cursed is this people that knoweth not the law.' Then followed enactments which placed the whole body of practitioners under the control of the justices, and apparently secured to them a monopoly of practice before the courts.

But the two bodies of professional men which, though their origin was different, had seemed likely to coalesce were destined to be separated again into the two branches which now exist; and the first definite enactment in this direction seems to have come from the citizens of London, who, in their civic courts, were much troubled by the ignorance and ill-manners of the lawyers. They provided that no lawyer should habitually practise there who had not been admitted by the mayor, and they added that no counsellor or 'counter,' as he was then called, should be an attorney. As already mentioned it seems not to have been till 1557, a date far outside the scope of the present volumes, that attorneys were finally excluded from the Inns of Court. This investigation into the *origines* of the legal profession is an instance of that which frequently occurs in these volumes, of a more thorough picture being presented than had hitherto been given of a matter of legal antiquity on which some learning was familiar.

The common law of England is a subject well worthy of the pains here spent in tracing its history and growth. It is wanting in some of the characters of the great jurisprudence of Rome; it may be less systematic, it may be less consistent; it may have greater breaks and gaps in its structure; but it may be doubted whether any body of law was ever marked by stronger common sense. Of all the victories of peace none is perhaps greater than the establishment of law—of a system of approximate righteousness which shall have sway and dominion over the passions and sins of mankind. The system is often far removed from ideal righteousness—nay, is often smirched by the selfishness or greed of the law-giving class—but no system of law can long prevail which does not, in the main, work for good; and certainly the English law, as a whole, has set before itself the weal of the people. To see this body of jurisprudence gradually emerge from the seething and conflicting elements of English life, from the conquests of Saxon, Dane, and Norman, from the jealousies of king and priest and noble and burgher; to watch the great master builders, Ethelbert and the Conqueror, Glanvil, Bracton and the second Henry, striving to erect this edifice, not only with skill and learning, but with indomitable courage and labour and hope—this is what our authors have striven in these volumes to enable us to do, and have striven with no ill success, but with an energy and perseverance worthy of their theme. No one who desires to regard early English law either in its social or political or its strictly legal aspect, will do well to neglect the aid afforded by our authors. We earnestly commend the volumes to the student of English history.

EDWARD FRY.

The History of Currency, 1252 *to* 1894. By W. A. SHAW. (London: Wilsons & Milne. n.d.)

MR. SHAW'S work purports to give an 'Account of the Gold and Silver Monies and Monetary Standards of Europe and America, together with an Examination of the Effects of Currency and Exchange Phenomena on Commercial and National Progress and Well-being' during the period 1252 to 1894. It is safe to say that no one really qualified for such a stupendous task as this would ever have undertaken it. The only two men of recent times at all equipped by knowledge and ability for such an undertaking, Dana Horton and Soetbeer, are unfortunately dead. But both these men would have said at once that they were not competent to deal with many of the matters of fact confidently handled by Mr. Shaw; and they would certainly have been astonished at the assurance with which he dogmatises on controversial points. Mr. Shaw must not be surprised, then, if scholars take up with a certain *prima facie* prejudice a work which pretends, in some 400 octavo pages, to give the history of the currencies of the western world. A mere catalogue of the principal works and documents bearing on the subject would occupy more space.

The tone of the work does not tend to mitigate such unfavourable presumptions. It is full of confident dogmatism, on points which are either disputable or decided in a sense opposed to the author's views. If Mr. Shaw had confined himself to the work of an annalist, his book, though something less than a history, might have been useful. But

theory is everywhere obtruded, from the preface to the conclusion, and unfortunately the theory is of the shallowest, and is enforced with a lecturing tone that becomes wearisome and offensive, especially if one considers the mass of experience and authority on the other side. Some of this petulance, and the affected humiliation of the author at the wretched work of his contemporaries, may be due to youthful fervour, and will, let us hope, be moderated by maturity of judgment and greater familiarity with the work he despises. But the real key to the unhistorical temper of the book is given us in its very first pages. It is really a controversial pamphlet masquerading in the guise of history. Its purpose, he tells us in the preface, 'is twofold—first and foremost, to illustrate a question of principle by the aid of historic test and application; secondly, to furnish for the use of historical students an elementary handbook of the currencies of the more important European states from the thirteenth century downwards.' The first purpose is explained a little further on: 'The verdict of history on the great problem of the nineteenth century—bimetallism—is clear and crushing and final, and against the evidence of history no gainsaying of theory ought for a moment to stand.'

To do justice to either of the objects aimed at by Mr. Shaw would have required a more serious work than the present volume, and there is obviously something injudicious in the attempt to kill the two birds with one stone. It is a mistake to complicate an historical handbook by attempts to distort early history into some presumption against a modern policy concerned with quite different conditions. The conscious polemical purpose is apt to disturb the historian's coolness of judgment and to interfere with the impartiality of his treatment, while the student's attention is perpetually distracted from the study of primitive institutions by references to controversial issues which he is unable to grasp, and which relate to highly developed and complicated modern currency systems unfamiliar to him.

A writer who chooses such a suspicious setting for his historical work ought to spare no pains to place the accuracy of his statements beyond question. Mr. Shaw, to say the least, has been most careless in this respect. There are more footnote references in many a single page of Ruding than in the whole of Mr. Shaw's book. He gives twelve such references for six centuries of history. Others are given in the text, but most of these without chapter and verse. There is, indeed, a list of authorities at the beginning. But such lists, easy enough to compile, neither inspire confidence nor assist the reader. The sound historian, instead of parading his authorities in this perfunctory way, presses them into active service by quoting them in detail wherever their support or illustration is required. Nor will the list bear examination. It is very miscellaneous and indiscriminate, and largely composed of merely numismatic works. Under 'England,' for instance, we find North[1] and Raleigh, neither of any special authority on this subject. But we look in vain for such treasure-houses of information as Malynes (1622),

[1] North is gibbeted by Macaulay as 'distinguished from all the merchants of his time by the obstinacy with which he adhered to the ancient mode of doing business long after the dullest and most ignorant plodders had abandoned that mode for one better suited to a great commercial society'—a fit authority for a writer whose view of currency seldom extends beyond the primitive mechanism of coinage.

Justice (1707, extolled by Thorold Rogers), Magens (1753–6, one of the few writers Adam Smith quotes). Nor, while he mentions the 'Mint Reports,' does Mr. Shaw direct the student to the mass of material in the appendices to the 'Parliamentary Reports' of 1797, 1810, 1819, &c., or to the indispensable reports of the international conferences, excepting only that of 1878. Among modern works he omits the masterly writings of Jevons and Dana Horton, which he shows no signs of having read, though he mentions, without any recognition of its authorship, the invaluable appendix contributed by Horton to the report on the conference of 1878. Under France there is no mention of Wolowski, equally eminent as theorist and historian, the principal expositor of the monetary policy which Mr. Shaw's book is an attempt to discredit. Under 'Italy' he omits such names as those of Scaruffi and Pagnini, while here, as elsewhere, inserting many works of only numismatic interest. Under 'Spain' he omits Carranza, who expressly deals with his subject, but includes Edward Clarke's 'Letters,' a miscellaneous quarto of which twelve pages, of no special value, happen to be devoted to an account of Spanish coins.

From Soetbeer's 'Litteraturnachweis' alone it would be easy to compile many better lists; but no such lists are of any use for the important purpose of verifying the author's statements and testing his quotations. In the absence of full references it must be clear that anything like due verification of so comprehensive a work is out of the question. But one or two serious blunders in the later history may be mentioned, which come oddly from a writer who gives us the value of a coin in the fourteenth century to the sixth place of decimals. He tells us (p. 177) that the French law of 1803 abolished seignorage. He must either be confusing here free with gratuitous coinage (as he certainly does in other places), or he must have confused the temporary provision of 1794 with the final constitution of the monetary law in 1803. Horton, always accurate, puts the point quite clearly. There has always been a charge for mintage in France since 1803, and the variations in these charges have been one of the causes of perplexity in calculations of the variations of the ratio. Again, he says the convention of the Latin union (which, by the by, came into force in August 1866, not 1869) prescribed free coinage (p. 193). Chevassus, in the excellent account of the Latin union written for the Institute of Bankers, Oct. 1886, observes: 'No provision is made in any of the clauses as to whether the states concerned shall or shall not keep their mints open for the unlimited coinage of either gold or silver. Nor is the question of uniform mint charges dealt with' (p. 7). In neither sense of the term, then, was free coinage prescribed by this convention. Horton has often insisted upon this important point. Of the convention generally Mr. Shaw says on p. 178: 'It is not until the broaching of a bimetallic theory as such, and until the expression of that theory, as a theory, in the formation of the Latin union, that anything like a special significance attaches to the monetary system' of France. On p. 190, however, he states that 'the formation of the Latin union was a measure of defence against the action of the bimetallic system.' These two propositions can scarcely both be true. But they are both false, and it would be difficult to say which is the more incorrect.

Later Mr. Shaw deals with the monetary congress of Paris in 1889. Of this there is an elaborate official *compte rendu.* Yet Mr. Shaw goes out of his way to make a blunder in his reference to it. He says Great Britain was not represented among the 194 members who attended. The fact is that Great Britain and Denmark were the only European governments who sent special delegations. This country was officially represented by the Master of the Mint and Mr. G. H. Murray, former secretary of the Gold and Silver Commission. More than that, at the special suggestion of Mr. Goschen the Bimetallic League sent six representatives, and altogether sixteen Englishmen assisted at the congress. To the 'Report of the English Gold and Silver Commission of 1888,' epoch-making as it was, Mr. Shaw can only devote three pages, less space than he gives to a trivial inquiry in 1381. However he contrives to stumble over two well-known names and substitutes for Sir Louis Mallet Lord Malet, a creation of his own. His statement that no opposition was expressed in the house of representatives or the senate, on the abolition of the double standard in America in 1873, will be appreciated by those who are familiar with that passage of history. Those who are not should read the emphatic words of General Walker.[2] It will be apparent how misleading Mr. Shaw's account is.

But it is hardly worth while to insist upon these and many similar errors, significant as they are, because the whole conception which Mr. Shaw has formed of his subject is at fault. His work can make no pretension to being a 'History of Currency' in the ordinary sense of that term. He tells us himself that it is confined entirely to the history of metallic currency, as if one element of our composite currencies could be considered in isolation from the others. But, what is still more extraordinary, we find him (on p. 122) dismissing as foreign to his book the most important part of the history even of metallic currency, viz. its debasements. 'It would be unfair,' he says, 'to treat of debasements in a history of bimetallism.' The subject matter of his book 'is restricted to the natural ebb and flow of the precious metals due to the action of bimetallic law.' These statements, though they throw an instructive light on the purpose of the book, really defy explanation. It is impossible to give a definite account of so illogically limited a conception. What can one say of a history of the English currency which dismisses the recoinage of 1696 in a page, which deliberately passes over the famous episode of the suspension of cash payments, which omits all reference to the celebrated proposals of Ricardo and Baring in 1816 and 1819, and which has not a word on the purchase clause of Peel's act of 1844, on which so much of modern legislation has been and so much more will be based? Ruding no doubt passed lightly over many of these subjects; but then he was well aware of his limitations. He never pretended to write a history of currency, even of the English currency. He modestly styled his great work the 'Annals of the Coinage.' As such it is admirable, and Mr. Shaw would have been better advised had he followed more closely upon Ruding's definite and unpretending lines.

On the whole the fairest account we can give of this singularly conceived work is that it is an historical dictionary of coins, with special

[2] *Journal of Political Economy*, March 1893, p. 171.

reference to the varying equivalences between gold and silver coins. Upon these changes Mr. Shaw lays a very exaggerated stress. No writer on money, not even the wildest pamphleteer of Nevada, has ever assigned so much importance to monetary influences. Mr. Shaw sees in them the clue to the evolution of modern history. 'On the increased basis of currency,' he says (p. 133), 'was built that commercial and national, yea, even literary growth and expansion which have made the Elizabethan age the glory of our history.' The introduction of gold coinage in the West seems to be his explanation of the Renaissance. 'So momentous a revolution' is enough to explain the brilliant prosperity of the Italian republics. 'For eight centuries or more those races in Europe which were to turn the course of the modern world and build its civilisation anew were ignorant of the commercial use of what has been through all history the most potent factor in civilisation—gold.' No thoughtful student of history will deny that price movements have had far-reaching effects, though he will feel that such language as we have just quoted is strained. But what makes it more singular, coming from Mr. Shaw, is that the author excludes all consideration of price movements from his work. On p. 59, note, he tells us, 'By prices here, and throughout this volume, is meant the price or tariff and mint rate of the coins. There is no reference whatever to general prices.' And although he cannot always adhere to this forced use of language it is perfectly true that there is nowhere in the book any treatment of the fundamental question of currency history, viz. the changes in the valuation or purchasing power of money; or, to put it conversely, the movements of general prices.

This is so remarkable an omission, and enables us so readily to appraise the real value of Mr. Shaw's work, that a word of comment upon it may be permitted. There are two kinds of problems involved in the working of monetary systems—problems of internal equivalence, or parity, and problems of external valuation, or stability of purchasing power. The currencies of all civilised nations are composite, some of them composite in a high degree; all use various metals as well as paper, and have several forms of legal tender. With all advanced nations it is a first principle that the various constituents of their currencies shall circulate at the par indicated by their nominal values. This parity may be secured in various ways—by limitation of issue, as in the case of token coinages; by convertibility on demand, as in the case of notes; or by free mintage at a fixed ratio, as in the case of French bimetallism. All these methods were in early times imperfectly understood and applied; and their consequent partial failures caused disturbances which are of interest to the historian. Such failures of internal parity, however, are for us things of the past. No country, for instance, has so complicated a currency as the United States, but absolute internal parity is maintained between its various moneys. The preservation of such parity may be regarded as a first principle with all highly civilised nations.

But the other group of problems concerned with the external relations of a currency, while they both now are and always have been infinitely more important in their historical effects, present difficulties which are still unsolved. Reasonable stability of prices is the first condition of

social justice in a society whose economic relations are determined by price. Clearness and fixity of relation between the moneys of various nations are as essential to international trade as the internal parity of a currency is to domestic trade. But the currencies of the western world are still notoriously unstable in their purchasing power; and the 'break of gauge' between east and west still continues, in spite of the repeated efforts of Europe to remove it. The real importance of currency history and the real interest of currency study lie in these questions of valuation —of the external relation of currencies. All such questions are deliberately ignored by Mr. Shaw, who does not even seem to see that they have any significance, though they were the occasion of our earliest economic literature, and have hitherto occupied the first place in all our histories of currency.

Starting with this stunted and inadequate conception of his subject, Mr. Shaw's work was foredoomed to failure. It is an attempt to prove that all the economic difficulties of former times were due to exchange and other difficulties connected with the rating of the gold and silver coins. This rating he vaguely calls bimetallism, though much of it was really part of a policy of depreciation of the coinage, and the rest, instead of aiming at international accord and uniformity, was really an instrument of the prevailing mercantile policy, a policy of the most uncompromising nationalism. That Mr. Shaw should confuse this rudimentary and many-purposed system of rating with the scientific international bimetallism which his book is written to discredit may seem curious. But the fact is that he has no glimmering either of the nature of the modern proposals or of the theory upon which they rest. Thus he everywhere puts forward the system of token currency as the alternative and displacer of the bimetallic system. It is really a device useful and economical under any monetary system. Looking at it from a broad historical view, we may say that it is only a first step in the direction of a policy in which all coins will be tokens, at least to the extent of a seignorage, and bullion will assume the main functions of money, both for bank reserve and international exchange. But, apologist as he is for the use of token money, Mr. Shaw has not taken the pains to understand the principle upon which it rests. He supposes (p. 171) that its value is guaranteed by the limitation of legal tender. He is not the first to make this mistake, which, as Horton has shown, appears in the early draft proposals for the English law of 1816. But it is beyond doubt that, without further provision than this, a token currency might go to a discount. The real safeguard is limitation of quantity, which was secured in our law of 1816 by placing the control of the mintage in the hands of the state.

There is hardly a page of his book in which Mr. Shaw does not declaim against 'the malignant bimetallic law' and its 'fatal perniciousness.' To this he ascribes every monetary difficulty. It drains a country of its money, and of *both* kinds of its money, though how a discrepancy between home and foreign ratios can have this latter effect is not obvious. Further, it seems to drain *all* countries of their money, for whatever the country of which Mr. Shaw is treating he invariably traces its ruin to the same cause. One is inclined to wonder what became of the money. Surely it cannot have left some countries without going to others. But it is

abundantly clear that Mr. Shaw has no real understanding of the law he so constantly reviles. It is difficult to attach any intelligible meaning to such passages as those on pp. 106, 122, 233, and elsewhere, where he declaims about this 'law.' It would be tempting to quote them, as specimens of sheer nonsense, did space permit. One example may serve to show how far he is qualified to deal with a subject of this kind. It is well known that the smooth working of a bimetallic system depends upon the automatic substitution of the two metals, by which the disturbances which might otherwise arise from irregularities in their relative supply are corrected. Will it be credited, then, that Mr. Shaw, in seeking to show that French bimetallism was ineffective and mischievous, actually relies upon the fact that the French mint law brought about this equilibrating substitution in 1852-60, a substitution which had the happiest results for the world in general, and was a source of profit to Frenchmen? When he goes on to say that it prevented France having a stable currency (p. 187), he shows that he either is ignorant of the sense attached to stability in monetary science or else misleads his readers by a verbal quibble. Whether the reserve of the Bank of France was mainly in yellow or white metal was of no real consequence to any one but bullion dealers. What was of consequence was that the money, yellow or white, should as far as possible be stable in value. Now the substitution of yellow for white metal, of which he complains, greatly increased monetary stability by lessening the disturbing effects of the Australian discoveries.

There must be a reason for everything, and Mr. Shaw's hostility to the innocent and necessary practice of rating gold and silver coins would seem to be due to his grudging suspicion of the gains made by the arbitragist in bullion. This unobtrusive person occupies much the same position in Mr. Shaw's economics as the forestaller in the eighteenth-century tracts, the silver-miner in monometallist literature, or the usurer in the economy of the middle age. Any system is *ipso facto* condemned, if it incidentally leaves an opening for profit to the bullion dealer. But even monometallism must avail itself of the useful functions of these men. And if Mr. Shaw had been versed in modern finance he might have reflected that monometallism exposes commerce to the depredations of a far more powerful class, the financial syndicates who control and manipulate the supplies of gold, and who count their profits by millions where the bullion dealer takes his thousands. During the last six months we have seen a small group, by its control over gold movements, able completely to reverse the natural movement of exchange between England and the United States.

It would be an endless task to point out all the inconsistencies into which Mr. Shaw has been led by the polemical bias which disfigures his work. In places, as on p. 164, he recognises the essential difference between the modern and the medieval situation, between the international bimetallism asked for by modern governments and the primitive, antagonistic ratings of the coin which were the rule before the present century. The difference, indeed, is far greater than that between the modern locomotive and the ancient wagon stage. But the whole purpose of his book, as explained in his preface, rests upon the confusion of these

systems, the object being to discredit the modern proposals by an exaggeration of the inconveniences of the earlier practice. In a similar way he falls into another contradiction, in his eagerness to attack bimetallism, both old and new. The greater part of his book is a highly coloured account of the difficulties arising from conflicting national ratios, one of the 'almost barbaric' methods to which nations formerly resorted in the struggle for gold (cf. pp. 16, 17). Yet he endeavours to twist this history into a presumption against a system the two main objects of which are to secure a more adequate supply of money and to establish a single uniform international ratio between the two monetary metals.

Perhaps enough has now been said to show that Mr. Shaw's book cannot be received as authoritative, or even used by students as a safe guide. It was necessary to make this quite clear, because the work, which happens to lend itself to controversial exigencies, has in some quarters been greatly overrated. At the same time it is agreeable to be able to call attention to much in it that is meritorious and gives promise of better performance in future, if the author should attempt some more modest task, better suited to his special abilities.

There can be no doubt that the work, as a whole, is a laborious compilation, and gives evidence of unusual industry. If the materials are too crowded and heterogeneous for the main features of the history to impress themselves clearly on the reader, this is not due so much to any defect in Mr. Shaw's style and treatment as to the impossible range of time and space he has sought to embrace in one inquiry. In certain parts of it he seems to have made original and interesting researches. Thus he has made a first-hand study of the English State Papers, which throw a valuable side-light upon the financial movements of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and on the names of those who played the principal parts in them. His interpretation of his material, as we have seen, is not usually successful. But in one instance at least (cf. p. 160) he suggests a new and interesting view of familiar facts which deserves careful consideration. He holds that the frequent 'raisings of the denomination' of the coins, which historians generally have decried as abuses of authority due to royal greed, were partly attempts by the legislator 'to follow the general rise of prices [this is evidently to be read 'rise in the value of money'] and meet it by reducing the contents of the coins in such proportion as he thought fit.' The subsequent statement, that the abandonment of the manipulation of the mint rates is a sign that mercantilism had lost its hold on men's minds, will not be admitted by careful students of that many-sided policy. It would not necessarily be true even of the more primitive balance of bargain system out of which mercantilism developed. Mercantilism was the dominant force in English affairs until the peace of 1815; nor is it even now as dead as is sometimes assumed.

Mr. Shaw deserves credit also for having shown, more clearly perhaps than any previous writer except Dana Horton, that England did not become monometallist upon well-considered grounds of principle, but stumbled into it accidentally in the very proper desire to secure her supply of small change, at times reduced by export, owing to the conflict

of ratios. In general he may be praised for the importance he assigns to the question of token currency in the history of bimetallism. If he has somewhat exaggerated it, most other writers have fallen into the worse error of almost wholly neglecting what is undoubtedly a very essential part of modern monetary systems.

If the final judgment on Mr. Shaw's book must be that it is a failure, it is for three obvious reasons, none of which he need allow to mar any subsequent work in the same direction. His plan was absurdly ambitious, comprehensive without precedent in the history of monetary literature; he is throughout too much preoccupied with what he calls 'the vital didactic importance' of currency history to relate it impartially, or even consistently; and he is evidently wanting in the economic training, and especially in the familiarity with the theory of money, which are required to make monetary history intelligible. If he would correct these defects, and address himself to some definite piece of historical research—say, to the monetary history of England from Elizabeth to the recoinage of 1696—he would in all probability give us a standard work, and render a much-needed service to students of English economic history. His present book will be of little or no value to scholars, whom it will not dispense from the necessity of consulting the original documents, while it can only be misleading to those for whom it is presumably intended, the younger students, whose previous knowledge will not be sufficient to put them on their guard against Mr. Shaw's continual misinterpretations. One valuable lesson, at all events, stands written in every page of Mr. Shaw's book. He has given us an unmistakable proof, if proof were needed, that to write economic history intelligently the writer must himself be an economist.

H. S. FOXWELL.

Résumé de l'Histoire de l'Egypte depuis les Temps les plus reculés jusqu'à nos Jours, précédé d'une Etude sur les Mœurs, les Idées, les Sciences, les Arts et l'Administration dans l'Ancienne Egypte. Par E. AMÉLINEAU. (Annales du Musée Guimet. Bibliothèque de Vulgarisation.) (Paris: E. Leroux. 1894.)

M. AMÉLINEAU is a recognised authority on Coptic Egypt, and his sketch of the Christian period is therefore of some value; but the rest of this little volume is evidently a mere compilation, not always from the most recent authorities. For example, the old confusion of Nitocris and the rosy-cheeked Rhodopis is here repeated, and we are gravely told that the third pyramid of Gîzeh was restored or completed by Nitocris, a queen who belonged to a period when pyramids were built of rubble. There is no evidence for any restoration of Menkaura's pyramid under the sixth dynasty. Nor, again, can the 'granite temple' be called the oldest monument in Egypt, since in all probability, as Professor Petrie has shown, it was built after the completion of the second pyramid. That the sphinx was sculptured *sans doute sous cette première dynastie* is pure assumption, since the famous Cheops inscription is now understood to belong to a much later date. The volume is full of similar over-confident statements. The Mohammedan period receives scanty justice—except when Hârûn er-Rashîd's reign is signalised as *un des rares qui fassent honneur à*

l'humanité. No Arabic scholar could write the name of Ibn-Tûlûn's suburb 'El-Qataîah,' or his son variously Khomarouîah, Kamarouîah, and Khamarouîah. 'Motkafy' (p. 256) and '957 *de l'hégire*' (p. 257) are, of course, misprints, but the last should be 358 and not 357. Many other dates are wrongly given, and the last Tûlûnid was certainly not called Sinan, nor the second and fourth Ikhshîdids Abou-Hour and Kofour. In his account of the Fâtimids M. Amélineau confounds the name El-Âmir with 'Amr, and divides El-Musta'li into two words, Musta 'Ali. On p. 267 we not only find Schirkouet (*sic*), but are informed that in the battle of Bilbeys carrier pigeons were used for the first time. As a matter of fact, without going back to Noah's ark, carrier pigeons have been employed in all ages, long before the twelfth century. 'Abd-el-Latîf hardly merits the unique position of *le plus honnête et le plus véridique des auteurs arabes*, and his name does not mean *le bon serviteur*, any more than Shejeret-ed-durr means *la perle des prairies*. There is no account of Egypt under the three centuries of Turkish pashas, because there happens to be no European authority to 'boil down;' and the recent history of Mohammed 'Ali's dynasty, though related at some length, is disfigured by many inaccuracies and by a frantic anglophobia which in France even learned men cannot resist, but which is totally out of place in a serious history, even in a *bibliothèque de vulgarisation*, where one is also surprised to find very frank references to unnatural vices, whether of Christian monks or Fâtimid caliphs. The book appears to have been hastily written and carelessly revised in proof. No references are given to authorities, and there is none of the usual French charm or lucidity; if it achieves any measure of popularity it will be in spite of itself. The *vulgarisation* unfortunately corresponds more with the English than the French sense. S. LANE-POOLE.

La Propriété Foncière en Grèce jusqu'à la Conquête Romaine. Par PAUL GUIRAUD. Ouvrage couronné par l'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques. (Paris: Librairie Hachette et Cie. 1893.)

THIS dissertation of 650 pages contains no preface, and we have no explanation given us why a work deemed worthy of a prize in 1890 was not published till 1893. It is clear, however, from the work itself that the intervening time has not been wasted. The results of investigation since 1890 are incorporated in the text. New discoveries, such as the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία, which did not appear till 1891, and recently found inscriptions have been utilised to make the work worthy of the distinction conferred upon it.

The author takes a wide view of his subject. He divides his essay into four books, of which the first deals with such subjects as the development of the law of property in primitive Greece, property under the patriarchal system, rural economy in early Greece and its relation to colonisation, and the connexion between the dissolution of the patriarchal community and the later varieties of political government in Greece. The second book deals with the law of real property in the various Greek states, while the third treats of rural economy, of the different classes of the agricultural population, of the crops grown, of the

expenses connected with different forms of culture and of land values. The fourth book treats briefly of Greek socialistic theories and practice with reference to land and the influence of property on foreign relations. In the epilogue M. Guiraud warns the political reader that little is to be got for modern practice from an investigation of Greek attempts at the nationalisation of land.

Like works which treat of different aspects of the Roman Empire, this monograph suffers from the danger of asserting as general what at any given time was true of some particular district from which a record is preserved. This danger in generalisation is greater with regard to agricultural matters than in most other cases. In agriculture the causes of success or failure are more local, more immediate in their action, and more difficult to unravel at a later period than those which affect other aspects of national life. Apart from the difficulties connected with the considerations of space and time, which make generalisations on agriculture difficult, the author seems to have done his work well. In the discussion of the rural life of the Homeric period Professor Ridgeway's attempt (*Journal of Hellenic Studies*, vi. 336) to establish the common-field system ought not to have escaped discussion. P. Giles.

The Ancient Bœotians. By W. Rhys Roberts. (Cambridge: University Press. 1895.)

