TRANSACTIONS

OF THE

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

The Society as a body is not responsible for the opinions advanced in the following pages

TRANSACTIONS

OF THE

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Fourth Series

VOLUME III.

LONDON
OFFICES OF THE SOCIETY
22 RUSSELL SQUARE, W.C. 1
1920

CONTENTS

TRANSACTIONS

OF THE

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

By Sir C. W. C. Oman, M.P., F.B.A., LL.D. (Edin.), K.B.E., President

Delivered February 12, 1920

EAST AND WEST

Ever since recorded history begins, and probably for untold centuries before, a never-ending strife between the East and the West has been in progress, and the tide of conquest and invasion has been mounting eastward or westward, only to reach its high-water mark, stand still for a moment, and then commence slowly or quickly to retire. The writers of the old classical world of antiquity saw this clearly enough. Herodotus, the father of all European historians, began his famous book with a tale of legendary raids and counter-raids between Europe and Asia, and traced down from them the great war of Greek and Persian which had formed the all-engrossing interest of his own youth.

Different nations have led the attack in different ages: the Greek, the Roman, the Frankish Crusader, last of all the British power, on the one side: the Persian, the Saracen, the Tartar, and the Ottoman Turk on the other. Three or four times Europe has seemed to submerge

Western Asia, and to plant herself down there so firmly that the lands of the debatable zone seemed incorporated for ever with the Western world. Alexander the Great, and after him the Romans, made so thorough a conquest of Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt, and planted there so deeply the laws and language of the West, that it seemed for long centuries incredible that these regions should ever slip back again into Orientalism. On the other hand the Persians, in the old days before the Christian era, the Saracens of Mohammed in the Dark Ages, the Tartars of the house of Genghiz Khan in the central Middle Ages, the Ottoman Turk in modern times, cut great cantles out of Europe and added them to the East. For six hundred years Southern Spain was an Oriental land, looking to Mecca and Bagdad for its culture and its creed, not to Rome and the nearer West. For more than four and a half centuries Constantinople and the lands behind it were in similar case: at the moment when I am speaking it seems that they may be so left for a few years more—thanks to the internal jealousies of Christendom, which now, as during the last whole century, have been retarding the inevitable, and still at this moment leave the Sultan—though with his baggage packed—sitting by the Golden Horn.

We are prone to look upon the Crusades as a unique phenomenon, because of the predominantly religious character of the impulse which in the eleventh and twelfth centuries hurled the legions of the Christian West upon Palestine and Syria and Egypt. A few generations ago historians who regarded themselves as citizens of the world, and presumed to look down on the affairs of men from some point of view of philosophic cosmopolitanism, taught that the Crusades were irrational outbreaks of blind fanaticism, leading to endless loss of life and waste of wealth for no adequate end. They did not see that the great movement was but one of the most stirring and picturesque episodes of the unending

struggle between East and West. The antagonism between Europe and Asia was but taking a new shape, and that this shape was for the moment religious was not the fault of the West—the first move of that kind had been made on the side of Asia. The Arabs whom Mohammed's preaching had roused from their deserts, and flung upon the Asiatic and African provinces of the Roman Empire, or the Gothic Kingdom of Spain, had gone forth conquering and to conquer with a purely religious war-cry "God is God, and Mohammed is his prophet: the nations of the world must accept the Koran, the tribute, or the sword". After more than four centuries of subjection to the Mohamedan danger, the nations of the West now roused themselves for the counter-stroke, and an impulse, fanatical in shape as that which had moved the Saracens in the seventh century, now launched the mailed chivalry of Western Europe against the East, and produced the great counter-stroke which made Jerusalem, Antioch, and Edessa for a time the capital of Christian states. It was one more back swing of the pendulum which had been swinging to and fro ever since the days of Darius and Alexander the Great. The rate at which the pendulum should swing forward to East or West, the causes of the coming of each wave of new conquerors, the race which might lead the van in each invasion, could never be foreseen by the wisest of prophets. But the process was always going on; in 1090 it was high time that one of the backward swings toward the East should begin—as it was high time in 1918 that the most recent of them all, and that in which Britain was for the first time the leader of the movement, should take its course.