The purpose of this charming little dissertation is 'simply to bring together some of the hard things which have been said of the Bœotians, and to advance certain considerations which may be urged in modification of so harsh an estimate, and in favour of a more lenient view.' This purpose Mr. Roberts carries out in clear and forcible fashion. He has made himself master of the literature bearing on the history of ancient Bœotia, nor has he neglected the modern discoveries of archæology; and he brings to his task great freshness and vigour, following the example of Freeman and Holm in culling analogies in many other fields of history. The comparison which he institutes between the ancient Bœotians and the modern Dutch is a very suggestive one if not carried too far. He even finds a sort of parallel between conspicuous men of the two countries, between Epaminondas and William the Silent, and between Plutarch and Erasmus. Mr. Roberts will not find great difficulty in convincing English scholars of the justice of his main thesis. There can be no question that our Attic authorities condemned too severely faults to which they themselves were not inclined, and, neighbour-like, made the worst of their neighbours' defects. When we remember that Bœotia contained only about eleven hundred square miles and a hundred thousand people, and produced Hesiod, Pindar, Epaminondas, and Plutarch, the sculptor Myron and the painter Aristides, we must allow that the district did at least its share of the world's best work. We have noticed in the book very few defects; but it must be considered a defect when Mr. Roberts (as at p. 47) prefers to quote an incorrect version of Plutarch in the text and to correct it in the note, rather than to supersede the version of Philemon Holland by one of his own. On almost every page are remarks

which give freshness and interest to the treatise—for example (p. 43), an excellent account of Simmias and Cebes, of the 'Phaedo;' a vindication of Plutarch (p. 64), the neglect of whose 'Lives' is one of the saddest blunders of modern education; or this criticism of Epaminondas:—

Epaminondas grappled with the difficulties and dissensions which confronted him in the spirit of a large-minded nationalist, one whose aims promise union rather than severance, the breaking down of old barriers rather than the erection of new ones.

PERCY GARDNER.

Cornelii Taciti De Germania. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Map, by HENRY FURNEAUX, M.A. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1894.)

AN editor of the 'Germania' has a somewhat unique task before him. He has two different publics to satisfy. There are the classical scholars, who will require of him a good text, faithful variants, notes appreciative of style and diction, and an introduction which assigns to this book its proper place in Latin literature. But then there is another public, for which the 'Germania' is the first document of medieval history, the first of a series of documents of which the second is the 'Lex Salica.' We may regret that this is so, and to be sure nothing can be worse as a document than this slight essay. We may hope that in course of time the obscurest pieces of the 'Lex Salica' will be understood, for they did once mean something definite, while it seems but too probable that some of Tacitus's phrases will be understood only by those who are content to say that they are vague, and therefore untrustworthy. Yet there the book is, and we cannot ignore what it says. Every attempt to explain or even to construe it is of necessity an attempt to state a theory—either the author's or the editor's theory—about Germanic laws and customs, and this had better be done explicitly and warily than implicitly and unconsciously. No doubt there is reason in the advice, often given and often neglected by those who give it, that a student of the 'Germania' should forget the coming middle ages and deal with his text as he would with another piece of Latin prose. But then there comes the choice between two readings or between two renderings. Which is the better? That which is in fuller harmony with what we know about these barbarous Germans. He who attacks such a question is wittingly or unwittingly taking a side in a fierce medieval battle. Let him write but one intelligible word about, for example, those *centeni comites* of the *princeps*, and he has, whether he wishes it or no, enlisted in one of the contending hosts. I must not make even a guess as to the judgment that classical scholars will pronounce upon Mr. Furneaux's work, and as to the fate which awaits it among students of Teutonic antiquities I dare say but very little. Still it seems to me a useful edition for the purposes of those who are beginning to read remote German or remote English history. They will, so I think, find it a much better edition than any that has heretofore been published in England, and a good introduction to the elaborate commentaries of the professed 'Germanists.' Mr. Furneaux has made a fair and sensible selection from among the various interpretations that German historians have put upon the

text, though I miss some opinions that I have seen elsewhere and which seem to me plausible. He notices in his preface one omission which he regrets. He has left out of account Fustel's brilliant, if perverse, endeavour to capture the 'Germania' and turn it against the Germanists. This is to be regretted, for English students should be told, for example, that what once was, and, for aught I know, still is, the orthodox translation of the passage touching the *centeni comites* has been vigorously assailed. *La théorie d'un grand tribunal populaire, présidé par un chef inerte et docile, est une pure hypothèse.* But, happily, Fustel's essays are as accessible as they are delightful, and in this country at the present moment there is perhaps more danger of their being overvalued than of their being neglected. For the rest, it seems to me that many of the doctrines that have clustered round the 'Germania' are judiciously represented in Mr. Furneaux's introduction and notes.

There are, of course, passages in the text which no one will ever explain to the satisfaction of all his readers. Thus when the talk is of those *centeni comites* I do not like the intrusion of 'jurors' and 'verdicts;' I should much prefer 'doomsmen' and 'dooms,' while the allusion to *praetor* and *iudices* seems to me very hazardous. The courage which reads *vicis* in that miserable chapter about agriculture is, to my mind, the courage of despair. But if as a critic I must needs quarrel with Mr. Furneaux, it shall be about something that is yet more obscure. I do not feel sure that he has thought out a question, which many of his readers are likely to ask, about the shape that the family takes among these Tacitean Germans. 'Patriarchal government,' he says (p. 31), 'has still its survivals, and the family tie is still of supreme importance; even the more primitive so-called matriarchal system is not untraceable, but the state of society as a whole has far outgrown them.' Now with the 'so-called' which Mr. Furneaux inserts before 'matriarchal system' I cordially agree. The word 'matriarchal' is surely a bad word, unless those who use it intend to imply—and this they seldom do—that the woman governs the family. A practice of tracing kinship only through women is not of necessity incompatible with a man's despotic power over his women-folk and their children. But a state of society which has far outgrown both patriarchal government and the so-called matriarchal system, and which yet shows traces of both, is a state of society which I find very difficult to conceive, unless I give to the terms which are here used a sense which they have not been bearing in current controversy. Are we to suppose that during the whole period of 'patriarchal government' the bond between a child and its mother's brother has been stronger than the bond between a child and its father, so that a man's sister's son was a more valuable hostage than his own son? If so, we ought to explain carefully that patriarchal government does not—and many English readers will, perhaps unfortunately, think that it does—imply an agnatic constitution of the family or 'blood-feud group.' But, further, even if we protest that the tie which unites our 'patriarch' to those whom he governs is not thought of as a tie of blood-kinship, but is merely a tie of power, I still think it very hard to reconcile what Tacitus says about hostages with even this sort of patriarchalism. Are you likely to get as a hostage for *A* a youth who is in *B*'s

power, when there is no tie of blood between *A* and *B*, or, in other words, why should I deliver up a boy, over whom I have absolute dominion, as a hostage for my wife's brother, who is not my kinsman? The few sentences which Tacitus gives to these matters seem to me to be beset with enormous difficulties, and as yet we know not how far we can trust him or his informants. Modern experience is showing us that able and observant Englishmen could live among a barbarous folk, and write of its customs, without having grasped the elementary rules of its family system. But, further, it seems to me that the hitherto popular theory which would make 'the family' of every race pass through the same sequence of stages – to be ticketed by such words as 'patriarchal' and 'matriarchal'—has seen its last days and will soon be on the shelf. And here I think that I must be agreeing with Mr. Furneaux, for he holds that the state of society that exists among these Germans has 'far outgrown' patriarchal government, and yet, I take it, would hardly say so much of the state of society that existed among the civilised Romans of Tacitus's time. Perhaps we shall have to learn that no part of human history has been more variously chequered, or is less reducible within the bounds of a general formula, than the history of kinship and marriage. But though in this and some other instances Mr. Furneaux has adopted some once fashionable phrases that are not wearing very well, it seems to me that his introduction, taken as a whole, will meet the needs of English students who are beginning to study the 'Germania.' F. W. MAITLAND.

Italy and her Invaders. By THOMAS HODGKIN, D.C.L., &c. Vols. V. and VI. (553–744). (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1895.)

TEN years have passed since Mr. Hodgkin completed his narrative of the Gothic kingdom in Italy; and though the interval has been far from unfruitful we are glad to welcome the two fine volumes now before us. They deal with the Lombard conquest, and with the Lombard kingdom to the death of Liutprand in 744. One more volume will be needed for the fall of the Lombard power and the coronation of Carl the Great.

The Lombard period is far less romantic than the Gothic. It is an age of exhaustion after the mighty struggle which had gone before. Rome and Italy were shadows of their former greatness, and the Lombards were much ruder than the Goths. They had no statesman like Theodoric; and even Agilulf and Liutprand are hardly peers of Totila. Cunimund's skull was a fitting goblet for Lombard kings. There was fighting on a grand scale, even in the seventh century; but it was by the Tigris and the Yermuk, and before Constantinople. In Italy we have desultory inroads of Franks and Avars, and obscure quarrels in every corner of the land; but they are only wars of detail. There is nothing decisive from Alboin to Pepin. True, we have romance enough in the early history of the Lombard people, the revenge of Rosamund, the marriages of Theudelinda, the adventures of Lopichis and Grimwald, of Perctarit and Cunincpert. But the meaning of Lombard history is not in these. It is in the building of the papal power during the triangular contest of emperor and pope and Lombard; in the growth of Lombard laws, as

marked by Rothari and Liutprand, and of Lombard learning from Cunincpert to Desiderius; and especially in the obscure beginnings of Italian freedom in Venice and other cities. Mr. Hodgkin has done his work as well as ever, though he cannot have found the Lombard kingdom so pleasant a subject as the Gothic war. If he is most at home in the romances, he is no stranger to the duller parts of the story. He has worked faithfully through his authorities, and is familiar with the latest writers who touch his subject, like Bury and Diehl, and he has not shunned such obscure matters as the Istrian schism and the organisation of Byzantine Italy. The chief criticism to make is the old one, that, though Mr. Hodgkin does not avoid ecclesiastical affairs as he used to, he scarcely even yet allows their full significance in secular history. Amongst other subjects carefully treated, or otherwise specially interesting, we may mention the Frankish invasions, the 'beastly' Heruli, the administration of Pope Gregory, the duchy of Friuli, the signs of improvement in Liutprand's times, the spurious letters of Pope Gregory II to the emperor Leo III, and the condition of the Roman provincials under the Lombards.

H. M. GWATKIN.

The Saga of King Olaf Tryggwason. Translated by J. SEPHTON, M.A. (London: David Nutt. 1895.)

THE history of King Olaf Tryggvason has never been translated into English before, except in the abridged and unsatisfactory form of the 'Heimskringla.' The present translation of the longer saga is a sensible addition to the small stock of Norwegian historians at present available in English. The saga of Olaf the King is a composite work, put together out of a number of incongruous materials, all of them interesting in one way or another. Mr. Sephton's introduction gives an admirably clear account of the difficult problems of the book, with his view of the nearest approaches to solution. He appears, it may be, somewhat too peremptory in his use of the term 'Heimskringla' to mean Snorri Sturluson's 'Lives of the Kings of Norway,' and in his opinion that the Heimskringla 'Life of King Olaf' was one of the sources of the present book. He has rightly called attention to passages in which the author or compiler of the long saga seems to have done injustice to his materials.

The translation is plain and unaffected, like Mr. Sephton's translation of 'Eric the Red.' It shows, unfortunately, some taste for respectability of diction; for example (p. 201), 'As a matter of common experience we know that no man preserves a prosperous career unbroken to the end of his life, if he has been guilty of the murder of even one man.' The heaviness of this is not to be found in the original. The translation also fails to render adequately what must be difficult to render at all—the variation of style between the different layers of the book, the change from the dramatic spirit of the history to the homiletic tone of the commentator, in places where a piece of the legend of King Olaf has been stuck in by the compiler in the middle of an historical chapter, or where he has himself broken out into a voluntary passage of alliterative and decorative commentary, as at the end of c. 104, on the death of Earl Hakon. But if the various colours of the style are inevitably dulled in the translation, the variety of the

matter is all there. It is called the 'History of King Olaf;' it really contains the history of the North from the time of Harold Fairhair, with the discovery and settlement of Iceland, the sagas of people who had dealings with the king, such as Hallfred the Troublesome Poet, Sigmund of the Faroes, and Kiartan Olafsson (out of 'Laxdæla'), besides a number of short stories of which 'Heimskringla' makes no account; and all this over and above the double biography of the king, historical and legendary. It was a heavy piece of work to undertake, and the result is honourable.

W. P. Ker.

Feudal England: Historical Studies on the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries. By J. H. Round. (London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1895.)

Mr. Round's historical researches are not specially devoted to legal institutions, but they are not the less welcome to all lawyers who are aware that law has a history, and that the common law in particular is hardly intelligible apart from its historical foundations. The Anglo-Norman period was beginning to be obscure, one suspects, even to Bracton and his contemporaries, and it has not only remained obscure ever since, but has been made more so by modern errors and premature dogmatising. Not the least of Mr. Round's merits is that the next generation will never want to know how much rubbish he has swept or helped to sweep away. He has done more than any one scholar to put us in the way of reading Domesday Book aright. He has illustrated by abundant examples the wisdom and the necessity of finding out by patient study of our documents what were the normal facts and the normal forms of describing them, instead of rushing into generalisation from examples that catch the eye and seem to promise a short cut to brilliant results just because they are not normal. Two years ago I ventured to affirm, in a paper read before the Devonshire Association, that 'neglect of this simple canon of research is answerable for a great deal of the confusion and dissension which have made Domesday Book a mystery even to learned persons.' Now Mr. Round says, 'With singular perversity Domesday students have always been inclined to pitch upon the exceptions as representing the rule, forgetting that it was precisely in exceptional cases that figures had to be given' (p. 84). The confirmation afforded by his acute and ever watchful criticism not only of modern opinions but of the documents themselves is even greater than I could have expected. I hope to say more about Domesday on a future occasion. For the present it may be enough to mention some of the points which Mr. Round has established, as it seems to me, with certainty or great probability. By careful collation of the 'Inquisitio Comitatus Cantabrigiensis' with the text of Domesday and with the 'Inquisitio Eliensis,' he has shown that neither the original returns nor the final version can have been free from a certain number of errors, but that the Domesday text is not compiled merely from the returns, but represents a process of revision, and is generally more correct. He confirms us in the faith that, whatever local variations existed, the normal hide in the 'hidated' counties was 120 acres, and that *caruca* is everywhere a plough team of eight oxen, neither more nor less. The occasional hides in the 'carucated' counties

are singularities, like the Cornish acre, and need not disturb us. People chose to call eighteen carucates (*i.e.* what would have been eighteen hides in a southern county) a hide in Leicestershire, and six carucates a hide in the land between the Ribble and the Mersey. Perhaps we shall know why some day, perhaps not (though Mr. Round has a very ingenious suggestion as to this too; see at p. 86). But for the general study of the Domesday formulas it does not matter. It should be needless to repeat that the fact of an estate being assessed or 'defending itself' for so many hides in the purely English counties or carucates in the Danelaw tells us nothing about the actual acreage or value, no more than the modern 'rateable value' of a house, though expressed in terms of the pound sterling, tells us what is its actual rent or letting value. This is one of the points well settled. All attempts to find uniformity of ratio or principle have failed. Domesday itself gives us the actual as well as the assessed values, and the differences admit of only the roughest generalisation as between different parts of England; and as between holdings in the same county—Devonshire, for example, which as a whole is very lightly assessed—they often seem not to admit of any. Mr. Round, however, goes a step further, and gives strong reasons for holding that the assessment of the king's geld was worked out by an even rougher process than any one had supposed. Many figures converge to the conclusion that not the vill or manor but the hundred was the unit, so far as the king's executive officers were concerned; that the hundred was assessed in the lump for some multiple of five hides, or, in the Danish counties, of six carucates; and that the incidence of assessment within the hundred was determined by local arrangement, perhaps in the hundred court. If Mr. Round is right, one of the supposed functions of the township court, and therefore one of the somewhat shadowy reasons for assuming the existence of such a court, now disappears into the limbo of needless hypotheses.

As to the formation of the survey in general, Mr. Round does not believe that it was completed in 1086, and he suggests that the difference between the 'Little Domesday' for the eastern counties and the 'Great Domesday' (to use Morgan's convenient terms) represents a revision and improvement of the scheme in the course of the work. He also traces a probable early reference to Domesday under the name of 'Liber de thesauro' in the Abingdon Chronicle.

The miscellaneous historical studies, which consist principally of reprinted matter, must be left to professed historians. I doubt not they are as good in their kind, but *non sunt de mea facultate*. And I confess I am rather glad to feel that it is absolutely irrelevant to the history of English law whether there was or was not a palisade at the battle of Hastings.

F. POLLOCK.

The Crusades: the Story of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem. By T. A. ARCHER and C. L. KINGSFORD. (London and New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1894.)

IN this volume the general reader will find a trustworthy and readable account of the crusades, and the student an excellent introduction to the subject. It is evident that the authors have not spared pains, and perhaps

the greatest merit of their book is that they have, if the phrase may be used, 'lived into' the twelfth century and sought, with much success, to reflect its spirit. The well-considered chapter on the 'Life of the People' is more valuable than many details of the fighting and the feuds. The illustrations are well chosen, the printing good, and the text free from typical errors (three unimportant misprints caught my eye, pp. 41, 171, 191). The style is agreeable and suits the subject, though one is amused at the recurrence of favourite words and phrases, like 'despite' and 'historically speaking.' The reader who is not familiar with certain modes of historical phraseology, and who thought that the Huns had been blotted out in the sixth century, may be puzzled at reading on p. 15 that the Huns had been converted to Christianity,' especially as, apparently, the Huns of Attila are referred to on p. 12. And in any case the propriety of calling the Magyars 'Huns' (as again on p. 41 and in the index), except for some rhetorical purpose, must be questioned. On p. 37 it might have been worth while (as the book is popular) to state in so many words that Bulgaria was then part of the eastern empire, though of course this fact is exhibited on the map. In cap. iii. the 'five distinct bodies' of crusaders, mentioned at the beginning, are not clearly marked, and seem to resolve themselves into four as the narrative proceeds. The description of the 'belfry' (p. 352) as 'the crowning achievement of medieval offensive engineering' would certainly convey the impression that this engine was invented in the middle ages. Do I misconceive its construction in supposing that it was simply the ancient helepolis? On p. 49 a notice of Isangeles (the count of St. Gilles) is quoted from Anna Comnena, to the effect that Alexius loved him for other reasons, and 'because he knew that he preferred honour and truth above all things.' I had the curiosity to look up the passage, to learn Anna's equivalent for 'honour,' and was disappointed to find that she simply says, *ὅποσον αὐτῷ τῆς ἀληθείας μέλει*. 'Truth' alone would have been a sufficient and safer translation.

It is to be regretted that the authors did not find it possible to add a few brief notes at the end of each chapter, as Miss Gardner has very wisely done in her recent volume on 'Julian' in the 'Heroes of the Nations.' The reader could then be informed occasionally when there is a difference of opinion on a question of real importance. It is rather hard to discover in the account of the 'Assize of Jerusalem' (pp. 122–4) whether the authors accept or not the main point in 'the story preserved by John of Ibelin,' that an assize of the nobles existed in written form in the twelfth century and was destroyed. And is it not a mistake to speak as if the two assizes, that of the *haute cour* and that of the *bourgeois*, were on the same footing? I had understood that the 'Assise des Bourgeois,' as we have it, is a revised edition (made in the sixteenth century) of an original text which probably went back to the second half of the twelfth century. Here one desires a note. Again, what is the authority for saying that the assizes of Antioch served, 'no doubt, also for the county of Tripoli'? Is there not good reason for supposing that the county of Tripoli had assizes of its own? J. B. Bury.

Caffaro e i suoi tempi. Per CESARE IMPERIALE DI SANT' ANGELO. (Turin: L. Roux & Ca. 1894.)

AMONGST other states, great and small, which sent their contribution of men to fight the infidel at the close of the eleventh century was an infant community which in a marvellously short time was to make itself the mistress of the sea, and to become the home of the world's bankers for centuries thereafter. Gradually after the fall of the empire one commune after the other in Italy—often merely a few families living together—had taken advantage of the weakness or absence of their feudal lords to assert their right to govern themselves, or had made their allegiance to them a shadowy one. The family of a certain Viscount Ido, who had governed the march of Liguria for the count, had thus formed themselves and their households into a regularly constituted government at Genoa, with six consuls elected every three years; and in the year 1100 they sent a fleet of 27 galleys and 6 ships, with 8,000 men, under a Genoese who was already famous in the holy war—William Embriaco—to fight under the banner of the cross. With the fleet went a young lad who, like the Embriaci, the Spinola, and all the leading families of Genoa, was descended from the Viscount Ido. The name of this lad was Caffaro, and he, like the rest of his kinsmen, would long ago have been forgotten, but that he not only rose to be one of the first citizens and magistrates who founded the greatness and wealth of his native republic, but he carefully recorded all the great events in which he took part during a long life of active public usefulness.

A true scion of the new era, full of energy, of ambition, and of patriotism, he was in turn warrior, magistrate, ambassador, admiral, consul, banker, and writer; and in his lifetime his 'Annales' were so highly esteemed by his fellow-countrymen that they were ordered to be read publicly before the people. He tells how the Genoese went from triumph to triumph: from Assur to Cesarea, to Acre, to Beyrout, conquering everywhere, coming back at last to their obscure little commune with their galleys fluttering with flags, all loaded with treasure from the first crusade. But the budding republic had rivals of its own to crush nearer at hand than the Saracens. A struggle like that between Rome and Carthage existed between Genoa and Pisa. The Genoese made a supreme effort and fell upon Pisa by surprise with an overwhelming force of 22,000 men, eighty galleys, and sixty-seven boats; and Pisa, for the time, was crushed; but soon to rise again, and by diplomacy at Rome to endeavour to repair its discomfiture. But Caffaro was sent thither as ambassador, and by bribes and otherwise obtained, in 1121, a revocation of the episcopal supremacy of Pisa over Genoa. The Pisans again appealed to arms, and Caffaro changed from an ambassador to an admiral, and chased, burned, and plundered the twice beaten foe. And then for nearly twenty years Caffaro is heard of no more. But in 1141 he was again in the government, just when the eloquence of St. Bernard was arousing Europe to a second crusade. Caffaro was an elderly man now, but still full of energy. To the Holy Land his duties at home would not allow him to go, but he led the Genoese fleet against the Saracens in Spain, besieged Almeria and Tortosa, overran the coast of the kingdom of Valencia, and captured Majorca; then he wrote a history of the war in curious Latin

called 'Ystoria Captionis Almarie et Turtose,' which, with the 'Annales' and 'De Liberatione Civitatum Orientis,' are all of his writings which remain to us. He was elected consul of the republic in 1149; and when he was nearly an octogenarian, in 1158, he took part in the deliberations which set the seal of greatness finally on his native city. Frederick Barbarossa had crossed the Alps for the second time with a great army, determined to destroy, once for all, the growing power and independence of the young communities in northern Italy. The Genoese rose like one man, and, as Caffaro himself says, were ready to defy, not Frederick alone, but the peoples of Germany and Italy united. They flatly refused the emperor, as they had done on a former occasion, tribute, hostages, submission, and duty; again asserted boldly their right of independent self-government, and bade him do his worst. The emperor invited a parley, and the wisest citizens of Genoa were sent as ambassadors, the aged Caffaro amongst them. Their firmness and confidence made even Frederick waver, and a truce was concluded, in which the material independence of Genoa was acknowledged, with a merely nominal suzerainty. But the moment Frederick had his hands free the pact was broken, and he turned all his force upon the bold city which defied him. One after another the communities of Italy had fallen; all Lombardy and central Italy had bent its neck to the yoke; Rome itself was in the hands of the conqueror; but still Genoa held out, and in 1162 Frederick, who wanted the Genoese galleys with which to attack the king of Sicily, was obliged to come to terms with the republic, which henceforward for centuries was mistress of the Mediterranean. It is this stirring story, mainly culled from Caffaro's own books, which Signor Sant' Angelo tells in fine flowing Italian, delightful to read.

Martin A. S. Hume.

Thomas of London before his Consecration. By Lewis B. Radford, M.A. (Cambridge Historical Essays, No. 7.) (Cambridge: University Press. 1894.)

Mr. Radford's essay is a painstaking and readable monograph. He has studied very carefully and thoroughly the lives and letters of St. Thomas. He has made good use of the Pipe Rolls, and he has read all the modern English biographies. In his criticisms of other writers he is generally acute, and in his own explanations he is lucid and methodical. I would especially commend his account of the difficult and complicated Battle Abbey case, of the circumstances connected with the appointment of Gilbert Foliot to the see of London, and of the discharge of Becket from his obligations as chancellor—on which points he seems to be more complete and convincing than any previous writer. The book as a whole is a sound and valuable piece of work, which reflects great credit upon its author and upon the methods of the Cambridge historical school. I must, however, point out some defects which I hope Mr. Radford may have the opportunity of correcting. The friend of Thomas's youth was Richer of Laigle, not de l'Aigle. Henry II was not 'duke' of Anjou. There is no contemporary authority for the nickname 'Barbarossa.' The note on John of Salisbury (p. 32, n. 3) is extremely inaccurate. He should

consult the article on John in the 'Dictionary of National Biography.' His reference to the French seneschalship could be improved by reference to M. Luchaire's 'Institutions Monarchiques.' He appears to be ignorant of much of the work of elucidation for which students of medieval history are indebted to Mr. J. H. Round. Thus the mistake of Arndt noted on p. 47 had been previously pointed out in 'Geoffrey de Mandeville,' pp. 253, 257 *n*. 4. He is silent also as to the real explanation of the 'scutage' of 1159, and is unacquainted with several other important matters which Mr. Round has explained. It may be hypercritical to suggest that his account of the relation between Robert of Cricklade and the Thomas Saga is hardly complete or satisfactory, but I think that Mr. Radford should have consulted M. Paul Meyer's edition of the 'Vie Anonyme.' From his general view of the character of Thomas there will not be much dissent, but I do not think that the sneer at the claim for 'incipient sanctity' is historically justified. Bossuet truly said that the discipline as well as the faith of the church needed its martyrs, and there can be no real doubt that Thomas seriously set himself to carry out a high ideal of clerical obligation, regardless of the consequences. His fight seemed to him to be for righteousness' sake. John of Salisbury was certainly not the man to apply the term *bestias curiae* to a merely 'anti-clerical party,' as Mr. Radford asserts (p. 154). The opponents who deserved the name were the licentious and brutal following of the king. Nor should the legal worth of Becket's chancellorship be undervalued. The reconstruction of a judicial system and the issue of the grand assize are works fully as important as anything done later in the reign. I hope Mr. Radford may be induced to continue his work beyond the point at which it stops. We are much in want of a good life of St. Thomas.

W. H. HUTTON.

Little St. Hugh of Lincoln, Boy and Martyr: Researches in History, Archæology, and Legend. A Paper read before the Jewish Historical Society of England, on 13 May 1894, by JOSEPH JACOBS, Vice-President of the Society. (London: *Jewish Chronicle* Office. 1894.)

THIS is an attempt to deal with the evidence which can be obtained regarding the story of 'Little St. Hugh of Lincoln.' Matthew Paris tells us that a boy of that name, eight years old, was stolen by the Jews at Lincoln in July 1255 and brutally murdered by them; that the body was discovered by the boy's mother, whose name is not given; that one of the canons of Lincoln took the matter up, brought pressure to bear upon the Jews, and induced one of them, named Copin, to make a confession, which must be taken for what it is worth; that inquiries were made; that ninety-one Jews were arrested and sent to London, and there thrown into gaol, and that, whatever they may have suffered, nobody pitied them. That an abominable persecution was set on foot in this year, and that the mob and their betters were stirred up to frantic anti-Semitic violence by the dissemination of the Lincoln story far and wide—all this is certain. The question remains, Was there any foundation for the charge, and if not on what facts was it based?