Any history book, however slight and short, will give you the formal causes of the first Crusade—it will tell you how the Seljouk Turks were thundering at the gates of Constantinople, and causing the Eastern Emperor, Alexius Comnenus, to utter constant cries for help to the

Christian nations of inner Europe. You will read how the Turkish governors of Jerusalem had been maltreating the pilgrims who (through so many dangers and difficulties) were always making their way from the Rhine and the Seine to worship at the Holy Sepulchre and the manger of Bethlehem. You will be told how Peter the Hermit wandered north and south denouncing the cruelties of the Infidel, how Pope Urban II summoned the bishops and princes of the West to the Council of Clermont in 1095, and how when he called upon them to punish the Turk and the Saracen, and to recover the Holy Places, the whole crowd started up crying with one voice "Dieu le Veult"—it is the will of God. You know how duke and count, baron and knight, man-at-arms and peasant stepped forward in unending file to receive from the Pope's own hands the cross which the armed pilgrims were to display as their special badge, and which gave to their bands the name of "Crusaders," and to their enterprise the style of "Crusade".

But this is only the outward and picturesque aspect of the movement. It had many other aspects—less spiritual and less inspiring, but not less important. It was not the fact that in 1095 Christendom was in worse straits than at any earlier crisis, and that an expedition to drive away the Turk from Palestine was the only way of salvation. Twice before, at least, the aspect of affairs for Christian Europe had looked much worse. Constantinople had been actually beleagured by the Moslems in 673 and 717, yet no help had then come from the West. Pilgrims had often been maltreated before, yet Christendom had not marched *en masse* to revenge their sufferings. The new factor in the world in 1095 was not the special cruelty or threatening power of the Seljouk Turks—whose Sultanate indeed was at this precise moment breaking up into fractions, and ceasing to be a danger—but the fitness of the West for opening an active campaign against Orientalism. Europe was in 1095 in better trim for

launching a great expedition against the Infidel than she had been at any moment since the break up of the old Roman Empire. For the first time for many ages she was in a condition to turn her main attention to the struggle with the East.

For the preceding three centuries Christendom had been engaged in beating off three deadly enemies whose attacks had come all at once. The Vikings from the Scandinavian north had ravaged England, Ireland, France and Northern Germany, breaking up survivals of old civilisation, upsetting dynasties, and sweeping away landmarks. From the East at the same time, or a little later, had come the wild Hungarian horse-bowmen, the plague which swept along the Danube to ravage South Germany and Northern Italy. And thirdly there had been the Mohammedan enemy, still formidable and active, though the caliphate had broken up, and though the attack was delivered not by one great power but by many separate adventurers, Saracen, Moor, and Turk, who worked by land in Asia Minor and Spain, by sea in Sicily and Crete, even in South Italy and for one short period in Provence. There had once been a day in the tenth century when Saracen raiders from Fraxinet on the Riviera met and fought with Hungarian raiders from the Danube, in the very heart of Switzerland, at Orbe in Canton Vaud. It looked as if the defence of Christendom had been pierced through on both sides. Beset by all three invaders at once, Europe had only just held her own for several generations. But the work of Alfred and Henry the Fowler, of Otto the Great, and Nicephorus Phocas had not really been in vain. By 1095 Christendom had saved herself: the two internal enemies, the Viking and the Hungarian, had not been conquered or exterminated, but they had been first beaten off, and then absorbed into the fellowship of Europe by conversion and the acceptance of Christian culture. And the worst attacks of the third enemy, the Mohammedan, whose

religion made him incapable of being absorbed as the Dane or Magyar had been, had been definitely checked on all the long front of his attack, from end to end of the Mediterranean, save at the extreme eastern point. He had long lost all hope of mastering Christian Spain: he had recently been evicted from all the islands from which he threatened Central Europe—Sardinia, Sicily, Crete, Cyprus, were all Christian once again. Only in Byzantine Asia Minor had a recent breach been made by that disastrous battle of Manzikert in 1071, which gave to the Seljouk Turks Angora and Iconium for all time, and even Nicæa and an outlook on to the Bosphorus for a few years. But this last thrust of the newest Mohammedan enemy of Christendom was to be answered by such a counter-stroke as Europe had never delivered since Pompey the Great went out to conquer the kings of Asia in the first century before Christ, some eleven hundred years before.

There are two ways from Western Europe to the Levant, one by sea and one by land. For the last three hundred years one of them had been dangerous and the other absolutely blocked. The natural road from France or Germany to Constantinople and Asia Minor lies down the Danube and across Hungary. But since the end of the sixth century the plain of the central Danube had been in the hands of wild pagan tribes, the enemies of Christendom and civilisation. First came the Avars, then the still more formidable Magyars, the scourge of Central Europe. The passage from Germany to Constantinople was absolutely stopped for more than three centuries. You will see, therefore, what a difference was made in the situation by the conversion of the Magyars to Christianity under St. Stephen in the early years of the eleventh century. The road was opened again; for the first time for ages it had become possible to cross the continent of Europe and reach the East without leaving friendly Christian territory.