Mr. Jacobs has gone into this matter with his usual car and in-

dustry. At Lincoln he found no documents of any service to him. At the record office he was more successful. Though no mention of any trial of Jews is to be found in the Assize Rolls for the fortieth year of Henry III, the entries in the Close Rolls referring to the Lincoln affair are extremely suggestive. On 22 November of that year ninety-two poor wretches were *brought before the king* at Westminster—not to be tried, but to answer whether they would submit to be tried by a Christian jury. Eighteen of them refused, whereupon, without more ado, they were hanged. Of the remaining seventy-four some suffered in one way, some in another. In the main the only question seems to have been how much could be squeezed out of them. The king's brother, Richard of Cornwall, appears to have got the lion's share; and only the friars—Franciscan and Dominican—are said to have exhibited the smallest sign of pity, sympathy, or common humanity to the sufferers.

I rise from the perusal of this learned and elaborate pamphlet with a strong impression that there was no more basis of fact for this story of 'Little Hugh' than there has been for hundreds of similar fabrications which have been greedily swallowed by the rabble during the periodical outbreaks of frenzy against the Hebrews all over Europe.[1] There is not an incident in the narrative of Matthew Paris which is not borrowed from the 'Life of St. William of Norwich,' which Mr. Montague James found in Brent-Eleigh Library, and which he and I are now carrying through the press. The Lincoln people were very impudent plagiarists. As to the local origin of these *myths*, Mr. Jacobs is wrong in giving England the discredit of it. As I have pointed out in the *Nineteenth Century* (No. 195, p. 749), the first germ of the story is to be found in Socrates, from whose 'Ecclesiastical History,' I suspect, it found its way into some early martyrology or other collection of edifying tales. There Thomas the Norwich monk read it, and he utilised it for the glorification of his own monastery. There too Chaucer read it, and hence he makes the events of his 'Prioresses Tale' to take place '*in Asie*, in a great citee.' Of course he works up the material which Thomas of Norwich had made ready to his hand.

Mr. Jacobs has brought together a valuable collection of information, gleaned from a very wide range of reading, which students of this subject will find of much service in pursuing further researches. He seems, however, to be unacquainted with the very curious article in Mr. Rye's *Norfolk Antiquarian Miscellany* (vol. i. pp. 312–4) on the 'Alleged Abduction and Circumcision of a Boy at Norwich in 1230.' Mr. Jacobs's book on the Jews of Angevin England is so creditable a piece of work that it is to be hoped he will, before long, continue his survey down to the time of the great expulsion by Edward I. A. JESSOPP.

Iohannis Wyclif Opus Evangelicum. Parts I. II. Edited by Dr. JOHANN LOSERTH. (Wyclif Society.) (London: Trübner & Co. 1895.)

THE interest of this work, which is a homiletic commentary upon the sermon on the Mount, St. Matthew xxiii–xxv. and St. John xiii–xvii., is

[1] Compare Mr. Lea's article on 'El Santo Niño de la Guardia,' in the ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW, iv. 230 ff.—ED.

mainly theological. Wyclif, where he intervenes between the lengthy quotations from SS. Augustine and Chrysostom, is at his plainest. His theological position is that of his other works of the date (1384)—the general sufficiency of the law of God (*i.e.* to him the Bible), without (if necessary) any church system at all, or even the sacraments (p. 375). The strength of such a position depended upon his own spirituality and the abuses he confronted; its weakness lay on the sides of practical life and of historic Christianity. But although mainly destructive (as on church organisation) or critical (as on the sacrament of the altar) he is in some cases cautious (as on auricular confession, p. 141; cf. 'De Blasphemia'); he also expresses a sincere readiness to be taught any truth *ex scriptura vel racione vivaci* (p. 305). His almost puritan tastes are seen in his dislike of singing, music, and gorgeous churches (pp. 262-3). On ecclesiastical matters he has a full treatment of lawsuits about benefices (pp. 294, 211, 213, and 200); the last reference shows that if Wyclif was concerned in the Canterbury Hall case he had changed his mind as to the desirability of appeals to law. The private teaching and the public teaching of the friars on transubstantiation are contrasted with a bitterness showing Wyclif's belief that some of them at heart agreed with him (p. 102); this along with appeals (pp. 410, 414) to some members of 'the private sects' to leave them for 'the sect of Christ' leads to the conclusion that Wyclif had many sympathisers among the friars (cf. on this point 'De Apostasia,' 'De Blasphemia,' and 'Purgatorium Sectae Christi'). Arguments such as that on p. 381 might, if loosely construed, lead to the later charge of teaching that the wickedness of ministers impaired the sacraments, although Wyclif held otherwise (cf. 'De Ecclesia,' p. 448). As to his private life, there is a personal ring in the passages on excommunication (375 *et passim*). Further proof of his citation to Rome is found on pp. 20 and 434: he seems, not unnaturally, to have asked for his expenses. There is an obvious allusion to his poor priests (*fideles*) on p. 417. P. 214 seems to glance indirectly, with deprecation of the violence, although in sympathy with the movement, at the death of Archbishop Sudbury (cf. here 'De Blasphemia' at length). The passages on serfdom (pp. 338, 415) show upon which side Wyclif's feeling lay in 1381; he was essentially communistic even so early as when he wrote the 'Questiones XII.,' on p. 268 of which he implies that in a state of innocence riches should be common, as air and water. A passage on p. 43 is interesting for the history of science, where he speaks of the studies of music, alchemy, and so on; and chap. xxv., on light, might be a medieval lecture on optics. P. 172 mentions as an illustration the old Irish and English sales of wives (a point often referred to by medieval writers). This work, largely copied by Hus, was named by him 'De Sufficiencia Legis Dei,' but the originality is entirely Wyclif's. As he wrote it near the end of his life (he gives in book iii. the date 1384, and the copyist says, *Autoris vita finitur et hoc opus ita*), it is pleasing to find strength of views (which we look for in Wyclif) joined to a spirit of growing calmness amid controversy. The indices and side notes (supplied by Mr. F. D. Matthew) are ample: the introduction is to follow with vol. ii. Dr. Loserth's name is sufficient to vouch for the text and edition. J. P. WHITNEY.

Eine mailändisch-thüringische Heiratsgeschichte aus der Zeit König Wenzels. Von Professor Dr. KARL WENCK. (Dresden: Baensch. 1895.)

IN this thin pamphlet Dr. Wenck reproduces without additional material, but with some difference of view, a piece of research by an Italian scholar which touches the subject in which he is particularly interested—the history of the house of Wettin in the fourteenth century. The marriage of Lucia Visconti, a daughter of Bernabò, to Frederick, son of the landgrave Balthasar of Thuringia, in 1399, to which Professor Romano, of Pavia, devoted an article in the *Archivio Storico Lombardo* (1891), was known to the Milanese annalists, but, as it was never consummated and was finally declared null, it had escaped the notice of the Saxon historians. Dr. Wenck is able to put its German antecedents in a clearer light. King Wenceslaus had just come near to throwing Balthasar into the arms of the princes who were aiming at his deposition by breaking off the betrothal of the young Frederick to Elizabeth of Görlitz, which held out to the house of Wettin the prospect of succeeding to the great Luxemburg inheritance. Discovering his mistake he apparently sought to soothe the landgrave's irritation by bringing about a marriage with a kinswoman of Gian Galeazzo Visconti, whose interests bound him to give every possible support to Wenceslaus, to whom he owed his recognition as duke of Milan. Nevertheless the landgrave lifted no hand to prevent the deposition of Wenceslaus, and after Gian Galeazzo's death Lucia got herself freed from the marriage on the ground that she had been forced into it against her will by her brother-in-law. Romano holds that this was only a pretext, but Dr. Wenck gives good reasons for concluding that compulsion had actually been used. The point has a particular interest for English students, since there is some reason to believe that Lucia had formed a prior attachment to no less a person than Henry of Derby. There is no doubt, at all events—though this has escaped his English historians—that in the summer and autumn of 1398 Henry made overtures for her hand. But at that time there did not seem any immediate prospect of the condition upon which Galeazzo insisted—that Henry should first be taken back into favour by Richard II—being fulfilled; and both parties turned elsewhere for a marriage alliance in the following winter, Henry to France and Gian Galeazzo to Germany. But Henry does not seem to have forgotten Lucia, and we may ascribe to him her second marriage to Edmund Holland, earl of Kent. The date—24 Jan. 1406—which Dr. Wenck accepts, on the authority of Fabyan, for this marriage is more than a year too early. Lucia survived her husband fifteen years, living in England until her death on 4 April 1424. On the English side of his subject Dr. Wenck is not perfectly at home. The account of Henry of Derby's foreign travels (p. 19) contains several inaccuracies.

JAMES TAIT.

Social England. By Various Writers. Edited by H. D. TRAILL, D.C.L. Vol. III: From the Accession of Henry VIII to the Death of Elizabeth. (London: Cassell & Co. 1895.)

IT must be owned that Dr. Traill's novel experiment in writing history by co-operation has made remarkable progress. Three stout octavo

volumes, published in three successive years, have now brought the work down to the death of Elizabeth, and if the same rate of progress is maintained it should not be many years before it will be possible for educated persons to possess in their own libraries a complete and continuous social history of the country, written, for the most part, by skilled and competent students working harmoniously to a common end. That the different sections are of unequal merit is, of course, no more than was to be expected; and that a considerable crop of errors might be gathered from this as well as from other histories was no less inevitable from the first. But while it is always desirable in any work to point out mistakes for correction, scarcely enough has been said, in the present instance, as to the advantages and disadvantages of the plan of the work itself.

The feeling is not of yesterday's growth that the lack of information about social life in the past has left the political historian's work incomplete and unsatisfactory. Attempts were made to supply the void even in the last century by Dr. Henry and James Pettit Andrews, who proceeded, except in the matter of co-operation, on much the same principles as Dr. Traill, with a little section, or it might be a chapter, from time to time, on art, literature, religion, manners, or some other outlying subject subordinate to the main story of political events. Now, however, it is rightly felt that each of these great departmental subjects requires an historian of its own; and there is also a feeling, no less just, that the knowledge gained in each of these different sections requires to be properly co-ordinated and unified. Art, religion, literature, and manners are part of the same story as political history, and each different section should throw light upon the others. How far does this book carry us on to the desired harmony? Undoubtedly it is a very considerable step; but the end is not yet. Our minds, unfortunately, still keep the history too much in compartments, and the critic feels this in himself quite as much as he sees it in the contributors.

Of all the specialists, of course, the military and naval specialists are least likely to lose sight of the main story, and the valuable articles of Mr. Oman and Mr. Laird Clowes deserve particular recognition. But surely the relaxation of military discipline under Henry VIII—which Mr. Oman, quite rightly, as I consider, traces to the breakdown of feudalism, the confiscations and attainders during the wars of the Roses, and the stern legislation of Henry VII against liveries and maintenance—points to new social conditions at home which have hitherto escaped attention. When English troops in Spain or Picardy mutinied for higher pay, or compelled their commanders to go home in spite of orders, they did things vastly unlike what as subjects they would have dared to do in England. But then they were no longer feudal followers; they were hired men, unused even to true military service, idle serving men, vagrants in time of peace, distinguished generally, as we know from More's 'Utopia,' by their audacity in theft and plunder. The maintenance of soldiers, as Sir Thomas More suggests, was very much the same thing as maintenance of thieves. The story of the navy, on the other hand, connects itself with that of trade and commerce, the king's ships being but the nucleus of a fighting force made up largely, when occasion came, from the mercantile marine. Mr. Laird Clowes has done his part well; but for that very reason his

matter naturally runs over into trade and voyages of discovery, while Mr. Beazley follows him with special chapters devoted to these same subjects. Mr. Beazley also undertakes religion, in which he has a divided empire with Mr. Hutton. Under Elizabeth, indeed, no less than four writers treat of religion. Has not Dr. Traill committed the mistake which, they say, the tendency of modern politics is forcing upon prime ministers, of having too large a cabinet? That his contributors agree among themselves pretty tolerably is only half a consolation. Separate essays in violent disagreement might even be more useful to the student, if there were any great tendency to vital differences. But we do not suppose that the agreement is at all forced. The only thing is that the separate articles have rather a look of being clipped in order to fit them into their separate compartments—to which, after all, some of them will not submit.

On the attractive subject of literature, again, no one will dispute that it is in the best possible hands when confided to Professor Saintsbury; and whatever other contributor may have felt himself 'cabined, cribbed, confined,' he at least, we may be sure, had the fullest scope allowed him. Yet even here, without any imposed restriction, is there not a want of something to connect literature more distinctly with the age and the actions of the age—in short, to make it a little more historic? Above all, are not the silences of literature sometimes almost as significant as its utterances when viewed from the historian's standpoint? When Mr. Saintsbury tells us that the literature of Henry VIII's time was intrinsically second-rate, he says what nobody will dispute; but when he adds that it nevertheless ranks high from an historical point of view as reflecting sweeping changes, is he not still thinking a little too much of his own subject and looking at mere changes of style? 'Here,' he says, 'English literature ceases to be mediæval and prepares itself to be modern' (p. 98). No doubt; but why were the utterances themselves so poor? The age which began with Hawes and Skelton and ended with Ascham and Surrey, although it also took in More and Latimer, could hardly have expressed its thoughts very fully on the deep tragedies passing before its eyes. Even More himself wrote only what it was safe to write, and Latimer, however much in earnest, was always on the side of authority. No one could say what he felt—and least of all could he say it in literary form—about judicial massacres, universal alarm, and the uprooting of old institutions like the monasteries, popular to the last, though less able to maintain themselves than they had been, and easily crushed, after the royal supremacy had been well established, by the heavy hand of Henry VIII, aided by his subservient parliaments. It was in the literature of the next generation—in poems such as those in the 'Mirror for Magistrates'—that the pathos of the past found utterance. And even then it was an imperfect utterance after all, for men had ceased to bewail a state of matters that could never be restored.

But while it was impossible that even the best writers could give complete satisfaction in a work on such a plan, the work itself is of undoubted value. I only regret now that my few criticisms have been necessarily levelled at the shortcomings of some of the best contributors, and space is not available to do justice either to them or to the others.

Mr. A. L. Smith sketches the political situation under Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Mary. His first contribution seems to me the most successful, the others gradually becoming weaker. Mr. Hassall, on the other hand, who takes up the constitution at the beginning of the book and the politics at the end, rather improves as he goes on. Mr. Beazley's view of the religious movements is a little conventional. Dr. Gasquet's chapter on the suppression of monasteries contains, of course, the essence of his book and of the fullest information attainable on the subject. Mr. Bass Mullinger was clearly the right man to treat of learning and education, and Dr. Creighton has a like claim to speak about public health and epidemics. Mr. Corbett's articles on agriculture are of high interest, and so are those on Scotch and Irish subjects by Mr. Heath, Mr. Colville, and Mr. Joyce. Indeed, there is no marked deficiency in any of the contributions, and probably the worst errors in the volume are due to mere popular misapprehensions, which larger research in future will tend to dispel.

James Gairdner.

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII. Preserved in the Public Record Office, the British Museum, and elsewhere in England. Arranged and catalogued by James Gairdner and R. H. Brodie. Vol. XIV. Part I. (London: H.M. Stationery Office. 1894.)

This volume has lost nothing by the association of Mr. R. H. Brodie with Mr. Gairdner. The preface is, of course, entirely the production of Mr. Gairdner's pen, but in the execution of the main body of the work Mr. Brodie has probably taken a more prominent part; and we are bound to say, after a careful investigation, that this volume will stand the test of comparison with any of the previous issues as regards both accuracy of detail and freedom from errors of the press. Mr. Gairdner has well earned the epithet of *Emeritus*, but, though he has entirely given up any active duties as assistant keeper of the records, he carries with him into his retirement the same keen interest in his subject and appreciation of all its details which we have noticed in the prefaces to his previous volumes. Most of the documents analysed here are entirely new, but we cannot but regret the necessity imposed upon the editors of curtailing the accounts of some of the most interesting of the foreign papers on the ground that they have been already fully epitomised by Don Pascual de Gayangos in the simultaneous issues of the 'Spanish Calendar.' The present arrangement is the more to be regretted because of the many inaccuracies of which Don Pascual has been found guilty. Some of these mistakes, we are glad to say, have been quietly pointed out and corrected by the editors in their footnotes.

Undoubtedly the prominent feature on the surface of the pages is the spoliation of the monasteries and the disposal of the plunder amongst various applicants for grants or purchase of the confiscated goods; though it is probable that to many, especially to those who are not acquainted with Cardinal Pole's letters as published by Quirini, the communications which passed between him and his various correspondents will prove the

most interesting feature in the volume. As, however, there are very few of these that have not before appeared in print, we must content ourselves with calling attention to two or three. Amongst them is a very interesting letter addressed by the cardinal to the emperor, which Mr. Gairdner has inserted as of January, though apparently thinking that it belongs to a period a few months later. In this letter Pole describes the state of things which has forced him to break altogether with the king and to urge the emperor to make war on him. In subsequent, or perhaps it would be more correct to say in some preceding, letters of March and April, addressed to Contarini and others, Pole gives in detail the account of his mission by the pope first to the emperor, then to the French king. In them he explains fully the refusal of the emperor to second the pope's wish for the invasion of England and the reluctance of Francis to act independently of the emperor. Here too is a letter which has never before been printed, and which has only recently been acquired by the record office. It is in Italian, written from Carpentras on 25 March 1539, and addressed to Cardinal Farnese. Pole is at that time waiting for further instructions from the pope after the failure of his negotiations with the emperor, which Pole is at a loss to understand. Unwilling to risk his life by travelling through France, where Henry VIII had spies ready to assassinate him, unless he could obtain a safe-conduct and permission from Francis, he had sent the abbot of San Saluto to feel the way and to report to the pope the state of the case. It appears as if the pope had at first expected that the emperor and the French king, in conjunction with James V of Scotland, might be induced to declare war against Henry, and that finding this could not be attained he had moderated his demands down to the hope that they would at least have interdicted all commerce between the English and their subjects. But the emperor was too cautious to entertain even this proposal, and at the end of July we find Pole still waiting at Carpentras for instructions how to proceed. It is sad to find in these papers not a little that confirms the accusation which Pole in one of his letters, which will appear in the second part of this volume, makes against the poet Sir Thomas Wyatt, at that time English ambassador in Spain. Pole distinctly alleges that he had heard from Spain that Wyatt had boasted that if only the cardinal were once declared a traitor he would within six months procure his death, and there are several dark hints about this secret service which occur in one of Wyatt's ciphered despatches. These would not amount to much in themselves, but are confirmation strong when added to what Mr. Gairdner has quoted in his preface from the cardinal's own letter. Mr. Gairdner seems to think it surprising that a man holding such a position and a court poet should have been guilty of planning a murder, but recent revelations have not tended to raise our estimate of Wyatt's character. Mr. Gairdner does ample justice to the cardinal in describing his spirit of self-sacrifice. The late Dr. Hook could only view his character and conduct in the light shed upon it from the point of view of an Anglican churchman. The pope, he held, was altogether in the wrong in denouncing the king of England, and Pole was an arrant traitor, combining with foreigners against his lawful sovereign. But surely, if ever a subject can be justified in rebellion, the English people

might righteously have risen up against one who had trampled on their liberties and violated every principle of justice. The horrid cruelties practised by the king were the topic of conversation in every court of Europe, and Henry had to send to France and Scotland to remonstrate against the language used by natives of those countries with regard to his conduct. In England people spoke with bated breath on the subject. Cromwell had organised such a system of espionage throughout the country that even the slightest mention of the king's name was reported, and several offenders tried and punished for such alleged offences. Many were the representations made to James of Scotland to stop the slanderous speeches and suppress the scurrilous ballads published in that country, and both Francis and James professed an anxiety to comply with the king's wishes. And it was proposed to send Sir Ralph Sadler on a second embassy to Scotland, to represent to Henry's dear nephew the real state of the case as regards recent severities practised on his subjects, and to explain the justice of his course in his separation from the tyranny of the Roman pontiff.

And here we encounter two remarkable documents which serve to show at once the value of these calendars in correcting the mistakes of previous chroniclers and the difficulties from time to time experienced by the accomplished editors of the series in affixing correct dates from internal evidence. The first of these is provisionally dated [15 April 1539], and is headed 'Instructions to Ralph Sadeler, one of the gentlemen of the Privy Chamber sent at this time unto the King of Scots.' The difficulty of ascertaining the proper place for this document is shown from the fact that it was first printed in the Sadler State Papers, as belonging to the year 1541, and when it appeared in the State Papers published by royal commission it was attributed to the year 1537, with a footnote disproving the date of 1541 and giving reasons which Mr. Gairdner thinks plausible for assigning it to the year 1537. Nevertheless the true date is plainly that now assigned to it, viz. 1539. And now Mr. Gairdner admits that he was himself deceived into the belief of the date 1537, and printed it accordingly in his twelfth volume, to which the reader is referred for an epitome of its contents. We can only regret that he did not see his way to reproducing it here in its proper place, as it is not always easy to get access to earlier volumes of these papers.

The other document we have alluded to is 'Sadler's oration on being sent to James, complaining of libels spread in Scotland against Henry VIII, and desiring that the authors may be punished.' Curiously enough the only reference here is to the pages of Foxe, the martyrologist. How the document came into his possession does not appear, as no copy is known to exist either in the public record office or in the Cottonian library. It is nevertheless a genuine State Paper, in which it is asserted that the king expects other princes to follow the example of the French king in punishing such slanderous words at Rouen. It is asserted also in this document that Henry had heard of the arrival of a papal nuncio at the court of James, sent, as he supposes, to enforce the papal censures which neither the emperor nor the French king will countenance. The alleged oration ends with a vain request that James will not suffer

any of his subjects to accept from that 'usurper of Rome that red hat of pride' which had already been conferred on David Beton, the archbishop of St. Andrew's. Now it is certain that this speech was never delivered at all, for the papal nuncio, Latino Juvenalè, never reached Scotland, having been detained in France, and it is even doubtful whether Sadler actually went to Scotland on this occasion, and Mr. Gairdner's solution of the difficulty is that the paper was drawn up in anticipation of affairs.

In reviewing a work the contents of which are confined to seven calendar months, it would obviously be impossible to attempt to give any adequate account of the circumstances which led up to the events recorded in it, but two notices of vol. xiii. parts i. and ii., which appeared in the English Historical Review in July 1893 and April 1894 respectively, may to some extent supply the deficiency. The present volume is concerned with the year of the eventful session of parliament which passed the celebrated act of the six articles, as it is commonly called, but which was really designated 'an act for abolishing diversity of opinions in certain articles concerning Christian religion.' The session began 28 April and lasted till 28 June. This calendar supplies very little new information as to the method of procedure either in the lords or commons, though of course it contains the remarkable anonymous letter from some member of the upper house, first published in Burnet's 'History of the Reformation,' which details the opposition offered by Cranmer and others amongst the bishops of the new learning and their subsequent recantation, supposed to have been produced by conviction of the validity of the king's arguments. But the volume is full of documents which show how unscrupulously the lower house was packed by Cromwell with members who were elected to do the king's bidding at all costs; and, though it tells us of the resignations of Latimer and Shaxton, it gives us no hint of the marriage of Latimer, which was probably the chief cause of his retirement; nor does it make any allusion to the precipitate action of the archbishop of Canterbury in sending off Mrs. Cranmer to her friends in Germany, there to remain till more propitious times should arise, when it would be safe for priests to acknowledge the women they had married in violation of their obligation to lead a life of celibacy.

We must not omit to notice one other very prominent feature in this calendar, viz. the extraordinary precautions taken to protect the eastern and southern coasts of the country from foreign invasion. They prove the extreme fear in which the king and Cromwell were plunged, lest the emperor and the French king should together make a descent on England, in obedience to the papal bull of excommunication. The ten years' truce agreed upon at Nice had united the two most powerful sovereigns in Europe, whom the pope was doing his utmost to excite to declare war against England, or, what was equivalent to it, to refuse all commercial intercourse between the king's country and theirs, and he had ample reason to fear lest in that case his nephew of Scotland would be induced to take part in the enterprise. There was, in reality, little reason for his fears, inasmuch as the French king would not act without the emperor, and Charles was already involved in troubles with the Turks in the Levant and the protestants in Germany. Nicholas Pocock.

Recueil des Instructions données aux Ambassadeurs et Ministres de France. XI. *Espagne.* Avec une Introduction et des Notes par A. Morel-Fatio. Tome I: 1649–1700. (Paris: Alcan. 1894.)

From the treaty of the Pyrenees and the fateful marriage of Louis XIV with the infanta Maria Teresa, long before the birth even of the principal actors in the great struggle for the Spanish succession, which was to change the face of Europe, diplomatists saw the probable ultimate importance of the events which were taking place, and for the next fifty years their private correspondence and memoirs supply the secondary but important information so often lacking in their official papers. The editor of the present collection of 'Instructions,' M. Morel-Fatio, whose knowledge of the *personnel* of the court of Charles II of Spain is unrivalled, edited recently (1893) the interesting 'Mémoires de la Cour d'Espagne,' by one of the French ambassadors, the marquis de Villars; and the sprightly letters of his wife, the marquise de Villars, written from Spain to Mme. de Coulanges, were published in Paris some years ago. The letters of Sir Richard Fanshaw, of Godolphin, of Alexander Stanhope, and other English representatives in Spain are as interesting from a social as from a political point of view; and as much may be said of Sir William Temple's anonymous account of his share in the treaty of Nymegen in 1679. Our knowledge, therefore, of events and individuals of the court of Charles II of Spain was already considerable, although the romantic historian, the novelist, and the dramatist have conspired from the first to misrepresent them. At the instance of Guizot M. Mignet was commissioned in 1835 to edit the series of French state papers relative to the Spanish succession, and his four volumes, carrying the story down to the peace of Nymegen, are well known to historical students. His task was worthily supplemented by M. Legrelle's four volumes on 'La Diplomatie Française et la Succession d'Espagne,' while the Vienna archives have been laid under tribute, and the Austrian view of events represented by Herr Gaedeke in his 'Politik Oesterreichs in der spanischen Erbsfolgefrage;' and the 'Avisos' of J. Barrionuevo (Madrid, 1892) and the papers in vol. lxxix. of the 'Documentos inéditos para la Historia de España' and elsewhere show the Spanish side of the subject. At first sight, therefore, it may appear somewhat unnecessary to have published the present portly volume of instructions to the French ambassadors to the court of Spain from 1649 to 1700, especially as the full correspondence of at least two of the ambassadors (Rebenac and Harcourt) has already been printed; but a perusal of the contents will show that the gradual development of the Roi Soleil's ambitious plans is far better understood from his instructions to his successive ambassadors than from any amount of correspondence without this key. Although, curiously enough, the dynastic questions arising out of the marriage of Louis XIV and the succession of his grandson to the throne of Spain have once more become burning ones of the present day amongst certain sections of French politicians, the interest of English readers is most alive to the picturesque side of the almost luridly dramatic decline and extinction of the house of Austria in Spain, and particularly to the part played by the granddaughter of our own Charles I in the ghastly drama. In the instructions to the prince

d'Harcourt in this volume the smallest point of etiquette for the marriage of the unhappy Marie Louise of Orleans with Charles the Bewitched is laid down; and then gradually, as the clouds darken over the doomed queen, and the hope of progeny fades, the instructions to Villars, to Feuquière, and to his son Rebenac show the successive steps by which she, aided by her own folly and ineptitude, becomes a person of no importance, and the claims of the Dauphin to the Spanish crown are dexterously brought forward. The subsequent instructions deal largely with the intrigues of the powers to obtain the upper hand in Spain after the marriage of the king with his second wife, Marie Anne of Neubourg, sister of the empress, the obstinate struggle for precedence between the French and English ambassadors especially reflecting the rivalry of the nations in greater matters. Of the astounding intrigues around the dying king,[1] by which the French party triumphed in the end, little is said in these grave diplomatic instructions, but it is evident that they were mainly conducted by the priests who were sent by Louis XIV on secret missions to Spain independently of his regular ambassadors, and whose official instructions are also contained in the present volume.

The book has been edited with M. Morel-Fatio's well-known learning and thoroughness. Hardly a prominent person in Spain of the time has been omitted from his copious descriptive notes, but the want of an index greatly militates against the value of the book as a work of reference.

MARTIN A. S. HUME.

Calendar of State Papers. Domestic Series. October 1668 to December 1669. Edited by Mrs. M. A. E. GREEN. (London: H.M. Stationery Office. 1894.)

THIS volume is rather disappointing, and does not throw much light on the political history of the period with which it deals. It contains the usual series of documents relating to the history of the navy, and petitions and warrants of all kinds. A series of letters reporting the motions of the nonconformists at Yarmouth, Newcastle, and other places illustrate the ecclesiastical policy of the government, and the notices of the arrest of unlicensed and seditious printers testify to the activity of Roger L'Estrange in executing his office. On 11 Aug. 1669 the king severely reprimanded the Stationers' Company for obstructing L'Estrange in his task (pp. 393, 446). Of the king himself there are few notices of interest, except accounts of his amusements at Newmarket and of his inspection of the dockyard at Harwich (pp. 3, 9). There are several papers of literary interest, viz. a letter from John Evelyn recommending Christopher Wase to succeed Howell as historiographer royal (p. 65), a petition by Aphra Behn from prison for payment on account of her services during the Dutch war (p. 127), a criticism of John Price's Life of Monck (p. 519), and a complaint from the earl of Castlemaine concerning his 'History of the Dutch War' (p. 488). The popularity of

[1] See the present writer's article on 'The Exorcism of Charles the Bewitched, *Gentleman's Magazine*, November 1893.

Dryden's 'Indian Emperor' is shown by its performance by the boys of Coleshill School (p. 145). Hollar petitions in 1669 to be sent with Lord Henry Howard, then going as ambassador to Morocco, in order to improve his own knowledge of Tangier, ingenuously adding, 'for although there is a large map thereof, done by me—but performed only upon the author's tradition by word of mouth and my own bringing into method—I conceive, if one should compare the print with the thing itself, I should find but little likeness and perhaps quite another thing' (p. 256). William Penn was imprisoned in 1669 for publishing the 'Sandy Foundation Shaken,' and the present volume contains a letter from Penn to Arlington in vindication of his innocence (p. 372), and a warrant for Dr. Stillingfleet's admission to the Tower to see Penn, 'in order to the convincing him, if it may be, of heretical and blasphemous opinions' (p. 146). In 1669 a condemned prisoner in Norwich gaol, one John Blancher, accused Major Wildman of being the king's executioner, and narrated many curious particulars about the manner of the execution. But, as he had been convicted of perjury, amongst many other crimes, the government found themselves unable to incriminate Wildman (pp. 424-6). A petition from William Ryley, for rewards for the losses and services of himself and his father, states that in 1660 he aided his father in sorting the Scottish records before they were returned to Scotland, found amongst them the original of the Solemn League and Covenant, and refused 2,000*l.* offered by the Scots to deliver it up (p. 135). This doubtless refers to the copy of the covenant signed by Charles II. in 1650, which came into the hands of Clarendon, and is now amongst his papers in the Bodleian Library.

C. H. FIRTH.

En Rejse til Rusland under Tsar Peter. Dagbogsoptegnelser af Vice-Admiral JUST JUEL, Dansk Gesandt i Rusland, 1709–1711. Med Illustrationer og oplysende Anmærkninger ved GERHARD L. GROVE. Copenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandels Forlag.)

A GREAT deal of interesting matter has been published on the life of Peter the Great since the appearance of the 'Tsarstvovanie Petra Velikago' of Ustrialov, but few works have been comparable in value to the present diary, which now first appears, at all events in a complete form, in the original language. The editor, Mr. Gerhard Grove, secretary in the office of the state archives at Copenhagen, had previously published some extracts only. Portions had also appeared in *Russki Arkhiv* for 1892, translated into Russian by the then secretary of legation at Copenhagen, M. Stcherbachev. Juel made his journey during the period from 30 Aug. 1709 to 9 Oct. 1711. The year in which he appeared in Russia was a memorable one in the annals of northern Europe: it was that of the mad expedition into that country of Charles XII. Juel was despatched by his master, Frederick IV, as an envoy extraordinary. The Danish king was anxious to conciliate the rising power of Peter the Great, and to form an alliance of Denmark, Russia, Prussia, and Poland against the Swedes. From the beginning of their reigns Charles and Frederick of Denmark had been at variance. The instructions given to

the envoy are printed from the German original at the end of the volume. He was to attend Peter during his campaign. Juel thus saw the country soon after the battle of Poltava, and was travelling in it during the time of the disastrous expedition to the Pruth, of which he has much to tell us.

The Scandinavian peoples, who had a secret dread of the growing power of their Muscovite neighbour, were fond of employing agents to report upon the country. One of the most interesting accounts of Russia under the tsar Alexis was written by a renegade *diak*, or secretary, named Kotoshikhin, who entered the Swedish service, and drew up his information under the orders of the Swedish government. This document, of primary importance for Russian history, lay unknown in the archives of Stockholm till it was discovered about fifty years ago by a Russian savant. To return, however, to Juel. He was born at Viborg, in Denmark, in 1664 of a distinguished family. After some time spent in travel he entered the navy in 1684, and in 1689 became a lieutenant. We do not hear much of him from that time till his journey to Russia. After his return he was made vice-admiral. He was killed in a battle with the Swedes at Jasmund on 8 Aug. 1715. In his report of the battle to the king Admiral Raben, who was in command on that occasion, declared that his majesty had in Juel lost one of his best officers. The narrative is not in Juel's own handwriting, but in that of his secretary, who appears to have largely added to it. He has, however, here and there made corrections. The original is preserved in the Danish state archives.

It has been most carefully edited by Mr. Grove, who has furnished it with useful notes throughout; great pains have been taken to identify the persons alluded to by Juel, and many Russian words and customs are explained. It is also illustrated with some very good engravings, chiefly copied from Professor Brückner's 'Life of Peter the Great,' which has appeared both in German and Russian.

Juel shows himself everywhere to be a most observant traveller; his descriptions of the leading persons he met are graphic, and his remarks on the whole are singularly accurate, if we reflect what a *terra incognita* Russia was at that time to Western Europe. The narrative first becomes interesting when the envoy reaches Berlin, where he finds not only the king of Prussia, Frederick I, but Augustus I of Poland and his own sovereign, Frederick IV. He describes the festivities there and a French comedy which he witnessed. The august arrival of the three monarchs had been duly announced by celestial apparitions. There had been witnessed at Potsdam the sun, Saturn, and Venus in juxtaposition. The meeting of the kings formed the subject of a curious allegorical picture, of which an engraving is given. Of Berlin Juel says that it is a very pretty and agreeable city, very clean, and resembling a Dutch town. He was as fond of going to sermons as Mr. Pepys, and always gives us his opinion of the divines. It is to this propensity that we are indebted for his elaborate accounts of Orthodox ceremonies which he witnessed while in Russia. To these however, as we gather from the preface, large additions have been made by the secretary. He was interested in the languages of the countries through which he passed, and now and then tells us some curious things. Thus on his way to Danzig he stopped at a place called Lupow, where he spent the night in a comfortable inn. He heard a sermon in the parish

church, but tells us that the singing was in the Cassubish language, although, he adds, the greater part of the common people understood German. The service, in fact, seems to have been conducted partly in Cassubish and partly in German. This language or dialect—probably the former—has been shrinking in its area for a considerable time. It is still spoken by some 10,000 people near Danzig, chiefly employed as fishermen. In modern times it has reached the dignity of having a grammar and dictionary. At Königsberg he notices the curious custom that on one Sunday a Calvinist preaches and on the next a Lutheran, and so on alternately. It must have been as bewildering for the audience as university sermons.

Just about the time when he was entering Russia he heard the order of the tsar causing his subjects to cut off their beards. This was a desperate attempt to europeanise his people, as Peter thought. If a man wished to preserve the appendage, which enjoyed almost sacred honours in Russia, he must pay a tax, and as a guarantee of the privilege a medal was struck representing a bearded head. Some of these coins are still preserved in Russia.

At Narva our envoy went to hear a Russian service, and gives a long and accurate account of it. On a subsequent page his remarks—or those of his secretary—on the Raskolniks are quite correct.

> It is noticeable that a sect of schismatics is to be found in Russia called Roskolski (*sic*); these men entirely separate themselves from the other Russians and will have no communication with them. They were for a long time cruelly persecuted, so that many of them were burnt and expelled; but they are not persecuted any more. Their schism mostly lies in the fact that they neither eat nor drink with the other Russians, and consider it a deadly sin to cut the hair of their head or their beard. They cross themselves in a way which they say has been handed down from the time of Christ, which he himself practised, and likewise the patriarchs in the Old Testament in their benedictions. The other Russians cross themselves with the thumb, the fourth finger, and the little finger.

Before leaving Narva he gives us a description of the country seat there of Menshikov, now at the height of favour. He has also many interesting remarks on Esthonia. On 30 Nov. 1709 he has his first interview with Peter the Great, and presents his credentials. The regenerator of Russia is thus described:—

> As soon as I had paid him the customary compliments, he inquired through an interpreter about the health of my gracious lord and king, to which I replied with the customary thanks. He asked further if I had previously served at sea, to which I answered in the affirmative. He then at once placed himself at the table and ordered me to sit down by him. After this he continued his discourse without an interpreter, for he could speak Dutch, so that I could easily understand him, and I let him know that I was familiar with that language. He perfectly understood me when I replied to his questions. He conversed with me as familiarly as if he had been my equal and had known me many years. He then drank to the health of my gracious lord and king, and gave me with his own hand a glass of wine, that I might do the same.

This account exactly coincides with all that we read about Peter, who seemed to take a delight in breaking through the rules of court etiquette. Juel thus proceeds to describe the tsar: 'He is a very tall man, wears his

own hair, which is short, brown, and curly, with a rather large pair of moustaches; of careless dress and appearance, very sharp-witted and clever.' On 11 Dec., which was St. Andrew's Day, and therefore the festival of the saint who gave his name to the order, there was a grand banquet. The tsar showed our envoy some swords which had been taken from the Swedes at the battle of Poltava. Unfortunately on this occasion we are told that the patriarch Zotov got very drunk. There are, indeed, a good many of these bouts recorded. We have the story of one at Tver, at which ladies were present, for Peter had broken through the oriental seclusion of the Russian women, and the wife of the host offered Juel a glass of brandy. Later on our author describes the terrible convulsions to which Peter was subject at intervals. They are supposed to have been caused by attempts to poison him. The mention of the origin of the empress Catherine leads Mr. Grove to furnish us with a valuable note which shows us how carefully the book is edited. Of course the lowliness of her family was an open secret, and during Peter's reign none of the Skavronskis, as their name was, were admitted to court or in St. Petersburg; but we find that after the tsar's death they were ennobled and married to members of wealthy families. Other ladies of the tsar's family with whose names we meet are Peter's sister Natalia and Prascovia, the widow of his elder brother Ivan, who died in 1696.

Juel has much to tell us about Menshikov, with whom he was familiar. The favourite introduced our envoy to his wife, the unhappy woman who was destined to die of grief on her journey to Siberia. His account of the rise of Menshikov agrees with what we are generally told of him. He was a comely youth who sold *pyroger*, as our author calls them (Russ. *pirogi*), or little meat pies, about the streets of Moscow; to this day it is a favourite itinerant trade. He attracted the attention of Peter by his smartness, as the Americans would say, and was made his page. We can see how thoroughly this story was believed in Russia during Menshikov's lifetime. Juel gives us some curious descriptions of the Moscow of his day; the account of the *sloboda* is particularly good. This was that part of the city in which foreigners resided who did not keep the regular Russian fasts and follow other Slavonic usages. He argues with considerable learning upon the derivation of the word 'tsar.' Certainly his philology is most respectable for his day, a time, we must remember, in which very grotesque notions prevailed about the derivation of words. He—or perhaps his secretary, who has largely interpolated—has a pretty clear idea of what languages belong to the Slavonic family, but makes the mistake of including Hungarian among them. Even the tendency of the Russian language to insert additional vowels in some of the Slavonic words is noticed—e.g. *grad*, town, Russ. *gorod*, called by modern scholars *polnoglasie*. In fact throughout the diary we are struck by the accuracy with which he reproduces Slavonic names and sounds. But perhaps much of this is owing to the judicious secretary of the envoy. Juel's literary curiosity, always on the alert, leads him to go and see the new Russian type, which had been founded by order of Peter the Great; some of the letters of the old Cyrillic alphabet had been modified by the tsar himself, who wished to adapt them better to printing. He also

desired to get rid of one or two superfluous letters. Afterwards the secretary gives us specimens of the Russian cursive alphabet.

But it is not only literature and literary efforts which he chronicles; he is witness also of the rollicking and frequently less creditable side of the tsar. At one time he tells us of his dancing, at another of his terrible drinking bouts. But, after all, these were, if we may use the phrase, but mere parentheses in a very active life, however much they are to be regretted. Russian writers are correct in saying that if Peter had been merely a drunkard he could not have found time to leave behind him such splendid monuments of his reign. There are, indeed, plenty of stories of feastings in the book, and we are constantly reminded of George Turberville, who was secretary to the embassy in Russia in the days of Queen Elizabeth, and said of the Russians of his time—

> Drink is their sole desire, the pot is all their pride;
> The soberest head doth once a day stand needful of a guide.

Among other places visited by our author was Kiev, and when there he did not fail to go to the catacombs. Of these he gives an elaborate description. While he was in those regions they seem to have been visited with a terrible plague of locusts. Our author was in South Russia during Peter's unfortunate campaign against the Turks, which led, as is well known, to the abandonment of Azov, at the mouth of the Don, which he had greatly valued as opening up communication with the Black Sea. On this occasion, when surrounded by the Turks on the banks of the Pruth, he is said to have been extricated from his embarrassing position by the ingenuity of Catherine. Undoubtedly bribery played a great part on this occasion, and the vizier was induced to abandon his advantages; but here, as elsewhere, when we get to the contemporary accounts we find nothing to justify the story that Peter wrote a letter to the senate declaring that they were not to consider themselves bound by anything which he might sign, but were to regard him merely as a person in duress. In the diary there is a good plan of the relative position of the armies on the Pruth. In October 1711 Juel begins to quit the country. The backward route of our author lies through Poland, and gives him opportunities of describing Warsaw, Lemberg, Danzig, and Oliva and its celebrated monastery, in which the treaty was signed between the Poles and Swedes in 1660. Of Warsaw he says that it was a very handsome city, consisting of houses some of which were five or six stories high. He describes the statue of Sigismund III, which still stands in the ancient capital. There is also a good account of Thorn. If Juel does not contribute any new historical facts, he has given us a vigorous representation of court life in the reign of Peter. We see the tsar himself, his wife and other female relatives, and the chief families and officials. We also have a full description of the marriage of Anne, Peter's niece, who was afterwards empress, with the duke of Courland. He seems to have picked up all the information which he could obtain. He was at the burial of an officer of the Preobrazhenski regiment, and takes the opportunity to give us a long account of Russian funeral ceremonies; on another occasion we find him at the baptism of one of the children of Menshikov. Certainly

at the battle of Jasmund the king of Denmark lost not only a valiant captain but an exceedingly intelligent and honest man and a devoted subject. W. R. Morfill.

Geschichte des letzten Ministeriums Königin Annas von England (1710–1714) *und der englischen Thronfolgefrage.* Von Dr. Felix Salomon. (Gotha: F. A. Perthes. 1894.)

Pending an opportunity, such as I have long been looking forward to, of attempting yet one more connected survey of the transactions dealt with in this volume, I must content myself with recommending it to the attention of students of an epoch rightly described by Dr. Salomon as unique in political history. His purpose was not to write over again the history of the peace of Utrecht, nor to trace through their gradual development the whole of the processes which led to the accomplishment of the Hanoverian succession and to the downfall of the hopes of the house of Stuart. He rather set himself the special task of delineating the relations between the two questions of the succession and the peace, and of defining the influence which the progress of the one exercised upon that of the other. If the results achieved by his signally acute as well as careful treatment of this theme may not seem altogether commensurate with the labour that must have been expended upon reaching them, the remark seems permissible that, while many valuable rectifications have been effected by the way in the course of this inquiry, it could hardly, from the nature of the case, have led to results of more than approximate conclusiveness. For who expects that documentary evidence will be discovered by the most conscientious search, whether in the Paris archives or even among the Longleat papers, to which Dr. Salomon was refused access, of a nature to expose before our eyes clearly the whole minds of Oxford and Bolingbroke at the most important of the successive stages in the complicated proceedings discussed in this volume? Not the less is a sustained endeavour to construct a consistent chain of probabilities—often so strong as to be practically irresistible—a legitimate undertaking for an historical scholar who, like Dr. Salomon, while sparing no pains in the collection of materials, shows so much discretion in their use. Of the documents first printed by him none throws any absolutely new light upon the transactions discussed; on the other hand, even where, as in the case of the Gaultier correspondence, he has made use of materials already printed, the *data* presented by him range themselves under his marshalling with remarkable inferential force.

Perhaps at the same time a doubt may be hinted whether the first proposition (so to speak) in his *ctaena* is not a little over-elaborated. He wishes to show that the system of government which Oxford to the last kept in view, and which broke down when in the end he succumbed to Bolingbroke as the champion of a strong, united, and militant toryism, was that of an administration which should stand above party and therefore include both whig and tory elements. But though it is quite true that St. John shared Harley's dismissal in 1708, and was (at first rather hesitatingly) brought back by him to power in 1710, is it warranted to represent Harley as during the interval practically at the head of a

species of 'third party,' including not only St. John and Harcourt, but Atterbury and Bromley, and from the other side Peterborough and the great dukes of Shrewsbury, Somerset, and Argyle? Undoubtedly the current view, which credits Harley with the simple scheme of turning out the whigs and substituting the tories, requires very considerable modification, and ignores the fact that in the *first* four years of Queen Anne Godolphin and Marlborough had not been party ministers. But that Harley's 'system,' as understood by himself and by those with whom he acted, meant much more than a cautious undoing of the work of the *junta* is an assumption to which I should hesitate to assent. By the way, is there not a trace of confusion on p. 34, where Harley is said by placing Anglesey and Paulet in the privy council, from which Sunderland and Godolphin had been excluded, to have secured a majority for his 'group'? Is he really referring to the privy council, from which, of course, Sunderland and Godolphin had been by no means excluded, but to which they would not as a matter of practice be summoned, or to the cabinet council, the real arena of ministerial discussion? Nothing, I may observe, could form a more instructive contribution to the settlement of the much-vexed question of the cabinet council under Queen Anne than the report of the duc d'Aumont printed in one of the appendices to this volume. But although, as is there stated, it was customary for the members of the cabinet, in meetings held at the office of one of the secretaries of state, from which she as a matter of course remained absent, to prepare the business to be laid before the queen at the Monday cabinet, it does not follow that she *voted* at the cabinet meetings themselves, as (unless it be a mere *façon de parler*) Dr. Salomon's phrase, p. 284, seems to imply.

This narrative puts very effectively the difficulties that beset the task of concluding peace imposed upon Harley on his return to power in 1710, both by his own dispassionate judgment and by his sensitiveness to the current of public opinion. Not the least of these difficulties lay in the fact that the tories rather than the whigs were primarily responsible for the pronouncement that England would not consent to leaving any part of the Spanish monarchy in the possession of the house of Bourbon. Another difficulty was the political impotence (for such it virtually was) of the great general whom public opinion identified with the continuance of the war. Dr. Salomon's relation illustrates very strikingly the lack of self-directed will which in these eventful years caused Marlborough to drift towards the not very noble ending of his great career. But though there is reason for believing that he was ultimately distrusted by the house of Hanover and its friends, as he had been in turn by every political party, this distrust must have been provoked by documents (whether originally obtained through Bolingbroke or otherwise) more heinous than the rather vapouring letters to Berwick printed by Dr. Salomon in his appendix, which, if I understand his note to p. 241 rightly, he supposes the French government to have retained in order to use them, should occasion serve, as evidence against the great adversary of their country.

A candid review of the endeavours of Oxford, with which those of Bolingbroke up to a certain point coincided, in respect of the mutually connected problems of the peace and the succession, is more flattering to

the ingenuity than to what may be called the higher imaginative power of one if not both of these statesmen. Such a power, indeed, presupposes a generosity of spirit incompatible either with the narrow-mindedness that makes itself perceptible through all the literary culture of Oxford, or with the intense selfishness that vitiated the genius of Bolingbroke. Perhaps, too, it would have ill agreed with the 'philosophy' (to borrow an expression used, if I remember right, by Torcy) of not looking beyond the morrow, which is the lasting inheritance of parliamentary statesmanship. In any case 'the greatest disappointment,' as, following Weber, Dr. Salomon terms it, which befell the ministers during the peace negotiations was the news that King Philip of Spain had, contrary to their expectations, put an end to their elaborate plan of exchange, which would have satisfied everybody, including the hungry house of Savoy, by preferring his Spanish to a chance of the French inheritance. Oxford, believing implicitly in Torcy's assurances as to Philip's inclinations, had been unable to imagine more than one solution—the solution which he wished—and the result was the most blameworthy feature of the peace, viz. the acceptance by England of a renunciation that was no renunciation, in a trustful spirit of waiting upon Providence which sits ill upon diplomacy.

And in the matter of the succession what was it but a deplorable want of imagination which led Oxford, and Bolingbroke with and after him, to trust to a change of religion on the part of the Pretender? Could they not rise to the conviction that, whatever happened, this would be impossible to the son of James II and of Mary of Modena? Dr. Salomon has furnished extracts of unprecedented completeness from the Pretender's correspondence in the French archives of foreign affairs, which prove more amply than ever his absolute consistency on this subject—and, it may be added, on the whole do credit to the head as well as the heart of the unfortunate prince. But what were the hesitating calculations of Oxford and what was the very logical scheme of Bolingbroke worth, if the prince remained true to his standard of right? Oxford sooner, and later Bolingbroke, although he had from the first declared that in all protestant England there would not be a handful of men unprejudiced enough to be willing, like himself, to accept a catholic king, concluded that they were worth nothing at all. Bolingbroke fell back upon his endeavours to strengthen and unite the tory party, leaving the question of the succession to take care of itself; and, as Dr. Salomon says, the dramatic interest of the last few days of Queen Anne's life is in sober truth fictitious.

I trust to meet Dr. Salomon again in a field where his researches have already proved of incontestable value; and I have, therefore, abstained from any reference to the very interesting passages in this volume referring to the attitude of the house of Hanover, and of the elector George Lewis in particular, to the succession question and to the course of English politics in the last years of Queen Anne's reign. By the way, the 'bishopric' of Westminster on p. 217 should be the deanery; and the misprint of 'confirmity' for 'conformity' has not been corrected throughout. English historians are responsible for the misleading practice of citing the bill *against* occasional conformity as the 'Occasional Conformity Bill.'

A. W. Ward.

Gustavus III and his Contemporaries, 1746–1792. From Original Documents. By R. Nisbet Bain. 2 vols. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, & Co. 1894.)

Except during the dreary interval between the death of Charles XII and the accession of Gustavus III, all the Swedish sovereigns of the house of Vasa have possessed the quality of interest. There is not one whom a partial biographer might not conceivably select as the principal figure of a narrative. The life of Gustavus III is not only a subject upon which it is difficult to be dull, but it is one which a dull man would hardly think of attempting. Mr. Bain but justifies expectation by an exceedingly attractive book, a book without an uninteresting page.

Another circumstance which may be foretold with some confidence, when we have to deal with the biography of a prince of the house of Vasa, is a certain amount of partisanship. There is no resisting the spell of these exceptional natures. Even Voltaire was much more favourable to Charles XII than he should have been, and missed an opportunity which one would have deemed irresistible to a philosophic historian. Mr. Bain, who does not write from such a point of view, inevitably magnifies the character of his hero by the spirit with which he details an interminable series of extraordinary actions. It was the destiny of Gustavus to be always attempting something exceptional. He began with an extraordinary *coup d'état*, which, in an age of liberal principles, made him the absolute master of his dominions. Everything that happened to him afterwards, if not always fortunate or edifying, is at least striking. His chivalrous contest with Russia, the knight-errantry with which he took up the cause of the French monarchy, his contests with his nobility, his travels, the intrigues and scandals of his court, his tragic death, were all episodes of an exceptional nature. The historian who enters sufficiently into them to depict them with the animation evinced by Mr. Bain cannot resist the fascination of the hero of so many adventures. He puts him of necessity on a high pedestal, and it remains for a colder criticism to point out that after all the 'shining' Gustavus, unlike the great sovereigns of his house up to and including Charles XI, did not succeed in establishing anything permanent, and, except for his financial and judicial reforms, left his kingdom much as he had found it. He may be compared with Charles XII, even though his lively and cultivated intellect made excursions on all sides, while Charles cared for nothing but war. Had he really been a sovereign of the first class, he would have either subjugated or conciliated his refractory nobility. He never thoroughly overawed his opponents, or got himself fully accepted by his friends. Part of this may have been owing to his taste for dramatic amusements and other recreations, carried too far for the dignity of a monarch, but never preventing his displaying the accomplishments of a warrior when the exigencies of the state required. He might not be inaptly compared to the emperor Gallienus, except that he was free from the imputation of cruelty, and that none would have said of him that 'he possessed all arts except the art of reigning,' for if not always a sagacious he was still not an inconsiderable statesman.

Mr. Bain is a connoisseur of Swedish literature at first hand, and his

preface shows that he has had recourse to every available authority. He has no new views respecting Gustavus to propound, and his abstinence from paradoxical novelties is a proof of his good sense. A substantial unanimity now prevails among historians respecting the character as well as the actions of Gustavus; the differences still existing are rather of degree than of kind. Mr. Bain paints his hero in hues of richness and warmth, and, generally speaking, discerns him in a fairer light than the majority of biographers have found possible. This attitude is entirely favourable to his history from a literary point of view, greatly conducing to its prevalent spirit and animation; and we are not disinclined to admit its correctness. That there was something histrionic about the character of Gustavus must be admitted, but he was after all no such thorough actor as Napoleon; and what might appear an unreasonable devotion to literature was shared by the two greatest sovereigns of his day, Frederick and Catherine. If on some occasions, such as his visit to Italy, he appeared to little advantage, these ought not to obscure his heroic bearing in such supreme crises as his *coup d'état*, the battle of Svensksund, and his lingering death from the bullets and rusty nails of Ankarström. The greatest reproach to his memory, perhaps, is his inability either to extirpate or to appease the spirit of aristocratic faction, which so nearly proved the ruin of Sweden, as it had proved the ruin of Poland. Mr. Bain's view of the leading events and the leading men of Sweden appears to us entirely correct. Differences of opinion on minor points may easily exist; we may not, for example, feel so entirely satisfied of the legitimacy of Gustavus IV as he appears to be. The extinction, however, of the male descent of the house of Vasa has deprived the question of practical importance. Mr. Bain's style is lively and terse, and his book is throughout most readable. He not only succeeds with such dramatic episodes as Gustavus's death, but imparts a lively interest to such less promising themes as his financial reforms. His chief fault as a writer is one easily cured—indulgence in colloquial expressions below the dignity of history. One interesting and unexpected feature in Mr. Bain's work is his appendix on the literature of the period, an appropriate addendum, since Gustavus occupies a high rank among royal patrons of letters, not merely through his munificence to authors and his cordial fellow feeling with them, but through the catholicity with which he encouraged and rewarded merit, even when not in accordance with his individual taste.

R. GARNETT.

Mémoires du Général Baron Thiébault. III: 1799–1806. IV: 1806–1813. (Paris: Librairie Plon. 1894–5.)