As long as the land-road had been impracticable, the

only other way of getting from Western Europe to the Levant had been, of course, by sea. From the ports of Italy the voyage ought not to have been difficult. But for the last two hundred years it had been very perilous, as long as the Mohammedans had naval supremacy in the central Mediterranean. While they held Sicily and Sardinia, and even for a time Crete and lodgments in Southern Italy, their countless swarms of piratical vessels made commerce and pilgrimage alike impossible. The Byzantine emperors were, till the eleventh century, the only Christian princes who possessed a war-fleet, and in despite of it they were driven out of their last hold on Sicily, which when it was, after fifty years of interval, won back from Christendom, was recovered, not by them, but by a new power. In the early eleventh century the Byzantine fleet was keeping the Ægean and sometimes the Adriatic practicable for commerce, but it had failed to hold the central Mediterranean.

So things remained on the side of the sea till the second quarter of the eleventh century, when naval enterprise began to be seen for the first time in the West. The Italians were at last beginning to take to the water and build war-fleets. First Venice in North-Eastern Italy, then Pisa and Genoa in North-Western, developed into maritime powers, and began to oppose and finally to drive away the Mohammedan pirates of Sardinia, Sicily, and the Moorish coast. As late as 1011 the last great Mohammedan naval expedition sacked Pisa —but only a very few years later Pisa and Genoa took the offensive and recovered Sardinia from the Infidel. A generation later arose the last, and for a time the most formidable, of the Italian naval powers, that established by the Norman adventurers (close kinsmen to the conquerors of Hastings) in Naples and Southern Italy. In a long series of campaigns between 1060 and 1091 they finally drove out the Moors from Sicily. Then all the Italian naval powers combined to hunt down the Barbary

pirates, and by 1095 and the start of the first crusade, the central Mediterranean was, what it had not been for many ages, once more a Christian lake. The enemy was pursued into Africa, and beaten off the seas. Safe transit from West to East was at last possible.

Clearly then, by the year 1095, there had been established a wholly new posture of affairs in Europe. It was possible to go from France or Germany or Italy to the Levant with safety, both by land and by water. It was this conjuncture which made the first Crusade a possibility, almost a necessity. For already Europe had taken the offensive against the Mohammedan enemy in the western and central waters of the Mediterranean, and was only wanting a start and an impulse to induce her to invade the eastern waters also. The new naval powers, both the three republics and the Norman Kings of Naples and Sicily, were militant and ambitious.

The thrust of the Seljouk Turks at Constantinople and their maltreatment of the western Pilgrims in Palestine were sufficient provocative causes. These acts of hostility, which early generations would have had to pass over, because they would have been unable to deal with them, could be resented with effect by the Europe of 1095. That they were punished, not merely by isolated expeditions of the Italian maritime powers in search of new fields of commercial activity, but by a sudden outburst of energy which affected most of the further nations of Christendom, was largely due to the statesmanship of the Papacy. It was from the first true that "the Crusades were the foreign policy of the Popes". It was Urban II, who, instead of stirring up merely Genoa and Venice and the Normans of Sicily, crossed the Alps and preached the Crusade to all Europe. The Papacy, no doubt, had its own ends to serve in its great contest with the Emperors of the West; it obtained an immense moral advantage by placing itself at the head of a movement whose moral purpose could not but be

approved by all Christendom. The Crusades showed the Papacy as a great international power, acting everywhere on the subjects of every king, whether the temporal ruler approved or not. And the ideal set forth was one which made the personal ambitions of emperors and kings, for themselves or their dynasty, appear local, petty, and mischievous. It is a noteworthy fact that to the first of these great expeditions there went forth no sovereign prince—neither the Emperor, nor the King of France, nor the King of England (imagine William Rufus on a crusade!) nor the King of Hungary, but that the subjects of each of these monarchs, from great dukes and counts like Robert of Normandy, or Robert of Flanders, or Godfrey of Bouillon, or Raymond of Toulouse, down to simple burghers and peasants, started by thousands for the East, at the papal fiat, and with the papal blessing.

Looking then at the fundamental causes which flung the armed pilgrims of the West by tens of thousands against the East, both by the sea route and the land route, with the intention of taking the Holy Places from the Moslem, we can distinguish three impulses—the one religious, the second political, the third arising from naval enterprise. The three ideals were hopelessly intermixed—many crusaders were inspired only by one of them—more perhaps by two—some (such are the complexities of human psychology) by all three at once.