THE third, like the preceding volumes of Thiébault's Memoirs, is a curious medley. Among tedious narratives of personal adventures and descriptions of personal sentiments, and a prodigious number of queer uncertified anecdotes, are to be found some military criticisms, some expressions of political opinion, and some trustworthy records of incidents within the writer's direct knowledge, which have an appreciable value for the patient historian. Although Thiébault did not take part in the actual fighting against Suvarov in 1799, his remarks on the Russian army of that time are probably based on the experience of his comrades.

He was secretary to Masséna during the celebrated siege of Genoa, but he does not describe it in this volume, having already made it the subject of a separate monograph. He served in the auxiliary force which the first consul sent in 1801 to assist the Spaniards against the Portuguese, but he has little to say about the expedition itself, although he draws a minute and unflattering portrait of his commander-in-chief, General Leclerc, husband of Pauline Bonaparte. He served again in the campaign of 1805, but it was not until the battle of Austerlitz that he was really in the thick of the conflict: at Austerlitz he was badly wounded after doing the most brilliant service which, thanks to the jealousy of Soult, never obtained due recognition; at least, this is Thiébault's version of the matter. Every student of military history knows how hopeless it is to determine on such occasions the relative merits of different corps and of different commanders.

Did we repose implicit faith in Thiébault's gossip, we should be forced to conclude that at the establishment of the consulate whatever chivalric ardour may once have inspired the generals of the republic had almost wholly disappeared, leaving behind little save rancour and unprincipled rivalry. But, since Thiébault was himself somewhat soured, we may abate something from these stories. Putting Bonaparte out of the question, he assigns the first place as commanders to Moreau and Masséna. The passage in which he contrasts their respective qualifications is one of the best in the third volume (pp. 260, 261). On his own showing, Moreau, if a profound and cautious strategist, was a boyish and impulsive politician who could not refrain from venting his rage against the first consul even in the presence of an utter stranger (p. 335). Thiébault's political sentiments were probably shared by the bulk of the army, or at least of the officers. He was a republican and a freethinker. He disliked the reconciliation with Rome. He states as his personal belief that France, but for Bonaparte's interference, was on the way to become protestant. This belief finds some support in statements made by contemporaries, but it is hard to believe that either Thiébault or they knew much about the French peasant or realised the power of tradition over the main body of the people. Thiébault also condemned Bonaparte's assumption of supreme power; but a firm repugnance for political conspiracy, the sense of military discipline, and the wonderful fascination of the man whom he neither loved nor trusted carried him along with his comrades. It is true that even as early as 1806 there were a few Frenchmen, like the M. Morin mentioned here (p. 541), who saw clearly the unsoundness of the Napoleonic system. But Thiébault owns that he himself had no such gift of prophecy.

For those who concern themselves with the history of the French possessions in the West Indies Thiébault's account of M. Chenais, the father of his second wife, affords some curious particulars. M. Chenais had been one of the greatest planters of St. Domingo. Thiébault assures us that he had at one time enjoyed an income equal to 31,000*l.* of English money, and that the commerce of France with the West Indies before the Revolution amounted to 700,000,000 francs a year.

The historical interest of the fourth volume begins with Thiébault's appointment as chief of the staff to Junot on the occasion of the invasion

of Portugal. He spent almost the whole of the following six years in the Peninsula, usually in important posts and not far from the chief theatre of the war. Here again his evidence must be received with caution, for his personal animosities, his self-complacency, and still more his national vanity colour every page of his narrative. Any disaster which befell the French was due either to inferiority of numbers or to the follies or dissensions of their chiefs, never to the merit of the adversaries, least of all to the merit of Wellington, whom *quelques niais* have mistaken for a great man. Thus he avers that at Vimeiro the French were only 9,200 strong, whilst Napier quotes a French order of battle showing that they numbered 14,000. Even so the English would have been outflanked, and probably destroyed, but for an inconceivable blunder of Junot. More confidence may be placed in his account of those internal vices which undermined the military power of France and which were most fully exhibited in the Peninsular war. Here Thiébault merely confirms and illustrates what has been told by many other writers. Were it not so we could hardly credit his description of the French chiefs, of their boundless self-indulgence, their insatiable greed of spoil, and their frantic rage for precedence. Thiébault piqued himself, perhaps justly, upon his zeal for the service and his consideration for the vanquished. As governor of Old Castile he won, he assures us, the esteem and gratitude of all conditions of men. Yet he relates with perfect simplicity and *intarissables regrets* a lost chance of making an immense fortune out of an infamous operation on Portuguese paper money. What, then, must have been the generals whom he considered unscrupulous?

F. C. Montague.

Essays in American History. By Henry Ferguson, M.A., Northern Professor of History and Political Science in Trinity College, Hartford. (New York: James Pott & Co. 1894.)

These essays belong to the same school of American history as the books of Mr. C. F. Adams, which I not long ago noticed in this Review. Mr. Ferguson and Mr. Adams have taken up, with fuller knowledge and far more of scholarly moderation, the work attempted a generation ago by Mr. Oliver in the 'Puritan Commonwealth.' All these represent a reaction against that sacred legend of New England history embodied in the writings of Mr. Bancroft and Mr. Palfrey. Mr. Ferguson, however, does not steer exactly the same course as Mr. Adams. The latter contended most emphatically for the view that sympathy of any kind was out of place in an historian: the ideal writer of history, according to him, strips himself of all enthusiasm. Convictions, whether political, patriotic, or religious, are a hindrance and a temptation to him. Mr. Ferguson, on the other hand, is not merely an iconoclast, but also a rehabilitator. Such at least he shows himself in two of his essays. The first, and I venture to think the most satisfactory, of his essays is on the 'Quakers in New England.' Mr. Ferguson here points out very forcibly how the struggle of puritan against churchman was a struggle not for toleration, but for ascendency. There is no great originality in that view for a generation which is outgrowing the teaching, shallow in this matter, of Hallam and Macaulay. But Mr. Ferguson states the case tersely and

effectively, and he shows how puritan intolerance, latent and seminal in England, became a full-blown plant in its new home. He points out too very clearly and with much force that many of those outrages on decency which New England historians have pleaded as an excuse for the maltreatment of the Quakers really followed that maltreatment. The second essay, on 'Salem Witchcraft,' deals with a subject so trite that there is little room for novelty. But no part of the book better illustrates the writer's moderation of tone and impartiality.

In the two remaining essays, on 'Sir Edmund Andros' and on the 'Loyalists in the War of Independence,' the writer in some measure abandons the part of a mere critic for that of an advocate. There is no attempt to present a coloured or one-sided statement of facts. Indeed, in thoroughness of research Mr. Ferguson compares favourably with most of those writers who have taken the opposite side. But it may be doubted whether an impartial jury would consider that in either instance Mr. Ferguson had made out his case. According to him Andros was a capable administrator thwarted by the ignorance and prejudices of those whom he ruled. 'The truth seems to be that Andros was shocked and scandalised at the loose, happy-go-lucky way of doing business that had up to that time served the colonies.' 'They' (the New Englanders) 'did not want to be improved; they had no desire for any more efficient or regular administration than they were accustomed to. They preferred managing their own affairs badly to having them done for them, were it ever so well.' The polity of Massachusetts, with its elaborate system of little town commonwealths, seems, measured by ordinary tests, to have served very satisfactorily all the main purposes for which government exists; nor is there, as far as I can see, one tittle of proof that any system which Andros was likely to introduce would be either in principle or in detail a better one. The best evidence of what the civic qualities of the New Englander trained by local government really were is to be found in the fact that after the expulsion of Andros the country did not show the slightest tendency to lapse into anarchy. Mr. Ferguson, too, gives credit to Andros and his master, James II, for their attempt to consolidate the colonies into a single province. It needed no special perception to see that such union was expedient both for military and administrative ends. The necessity for such union was an official commonplace at the end of the seventeenth century. Assuredly it showed very little wisdom to attempt to effect such union by the cast-iron methods used by the English government. But statesmanship might have been shown in an attempt to bring about such union without overriding local prejudices or uprooting such political life as already existed.

The first essay, that on the 'Loyalists,' is marked by the same merits, and I think by the same defects. As Mr. Ferguson has shown that Andros was an honest official, well-intentioned and not unkindly, so he has little difficulty in showing that the despised and reviled 'tories' were many of them high-minded and honourable men, that to some of them the good name and the prosperity of America were just as dear as they were to any heady young patriot who sat at the feet of Warren. But Mr. Ferguson cannot explain away the fact that the loyalists wholly failed to organise any kind of effective resistance, or to influence public opinion even by

legitimate means. Nothing, for example, could be weaker than the way in which, at the time of the first congress, the loyalists of Georgia suffered the representatives of three towns to assume the position of colonial delegates, and thus allowed their colony to be, so to speak, captured and annexed by the national party. It is significant too that the one colony in which the English cause had really some effective body of popular feeling at its back was North Carolina, in all ways the most behindhand and least civilised of the colonies.

But, though one may differ a good deal from Mr. Ferguson's conclusions, one cannot regret that his book has been written. Not only has he, like his fellow worker in the same field, Mr. Adams, pushed away many fallacies, but even where he has, as I venture to think, exaggerated, his exaggerations are not unprofitable. American history has suffered in the past because the writers of it have been maintaining an accepted thesis before a convinced audience. Sound views will gain and not lose in being criticised by a 'devil's advocate' as learned, as argumentative, and as temperate as Mr. Ferguson. J. A. Doyle.

Die Begründung des deutschen Reiches durch Wilhelm I. Von Heinrich von Sybel. Band VII. (München: R. Oldenbourg. 1894.)

This last instalment of Dr. von Sybel's great work on the foundation of the German empire has been produced under the same disadvantages as those which accompanied the composition of the sixth volume. The archives of the German foreign office continued to be closed to the author's researches, so that his account can hardly be described as final. It is unfortunate too, as he points out in his preface, that the present volume was printed before the appearance of M. Emile Ollivier's 'L'Empire Libéral,' which to a certain extent covers the same ground as Dr. von Sybel's narrative. But, in spite of these unavoidable drawbacks, this portion of the book is extremely interesting to all who wish to understand the Prussian version of the events which led up to the war of 1870. The volume falls by a natural division into two parts. The former deals with the domestic affairs of Germany, the history of the Zollparlament of 1868, the growth of socialism and clericalism—those twin forces which were to give so much trouble to the young empire a few years later—and contains an outline of the changes in French politics which culminated in the appointment of the duc de Gramont as minister of foreign affairs in May 1870. The latter part is entirely occupied with a lengthy discussion of the causes which produced the war. Some idea of the minuteness with which this portion of the story is told may be gathered from the fact that no fewer than 180 pages are devoted to the events of twelve days. The volume closes with an elaborate explanation of the various reasons which induced the other great powers to remain neutral.

The chapters upon the internal affairs of Germany during the period immediately preceding the war contain much that is usually ignored by writers, but which is of considerable interest in the light of recent history. We are given an account, for example, of the proposal for payment of members in 1868, which was then defeated, but has been adopted in principle by a majority of the Reichstag during the present year. We find

the present chancellor, Prince Hohenlohe, elected, in spite of clerical opposition, as first of the two vice-presidents of the Zollparlament of 1868. It is noticeable that, in commenting upon the deliberations of that body, Dr. von Sybel expresses the opinion that it did very little for the realisation of German unity, and thinks that the influence of the Zollverein in that direction has been unduly magnified by historians. We could have wished for a more detailed account of the rise of social democracy in Germany, which awakened little interest previous to 1848, but which had its spokesmen in parliament twenty years later. But, beyond a rather meagre sketch of Marx, Liebknecht, and Bebel, we are told little about the infancy of perhaps the most important movement in modern Germany. Dr. von Sybel concludes his summary with the prophecy that, if communism ever come in sight, the German nation, like France in 1851, will throw itself into the arms of a dictator and beg him to suspend its political rights till the danger be past.

The story of the Hohenzollern candidature is set out with great clearness. Dr. von Sybel lays down three propositions on the subject. In the first place he points out that the idea occurred originally not to a Prussian at all, but to the Spanish statesman Salazar, a man of liberal views, who was in no sense, as asserted by the duc de Gramont, a Prussian agent. In the second place he reminds us that Prince Leopold never sought the candidature, but, on the contrary, refused it three times and only yielded on the fourth appeal. Thirdly, he shows that, according to the Hohenzollern family law, there was no legal necessity for the prince to obtain the consent of the king of Prussia to his candidature. He controverts in great detail the famous story of the falsification of the Ems telegram ; but he admits, on the authority of Moltke, that the effect of the original message was entirely altered by Bismarck's editing. Bismarck read his version aloud to Moltke and Roon. Roon said, 'That sounds better.' Moltke added, *Vorhin klang es wie Chamade, jetzt wie eine Fanfare* (p. 331).

Although he shows a bias against France, the author is not unfair to Napoleon III. His pet aversion is the duc de Gramont, upon whom he lays the chief blame for the war, and whose animosity to Bismarck he traces to the latter's concise description of him as 'the greatest blockhead in Europe.' He fully admits the French emperor's desire for peace, which he advocated as late as the historic cabinet council on the morning of 14 July, on which occasion Gramont threatened to resign if the emperor's suggestion of a congress were repeated. Napoleon himself confessed to Queen Sophie of Holland that he had never desired the war, but had been forced to it by the pressure of public opinion, which, as so shrewd an observer as Lord Lyons remarked, was irresistible in Paris, although by no means strong in the provinces. The author's comments upon the attitude of Great Britain at the outbreak of the contest seem, however, to be quite unjustifiable. He appears to think that it was the duty of our government to join in a quarrel in which it had no concern, and argues that it would have been in the interests of humanity had we espoused the cause of Prussia. In that case, he thinks, Napoleon would have been strengthened in his opposition to the war party and peace might have been secured.

The volume is distinguished, like those which preceded it, by several 'purple patches' of rhetoric. There is a fine bit of descriptive writing on the commencement of the war (pp. 356–8), and the character sketches of Pius IX, of Lasker, of the duc de Gramont, and of Ollivier are in Dr. von Sybel's best style. His work will long be the standard book upon the great subject which he chose for his study.[1] W. MILLER.

Parliamentary Government in England: its Origin, Development, and Practical Operation. By the late ALPHEUS TODD, LL.D., C.M.G., Librarian of Parliament for the Dominion of Canada. New edition, abridged and revised by SPENCER WALPOLE. 2 vols. (London: Sampson Low, Marston, & Co. 1892.)

Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies. By ALPHEUS TODD, LL.D., C.M.G. Second edition, edited by his Son. (London: Longmans & Co. 1894.)

THE first of these two valuable books is too well known to require any special recommendation. Mr. Spencer Walpole's edition is more compact and convenient than the original work, and he has been able to reduce the bulk by avoiding the repetitions which arose from the fact of the work having been originally published (1867 and 1869) in two separate parts, each of which the author wished to make complete in itself. The editor has also not scrupled to omit the political opinions of the author, leaving the facts and arguments to speak for themselves: *e.g.* Dr. Todd's predictions of the consequences of the Reform Act of 1867 have been suppressed, 'because, in the first place, they do not seem to have been verified by the result; and, in the next place, whether right or wrong, they are apparently out of place in a grave constitutional treatise.'

The first edition of the work on the colonies appeared in 1880. 'In the present work the editor has—to his utmost endeavour—embodied important legislation, illustrative of the author's constitutional doctrines, in Canada and other colonies, covering the past ten years—the period since the author's demise.' Dr. Todd died in the beginning of 1884. (The same misuse of the term 'demise' occurs on p. 60, 'the cabinet was dissolved through the demise of its leader,' where 'decease' is meant.) The constitutional doctrine on which Dr. Todd laid special stress was the continued importance of the political functions of the crown, which, he says, 'are too frequently assumed to have been wholly obliterated wherever a parliamentary government has been established' (p. xiii). With regard to the power of the crown in such matters as the dismissal of ministers, Dr. Todd seems to rest his case rather too much on the official or semi-official utterances of public men, who are of course bound to speak according to the formal theory of the constitution, from which theory the *de facto* distribution of power may have come to deviate considerably. At least Dr. Todd's account of the British constitution tends to minimise the actual changes in the relative powers of crown, parliament, and electorate which have taken place between the time of George III and the present reign. In his account of the functions of the crown in the self-governing colonies, whether those exercised directly through the secretary of state

[1] This review was printed before the eminent historian's death.

or those exercised indirectly through the colonial governors or lieutenant-governors, he is dealing with facts of recent history, and, so far as Canada is concerned, with facts regarding which he had very special means of information; and although his theory of the constitution is very prominent, there does not appear to be any undue bias in his description of imperial control over colonial legislation and administration. Among the additions of the editor may be specially noted the very full account of the Jesuit estate question in Canada. As might be expected, the volume deals more fully with Canadian affairs than with those of the other colonies; but as the Canadian constitution, being federal, is more complex than those of the other colonies, this is no disadvantage, but the reverse. An appendix gives the British North America Act of 1867, with the supplementary acts passed in 1871, 1875, and 1886. There are also lists of the successive governors and prime ministers of the Dominion of Canada, of the Australasian colonies, and of the Cape. Both works have full indexes.

D. G. Ritchie.

In writing *A History of Germany in the Middle Ages* (London and New York: George Bell & Sons, 1894), Dr. Ernest F. Henderson should have considered more carefully the scale on which to plan it. It is too small in bulk to be complete and exhaustive; it enters too much into detail for the main features of the history to appear. The reader who has not much previous knowledge is therefore likely to lose his sense of proportion. Thus the divorce of Lothar and Teutberga is made to fill three pages, while the whole reign of Otto III is dismissed in eight. In a work of such limits it is impossible adequately to sketch characters, or describe the greater events, without some sacrifice of detail. The writer's short account of the authorities is a good piece of work; but we expect a high standard both of power and knowledge in a writer who speaks of 'Bryce's Essay' as 'the merest fleeting sketch.' And, judged by such a standard, the work falls short both in general grasp and in specific knowledge. Inaccuracies abound, and the spelling of proper names varies from page to page. 'Richard Cornwallis' for Richard of Cornwall in a book written in English is unpardonable. Moreover maps are absolutely essential for a history of the period, and perhaps the treatment of territorial matters is the least satisfactory part of the work, while it is the most difficult side of German history.

In the prefatory note to *The French Revolution tested by Mirabeau's Career* (Chicago: Callaghan & Co.; London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, & Co., 1894) Mr. von Holst reminds his readers that they are to expect 'not a book on the French Revolution, but merely some lectures on it.' Regarding his work from this point of view, we can heartily commend it to those who wish to have a spirited view of the career of the only statesman of the Revolution. The tragedy of the situation is admirably impressed on us, though it may be doubted whether the absolute certainty of the catastrophe is adequately conveyed. Mr. von Holst, indeed, lays full stress on the stupidity of Louis XVI and the prejudices of the queen, but the causes of Mirabeau's failure to convert them to his wise policy lay deeper than that. Stupid and prejudiced people may possibly grasp a hand held out to save them under the stress of dire calamity. It is when their antipathies are strongly enlisted

against the cause advocated by the man offering to save them that the case is hopeless. That Mirabeau should have perceived that without a government the revolution must drift into anarchy is to the credit of his marvellous perspicacity; but if Mr. von Holst had dwelt more than he has done on Louis's strong feelings against the equalitarian principles of the assembly he would not have been quite so hard on the vastly inferior men who rejected the leadership even of a Mirabeau, when he attempted to establish authority in the person of a king whom they instinctively felt to be hostile to their aims.

In *Documenti su lo sbarco, la cattura e la morte di Re Gioacchino Murat al Pizzo* (Palermo: Reber, 1895) Dr. Travali has printed from the state archives at Palermo the official reports on the capture and execution of the unfortunate king.

The third and concluding volume of Dr. Sharpe's *London and the Kingdom* (London: Longmans & Co., 1895) follows very much in the steps of its predecessors. There is a good deal about the city, and a good deal about the kingdom; but the author somehow fails to handle his knowledge with dexterity, and the result is dreary and disappointing.

A reprint of Sir J. R. Seeley's *Lectures and Essays* (London: Macmillan, 1895) will be generally welcomed. From an historical point of view the three lectures on Roman imperialism and the essay on Milton's political opinions are the most attractive. The three lectures, too, may serve as an excellent illustration of Seeley's merits and defects as an historian. On the one hand the clear-sightedness which enabled him to single out the important from the less important is displayed in his argument that the rise of the empire was brought about by military necessities, and not by any growth of democratic sentiment. On the other hand in fixing on the decline of population as the special cause of the failure of the empire, he displays the tendency, often traceable in his other writings, to gain effect—no doubt unconsciously—by neglecting secondary causes, and by throwing brilliant light on the one which he considers to be primary. He does not ask, for instance, whether slavery had anything to do with the decline of population or not, just as in his most noted work, 'The Expansion of England,' he lays no stress on the fact that communities separated by the sea are likely to be less united in feeling than communities with no such separating barrier.

Last year (vol. ix. 601) we noticed the *Index to the Periodical Literature of the World* for 1893. Its successor, for which Miss Hetherington is likewise responsible, bears the title *Index to the Periodicals of* 1894 (London: 125 Fleet Street, 1895); but it is not stated, as it should have been, that the work is now limited to publications issued in the English language. The limitation is probably wise, for it was impossible to deal with the whole range of periodical literature satisfactorily. For the same reason, no doubt, the number of publications indexed has been enormously reduced, though this fact, again, is not mentioned in the preface. The change, however, is certainly advantageous, since the eye is no longer so much distracted from the more important entries by a multitude of comparatively trivial ones. For practical purposes the index, as now arranged, is likely to be still more serviceable than its predecessors.

Periodical Notices

[Contributions to these Notices, whether regular or occasional, are invited. They should be drawn up on the pattern of those printed below, and addressed to Mr. R. L. Poole, at Oxford, by the first week in March, June, September, and December.]

On the method of editing historical materials: by T. Lindner [who advocates their publication without comment in order (1) to avoid creating a prepossession on the reader's part in favour of any particular views, (2) to avoid becoming rapidly superseded, and (3) to save expense and time. Introductions should be rigidly limited to the discussion of the transmission of the text, notices of the writer, and the placing of undated documents and examination of their genuineness ; notes, to the identification of names, the explanation of difficult words, and occasional references].—Mitth. Inst. Oesterreich. Gesch.-forsch. xvi. 3.

On the manuscripts of Procopius: by J. Haury.—SB. Bayer. Akad. Wiss., phil.-hist. Cl., 1895. 1.

On the Carolingian imperial annals [741–829] *and their redacted form*: by F. Kurze. III. 1: The annals published between 795 and 813. 2: The second half of the imperial annals [of which the part down to 820 is here attributed to Einhard]. 3: The redacted form [the 'Annales Einhardi,' which are here considered not to be by Einhard, who is claimed as the author of the first part of the 'Annales Fuldenses,' but by some Low-German writer].—N. Arch. xxi. 1.

Note on the 'Formulae Augienses:' by E. Dümmler [dealing with questions of their possible authorship, and conjecturing two of the letters to be by Walahfrid Strabo].—N. Arch. xxi. 1.

John XIII's bull for Meissen [2 Jan. 968]: by K. Uhlirz [who maintains that such a bull was issued, although the extant document is forged on the model of one for Hersfeld bearing the same date].—Mitth. Inst. Oesterreich. Gesch.-forsch. xvi. 3.

The chronicles of Frutolf of Bamberg and of Ekkehard of Aura: by H. Bresslau [who attributes the first recension of Ekkehard's chronicle extending to 1101, to Frutolf, prior of Michelsberg, Bamberg, and relates what is known about Frutolf and his other writings].—N. Arch. xxi. 1.

Notes on the history of the library of the monastery of Michelsberg at Bamberg: by H. Bresslau [who prints catalogues of the twelfth and fifteenth centuries and other documents].—N. Arch. xxi. 1.

Books of formulae in the Graz university library [John of Bologna's 'Summa Notarie' and Laurence de Sumelone's 'Summa']: by J. Loserth.—N. Arch. xxi. 1.

Notes on the 'Provinciale' in Tangl's 'Päpstliche Kanzleiordnungen:' by K. Eubel.—Hist. Jahrb. xvi. 2.

Unpublished letters and memoirs of Marino Sanudo the elder [1334–1336-7]: described and printed by C. de la Roncière and L. Dorez. [They concern the crusade against the Turks, the relations of the Tartars with the pope, the schism of Lewis of Bavaria, and the literary, artistic, and commercial intercourse between Venice and Flanders.]—Bibl. École Chartes, lvi. 1, 2.

The medieval service books of Aquitaine: by R. Twigge. II: Auch.—Dublin Rev., N.S., 15. *July*.

The official minutes of the proceedings of the council of Basel: by J. Haller [who decides that the 'Liber diurnus Petri Bruneti' (Paris MS. Lat. 15623–4) is not, as R. Beer maintains, a fair copy compiled from the notary's collectanea, but a copy

of the official minutes of the council ('Acta concilii') made for the use of the notary. A description is given of another manuscript (Vatican MS. Regin. 1017) which in part agrees with it].—Hist. Zft. lxxiv. 3.

Documents relating to the council of Basel: printed from the state archives at Basel by R. THOMMEN].—Anz. Schweiz. Gesch. 1895. 3.

The Breton book of hours of the sixteenth century: by L. DELISLE [who assigns it to the diocese of St. Pol de Léon, and prints the list of confessors, &c., and typical names from the calendar].—Bibl. École Chartes, lvi. 1, 2.

Inventory of the castle of Quart in the valley of Aosta [1557]: printed with an elaborate commentary by C. MERKEL.—Bull. Ist. stor. Ital. xv.

The historical geography of the Holy Land [in connexion with G. A. Smith's work]. Church Qu. Rev. 80. *July.*

The archæology of the Pentateuch: by major C. R. CONDER.—Scott. Rev. 51. *July.*

The chronology of the kings of Israel and Judah: by F. RÜHL.—D. Zft. Gesch.-wiss. xii. 1.

Croesus at the stake: by F. KOEPP [giving reasons for believing that there was a story about the Lydian king's offering himself to the gods as a sacrifice in the fire, in order not to survive his defeat, and suggesting that Herodotus' statement that Cyrus condemned him to be burnt grew up out of this].—Hist. Zft. lxxiv. 3.

The feast of Hanoucca: by S. KRAUSS.—Rev. Études Juives, 59, 60.

Landed estates among the Romans: by A. SCHULTEN. II.—Zft. Soc.-Wirthsch.-Gesch. iii. 3, 4.

On the legends of Constantine the Great's youth: by E. HEYDENREICH.—D. Zft. Gesch.-wiss. xii. 1.

The Christian clergy in the middle of the fourth century: by P. ALLARD. I: The social and political position of the bishops. II: Their popularity. III: The condition and the privileges of the clergy. IV: The earliest monastic foundations.—Rev. Quest. hist. lviii. 1. *July.*

The Greek churches, 'autonomous and autocephalous' [451–1885]: by the baron A. D'AVRIL.—Rev. Quest. hist. lviii. 1. *July.*

St. Sophia, Constantinople: by R. W. SCHULZ.—Scott. Rev. 51. *July.*

The influence of Mohammedanism on civilisation.—Quart. Rev. 363. *July.*

The indebtedness of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite to the Neoplatonist Proclus for his doctrine of evil: by J. STIGLMAYR.—Hist. Jahrb. xvi. 2.

Pippin's promissio of 754 *and its renewal by Charles the Great*: by E. SACKUR [seeking to reconcile the 'ista Italia provincia' of the 'Vita Stephani II' with the precise delimitation given in the 'Vita Hadriani' (the authenticity of which is accepted) by regarding the latter as a description of the frontier between the Byzantine and Lombard territories as they had been down to the time of Authari; in other words, of the northern boundary of the Italian province as it was after the first stage in the Lombard conquests].—Mitth.Inst.Oesterreich.Gesch.-forsch.xvi.3.

Hadrian I's defence of the second synod of Nicea against the attacks of Charles the Great: by K. HAMPE.—N. Arch. xxi. 1.

The treaties of the popes with the Carolings, and the new empire: by W. SICKEL. VII: The empire.—Deutsche Zft. Gesch.-wiss. xii. 1.

The 'interventions' in the documents of Otto III down to the death of the empress Theophanu [as illustrating the respective influence of the empress Adelaide, of Theophanu, and of archbishop Willigis]: by K. UHLIRZ.—N. Arch. xxi. 1.

Two Icelandic law cases from the Eigla [relating to inheritance]: by K. MAURER.—SB. Bayer. Akad. Wiss., phil.-hist. Cl. 1895, 1.

Gregory VII was not a monk: by W. MARTENS [who reasserts and defends his view against P. Scheffer-Boichorst].—Hist. Jahrb. xvi. 2.

Hildebrand a monastic cardinal: by H. GRAUERT [who maintains that Gregory was a monk, and adduces illustrations of the extent to which it was possible for monastic dignitaries to be exempted from the obligations of their rule].—Hist. Jahrb. xvi. 2.

Innocent III and the right of taxing the laity for the purposes of the crusade: by A.

Gottlob [who holds that Innocent asserted their moral duty, not their legal obligation, to pay such taxes].—Hist. Jahrb. xvi. 2.

St. Francis of Assisi.—Church Qu. Rev. 80. *July.*

On the history of the county of the Upper Engadine [in the thirteenth century]: by F. L. Baumann.—Mitth. Inst. Oesterreich. Gesch.-forsch. xvi. 3.

The suppression of the Templars: by G. Salvèmini [a summary and criticism of recent works on this subject].—Arch. stor. Ital. 5th S. xv.

The date of the death of Nicolas de Lyra (Lire): by J. Viard [who supports 1349 against 1340].—Bibl. École Chartes, lvi. 1, 2.

The alliance between Alexander VI and Louis XII: by L. G. Pélissier [with numerous documents of 1498–9]. Continued.—Arch. della R. Soc. Rom. xviii. 1, 2.

The family of John de Lasco: by C. Pascal.—Bull. Soc. Hist. Protest. Franç. xliv. 5, 6. *May, June.*

The political relations between Venice and Savoy [down to 1642; relating specially to the Savoyard claim on Cyprus]: by G. Claretta.—N. Arch. Ven. ix. 2.

The Spanish armada [in connexion with J. K. Laughton's collection of 'State Papers'].—Quart. Rev. 363. *July.*

The legal position and constitution of Old Gothenburg [1603–1612]: by K. Maurer.—D. Zft. Gesch.-wiss. xii. 1.

Richelieu's aims upon the principality of Orange [1625 1630]: by A. Waddington.—Rev. hist. lviii. 2. *July.*

Urban VIII and Gustavus Adolphus: by S. Ehses [printing a letter of 14 Dec. 1632].—Hist. Jahrb. xvi. 2.

Sir Andrew Melville [the 'chevalier de Melvill,' 1621–1706, his family and his services on the continent].—Scott. Rev. 51. *July.*

The naval battle of the Dardanelles [26 June, 1656, as illustrated by an unpublished plan by P. Passionei, a knight of Malta and a combatant].—N. Arch. Ven. ix. 2.

Elizabeth Charlotte, princess palatine, duchess of Orleans, mother of the regent, and her correspondence with her aunt Sophia, electress of Hanover: by G. Depping. III.—Rev. hist. lviii. 2. *July* (continued from vol. lvi. 1).

Extracts from the diplomatic correspondence about Russia during the eighteenth century [on the reign of Anne and the accession of Elizabeth, chiefly from the correspondence of the English ambassadors, Rondeau and Finch].—Russk. Starina *July, August.*

Carvalho, marquis of Pombal: by count J. du Hamel de Breuïl.—Rev. hist. lix. 1. *Sept.*

Frederick the Great and lord Bute in 1762: by A. von Ruville [who defends the English minister against the charge of bad faith in connexion with the secret overtures made to Maria Theresa].—D. Zft. Gesch.-wiss. xii. 1.

The relations between the Abyssinians and the Russians during the last century: by A. Lvov [a letter is given from the patriarch of Alexandria written on their behalf to the empress Elizabeth].—Istorich. Viestnik. *August.*

Catherine II and the French Revolution: by A. Brückner.—Istorich. Viestnik. *August.*

Articles from the 'Bulletin Hélvétique' of 1800 relating to the union of Geneva with France: reprinted by J. Strickler.—Anz. Schweiz. Gesch. 1895. 3.

Letter of Lucchesini to Haugwitz [10 Jan. 1803] [relating to Napoleon's overtures to the Bourbon princes]: printed with a commentary by P. B.—Hist. Zft. lxxiv. 3.

The Russian embassy to Japan at the beginning of the nineteenth century: by K. Voyenski [on the embassy of Rezanov during the years 1803–1805].—Russk. Starina. *July.*

Wilhelm von Humboldt as ambassador in Vienna [1810–1813]: by B. Gebhardt.—D. Zft. Gesch.-wiss. xii. 1.

The life and correspondence of sir Bartle Frere.—Edinb. Rev. 373. *July.*

Prince V. Cherkaski and the civil administration of Bulgaria during the years 1877–1878: by D. Anuchin [continued].—Russk. Starina. *Aug.*

France

Villard of Honnecourt, the architect: by C. Enlart [who accounts for the wide extent of his activity by the hypothesis of his having been in the service of the Cistercians].—Bibl. École Chartes, lvi. 1, 2.

Louis VIII and the Jews: by I. Lévi.—Rev. Études Juives, 60.

Thomas de la Marche, bastard of France [c. 1322–1361]: by M. Boudet.—Rev. hist. lix. 1. *Sept.*

The date of Bertrand du Guesclin's knighting [not 1354 but 1357]: by J. Lemoine.—Bibl. École Chartes, lvi. 1, 2.

The siege of Rheims [1359–1360]: by H. Moranvillé.—Bibl. École Chartes, lvi. 1, 2.

Jean de la Roche, a captain of routiers under Charles VII: by G. Clément-Simon.—Rev. Quest. hist. lviii. 1. *July.*

The trade relations of France in the later middle ages: by C. de la Roncière. I: Defensive protectionism [1444–1467]. II: Armed protectionism 1467–1483].—Rev. Quest. hist. lviii. 1. *July.*

Jean Meschinot, his life and works; his satires against Louis XI: by A. de la Borderie [with documents and extracts].—Bibl. École Chartes, lvi. 1, 2.

Protestantism in La Rochelle and the isle of Ré: by various writers [with documents and illustrations].—Bull. Soc. Hist. Protest. Franç. xliv. 7–9. *July–Sept.*

The bourgeoisie of La Rochelle in the eighteenth century: by J. Périer [pointing out that the town owes its remarkable commercial development during the eighteenth century chiefly to its bourgeoisie. An examination of the characteristics of the merchants of La Rochelle during the period shows that this result was chiefly due to the penal laws which left commerce the only pursuit open to the Huguenots].—Ann. Sciences polit. x. 4. *July.*

The foreign policy of France in 1756: by R. Waddington.—Rev. hist. lviii. 2. *July.*

Small holdings in France before the revolution, and the sale of national property: by J. Loutchitsky [giving the results of an examination of the archives of selected departments, to show the extent to which the peasantry owned land and to which they benefited by the sale of the property of the church and of the *émigrés*].—Rev. hist. lix. 1. *Sept.*

A revolutionary poem in 1779 [the Mois of Roucher]: by Louis Amiable.—Révol. Franç. xv. 2, 3. *Aug., Sept.*

The tactics and ideas of the parliamentary opposition [1788–1789]: by H. Carre [based on the important and hitherto unpublished correspondence of Cortot and Godard]. Révol. Franç. xv. 2. *Aug.*

Ignace Joseph de Brosse created marquis de Montandre by Louis XVI [27 May 1789]: by L. Audiat [who claims that Brosse was a clever impostor].—Rev. Quest. hist. lviii. 1. *July.*

The missing cahiers of 1789 [enumerated]: F. A. Aulard.—Révol. Franç. xv. 2. *Aug.*

Mirabeau's military service: by A. Brette [showing that he was only nominally captain of dragoons].—Révol. Franç. xv. 3. *Sept.*

The revolution in Périgord from the notes and correspondence of the abbé Pierre Lespine [†1831]: by L. de Lanzac de Laborie.—Rev. Quest. hist. lviii. 1. *July.*

Nine unpublished letters of Madame Roland to Champagneux [29 March–12 Oct. 1791]: published by C. Perroud.—Révol. Franç. xv. 2. *Aug.*

The mission of Laplanche in the Cher: by T. H. Lemas.—Révol. Franç. xiv. 12, xv. 1. *June, July.*

The dates of the execution of Madame Roland and of the suicide of Roland: by C. Perroud [proving that Madame Roland died on 8 Nov. and Roland on 10 Nov., 1793].—Révol. Franç. xv. 1. *July.*

The memoirs of Barras: by F. A. Aulard.—Révol. Franç. xv. 1. *July.*

The Chouans in La Manche: by V. Jeanvrot [based chiefly on Sarot's 'Les Tribunaux répressifs ordinaires de la Manche').—Révol. Franç. xv. 1. *July.*

André Réville [1867–1894]: by C. Petit-Dutaillis.—Bibl. École Chartes, lvi. 1, 2.

Germany and Austria-Hungary

On the authorities for Thuringian history: by O. Holder-Egger. III: The transmission of the text of the chronicle of Reinhardsbrunn and the works derived from it.—N. Arch. xxi. 1.

Recent literature on the history of German towns: by K. Uhlirz (continued).—Mitth. Inst. Oesterreich. Gesch.-forsch. xvi. 3.

German notices from the English pipe rolls [1158–1171]: by F. Liebermann.—N. Arch. xxi. 1.

Sigmar and Bernhard of Kremsmünster; a criticism of the materials for the history of Kremsmünster in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries: by J. Loserth.—Arch. Oesterreich. Gesch. lxxxi. 2.

Corruption and benefice-hunting at the court of Albert I and Henry VII: by S. Herzberg-Fränkel [with documents].—Mitth. Inst. Oesterreich. Gesch.-forsch. xvi. 3.

Contributions to the history of Upper Hungary: by F. von Krones. I: Documents from the municipal archives at Kaschau [1444–1491]. II: On the history of the royal free town of Zeben [1370–1770]. III: Two German legal manuscripts at Göllnitz.—Arch. Oesterreich. Gesch. lxxxi. 2.

On the statistics of population and wealth in Germany in the fifteenth century: by F. Eulenburg.—Zft. Soc.-Wirthsch.-Gesch. iii. 3, 4.

Sender's Augsburg chronicle: by F. Frensdorff.—Goetting. gel. Anz. 1895. 7. *July*.

The dearth in the duchy of Jülich in 1557: by G. von Below [printing an ordinance on the subject].—Zft. Soc.-Wirthsch.-Gesch. iii. 3, 4.

The Teutonic order and the defence of the Hungarian frontier against the Turks in the latter part of the sixteenth century: by W. Erben.—Arch. Oesterreich. Gesch. lxxxi. 2.

On the resistance of the merchants of Augsburg to the postal monopoly of the house of Taxis [chiefly 1572–1621]: by J. Hartung.—Zft. Soc.-Wirthsch.-Gesch. iii. 3, 4.

The marriage of the margravine Jakobe of Baden with duke Johann Wilhelm of Jülich-Cleve-Berg [1581–1585]: by M. Lossen.—SB. Bayer. Akad. Wiss., phil.-hist. Cl., 1895. 1.

The policy of the Palatinate at the end of 1622 *and the beginning of* 1623: by M. Ritter.—Hist. Zft. lxxiv. 3.

Documents illustrating the history of the year 1756: printed by M. Lehmann [two letters from the secretary of the Austrian cabinet, baron Koch, written in May; and minutes of the imperial council of war, 8 and 9 July].—Mitth. Inst. Oesterreich. Gesch.-forsch. xvi. 3.

A letter of Stein written during his retreat at Brünn [7 May 1809]: printed by A. Becker [who enters into particulars concerning Stein's position and prospects].—Mitth. Inst. Oesterreich. Gesch.-forsch. xvi. 3.

Recent communications and illustrations concerning vols. vi. and vii. of H. von Sybel's 'Foundation of the German Empire by William I': by the author [a notable series of replies to criticisms by Rössler, Geffcken, Brandenburg, &c., and of comments on publications cited by them. The sections entitled 'Napoleon and Eugénie,' contrasting the legend as to her influence with the historical data on the subject, and 'Bismarck's policy' in reference to the Hohenzollern candidature for the Spanish throne, are specially interesting].—Hist. Zft. lxxv. 1.]

Great Britain and Ireland

Monasticism in England and its suppression by Henry VIII.—Quart. Rev. 363. *July*.

The bishops of Exeter in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries [1257–1419], in connexion with F. C. Hingeston-Randolph's edition of their registers]: by A. Hamilton.—Dublin Rev., N.S., 15. *July*.

The expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290: by L. Abrahams. III (concluded). Jew. Quart. Rev. 28. *July*.

A consultation on the divorce of Henry VIII: by D. Kaufmann.—Rev. Études Juives, 60.

The first twenty years of the reign of queen Elizabeth [from the Calendars of Venetian and Spanish state papers].—Church Qu. Rev. 80. *July.*

Mary Tudor and the reformers: by J. D. FREEN [who lays stress upon the queen's natural moderation and upon the fact that from 1555 she took little part in government].—Dublin Rev. N.S. 15. *July.*

Archbishop Laud. II.—Church Qu. Rev. 80. *July.*

The life of sir William Petty [in connexion with lord E. Fitzmaurice's biography].—Edinb. Rev. 373. *July.*

Letter of Henri de Ruvigny, earl of Galway [31 Aug. 1702, relating to the payment of the French refugee troops in the English service]: printed by C. PASCAL.—Bull. Soc. Hist. Protest. Franç. xliv. 5. *May.*

Adam Smith and his friends.—Edinb. Rev. 373. *July.*

English church bells and customs connected with them: by Miss F. PEACOCK.—Dublin Rev., N.S., 15. *July.*

Italy

Bibliography of recent works on medieval Italian history: by C. CIPOLLA.—N. Arch. Ven. ix. 2.

Agnellus of Ravenna and the Pontificale Ambrosianum: by L. A. FERRAI [showing the relation of the anonymous Milanese historian to the earlier work of Agnellus].—Arch. Stor. Lomb. ser. iii. 6. *June.*

The archives of Viterbo: by P. SAVIGNONI. [The documents selected for print begin with 1169.]—Arch. della R. Soc. Rom. xviii. 1, 2.

The archives of Tuscan Romagna: by D. MARZI [illustrating the relations of the communes to Florence].—Arch. stor. Ital. 5th ser. xv.

Buoncompagno's 'Siege of Ancona' ('Ystoria obsidionis civitatis Anchonitane'): printed from two manuscripts by A. GAUDENZI.—Bull. Ist. stor. Ital. xv.

On the date of the birth of Cangrande I della Scala: by G. SOMMERFELDT [arguing for April 1281, not 1291].—Mitth. Inst. Oesterreich. Gesch.-forsch. xvi. 3.

The economic consequences of the black death in Italy: by M. KOVALEVSKY.—Zft. Soc.-Wirthsch.-Gesch. iii. 3, 4.

The corporation of Milanese painters of 1481: by E. MOTTA [with documents relating to other Milanese artists].—Arch. stor. Lomb ser. iii. 6. *June.*

Marcello Alberini and the sack of Rome in 1527: by D. ORANO [who gives a description of an autograph diary of Alberini, of which the manuscript 'Narrazione o diario del saccheggio' is an excerpt much altered. This diary is also the source of the account of the sack in the *Memorie* of de Rossi].—Arch. della R. Soc. Rom. xviii. 1, 2.

An unpublished letter of F. Guicciardini and A. Pazzi to G. B. Sanga, papal secretary [30 Sept. 1529] [describing Guicciardini's departure from Florence with the pope's approval, and the state of public feeling in the city previous to the siege]: printed by A. ROSSI.—Arch. stor. Ital. 5th ser. xv.

The assembly of the province of Milan [a representative body for the rural districts instituted in 1572 owing to the jealousy between city and country with regard to taxation. It dealt with imports and military service to 1760]: by E. VERGA.—Arch. stor. Lomb. ser. iii. 6. *June.*

The works of the Cistercian Ermete Bonomi: by A. RATTI [on a gift of 23 manuscript volumes of researches into Lombard ecclesiastical archives by Bonomi made to the Biblioteca Braidense].—Arch. stor. Lomb. ser. iii. 6. *June.*

Russia

On the composition of the Moscow chronicles between the years 1425–1533: by I. TIKHOMIROV [an examination of the materials out of which three of these important historical monuments in the vernacular were compiled].—Zhur. Min. Narod. Prosv. *July.*

Michael Suslov, a political agent of the seventeenth century [chiefly in Poland, but also in Wallachia, Venice, and the German empire]: by N. OGLOBLIN [interesting extracts from his reports preserved in the archives].—Istorich. Viestnik. *July.*

Hapsal and traditions of Peter the Great [who visited it in 1715; the house in which he stayed being still preserved]: by I. TIUMENEV.—Istorich. Viestnik. *June.*

One of Catherine's bulldogs in the Black Sea: by V. TIMIRIAZEV [a sketch of the Russian career of Paul Jones].—Istorich. Viestnik. *July.*

Memoirs of Andrei Bolotov [resumed from the last instalment published in 1892 in consequence of the acquisition of fresh material. These memoirs are of great importance in illustration of the reigns of Catherine II and Paul].—Russk. Starina. *August.*

Memoirs of Joseph Dubetski [describing the war in Turkey in 1828], continued.—Russk. Starina. *June.*

The Polish revolution of 1830–1831 *and the deposition of Nicholas*: by F. BAROSZ [severely blaming the policy of Chlopicki, and justifying the vote for the deposition of Nicholas].—Ann. Sciences polit. x. 3, 4. *May, July.*

Memoirs of M. Olshevski [on the war in the Caucasus from 1841 to 1866], continued.—Russk. Starina. *June.*

Spain

Documents relating to the first cardinals in the see of Toledo [1181–1299]: by R. RIU Y CABANAS.—Boletin R. Acad. Hist. xxvii. 1–3. *July–Sept.*

Bulls of Celestine III and Innocent III relating to Navarre [1196–1199]: printed by F. FITA [with a full commentary, throwing light on the hostile relations of Castille and Aragon with Navarre after the defeat of Alfonso VIII at Alarcos].—Boletin R. Acad. Hist. xxvi. 6. *June.*

A diary written at Teruel [1500–1543]: by G. LLABRÉS.—Boletin R. Acad. Hist. xxvii. 1–3.

Alonso de Zamora [with a bibliography of his works]: by A. NEUBAUER.—Boletin R. Acad. Hist. xxvii. 1–3.

His collaboration with cardinal Ximenez: by the Same.—Jew. Qu. Rev. 28. *July.*

Switzerland

The lords of Aigle [in the twelfth and thirteenth century]: by R. HOPPELER.—Anz. Schweiz. Gesch. 1895. 3.

The earliest league of the original Swiss cantons: by H. BRESSLAU [arguing from a diplomatic study of the document of 1291 and on other grounds, that the league was a renewal of a previous one dating not from about 1245, but either from the period of the Interregnum or from the reign of Rudolf of Habsburg].—Jahrb. Schweiz. Gesch. xx. (Compare a notice by A. BERNOULLI, Anz. Schweiz. Gesch. 1895. 3.)

The part taken by count Aimon of Savoy in the war of Laupen from the accounts of the bailiff of Chablais [1338–1339]: by V. VAN BERCHEM.—Anz. Schweiz. Gesch. 1895. 2.

Bernese chronicles of the fifteenth century: by G. TOBLER [on the relation of Schilling to Tschachtlan].—Anz. Schweiz. Gesch. 1895. 2.

Notes on Albert of Bonstetten: by A. BÜCHI.—Anz. Schweiz. Gesch. 1895. 3.

Commemoration of Schwyzers who fell in the war with Zürich and other wars: printed from the Schwyz 'Jahrzeitbuch' by A. DETTLING.—Anz. Schweiz. Gesch. 1895. 1.

The religious movement in the landvogtei of Sargans: by F. FÄH. II: 1526–1533.—Jahrb. Schweiz. Gesch. xx. (continued from vol. xix.

Document on the reformation at Chur [1529]: printed by F. JECKLIN.—Anz. Schweiz. Gesch. 1895. 3.

The publication of Tschudi's 'Rhetia:' by W. OECHSLI [who exposes certain mystifications on its author's part with reference to the delay in printing it].—Anz. Schweiz. Gesch. 1895. 2.

The civil war in Lucerne of 1653: by T. VON LIEBENAU.—Jahrb. Schweiz. Gesch. xx. (continued from vol. xix.)

An account of the events in the war of Villmergen [4 Jan.–14 Feb. 1656]: reprinted by T. von Liebenau [from an extremely rare tract of the same date written by a Jesuit of Lucerne].—Anz. Schweiz. Gesch. 1895. 1.

Documents on the engagements at Bremgarten and Villmergen [1712]: printed by T. von Liebenau.—Anz. Schweiz. Gesch. 1895. 3.

America and Colonies

White servitude in the colony of Virginia: by J. C. Ballagh [tracing first the history of servitude under the London Virginia company's rule, 1606–1624; next, the growth of the system of indented servants down to the prohibition of the further importation of convicts in 1788; finally examining the social condition of indented servants and freedmen, and the consequences of the system economically and socially].—Johns Hopkins Univ. Stud. in Hist. and Pol. Science, xiii. 6, 7.

New Rochelle (Long Island, New York) *and its Huguenot associations*: by G. Bonet-Maury.—Bull. Soc. Hist. Protest. Franç. xliv. 7–9. *July–Sept.*

The French in Canada; the early years of Bougainville and the seven years' war [1729–1763]: by R. de Kerallain.—Rev. hist. lviii. 2. *July.*

A Huguenot refugee in the American war of independence [Pierre Chaillé and his family history]: by colonel Chaillé-Long and N. Weiss.—Bull. Soc. Hist. Protest. Franç. xliv. 6. *June.*

The finances of the United States [1775–1789] with special reference to the budget: by C. J. Bullock.—Bull. Univ. Wisconsin, Econ., Pol. Sci., and Hist. i. 2.

The colony of the Isle of France in 1790: by A. Brette.—Révol. Franç. xiv. 12. *June.*

The genesis of California; the first constitution [1846–1849]: by R. D. Hunt.—Johns Hopkins Univ. Stud. in Hist. and Pol. Science, xiii. 8.

Double taxation in the United States: by F. Walker.—Columbia Coll. Stud. in Hist., Econ., and Public Law, v. 1.

List of Recent Historical Publications

I. GENERAL HISTORY

(Including works of miscellaneous contents)

Bleunard (A.) Histoire générale de l'industrie. I: Industries du règne végétal. Pp. 408. Paris: Laurens. 7·50 f.

Borgeaud (C.) Adoption and amendment of constitutions in Europe and America. Tr. by C. D. Huzen. Pp. 350. London: Macmillan. 8/6.

Casa Valencia (C. de). Estudios históricos: La embajada de Jorge Juan á Marruecos [1767]; La guerra de España con las repúblicas del Perú y de Chile [1866]; Un diario de Fernando VII [1823]. Pp. 249. Madrid: Fortanet.

Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France. Départements. XXIV. Pp. 769. Paris: Plon. 12 f.

Duhamel (L.) Les archives notariales d'Avignon et du Comtat-Venaissin. Pp. 68. Paris: Picard. 2 f.

Gil Maestre (A.) Compendio de derecho internacional de guerra. Pp. 268. Madrid: Suárez. 4to.

Labande (L. H.) Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France. Départements. XXVII: Avignon. 1. Pp. cxii, 649. Paris: Plon. 12 f.

Littlejohn (J. M.) The political theory of the schoolmen and Grotius. I-III. Pp. 296. College Springs (Iowa): Current-press.

Mucke (J. R.) Horde und Familie in ihrer urgeschichtlichen Entwickelung: eine neue Theorie auf statistischer Grundlage. Pp. 308. Stuttgart: Enke. 8 m.

Neukamp (E.) Entwicklungsgeschichte des Rechts. I. Pp. 192. Berlin: Heymann. 5 m.

Schmidkontz (J.) Ortskunde und Ortsnamenforschung im Dienste der Sprachwissenschaft und Geschichte. I. Pp. 94. Halle: Niemeyer. 2·40 m.

Walker (T. A.) A manual of public international law. Pp. xxviii, 228. Cambridge: University Press. 9/.

II. ORIENTAL HISTORY

Aegyptische Urkunden aus dem königlichen Museum zu Berlin. Griechische Urkunden. I. 12: Indices und Nachträge. Pp. 353-399, 2 plates. Berlin: Weidmann. 4to. 2·40 m.

Ahlwardt (W.) Verzeichniss der arabischen Handschriften der königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin. Pp. 806. Berlin: Asher. 4to. 36 m.

Amélineau (E.) Essai sur l'évolution historique et philosophique des idées morales dans l'Egypte ancienne. Paris: Leroux. 8 f.

—— Monuments pour servir à l'histoire de l'Egypte chrétienne aux 4e, 5e, 6e et 7e siècles. Texte copte publié et trad. par. Paris: Leroux. 4to. 36 f.

Grunwald (M.) Die Eigennamen des Alten Testamentes in ihrer Bedeutung für die Kenntnis des heidnischen Volksglaubens. Pp. 77. Breslau: Koebner. 2·50 m.

Piehl (K.) Inscriptions hiéroglyphiques, recueillies en Egypte. III. 1. 100 plates. Leipzig: Hinrichs. 4to. 25 m.

Poels (H. A.) Le sanctuaire de Kirjath-Jearim: étude sur le lieu du culte chez les Israélites au temps de Samuel. Pp. 140. Louvain: Istas. 3 f.

Robiou (M.) L'état religieux de la Grèce et de l'Orient au siècle d'Alexandre. II: Les régions syro-babyloniennes et l'Eran. Pp. 116. Paris: Klincksieck. 4to. 4·50 f.

Slane (baron de). Catalogue des manuscrits arabes du département des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale. III. Pp. 657–820. Paris: imp. nationale. 4to.

III. GREEK AND ROMAN HISTORY

ARNETH (F. H. von). Das classische Heidenthum und die christliche Religion. 2 vol. Pp. 396, 332. Vienna: Konegen. 15 m.

BAUMGARTEN (M.) Lucius Annaeus Seneca und das Christenthum in der tiefgesunkenen antiken Weltzeit. Pp. 368. Rostock: Werther. 6 m.

HOLM (A.) The history of Greece, from its commencement to the close of the independence of the Greek nation. Transl. II: Fifth century B.C. Pp. 536. London: Macmillan. 6/.

LANCIANI (R.) Forma urbis Romae, dimensus et ad modulum 1 : 1000 delineavit. III. Milan: Hoepli. Fol. 25 l.

WALTZING (J. P.) Etude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains depuis les origines jusqu'à la chute de l'empire d'Occident. I. Pp. 528. Louvain: Peeters. 10 f.

WILLS (A.) Die Schlacht bei Cannae. Pp. 29, map. Hamburg: Herold. 2 m.

IV. ECCLESIASTICAL AND MEDIEVAL HISTORY

ALEXANDRE IV, Les registres d': recueil des bulles de ce pape, publiées ou analysées, d'après les manuscrits originaux des archives du Vatican. Par C. Bourel de la Roncière. I. Pp. 1–128. Paris: Thorin. 4to. 9·60 f.

BELFORT (A. de). Description générale des monnaies mérovingiennes, publiée d'après les notes manuscrites de M. le vicomte de Ponton d'Amécourt. V. Pp. 294. Paris: Société française de numismatique. 8 f.

BERNOULLI (C. A.) Der Schriftstellerkatalog des Hieronymus: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur. Pp. 342. Freiburg: Mohr. 6·60 m.