No doubt some of the princes and great multitudes of the minor pilgrims who went forth to Palestine did so on a genuine religious impulse—the same that had been taking a few eager souls eastward to the Holy Places at intervals during the whole of the Dark Ages, when the enterprise had been so far more difficult. It was certainly neither political ambition, nor commercial enterprise that led individuals, many of whom were advanced in age, and powerful and wealthy in their own lands, to desert their homes for years, and risk death or

captivity in the unknown East. In some Crusaders, no doubt, simple militant piety was mixed with the spirit of adventure: feudal Europe loved fighting for fighting's sake, as its tournaments showed: and the desire to chastise the pilgrim-persecuting infidel, or to worship at the primitive shrines of the Christian faith, might be none the less genuine because in the process of it hard knocks would certainly have to be given and taken.

But along with the genuine pilgrims there went those others whose aims were less idealistic. From the point of view of the Italian republics and the Normans of Sicily, the Crusade was undoubtedly a great venture for naval domination and commercial exploitation in the Levant. Venice and Genoa threw themselves vigorously into the enterprise; they spoke like their allies of the delivery of the Holy Places, but their action shows that they were mainly set on getting control of the great sea-routes to the East. When Syria was conquered, the Italians greedily grabbed every port, to the detriment of the newly crowned King of Jerusalem, and spent enormous pains in diverting to Jaffa and Acre, to Beyrout and Laodicea, the Persian and Indian commerce that had been wont to go overland to Constantinople. They would not allow the feudal princes of Palestine and Syria to get any real control of their own harbours, or to tax the imports and exports that passed through them. It was this self-seeking of the Italians that ultimately proved no small factor in the ruin of the short-lived Kingdom of Jerusalem.

But there were not only religious enthusiasts and commercial monopolists among the Crusaders. The third element was the military caste who were in search of fiefs and castles in the wealthy East, the cadets and landless younger sons of all the noble houses of the feudal West, with those restless or impoverished landowners who were discontented with their home conditions. It was these land-seeking adventurers who built up the Frank-

ish community in Syria, such as it was. The religious pilgrims went home, such of them as had not perished, the merchants settled down in some seaport, and ultimately went home also. The free lances stayed out in the East for good, seized some fief, small or great, and fought against the Moslem to retain it or to enlarge it, for all the days of their life. Adventurers never ceased drifting eastward to the "Holy War" till, in the thirteenth century, it became evident that the game was up, and that it was more promising as a career to become a captain of mercenaries, or a professional rebel at home, than to go out to be slain by Turk or Saracen on the Holy Soil.

All the three aims of the Crusaders were attained at the cost of enormous waste of life and energy, due to two main causes—indiscipline and ignorance. The first Crusade, as all know, was nearly wrecked because the great invading horde was led by no single leader of an eminence sufficiently great to command the obedience of his fellows. The crowd of dukes and counts, vassals of different suzerains, were too proud to obey one of their equals. The host was really directed by an unruly council of war, in which every magnate urged his own plan, and finally some compromise was adopted which pleased nobody. Orders were not obeyed—he who chose went off on a side-expedition, or melted away from the banner. It is wonderful that the first Crusaders ever reached Palestine, or took Jerusalem. More than once they were on the verge of ruin, owing to their stupid indiscipline: only their indomitable courage finally pulled them through.

But geographical ignorance was almost as fatal a drawback as want of discipline. The moment that they left Constantinople they were "wandering about in worlds not realised"—any sort of misdirection was possible in days when all East of the Bosphorus was in the land of marvels and legends, whose darkness was only lit up by casual oral information gathered from stray merchants,

pilgrims, or prisoners. Even in the Balkan Peninsula the Crusaders made strange errors—one army of South French origin actually marched from Trieste to Constantinople, through the stony mountains of Dalmatia, Montenegro, and Albania, because they thought it would be a "short cut," as compared with the obvious route through Hungary: half of them died before they reached the Bosphorus. There was a more disastrous incident still in 1101, when a whole expedition, disregarding the advice of the Byzantine Emperor, who tried to put them right, strove to march on Bagdad *via* Armenia, by a non-existent route. Most of them left their bones in Kurdistan. To be fair, however, to the general intelligence of the Crusaders, we must acknowledge that it was always the landsmen, the French, and Germans in the first two Crusades, the Germans alone in the third, who took the difficult and circuitous route across the Balkan Peninsula and Asia Minor. Even on the first Crusade many of the Italians arrived by water, and when the naval control in the Levant had once fallen into Christian hands, it became normal to use the sea-route, as did Richard Cœur de Lion and Philip Augustus in the third Crusade, and many before them, and St. Louis in the last great venture of the thirteenth century.

Two juxtaposed facts had much to do with the success of the first Crusade, and the comparative failure of all that followed. The one fact we have already noted—that after the final expulsion of the Moors from Sicily in 1091 the Mediterranean had just become safe sailing for Christian fleets. The second and simultaneous fact was the break up of the great Moslem State which had been a few years before dominating all the nearer East. The power of the Seljouk Turks, which had in 1080 been still a single sultanate, which extended all over Asia Minor, Syria, Mesopotamia, and Persia, had just fallen apart by civil war into a dozen jarring fragments. The last heirs of the great Seljouk monarch in Persia, were no longer

obeyed by the minor sultan in Asia Minor, or by the petty emirs who had just made themselves independent at Antioch, Aleppo, Damascus, Mardin, and elsewhere. And a power hostile to all the Turkish race, the Fatimite sultan of Egypt, had just conquered Palestine. Jerusalem in 1097 was held no longer by those Seljouks, who had recently been maltreating the Christian pilgrims, but by an Egyptian governor and garrison. Fighting against jealous and divided enemies, the Crusaders only just succeeded in conquering Antioch and Edessa, Jerusalem and Tripoli. Opposed by a single monarch wielding the resources of the whole of Syria, Mesopotamia, and Persia, they would certainly have failed, and would never have seen the Holy Sepulchre, or established the short-lived Latin Principalities of the Levant.

The best proof of this is that the gradual reunion of the group of Mohammedan petty states into a single great monarchy was the ruin of the Crusading venture. There was a bare half century during which those great fighters the Baldwins and Amaurys increased their borders and held their own. But at last a Mesopotamian prince named Zenghi united the states on each side of the Euphrates, and in 1144 attacked and destroyed the most outlying Christian principality, the county of Edessa. The last chance for the survival of the invaders came five years later, when the King of Jerusalem aided by the depleted armies of the Second Crusade, laid siege to Damascus in 1149—this was the high-water mark of the Crusading wave. If the Franks had taken Damascus, and cut through completely to the Syrian desert, the Mohammedan North and the Mohammedan South—Mesopotamia and Egypt—would have been completely severed. But the siege of Damascus did not succeed, through dissension between the Syrian barons and the Western pilgrims, and the stroke failed. Five years later the Emir Nur-ed-din, son of Zenghi, conquered the Emirate of Damascus, and became master of Southern as well as

Northern Syria. His state was getting too powerful to be resisted by the little Kingdom of Jerusalem. In 1171 the end become inevitable, when Nur-ed-din annexed Egypt—his generals having made an end of the last Fatimite Caliph. The enormous new sultanate which embraced Mesopotamia, Syria, and Egypt was too strong to be resisted, especially when its strength was wielded by Nur-ed-din's great successor, the famous usurper Saladin (1172-1192). He crushed the Franks by numbers combined with good generalship, at the fatal battle of Tiberias in 1187, and took Jerusalem a few months after.

The overpowering strength of the great Mohammedan state thus united was the dominating cause of the failure of the Crusades. Minor causes there were in plenty—(1) the feudal organisation which made the intrusive Christian states of Syria, not a single military monarchy, but an ill-compacted group of quarrelsome feudatories. (2) The want of a loyal and homogeneous lower class to serve as a safe basis for society—the tillers of the soil were either discontented Mohammedan fellaheen, or Syrian Christians, who hated the Western Church only less than they hated Islam. The army of the King of Jerusalem counted many barons and knights, but never enough foot soldiery—the material for it was wanting. Only in time of very dire need would the Italian burghers of the sea-port towns turn out in arms. (3) The King was always poor, because the greedy Italian maritime powers had only joined in setting him up on condition that they should have a monopoly of all commerce. The lively trade which sprang up profited the Venetian Genoese or Pisan factories, not the King's exchequer. The titular sovereign had only his small feudal revenue on which to depend—not the customs revenue on which other princes could count. (4) Geography too was against the survival of the Crusading states. If the first rush had occupied all Syria from the sea to the Arabian desert, the Kingdom of

Jerusalem would have had a defensible boundary. But Aleppo and Damascus were never won, and the Crusading states remained a narrow coast slip, all frontier, and all equally exposed to the enemy. Islam was never cut in two—the route from the Euphrates to Egypt *via* Damascus, Maan, and Akabah was always open to the enemy, and the doom of the Crusaders came precisely from the fact that Syria and Egypt were finally joined under a single great monarch, who was altogether too strong to be resisted.