BLADÉ (J. F.) Le sud-ouest de la Gaule franque depuis la création du royaume d'Aquitaine jusqu'a la mort de Charlemagne. Pp. 91. Paris: Leroux. 2·25 f.

BRANTS (V.) Les théories économiques aux 13e et 14e siècles. Pp. 279. Louvain: Peeters. 12mo. 3 f.

CABROL (F.) Etude sur la Peregrinatio Silviae; les églises de Jérusalem; la discipline et la liturgie au 4e siècle. Pp. 208. Poitiers: Oudin. 5 f.

CHEVALIER (U.) Répertoire des sources historiques du moyen âge. Topobibliographie. II: *B–E*. Pp. 530–1055. Montbéliard: Hoffmann.

CHRONICA minora saec. IV, V, VI, VII. Ed. T. Mommsen. III. (Monumenta Germaniae historica. Auctores antiquissimi. XIII.) 2. Pp. 223–354. Berlin: Weidmann. 4to. 5 m.

GOTHEIN (E.) Ignatius von Loyola und die Gegenreformation. Pp. 795. Halle: Niemeyer. 15 m.

GREGORII I papae registrum epistolarum. II. 2: libri X—XIV cum appendicibus. Post Pauli Ewaldi obitum ed. L. M. Hartmann. (Monumenta Germaniae historica. Epistolae. II. 2.) Pp. 233–464. Berlin: Weidmann. 4to. 8 m.

HARNACK (A.) Sources of the apostolic canons; with a treatise on the origin of the readership and other lower orders. Tr. by L. A. Wheatley. Pp. 230. London: Black. 7/6.

HAUSRATH (A.) A history of the New Testament times: the times of the apostles. 4 vol. Tr. by L. Huxley. London: Williams & Norgate. 42/.

KAROLINI aevi epistolae. Rec. E. Dümmler. (Monumenta Germaniae historica. Epistolae. IV.) Pp. 639. Berlin: Weidmann. 4to. 21 m.

KNÖPFLER (A.) Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte, auf Grund der akademischen Vorlesungen von Joseph von Hefele. Pp. 748. Freiburg: Herder. 9 m.

KRUMBACHER (K.) Michael Glykas: eine Skizze seiner Biographie und seiner litterarischen Thätigkeit, nebst einem unedierten Gedichte und Briefe desselben. Pp. 70. Munich: Franz. 1·60 m.

LEGRAND (E.) Recueil de documents grecs concernant les relations du patriarcat de Jérusalem avec la Roumanie. Pp. 480. Paris: Welter. 30 f.

MIRBT (C.) Quellen zur Geschichte des Papstthums. Pp. 288. Freiburg: Mohr. 4 m.

PAPAL registers, Calendar of entries in the, relating to Great Britain and Ireland. Papal letters. II: 1305–1342. Ed. by W. H. Bliss. Pp. 675. London: H.M. Stationery Office. 15/.

RÖRDAM (H. F.) Kirkehistoriske Samlinger. III. 2. Pp. 224. Copenhagen: Gad.

SCHULTZE (V.) Archäologie der altchristlichen Kunst. Pp. 382, ill. Munich: Beck. 10 m.

SEEBERG (R.) Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte. I: Die Dogmengeschichte der alten Kirche. Pp. 332. Leipzig: Deichert. 5·40 m.

STEYERT (A.) Nouvelle histoire de Lyon et des provinces de Lyonnais; Forez, Beaujolais, Franc-Lyonnais, et Dombes. Pp. 621, ill. Lyons: Bernoux & Cumin. 8 f.

TAGLIALATELA (G.) Lezioni di storia ecclesiastica e di archeologia cristiana. I. Pp. 508. Naples: tip. Napoletana. 4 l.

WULF (M. de). Etudes sur Henri de Gand. Pp. 228. Louvain: Uystpruyst-Dieudonné. 2·50 f.

V. HISTORY OF MODERN EUROPE

Broglie (duc de). La paix d'Aix-la-Chapelle. Pp. 350. Paris: C. Lévy. 18mo. 3·70 f.

Denmark.— Recueil des instructions données aux ambassadeurs et ministres de France depuis les traités de Westphalie jusqu'à la révolution française. XIII: Danemark, avec introd. et notes par A. Geffroy. Pp. lxvii, 240. Paris: Alcan. 14 f.

Eugenio di Savoia, principe, Campagne del. Serie I, VII: Guerra per la successione di Spagna; campagna del 1705. Pp. 475. Turin: Roux. 10 l.

Lehautcourt (P.) Campagne de la Loire en 1870-1871: Josnes, Vendôme, le Mans. Pp. 448, 13 maps. Nancy: Berger-Levrault. 7·50 f.

Lichtenberger (A.) Le socialisme au dix-huitième siècle. Pp. 473. Paris: Alcan. 7·50 f.

Lumbroso (A.) Saggio di una bibliografia ragionata per servire alla storia dell' epoca napoleonica. III: *Barluzzi—Bazzoni*. Pp. 179. Modena: tip. Namias. 5 l.

Luyten (A.) Het ontstaan van den oorlog van 1870: eene geschiedkundige bijdrage. Pp. 31. Amsterdam: Allert de Lange.

Mocenigo (A.) Relazione ufficiale della battaglia navale di Paros [1651]. Pp. 58. Venice: tip. Emiliana.

Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland, nebst ergänzenden Aktenstücken. IV: 1628–1635. Nuntiatur des Pallotto [1628–1630]. I: 1628. Bearbeitet von H. Kiewning. Pp. cvii, 380. Berlin, Bath. 16 m.

Oxenstiernas (rikskansleren Axel) skrifter och brefvexling. Senare afdelningen VII. 1: Hertig Bernhards af Sachsen-Weimar bref [1632–1639]; 2: Landgrefve Wilhelms af Hessen-Kassel bref [1632–1637]. Stockholm: Norstedt. 9·50 kr.

Professione (R.) Storia moderna e contemporanea dalla pace di Acquisgrana ai giorni nostri. II: 1815–1895. Pp. 536. Turin: tip. Bona. 3·50 l.

Réaulx (marquise des). Le roi Stanislas et Marie Leczinska. Pp. 423, ill. Paris: Plon. 7·50 f.

Ribier (G. de). Répertoire de traités de paix, de commerce, d'alliance, etc., conventions et autres actes conclus entre toutes les puissances du globe depuis 1861 jusqu'à nos jours (faisant suite au Répertoire de M. Tétot). Table générale, partie chronologique [1867–1894]. I: Pp. 346. Paris: Pedone. 15 f.

Rott (E.) Inventaire sommaire des documents relatifs à l'histoire de Suisse conservés dans les archives et bibliothèques de Paris et spécialement de la correspondance échangée entre les ambassadeurs de France aux ligues et leur gouvernment [1444–1700]. V: Tables. Pp. 495. Geneva: Georg. 15 f.

Rousset. Histoire générale de la guerre franco-allemande. III: Le siège de Paris. Paris: Librairie illustrée. 7·50 f.

Spain.—Calendar of letters, despatches, and state papers, relating to the negotiations between England and Spain. VI. 2. Henry VIII: 1542–1543. Ed. by P. de Gayangos. Pp. li, 740. London: H. M. Stationery Office. 15/.

Venice.—Calendar of state papers and manuscripts, relating to English affairs, existing in the archives and collections of Venice, and in other libraries of northern Italy. VI: 1581–1591. Ed. by H. F. Brown. Pp. xlvi, 619. London: H.M. Stationery Office. 15/.

Wachter (A.) La guerre franco-allemande de 1870–71: histoire politique, diplomatique, et militaire. Edition remaniée et augmentée. 2 vol. 10 plates. Paris: Baudoin. 21 f.

A. FRANCE

Albanès (J. H.) Gallia christiana novissima: histoire des archevêchés, évêchés, et abbayes de France. I. 1: Province d'Aix; archevêché d'Aix; évêchés d'Apt et Fréjus. Pp. 240. Montbéliard Hoffmann. 4to. 10 f.

Audiat (L.) Le diocèse de Saintes au dix-huitième siècle; hôpitaux, communautés religieuses, abbayes. Pp. 509. Paris: Picard. 10 f.

Aulard (F. A.) Recueil des actes du comité de salut public, avec la correspondance officielle des représentants en mission et le registre du conseil exécutif provisoire. VIII: 4 brumaire 6 frimaire an II. Pp. 775. Paris: Leroux. 12 f.

Aussy (D. d'). Campagnes des Anglais dans les provinces de l'Ouest [1345–1355]. Pp. 24. Vannes: Lafolye.

Auton (Jean d'). Chroniques de Louis XII; publ. par R. de Maulde la Clavière. IV. Pp. 557. Paris: Laurens. 9 f.

Barras. Memoirs. Tr. by C. E. Roche. I, II. Pp. 1220. London: Osgood. 32/.

Belhomme (V.) L'armée française en 1690. Pp. 210. Paris: Baudoin. 5 f.

Bondois (P.) Napoléon et la société de son temps [1793–1821]. Pp. 445. Paris: Alcan. 7 f.

Bonnefoy (G.) Histoire de l'administration civile dans la province d'Auvergne et le département du Puy-de-Dôme depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu'à nos jours. I. Pp. 685, ill. Paris: Lechevalier. 10 f.

BOUDON (A.) Les municipalités du Puy pendant la période révolutionnaire; leur fonctionnement, leurs actes. IV: Pp. 433. Le Puy: Prades-Freydier.

BROC (vicomte de). La vie en France sous le premier empire. Pp. 528. Paris: Plon. 7·50 f.

CHARAVAY (E.) Le général Alexis le Veneur, le héros de Namur et le maître de Hoche [1746-1833]. Pp. 115. Paris: imp. nationale.

CHARRIER (G.) Les jurades de la ville de Bergerac, tirées des registres de l'hôtel de ville. IV: [1576-1598]. Pp. 401. Bergerac: imp. générale du Sud-Ouest. 16mo. 4 f.

CHASSIN (C. L.) Etudes documentaires sur la révolution française; La Vendée patriote [1793-1795]. IV. Pp. 703. Paris: Dupont. 10 f.

CONDE (Louis de Bourbon, prince de). Lettres au maréchal de Grammont [1641-1678]. Pp. 63. Paris: imp. May & Motteroz. 4to.

COSNAC (comte J. de). Le baron de Penacors et le cardinal de Retz. Pp. 68. Tulle: imp. Crauffon.

COYECQUE (E.) Inventaire sommaire d'un minutier parisien pendant le cours du seizième siècle. I: [1498-1530]. Pp. 124. Nogent-le-Rotrou: imp. Daupeley-Gouverneur.

FABRE (J.) Procès de condamnation de Jeanne d'Arc, d'après les textes authentiques des procès-verbaux officiels. Pp. 432. Paris: Hachette. 18mo. 2·25 f.

FINOT (J.) & VERMAERE (A.) Inventaire sommaire des archives communales de la ville de Saint-Amand (département du Nord) antérieures à 1790. Pp. xlii, 89. Lille: imp. Danel. 4to.

FOCKE (R.) Charlotte Corday: eine kritische Darstellung ihres Lebens und ihrer Persönlichkeit. Pp. 162, portr. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. 3·60 m.

GOURVILLE (M. de). Mémoires, publiés par L. Lecestre. II: [1670-1702]. Pp. 338. Paris: Laurens. 9 f.

GRAND-CARTERET (J.) Napoléon en images; estampes anglaises, portraits, et caricature. Pp. 190, 130 ill. Paris: Firmin-Didot. 4to. 5 f.

GUERY (G.) Économie rurale; mouvements et diminution de la population agricole en France. Pp. 230. Paris: Rousseau. 6 f.

GUILLON (E.) Histoire de la révolution et de l'empire. Pp. 320, 150, ill. Paris: Charavay. 4to. 6 f.

HASSALL (A.) Louis XIV. Pp. 444, ill. London: Putnam. 5/.

LEDAIN (B.) Archives historiques du Poitou. XXV: Cartulaires et chartes de l'abbaye de l'Absie. Pp. 466. Poitiers: imp. Oudin. 12 f.

MAUGRAS (G.) Le duc de Lauzun et la cour de Marie-Antoinette. Pp. 555. Paris: Plon. 7·50 f.

MÉNARD (abbé). Un chapitre de l'histoire de la terreur à Avranches, d'après les pièces officielles [juillet 1794]. Pp. 44. Avranches: imp. Perrin.

MONTGAILLARD (comte de), agent de la diplomatie secrète pendant la révolution, l'empire, et la restauration. Souvenirs. Pp. 340. Corbeil: Crété.

MOUGENOT (L.) Jeanne d'Arc, le duc de Lorraine, et le sire de Baudricourt. Pp. 165. Nancy: imp. Berger-Levrault.

PICHON (J.) & VICAIRE (G.) Documents pour servir à l'histoire des libraires de Paris [1486-1600]. Pp. 300. Paris: Leclerc & Cornuau. 10 f.

PILOT (J. J. A.) Histoire municipale de Grenoble. I. Pp. 233. Grenoble: Drevet.

POLI (O. de). Les défenseurs du mont Saint-Michel [1417-1450]. Pp. clxxvi, 251. Saint-Amand: imp. Destenay. 18mo.

ROYE (J. de). Journal connu sous le nom de Chronique scandaleuse [1460-1483]; publié par B. de Mandrot. I. Pp. 373. Paris: Laurens. 9 f.

SAINT-SAUD (comte de). Documents inédits concernant la Guyenne. I. Pp. 38. Bordeaux: imp. Gounouilhou. 4to.

SÉGUR (comte de). Le maréchal de Ségur [1724-1801], ministre de la guerre sous Louis XVI. Pp. 398, portr. Paris: Plon. 7·50 f.

SERRES (J. B.) Histoire de la révolution en Auvergne. I. Pp. 216. Paris: Vic & Amat. 16mo.

SILVAGNI (U.) Napoleone Bonaparte e i suoi tempi. I. Rome.

STOURM (R.) Bibliographie historique des finances de la France du dix-huitième siècle. Paris: Guillaumin. 9 f.

THIRRIA (H.) Napoléon III avant l'Empire. Pp. 494. Paris: Plon. 8 f.

VALENTIN (F.) Augustin Thierry. Pp. 240. Paris: Lecène et Oudin. 1·50 f.

VIOLLET (P.) Les états de Paris en février 1358. Pp. 36. Paris: impr. nationale (Klincksieck). 1·70 f.

—— Comment les femmes ont été exclues en France de la succession à la couronne. Pp. 58. Paris: impr. nationale (Klincksieck). 2·60 f.

B. GERMANY

AHRENS (H.) Die Wettiner und Kaiser Karl IV: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der wettiner Politik [1364-1379]. (Leipziger Studien aus dem Gebiet der Geschichte, I. 2.) Pp. 103. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. 2·60 m.

ALTMANN (W.) & BERNHEIM (E.) Ausgewählte Urkunden zur Erläuterung der Verfassungsgeschichte Deutschlands im Mittelalter. 2nd ed. Pp. 405. Berlin: Gaertner. 6 m.

BALLHEIMER (R.) Zeittafeln zur hambur-

gischen Geschichte. Pp. 28. Hamburg. Herold. 4to. 2 m.

BRANDENBURG (E.) Die Gefangennahme Herzog Heinrichs von Braunschweig durch den schmalkaldischen Bund [1545]. Pp. 74. Leipzig: Fock. 1·50 m.

EBERHARD (W.) Ludwig III, Kurfürst der Pfalz, und das Reich [1410–1427]. I: [1410–1414]. Pp. 54. Giessen: Ricker. 1·20 m.

FROHNHÄUSER (L.) Gustav Adolf und die Schweden in Mainz und am Rhein. Pp. 232, ill. Darmstadt: Bergsträsser. 3 m.

JOACHIMSOHN (P.) Die humanistische Geschichtschreibung in Deutschland. I: Die Anfänge; Sigismund Meisterlin. Pp. 335. Bonn: Hanstein. 10 m.

LOESCHE (G.) Johannes Mathesius: ein Lebens- und Sittenbild aus der Reformationszeit. II. Pp. 467. Gotha: F. A. Perthes. 6 m.

LOEWE (V.) Die Organisation und Verwaltung der Wallensteinischen Heere. Pp. 99. Freiburg: Mohr: 2 m.

LÖWENSTEIN (L.) Beiträge zur Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland. I: Geschichte der Juden in der Kurpfalz. Pp. 329. Frankfurt: Kauffmann. 6 m.

PAULI (Elisabeth). Reinhold Pauli: Lebenserinnerungen nach Briefen und Tagebüchern zusammengestellt. Pp. 377. Halle: Karras (privately printed).

VILLERMONT (comte de). Marie-Thérèse [1717–1780]. Pp. 432, 436. Brussels: Desclée & De Brouwer. 15 f.

ZIEGLAUER (von). Geschichtliche Bilder aus der Bukowina zur Zeit der österreichischen Militär-Verwaltung. II: Die Jahre 1780 und 1781. Pp. 176. Czernowitz: Pardini. 2 m.

C. GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

ADMIRALTY, Select pleas in the court of. I: The court of the admiralty of the west [1390–1404] and the high court of admiralty [1527–1545]. Ed. by R. G. Marsden. (Selden Society. VI.) Pp. lxxxviii, 263. London: Quaritch. 4to.

BABCOCK (W. H.) The two lost centuries of Britain. Pp. 239. Philadelphia: Lippincott.

BATES (C. J.) The history of Northumberland. Pp. 303. London: Stock. 7/6.

BIOGRAPHY, Dictionary of national. Ed. by S. Lee. XLIV: *Paston – Percy*. Pp. 447. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 15/.

BRADLEY (A. G.) Wolfe. Pp. 214. London: Macmillan. 2/6.

BROSCH (M.) Geschichte von England. VIII. (Geschichte der europäischen Staaten. LVI, 1.) Pp. 517. Gotha: F. A. Perthes. 10 m.

CALENDAR of state papers, domestic series, Jan.–Nov. 1671, preserved in the public record office. Ed. by F. H. B. Daniell. Pp. xliv, 712. London: H.M. Stationery Office. 15/.

CAMDEN miscellany, The. IX. London: Printed for the Camden Society. 4to.

CLARK (A.) The life and times of Anthony Wood, antiquary, of Oxford [1632–1695] described by himself; collected from his diaries and other papers. IV: Addenda. Pp. 322, plates. (Oxford Historical Society.) Oxford: Clarendon Press.

EDWARDS (rev. Griffith). Works. Ed. by E. Owen. Pp. 296. London: Stock.

HEALY (J.) Maynooth College [1795–1895]. Pp. 770, ill. Dublin: Browne & Nolan. 4to. 28/.

HEWISON (J. K.) The Isle of Bute in the olden time. II: The royal stewards and the Brandanes. Pp. 408, ill. Edinburgh: Blackwood. 4to. 15/.

HOOD (sir Samuel), viscount Hood, Letters written by [1781–83]; illustrated by extracts from logs and public records. Ed. by D. Hannay. Pp. xlvii, 170. London: Printed for the Navy Records Society.

HORSTMANN (C.) Richard Rolle of Hampole and his followers. Pp. 443. London: Sonnenschein.

KALKMANN (P.) England's Übergang zur Goldwährung im achtzehnten Jahrhundert. (Knapp's Abhandlungen aus dem staatswissenschaftlichen Seminar zu Strassburg. XV.) Pp. 140. Strassburg: Trübner. 4 m.

KROMSIGT (P. J.) John Knox als kerkhervormer. Pp. 360. Utrecht: A. H. ten Bokkel Huinink.

LONDON.—Visitations of churches belonging to St. Paul's cathedral [1297 and 1458]. Ed. by W. S. Simpson. Pp. lxx, 130. London: Camden Society. 4to.

MASON (A. J.) Lectures on Colet, Fisher, & More. London: Society for promoting Christian knowledge. 12mo. 1/6.

MILLAR (A. H.) Fife, pictorial and historical: its people, burghs, castles, and mansions. 2 vol. Edinburgh: Menzies. 42/.

MIRROR of justices (The), ed. by W. J. Whittaker, with introd. by F. W. Maitland. (Selden Society. VII.) Pp. lv, 210. London: Quaritch. 4to.

NEILSON (G.) Repentance Tower and its traditions. Pp. 25. Edinburgh: Johnston. 4to.

PATENT rolls, Calendar of the, preserved in the public record office. Edward I: 1292–1301. Pp. 889. London: H.M. Stationery Office. 15/.

PEPYS (Samuel). Diary. Ed. by H. B. Wheatley. VI: 1 Oct. 1666–30 June 1667]. Pp. 408, ill. London: Bell.

RANSOME (C.) History of England. Pp. 1069, maps, &c. London: Rivington. 7/6.

Reid (S. J.) Lord John Russell. Pp. 381, portr. London: Low. 3/6.
Scotland, The register of the privy council of. Ed. by D. Masson. XII: 1619–1622. Edinburgh: Published under the direction of the lord clerk register. 15/.
Shand (A. I.) The life of general sir Edward Bruce Hamley. 2 vol. Pp. 622, portr. Edinburgh: Blackwood. 21/.
Sharpe (R. R.) London and the kingdom: a history derived mainly from archives at Guildhall. III. Pp. 567. London: Longmans. 10/6.
Smith (G. Barnett) John Knox and the Scottish reformation. Pp. 160, ill. London: Partridge. 1/6.
Stephen (L.) The life of sir James Fitzjames Stephen, a judge of the high court of justice. Pp. 510, portr. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 16/.
Strickland (P.) Chronological table of public general acts in force, 20 Hen. III [1235]–57 & 58 Vict. [1894]. Pp. 82. London: Clowes. 4to. 3/.
Yorkshire.—The certificates of the commissioners appointed to survey the chantries, guilds, hospitals, &c., in the county of York. II. (Publications of the Surtees Society. XCII.) Durham: Andrews (London: Whittaker). 31/6.
Yorkshire royalist composition papers, or, proceedings of the committee for compounding with delinquents during the commonwealth. (Yorkshire Archæological Society. Record series. XVIII.) Ed. by J. W. Clay. Pp. 244. *S. l.*: Printed for the society.

D. ITALY

Alvisi (E.) Il libro delle origini di Fiesole e di Firenze, pubblicato su due testi del secolo XIII. Pp. 124. Parma: tip. Ferrari e Pellegrini. 24mo.
Capasso (B.) Inventario cronologico-sistematico dei registri angioini conservati nell' archivio di Stato di Napoli. Pp. lxxxi, 542. Naples: tip. di R. Rinaldi. 25 l.
Ciesco (T. di). Catalogo dei vescovi della venosina diocesi, con brevi notizie intorno a Venosa e le sue chiese. Pp. 108. Siena: tip. s. Bernardino.
Gherardi (A.) Le consulte della repubblica fiorentina, per la prima volta pubblicate. XXVII. Pp. 513–552. Florence: Sansoni. 4to. 4 l.
Giovanni (V. di). Giovanni Pico della Mirandola nella storia del rinascimento e della filosofia in Italia. Pp. 208. Palermo: tip. del Boccone del Povero. 3 l.
Gotti (A.) Vita del barone Bettino Ricasoli. Pp. 406. Florence.
Morozzo della Rocca (E.) Le storie dell' antica città di Monteregale ora Mondovi in Piemonte. Pp. 616. Mondovi: tip. Fracchia. 5 l.
Nogara (B.) Il nome personale nella Lombardia durante la dominazione romana. Pp. 272. Milan: Hoepli. 12 l.
Orano (D.) Marcello Alberini e il sacco di Roma [1527]. Pp. 50. Rome: Società Romana di Storia Patria.
Oreglia (G.) Giovanni Pico della Mirandola e la cabala: studio storico. Pp. 67. Mirandola: tip. Cagarelli. 4to.
Pepe (L.) Storia della città di Ostuni [1463–1639]. Pp. 292. Trani: Vecchi. 4 l.
Pyrris (G. B.) Cronaca della città e provincia di Bari [1647–1648], edita da E. Rogadeo di Torrequadra. Pp. 82. Trani: Vecchi.
Santalena (A.) Un' ambasciata trevigiana a Venezia al tempo della lega di Cambray. Pp. 16. Treviso: tip. della Gazzetta.
Santini (P.) Documenti dell' antica costituzione del comune di Firenze. Pp. lxxii, 742. Florence: Vieusseux. 4to 15 l.
Villari (P.) Niccolò Machiavelli e i suoi tempi, illustrati con nuovi documenti. II. 2nd ed. revised. Pp. 639. Milan: Hoepli.
Vogelstein (H.) & Rieger (P.) Geschichte der Juden in Rom. II. Pp. 456. Berlin: Mayer & Müller.

E. OTHER COUNTRIES

Agram.—Monumenta historica liberae regiae civitatis Zagrabiae metropolis regni Dalmatiae, Croatiae et Slavoniae. Collegit et sumptibus ejusdem civitatis edidit J. B. Tkalčić. II: Diplomata [1400–1499]. Pp. ccxliii, 587. 10 m.
Bakunin (M.) Social-politischer Briefwechsel mit Alexander I. Herzen und Ogarjow, mit einer biographischen Einleitung von M. Dragomanow. Aus dem Russischen von L. Minzes. (Schiemann's Bibliothek russischer Denkwürdigkeiten. VI.) Pp. cx, 420. Stuttgart: Cotta. 6 m.
Bang (A. C.) Den Norske kirkes historie i det sextende aarhundrede. Pp. 435. Christiania. (10 m.)
Discailles (E.) Charles Rogier [1800–1885], d'après des documents inédits. 4 vol. Pp. 211, 446, 440, 390, portraits. Brussels: Lebègue.
Holberg (L.) Konge og Danehof in det 13. og 14. Aarhundrede. I. Pp. 350. Copenhagen. (7·50 m.)
Holm (E.) Danmark-Norges Historie under Kristian VI [1730–1746]. Anden Halvdel. Pp. 474. Copenhagen: Gad.
Hubert (E.) Un chapitre de l'histoire

du droit criminel dans les Pays-Bas autrichiens au dix-huitième siècle ; les mémoires de Goswin de Fierlant. Pp. 102. Brussels: Hayez.

Janssen van Raaij (H. L.) Kroniek der stad Haarlem, van de vermoedelijke stichting der stad tot het einde van het jaar 1890. Pp. 281. Haarlem: Loosje.

Kievits (D. B.) Hoofdpunten der geschiedenis van Nederland. I. Pp. 262. Groningen: Wolters.

Legrand (L.) Geschiedenis der Bataafsche republiek. IV–VII. Pp. 176–371. Arnhem.

Labayru y Goicoechea (E. J. de). Historia general del señorio de Bizcaya. I. Pp. 889, 64 plates. Bilbao.

Le Court (J. de) Recueil des anciennes ordonnances de la Belgique; recueil des ordonnances des Pays-Bas autrichiens. 3e série: 1700–1794. VIII: [12 janvier 1756–29 décembre 1762]. Pp. 549. Brussels: Goemaere. Fol. 25 f.

León y Pizarro (D. José García de), Memorias de la vida del excelentisimo señor. (Colección de escritores castellanos. CIV.) Pp. 443. Madrid: Rivadeneyra.

Schweizer (P.) Geschichte der schweizerischen Neutralität. III. Pp. 529–1032, maps. Frauenfeld: Huber.

Villanueva (L.) Vida del gran mariscal de Ayacucho. Pp. 590, portr. Caracas. 4to.

Wauters (A.) Les plus anciens échevins de la ville de Bruxelles: essai d'une liste complète de ces magistrats pour les temps antérieurs à l'année 1339. Pp. 54. Brussels: Vromant. 2·50 f.

Wyss (G. von). Geschichte der Historiographie in der Schweiz. II, III. Pp. 81–338. Zürich: Fäsi & Beer.

VI. AMERICAN AND COLONIAL HISTORY

Cappa (R.) Estudios criticos acerca de la dominación española en América. IV. 13, 14. Madrid: G. del Amo.

Coroleu (J.) América: historia de su colonización, dominación, é independencia. II. Pp. 376. Barcelona. 4to.