That the fall of Jerusalem in 1187 was not immediately followed by the expulsion of the Franks from the Levant was due to that much mis-represented enterprise, the Third Crusade. It is generally spoken of as a complete failure, because it failed to recover the Holy Places. But this is to do Richard Cœur de Lion scant justice. He met Saladin at the height of his power, when he had subdued all Palestine save a few harbour towns, faced him, recovered Acre, then the greatest port of Syria, in spite of all the efforts of a great relieving army, and finally beat the Sultan in pitched battle at Arsouf, a famous spot again in 1918, for it is the precise point at which General Allenby broke through the Turkish lines and started that wonderful turning movement which won all Palestine in a week, and ended in the surrender of 100,000 Ottoman troops. It is true that Cœur de Lion failed to recover Jerusalem, owing to the mean fashion in which he was betrayed by his jealous allies. But it was no small feat to force Saladin to a treaty which left all the coast, with its harbours and its castles, to Christendom, if the highlands of the interior had to be abandoned as irrecoverable. The best proof of Richard's success is that what he had recovered was able to be held for nearly a century more. At the same time it must be confessed that the surviving remnant of the Kingdom of Jerusalem—it was now more truly the Kingdom of Acre and Tyre—continued to exist for so long mainly as a result of lucky chance. The

great Saladin died not long after the treaty of peace, and his empire, which had extended from the Tigris to the Cataracts of the Nile, broke up for a time, being parted between his brother and his sons. This delayed the final ruin of the states of Christian Syria for some time, for it is possible to make a long fight against enemies who have jealousies and divided interests. But the Kingdom of Jerusalem was, during its last ninety years of life, entirely destitute of any power to recover itself. Nothing but the ports being left, the maintenance of the state practically depended on the Italian commercial powers, who were deeply interested in keeping their profitable factories safe, but had no reason to take thought for the recovery of the inland. That would have been of no use to themselves, though it might profit the Syrian baronage and the nominal king. Hence a passive defence of the harbours, and truce, if possible, and trade with the Mohammedan powers, were their natural aims.

There was still in the earlier thirteenth century some chance that succour might come from outside, to reinforce the decadent Christian power in Syria. The Crusading spirit was not yet entirely dead, and the papacy still continued its consistent policy of encouraging Eastern expeditions with the old aims. But the leaders of the so-called Fourth Crusade disappointed all Christendom. Instead of reinforcing Palestine, they allowed themselves to be led astray by the selfish and intriguing Venetians, went off to the Bosphorus instead of to Syria, and, like pirates, seized, plundered, and occupied Christian Constantinople in 1204. This was one of the greatest crimes of history—perhaps the greatest ever committed under the name of religion—and no excuse can be made for the greedy Venetians, who lured off the princes of the West on a side-issue, profitable to Venice alone, but ruinous to the general defences of Christendom For one of its side effects was to let the Seljouk Turks

once more into Western Asia Minor, from which they had been driven away by the First Crusade a century back.

There were yet several crusades to come, before the Papacy and the Christian West finally gave up the idea of the recovery of the Holy Places. The Fifth Crusade of 1218 is interesting as a strategical variant on all the earlier expeditions. It was launched not against Palestine, but against Egypt, on a hypothesis which was strategically sound, that a blow struck there, at the narrow middle-point of the Mohammedan world, would be decisive of the fate of the whole East, since Syria and Africa are linked only by the narrow isthmus of Suez, and he who could occupy the Nile Delta would cut the power of Islam in two. But the blow was tactically misdirected, since campaigning amid the canals and marshes of Lower Egypt was unsuited for an army composed of feudal men-at-arms, who needed broad plains and pitched battles to display their efficiency. The only way to tackle Egypt by an invasion from the sea, is to land either west of the Delta-Marshes at Alexandria, as Napoleon did in 1798, or east of them, as did Lord Wolseley in 1882, and to avoid the marsh dangers, by refusing to be entangled in them. The enterprise of 1218, though it secured a base at Damietta, flickered out among topographical difficulties. Yet precisely the same mistake was repeated a generation later, when the enthusiastic St. Louis led the great French host of 1249-50 to perish miserably in a blow at Cairo aimed through the inextricable net work of the dykes and canals of the Delta. His army, thrown ashore at Acre, might certainly have accomplished much in Syria: if he had landed at Alexandria, clear of the water-courses, he might have got forward a long way, if he could have solved the problem of transport. But, landing at Damietta, like his predecessors of the Fifth Crusade, he involved himself in the swamps and water-ways, failed in his thrust, was

himself finally besieged in his advanced camp, and forced to surrender with the wreck of his host. It was only after his ransom, and release from Egyptian captivity, that St. Louis went to Palestine, and spent more than two years in endeavouring to restore concord among the Christians, and in strengthening and repairing their long line of harbour-fortresses. But he came without the great army that he had wasted in Egypt, and, therefore, his efforts were of little avail.

Yet so long as the Mohammedan powers remained divided, the Christian coast-power in Syria survived. Once for a few years the Emperor Frederic II, by taking part in a civil war between the Eyubite princes, recovered Jerusalem by treaty (1229), but only the city and the pilgrims' way thereto from Jaffa. It was a peace-arrangement which ceased when the next war came, and a Turkish army in the pay of the Egyptian sultan stormed Jerusalem in 1244—the last time, I believe, that it was taken by fighting till 1918. But this rather illusory occupation of Jerusalem for 12 years had no military or political meaning: it was a diplomatic rather than a strategical achievement; safe access to the ceded city had not been secured, and at the first renewal of war it was bound to fall back to the Sultan, whose territory surrounded it on every side.

If it be asked how it came to pass that the Frankish holding in Syria survived for forty years after King Louis fiasco in Egypt in 1250, the answer must, I suppose, be that if aid practically ceased to come in from the West (though one must not forget petty succours like that which the English prince, Edward Longshanks, brought in 1270), yet for some years after 1250 the Mohammedan central power was in trouble. The last Eyubite sultan of Egypt and Syria did not survive the year in which St. Louis was defeated and taken prisoner. He perished in a mutiny of his mercenary troops, the famous Mamelukes, just after his victory. The rebels made an end of

his family in Egypt, but not for the moment in Syria, where many towns held out for the old dynasty, but fell to internal strife as to the succession: and it was some little time before all the old lands of Saladin's empire were united again under Sultan Eibek, the first of the so-called Mameluke dynasty. The reign of this short-lived prince was disturbed by the threat of a great invasion, not of Christians from the West but of Mongols—a new name for us—from the East. This vast horde which Genghiz Khan had set rolling westward from the borders of China wasimpending as a common danger over the Mohammedan East and the Christian East. It was, as I shall have to mention in a moment, the first serious threat from Asia that Europe had seen for 200 years. But it was also a threat to Moslem civilization: after sweeping over and devastating Persia, the Mongol Khan Hulagu captured Bagdad in 1258, slew (or rather starved) the last Caliph, and reduced the ancient capital of the Mohammedan world to a ruin. The Mongols then flooded forward into Syria and took Aleppo: unless beaten they would next make for Damascus and Egypt. The Mamelukes stood fiercely to defend the sultanate they had recently mastered, and after two years of hard fighting finally achieved a decisive victory over the Mongol Khan in 1260. It was only when they had saved themselves from this danger, that they turned at last to the systematic extermination of the Franks of the Syrian coast-land. The process took about a quarter of a century, for the Christian harbour cities were strong, the Italian commercial states had every reason for keeping them safe, and the military orders of the Temple and the Hospital provided a solid nucleus of fighting power, though the old Frankish baronage of Palestine had dwindled away to nothing. The process therefore was slow, if sure. Bibars, the fourth and perhaps the greatest of the Mameluke sultans, captured Antioch, the largest city still in Christian hands, in 1268, and Jaffa, the southernmost Christian port, in the same

year. From thenceforward the dwindling coast-slip was doomed, and in 1289 Tripoli and in 1291 Acre, the vital point of all commerce, was taken by the successor of Bibars. Abandoning the last few sea-castles, the Franks gave up the game and retired by sea to the West. The episode of the attempt by Europe to master the Levant had come to a disastrous end. No European army set foot in the disputed lands of Western Asia again till 1798, when Bonaparte's extraordinary and reckless raid on Egypt brought him for a moment into Syria, there to be checked before Acre by the indefatigable Sydney Smith, rather than by the local Mohammedan power. But Bonaparte's raid from the first was an insane *tour de force*. How could he create an Eastern Empire with 30,000 men, when he was not sure of his sea-communication with France, his only base? Nelson's victory of the Nile had stultified his enterprise ere ever he set foot on Syrian soil.