Davies (H. E.) General Sheridan. Pp. 339, portr. New York: Appleton.

Fiske (J.) and others. The presidents of the United States [1789–1894]. Ed. by J. G. Wilson. Pp. 538. London: Gay Bird. 12/6.

Gannett (H.) The building of a nation: the growth, present condition, and resources of the United States. Pp. 252, maps. New York.

Herrán (G.) Relación historial de las misiones de indios Chiquitos que en el Paraguay tienen los padres de la Compañía de Jesús [1726]. (Colección de libros raros que tratan de América. XI.) I. Pp. 282. Madrid: Minuesa de los Ríos.

Jenks (E.) The history of Australasian colonies from their foundation to the year 1893. Pp. 352, maps. Cambridge: University Press. 6/.

Kirkland (J.) The Chicago massacre of 1812. Ill. Chicago: Dibble Publishing Co. 12mo.

—The story of Chicago [to 1894]. 2 vol. Ill. Chicago: Dibble Publishing Co. 12mo.

Lorin (H.) Le comte de Frontenac: étude sur le Canada français à la fin du dix-septième siècle. Paris: Colin. 10 f.

Marcel (G.) Reproductions de cartes et de globes relatifs à la découverte de l'Amérique du seizième au dix-huitième siècle avec texte explicatif. Pp. 147. Paris: Leroux. 4to; and atlas of 40 plates, fol. 100 f.

Millares (A.) Historia general de las Islas Canarias. VIII–X. Las Palmas: Miranda. 4to.

Moore (J. W.) The American congress: a history of national legislation and political events [1774–1895]. Pp. 581. London: Longmans. 15/.

Prowse (D. W.) A history of Newfoundland from the English, colonial, and foreign records. Pp. 742, maps, &c. London; Macmillan. 21/.

Rhodes (J. F.) History of the United States, from the compromise of 1850. III: [1860–1862]. Pp. 659. London: Macmillan. 12/.

Thompson (R. E.) History of the presbyterian churches in the United States. New York: Christian Literature Co. 12mo. (12/6.)

Walker (F. A.) The making of the nation [1783–1817]. Pp. 329, maps. New York: Scribner. 12mo. (6/6.)

Winsor (J.) The Mississippi basin: the struggle in America between England and France [1697–1763]. Pp. 494. London: Low. 15/.

INDEX

TO

THE TENTH VOLUME

ARTICLES, NOTES, AND DOCUMENTS

ANATOLIUS of Laodicea, The Paschal canon attributed to: by A. Anscombe, 515

—— by C. H. Turner, 699

Anne Boleyn, The age of: by J. Gairdner, 104

BENGAL, The permanent settlement of: by B. H. Baden-Powell, C.I.E., 276

Bulstrode, Sir Richard, The memoirs of: by C. H. Firth, 266

CAMBRIDGESHIRE, An ecclesiastical experiment in (1656–1658): by the Rev. H. W. P. Stevens, 744

Campaign of 1815, Disputed passages of the: by his Honour Judge W. O'Connor Morris, 55

City parish under the Protectorate, Troubles in a: by the Rev. J. A. Dodd, 41

Clement, Henry, The murder of [1235]: by Professor Maitland, LL.D., 294

Constable, The office of: by H. B. Simpson, 625

Constantine, The Donation of: by H. C. Lea, LL.D., 86

Coote, Sir Eyre, and the 'Dictionary of National Biography:' by F. Dixon, 336

Crecy, The archers at: by the Rev. H. B. George, 733

Crecy, The 'herse' of archers at: by Lieutenant-Colonel E. M. Lloyd. R.E., 538

Cromwell's major-generals: by D. W. Rannie, 471

DANTE, A biographical notice of, in the 1494 edition of the 'Speculum Historiale:' by P. Toynbee, 297

EDMUND, earl of Lancaster: by W. E. Rhodes, 19, 209

Edward VI., The condition of morals and religious belief in the reign of; by the Rev. N. Pocock, 417

English topographical notes: by F. Haverfield, 710

Erasmus in Italy: by the Rev. E. H. R. Tatham, 642

GUISES, The assassination of the, as described by the Venetian ambassador: by Horatio Brown, 304

HENRY I. at Burne: by J. H. Round, 536

Heraldry of Oxford colleges: by the Rev. A. Clark, 333, 543

—— by P. Landon, 541

Humphrey, duke of Gloucester, Some literary correspondence of: by the Bishop of Peterborough, 99

Hundred and the geld, The: by J. H. Round, 732

IRISH absentee, An, and his tenants [1768–1792]: by J. G. Alger, 663

KING STEPHEN and the earl of Chester by J. H. Round, 87

LESDIGUIÈRES, The Constable: by E. Armstrong, 445

Morals and religious belief, The condition of, in the reign of Edward VI: by the Rev. N. Pocock, 417

Oxford colleges, Heraldry of: by the Rev. A. Clark, 333, 543
—— by P. Landon, 541

Paschal canon, The, attributed to Anatolius of Laodicea: by A. Anscombe, 515
—— by C. H. Turner, 699
Pope who deposed himself, The: by Sir F. Pollock, Bart., LL.D., 293, 536
Pym, John, An alleged notebook of: by S. R. Gardiner, D.C.L., 105

Saye and Sele, Lord, A letter from, to Lord Wharton, 1657: contributed by C. H. Firth, 106
School, A sixteenth-century: by P. S. Allen, 738
Seeley, John Robert: by J. R. Tanner, 507
Shakespeare and the Jews: by the Rev. A. Dimock, 192
Sonderbund, The War of the: by W. B. Duffield, 675
Stephen, King, and the earl of Chester: by J. H. Round, 87
Syria and Asia Minor, The early history of: by J. E. Gilmore, 1

Vanini in England: by R. C. Christie, 238

Wycliffite Bible, The authorship of the: by F. D. Matthew, 91
Worcester Cathedral book of ecclesiastical collections made *c.* 1000 A.D.: by Miss M. Bateson, 712

LIST OF REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Adamnani *Vita S. Columbae*; edited by J. T. Fowler: by the Rev. F. E. Warren, 554
Alberoni, *Lettres intimes adressées au comte J. Rocca*; edited by E. Bourgeois: by E. Armstrong, 382
Alger (J. G.) *Glimpses of the French revolution*: by Professor Montague, 393
Amélineau (E.) *Résumé de l'histoire de l'Egypte*: by S. Lane-Poole, 776
Andrews (E. B.) *The history of the United States*: by J. A. Doyle, 604
Aragon (Marquis d') *Le prince Charles de Nassau-Siegen* [1784–1789]: by Principal Ward, Litt.D., 179
Archer (T. A.) & Kingsford (C. L.) *The Crusades*: by Professor Bury, Litt.D., 784
Ashley (W. J.) *An introduction to English economic history and theory*, i, 2: by W. J. Corbett, 563

Bain (R. N.) *Gustavus III and his contemporaries*: by R. Garnett, LL.D., 808
Balau (S.) *La Belgique sous l'empire et la défaite de Waterloo* [1804–1815]: by Professor Hubert, 182
Bath, Two chartularies of the priory of St. Peter at: edited by W. Hunt: by Professor Maitland, LL.D., 558
Beale (T. W.) *Oriental biographical dictionary*; edited by H. G. Keene: by S. Lane-Poole, 132
Bertolotti (A.) *Martiri di libero pensiero e vittime della santa inquisizione nei secoli xvi, xvii, e xviii*: by the Rev. A. J. Carlyle, 167
Binterim & Mooren, *Die Erzdiöcese Köln bis zur französischen Staatsumwälzung*, 191
Bower (H. M.) *The Fourteen of Meaux*: by W. A. Shaw, 576
Breyer (R.) *Die Legation des Kardinalbischofs Nikolaus von Albano in Skandinavien*: by Miss K. Norgate, 351
Bury (J. B.) *A history of the Roman Empire from its foundation to the death of Marcus Aurelius*: by R. M. Burrows, 121

Calendar of letters and state papers relating to English affairs, preserved principally in the archives of Simancas, ii.; Elizabeth [1568–1579]; edited by M. A. S. Hume, 162
—— See also *Henry VIII* and *State papers*
Canada, Proceedings and transactions

of the royal society of: by C. P. Lucas, 188
Cartwright (Julia) *Madame, a life of Henrietta, duchess of Orleans*: by C. H. Firth, 173
Church (S. H.) *Oliver Cromwell*, 191
Clarke Papers, The, ii. [1647–1649]; edited by C. H. Firth: by F. Harrison, 374
Colvin (Sir A.) *John Russell Colvin*: by the Rev. W. H. Hutton, 604
Conybeare (F. C.) *The Apology and Acts of Apollonius, and other monuments of early Christianity*: by the Rev. A. C. Headlam, 125
Crampe (R.) *Philopatris; ein heidnisches Konventikel des siebenten Jahrhunderts zu Constantinopel*: by Professor Bury, Litt.D., 130
Cromwell's Soldier's Bible: by C. H. Firth, 582

Dante, *Opere di*: ed. E. Moore, 190
Darmesteter (Mary) *Froissart*: by J. Tait, 608
Davenport (F. G.) *List of materials for English manorial and agrarian history during the middle ages*, 192
Dieterich (A.) *Nekyia: Beiträge zur Erklärung der neuentdeckten Petrus-Apokalypse*: by the Rev. A. C. Headlam, 348
Dusseldorpii, Francisci, *Annales* [1566–1616]; edited by R. Fruin: by the Rev. G. Edmundson, 579

Egils Saga Skallagrimssonar; edited by Finnur Jónsson: by Professor Ker, 563
Ermini (F.) *Gli ordinamenti politici e amministrativi nelle 'Constitutiones Aegidianae*:' by E. Armstrong, 567

Ferguson (H.) *Essays in American history*: by J. A. Doyle, 811
Ferguson (R. S.) *History of Westmorland*: by C. H. Firth, 187
Fishwick (H.) *History of Lancashire*: by C. H. Firth, 187
Flint (R.) *Historical philosophy in France and French Belgium and Switzerland*: by Lord Acton, D.C.L., 108
Forst (H.) *Maria Stuart und der Tod Darnleys*: by T. F. Henderson 160
France, Recueil des instructions données aux ambassadeurs et ministres de, xi, *Espagne*, i.: by Major Hume, 798
Fredericq (P.) *Geschiedenis der inquisitie in de Nederlanden* [1025-1520], i., 190
Freeman (E. A.) *The history of Sicily*, iv.: by the Rev. Sir G. W. Cox, Bart., 341
Froissart, The chronicles of; translated by Lord Berners, edited by G. C. Macaulay: by J. Tait, 608
Froude (J. A.) *Life and letters of Erasmus*: by the Rev. A. Jessopp, D.D., 574

Gardiner (S. R.) *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate*, i.: by T. F. Henderson, 378
Garnier (R.) *History of the English landed interest*: by Miss E. A. McArthur, 135
Gelasian Sacramentary, The, Liber sacramentorum Romanae ecclesiae; edited by H. A. Wilson, 399
Geschiedkundige opstellen, aangeboden aan Robert Fruin: by the Rev. G. Edmundson, 363
Glynne (Sir S. R.) *Notes on the churches of Cheshire*; edited by the Rev. J. A. Atkinson: by Miss Thompson, 602
Gottlob (A.) *Die päpstlichen Kreuzzugssteuern des dreizehnten Jahrhunderts*: by the Rev. J. P. Whitney, 147
Grasso (G.) *Studi di storia antica e di topografia storica*: by G. McN. Rushforth, 118
Green (J. R.) *Short history of the English people* (illustrated edition), iv., 400
Green (Mrs. J. R.) *Town life in the fifteenth century*: by J. Tait, 157
Greenidge (A. H. J.) *Infamia, its place in Roman public and private law*: by H. Bond, LL.D., 119
Guiraud (P.) *La propriété foncière en Grèce jusqu'à la conquête romaine*: by P. Giles, 777

Hardy (E. G.) *Christianity and the Roman government*: by T. W. Arnold, 546

Heigel (C. von) *König Ludwig II von Bayern*: by Principal Ward, Litt.D., 185

Henderson (E. F.) *A history of Germany in the Middle Ages*, 816

Henry IV.—Expeditions to Prussia and the Holy Land made by Henry, earl of Derby, 1390–1 *and* 1392–3; *being the accounts of his treasurer*; edited by Miss L. Toulmin Smith: by Professor Tout, 569

—— *Rechnungen über Heinrich von Derby's Preussenfahrten*, 1390–1 *und* 1392; edited by H. Prutz: by Professor Tout, 569

Henry VIII, Letters and papers, foreign and domestic, of the reign of, xiv. 1, edited by J. Gairdner & R.H. Brodie: by the Rev. N. Pocock, 794

Hildebrand (R.) *Ueber das Problem einer allgemeinen Entwickelungsgeschichte des Rechts und der Sitte*: by Sir F. Pollock, Bart., LL.D., 113

Hinds (A. B.) *The making of the England of Elizabeth*, 609

Hodgkin (T.) *Italy and her invaders*, v, vi: by the Rev. Professor Gwatkin, 781

Hollande, La révolution française en; la république batave: by H. A. L. Fisher, 591

Holst (H. E. von) *The French revolution tested by Mirabeau's career*, 816

Humboldt, W. von, *Briefe an G. H. L. Nicolovius*; edited by R. Haym: by W. Miller, 184

Hutton (W. H.) *William Laud*: by S. R. Gardiner, D.C.L., 372

Jacobs (J.), *Little St. Hugh of Lincoln*: by the Rev. A. Jessopp, D.D., 788

Jorga (N.) *Thomas III, marquis de Saluces, étude historique et littéraire*: by the Rev. W. A. B. Coolidge, 156

Juel (Just) *En Rejse til Rusland under Tsar Peter*: by W. R. Morfill, 800

Kempf (J.) *Geschichte des deutschen Reiches während des grossen Interregnums* [1245–1273]: by F. Keutgen, 353

Kugler (B.) *Eine neue Handschrift der Chronik Alberts von Aachen*: by C. L. Kingsford, 557

Kükelhaus (T.) *Der Ursprung des Planes vom ewigen Frieden in den Memoiren des Herzogs von Sully*: by Principal Ward, Litt. D., 369

Lacombe (P.) *De l'histoire considérée comme science*: by Professor Ritchie, 818

Lair (J.) *Etude sur la vie et la mort de Guillaume Longue-Epée, duc de Normandie*: by J. H. Round, 134

Lamballe, Princess, *Secret memoirs of the royal family of France during the revolution*: by A. F. Pollard, 588

Lane-Poole (S.) *The Mohammedan dynastics*: by Sir H. H. Howorth, K.C.I.E., M.P., 131

Lavalette, Count, *Memoirs*, 610

Lee-Warner (W.) *The protected princes of India*, 189

Leroux (A.) *Nouvelles recherches critiques sur les relations politiques de la France avec l'Allemagne* [1378–1461]: by J. Tait, 568

Leroy-Beaulieu (A.) *The empire of the Tsars and the Russians*; translated by Z. A. Ragozin: by W. R. Morfill, 394

Letters and papers illustrating the relations between Charles the Second and Scotland [1650]; edited by S. R. Gardiner: by T. F. Henderson, 378

Liebermann (F.) *Ueber Pseudo-Cnuts 'Constitutiones de Foresta*:' by H. Hall, 560

Longman (C. J.) & Walrond (H.) *Archery*: by C. Oman, 607

Luckock (H. M.) *History of marriage, Jewish aud Christian*: by Professor Maitland, LL.D., 755

Ludlow (Edmund) *Memoirs* [1625–1672]; edited by C. H. Firth: by Principal Ward, Litt. D., 583

Madan (F.) *The early Oxford press* [1468–1640], 610

Malden (H. E.) *English records: a companion to the history of England*, 399

Medley (D. J.) *A students' manual of English constitutional history*: by A. G. Little, 555

Mirbt (C.) *Die Publicistik im Zeitalte Gregors VII*: by the Rev. J. H. Maude, 349

—— *Die Wahl Gregors VII*: by th Rev. J. H. Maude, 349

NEILSON (G.) *Peel, its meaning and derivation*: by the Rev. Professor Skeat, Litt. D., 187
Neumann (C.) *Die Weltstellung des byzantinischen Reiches vor den Kreuzzügen*: by Professor Bury, Litt. D., 557
Nys (E.) *Les origines du droit international*: by J. Westlake, LL.D., Q.C., 114

OGLE (A.) *The marquis d'Argenson*: by Principal Ward, Litt. D., 388
Olaf Tryggwason (*king*), *The saga of*; translated by J. Sephton: by Professor Ker, 782
Opel (J. O.) *Der niedersächsisch-dänische Krieg*, iii.: by Principal Ward, Litt. D., 371
Ordish (T F.) *Early London theatres*: by H. B. Wheatley, 397

Parisiensis, *Chartularium universitatis*, iii.; edited by H. Denifle and E. Chatelain: by the Rev. H. Rashdall, 566
—— *Auctarium chartularii universitatis*; edited by H. Denifle and E. Chatelain: by the Rev. H. Rashdall, 566
Pasquier (*Chancelier*) *Mémoires*, i. ii.; edited by the Duc d'Audiffret-Pasquier: by A. Hassall, 592
Pastor (L.) *History of the popes from the close of the middle ages*; Engl. transl., edited by F. I. Antrobus, 609
Patent rolls, *Calendar of the*, Edward II. i. [1307-1313]: by A. G. Little, 362
—— Edward III [1330-1334]: by Professor Tout, 150
Paulus (N.) *Der Augustiner Bartholomäus Arnoldi von Usingen*, *Luthers Lehrer und Gegner*: by the Rev. J. P. Whitney, 573
Pepys (Samuel) *Diary*, ii-iv., edited by H. B. Wheatley: by Principal Ward, Litt. D., 169
Periodicals of 1894, *Index to the*, 817
Philippson (M.) *Ein Ministerium unter Philipp II*; *Kardinal Granvella am spanischen Hofe* [1579-1586]: by Major Hume, 577
Pollock (Sir F.) & Maitland (F. W.) *History of English law*: by the right hon. Sir E. Fry, D.C.L., 760

RADFORD (L. B.) *Thomas of London before his consecration*: by the Rev. W. H. Hutton, 787
Ramsay (W. M.) *The church in the Roman empire before A.D.* 170: by W. T. Arnold, 546
Roberts (W. Rh.) *The ancient Bœotians*: by Professor Gardner, Litt. D., 778
Roper (W. O.) *Materials for the history of the church of Lancaster*, ii.: by J. H. Round, 398
Round (J. H.) *Feudal England*: by Sir F. Pollock, Bart., LL.D., 783

SACKUR (E.) *Die Cluniacenser in ihrer kirchlichen und allgemeingeschichtlichen Wirksamkeit bis zur Mitte des elften Jahrhunderts*: by Miss M. Bateson, 137
St. Mary Magdalen College, *Oxford*, *A register of the members of*, i.; edited by the Rev. W. D. Macray: by the Rev. H. Rashdall, 572
Salomon (F.) *Geschichte des letzten Ministeriums Königin Annas von England* [1710-1714]: by Principal Ward, Litt. D., 805
Salutati (Coluccio), *Epistolario* i., ii. edited by F. Novati: by E. Armstrong, 151, 400
Sant' Angelo (C. I. di) *Caffaro e i suoi tempi*: by Major Hume, 786
Saxo Grammaticus, *Danish History*, i-ix.; translated by O. Elton: by H. L. D. Ward, 141
Schnürer (G.) *Die Entstehung des Kirchenstaates*: by F. Zinkeisen, 556
Seeley (J. R.) *Lectures and essays*, 817
Sharpe (R. R.) *London and the kingdom*, i., ii., 395; iii., 817
Shaw (W. A.) *History of currency* [1252-1894]: by Professor Foxwell, 768
Sheppard (E.) *Memorials of St. James's Palace*: by Miss M. Bateson, 603
Simcox (E. J.) *Primitive civilisations*, *or outlines of the history of ownership in archaic communities*: by H. W. Blunt, 339
Simpkinson (C. H.) *Life and times of William Laud*: by S. R. Gardiner, D.C.L., 372
Simpson (W. S.) *St. Paul's cathedral and old city life*, 192

State papers relating to the defeat of the Spanish Armada; edited by J. K. Laughton: by Major Hume, 365

State papers, Calendar of; domestic series, 1668–69; edited by Mrs. M. A. E. Green: by C. H. Firth, 799

Stephens (W. R. W.) *Life and letters of Edward A. Freeman*: by T. Hodgkin, D.C.L., 599

Stern (A.) *Geschichte Europas*, 1815–1871, i.: by J. W. Headlam, 593

Strabo, Selections from; edited by the Rev. H. F. Tozer: by W. T. Arnold, 116

Strachan-Davidson (J. L.) *Cicero and the fall of the Roman republic*: by E. S. Shuckburgh, 345

Strakosch-Grassmann (G.) *Der Einfall der Mongolen in Mitteleuropa* [1241–1242]: by S. Lane-Poole, 352

Swift (F. D.) *Life and times of James I, the Conqueror, king of Aragon*: by Major Hume, 147

Sybel (H. von) *Die Begründung des deutschen Reiches durch Wilhelm I*, vi., vii.: by W. Miller, 596, 813

Taciti (C.) *de Germania*; edited by H. Furneaux: by Professor Maitland, LL.D., 779

Thiébault (général baron) *Mémoires*, iii., iv. [1799–1813]: by Professor Montague, 809

Thüna (L. von) *Die Würzburger Hilfstruppen im Dienste Oesterreichs* [1756–1763]: by Principal Ward, Litt. D., 586

Tilton (W. F.) *Die Katastrophe der spanischen Armada*: by Professor Laughton, 578

Todd (A.) *Parliamentary government in England* (new ed.): by Professor Ritchie, 815

—— *Parliamentary government in the British colonies* (2nd ed.): by Professor Ritchie, 815

Tomkinson (W.), *Diary of a cavalry officer in the Peninsular and Waterloo campaigns*: by Professor Montague, 184

Traill (H. D.) *Social England*, ii. [1272–1509] edited by: by J. Tait, 359

—— iii. [1509–1603]: by J. Gairdner, 791

Travali (G.) *Documenti su lo sbarco, la cattura, e la morte di Re Gioacchino Murat al Pizzo*, 817

Turba (G.) *Zur Verhaftung des Landgrafen Philipp von Hessen*: by Principal Ward, Litt. D., 160

Utrecht, *Bullarium Traiectense*: edited by G. Brom, i. 3–ii. 2, 190

—— *Het oudste cartularium van het sticht*: edited by S. Muller Fz., 190

Villari (P.) *I primi due secoli della storia di Firenze*, ii.: by E. Armstrong, 355

—— *The two first centuries of Florentine history*, i., translated by Linda Villari: by E. Armstrong, 358

Wakeman (H. O.) *Periods of European history*, v. [1598–1715]: by Principal Ward, Litt.D., 168

Webb (S. and Beatrice) *History of trade unionism*: by the Rev. L. R. Phelps, 186

Weill (G.) *Un précurseur du socialisme, Saint-Simon*: by J. Bonar, LL.D., 391

Wenck (K.) *Eine mailändisch-thüringische Heiratsgeschichte aus der Zeit König Wenzels*: by J. Tait, 791

Westlake (J.) *Chapters on the principles of international law*: by Professor T. Raleigh, 341

Wolseley (Viscount) *Life of John Churchill, duke of Marlborough, to the accession of Queen Anne*: by C. H. Firth, 174

Woodward (J.) *A treatise on ecclesiastical heraldry*: by R. L. Poole, 605

Wyclif (Iohannis) *Opus evangelicum*, i., ii.: by the Rev. J. P. Whitney, 789

LIST OF WRITERS

Acton, Lord, D.C.L., 108
Alger, J. G., 663
Allen, P. S., 738
Anscombe, A., 515
Armstrong, E., 151, 355, 382, 400, 445, 567
Arnold, William T., 116, 546

Baden-Powell, B. H., C.I.E., 276
Bateson, Miss Mary, 137, 603, 712
Blunt, Herbert W., 339
Bonar, James, LL.D., 391
Bond, Henry, LL.D., 119
Brown, Horatio, 304
Burrows, Ronald M., 121
Bury, Professor J. B., Litt.D., 130, 557, 784

Carlyle, Rev. A. J., 167
Christie, Richard Copley, 238
Clark, Rev. Andrew, 333, 543
Coolidge, Rev. W. A. B., 156
Corbett, W. J., 563
Cox, Rev. Sir George W., Bart., 341

Dimock, Rev. Arthur, 192
Dixon, Frederick, 336
Dodd, Rev. J. A., 41
Doyle, J. A., 604, 811
Duffield, W. B., 675

Edmundson, Rev. George, 363, 579

Firth, C. H., 106, 173, 174, 187, 266, 582, 799
Fisher, H. A. L., 591
Foxwell, Professor H. S., 768
Fry, Right Hon. Sir Edward, D.C.L., 760

Gairdner, James, 104, 791
Gardiner, Samuel R., D.C.L., 105, 372
Gardner, Professor Percy, Litt.D., 778
Garnett, R., LL.D., 808
George, Rev. Hereford B., 733
Giles, P., 777
Gilmore, John E., 1
Gwatkin, Rev. Professor H. M., 781

Hall, Hubert, 560
Harrison, Frederic, 374
Hassall, A., 592
Haverfield, F., 710
Headlam, Rev. A. C., 125, 348
Headlam, J. W., 593
Henderson, T. F., 160, 378
Hodgkin, Thomas, D.C.L., 599
Howorth, Sir Henry H., K.C.I.E., M.P., 131
Hubert, Professor Eugène, 182
Hume, Major Martin A. S., 147, 365, 577, 786, 798
Hutton, Rev. W. H., 604, 787

Jessopp, Rev. Augustus, D.D., 574, 788

Ker, Professor W. P., 563, 782
Keutgen, F., 353
Kingsford, C. L., 557

Landon, Perceval, 541
Lane-Poole, S., 132, 352, 776
Laughton, Professor J. K., 578
Lea, Henry Charles, LL.D., 86
Little, A. G., 362, 555
Lloyd, Lieutenant-Colonel E. M., R.E., 538
Lucas, C. P., 188

McArthur, Miss Ellen A., 135
Maitland, Professor F. W., LL.D., 294, 558, 755, 779
Matthew, F. D., 91
Maude, Rev. J. H., 349
Miller, W., 184, 596, 813
Montague, Professor F. C., 184, 393, 809
Morfill, W. R., 394, 800
Morris, His honour Judge William O'Connor, 55

Norgate, Miss Kate, 351

Oman, C., 607

Peterborough, Right Rev. Lord Bishop of, 99
Phelps, Rev. L. R., 186
Pocock, Rev. Nicholas, 417, 794
Pollard, A. F., 588
Pollock, Sir Frederick, Bart., LL.D., 113, 293, 536, 783
Poole, Reginald L., 605

Raleigh, Professor T., 341
Rannie, David Watson, 471
Rashdall, Rev. H., 566, 572

Rhodes, Walter E., 19, 209
Ritchie, Professor D.G., 754, 815
Round, J. H., 87, 134, 398, 536, 732
Rushforth, G. McN., 118

SHAW, William A., 576
Shuckburgh, E. S., 345
Simpson, H. B., 625
Skeat, Rev. Professor Walter W., Litt.D., 187
Stevens, Rev. H. W. P., 744

TAIT, James, 157, 359, 399, 568, 608, 791
Tanner, J. R., 507
Tatham, Rev. Edward H. R., 642

Thompson, Miss Edith, 602
Tout, Professor T. F., 150, 569
Toynbee, Paget, 297

WARD, Principal A. W., Litt.D., 160 168, 169, 179, 185, 369, 371, 388 583, 586, 805
Ward, H. L. D., 141
Warren, Rev. F. E., 554
Westlake, Professor J., LL.D., Q.C., 114
Wheatley, Henry B., 397
Whitney, Rev. J. P., 147, 573, 789

ZINKEISEN, F., 556

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON

DA The English historical
20 review
E58
v.10
cop.2

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
LIBRARY