It was not the Mameluke conquerers of the last Frankish strongholds of Syria, who were to be the real gainers by the extinction of the Crusading states, nor were they ever destined to follow up their success by important offensive action against Christendom. During the 230 years for which their power was destined to survive, they accomplished no more than the conquest of the small Armenian Kingdom in Cilicia, and some unsuccessful raids on the island-realm of Cyprus. The destruction of the Christian states of the Latin East was rather a necessary preliminary to the last great Eastern attack on Europe by quite another power—the Ottoman Turks. I count this the last great swing of the pendulum westward, not reckoning the awful but transient inroad of the Mongols, which indeed had taken place fifty years before the end of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. The year of terror for Western Europe had been 1241-42 when the immense horde of Batu Khan, after sweeping all over Southern Russia and sacking Kief, had entered Poland,

beaten its dukes and their East-German neighbours at Liegnitz, and then thrown itself upon Hungary. The Hungarian kingdom seemed absolutely annihilated at the battle of the Sajo "ubi fere extinguitur militia totius regni Hungariae," and the Mongols actually pressed down into Dalmatia, and saw the waters of the Adriatic. But they vanished as quickly as they came, and after one winter of acute panic, which spread as far as Italy and England, Christendom breathed again. Hungary and Poland emerged from the deluge battered but safe, and it was only in unlucky Russia, for which Latin Europe had little concern, that the effects of the Mongol inroad, lasted for generations—perhaps spiritually even down to to-day. For Russian barbarism is a survival in some sense from the destructive action of the eastern savages of the thirteenth century.

But the Ottoman Turks, not the Mongols, were the peril to Europe in the centuries that followed the fall of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. As long as Christendom had held a great outwork in the Levant, and the heart of the Mohammedan world was always liable to be assailed by a new Crusade, the solid advance of the East against the West was not possible. But the Crusaders of 1204 had knocked to pieces the old Byzantine Empire, the ancient guardian of the gate against eastern adventurers, and had set up nothing to replace it. After 1291 there was no Christian military power left on guard towards the frontiers of Islam. The Frankish principalities of the nearer East—Cyprus, Athens, Achaia—were miserably weak. The restored Byzantine Empire of the wretched Paleologi was no stronger. There was nothing left to resist the Ottoman Turks of Asia Minor, who after small beginnings which date back to the thirteenth century, began to assail Christendom in the fourteenth, and crossed over into Europe—where their remnant still remains encamped—in 1354.

Then came the nemesis of the commercial republics

of Italy, for whose sole profit the Crusades seemed to have been fought out to an unsuccessful end. For, though the lands of the Levant had been lost, control over the sea and its trade was still retained by them after 1291. The fall of Acre had not ruined Venice or Genoa, who (accepting the situation) made financial compromises with the Mameluke conqueror, and by commercial treaties, kept open the trade routes of the East (mainly now through Alexandria), for another two centuries and more, so long as the Mameluke dynasties endured. But when the Ottoman Turks, whose growing power and persistent hostility to Christendom the Italians deliberately ignored in their blind commercialism, finally built a navy, and captured the long-defended Constantinople in 1453, the face of the world was changed. Venice and Genoa had very deliberately refused to send any adequate help to save Constantinople—the Venetian fleet had actually run up to the Bosphorus, just before the siege, taken on board the greater part of the Venetian colony there, and gone off for good. The nemesis came in a few years. Mahomet II. set himself to create a great naval power, and to cut off all the threads of Western commerce. Before he was dead he had effectually blocked the way to the Black Sea, and had practically mastered the Ægean. Christian vessels could get no further than Crete, Rhodes, and Cyprus. Venice fought hard now, when it was too late; but her Golden Age was gone for good. Forty years later Selim the Terrible conquered Syria and Egypt, and blocked the sole surviving avenue of Western and Eastern trade, by destroying the Mameluke Sultanate, and capturing Alexandria in 1517. The Turk, in his day of triumph, was altogether fanatical, and anti-commercial; he wished to have no dealings with the West save with the sword. That which followed—the great sixteenth century assault of the Ottoman Empire on Central and Southern Europe, culminating at the siege of Vienna in 1529—is another story, too long to be told

to-day. I take the tale of East and West no further than the time when Venice and Genoa, stripped of their ancient sea-supremacy, no longer "holding the gorgeous East in fee," nor living the wealthy exuberant life that they had enjoyed for the last three centuries, ultimately paid the penalty of commercial ruin for their failure to back up the Christian powers of the East, and were left to moulder, "stranded shells of former greatness" by the Mediterranean shore.

Who could have foreseen in 1291 or in 1453 or in 1517 that the next conquest of Egypt and Syria from the West would be carried out by an invader as remote and improbable as—let us say—the Mongols were in 1099, when Frank and Turk and Saracen first contended for the guardianship of the Holy Places? There was one well-known Englishman in the first Crusade—the worthy but unlucky Edgar Atheling. It would be interesting to know what he would have thought of the prophecy—if it had been made to him—that the armies of a descendant of his sister, Queen Margaret of Scotland, would one day, without any appreciable help from any other Christian power, sweep the Turk out of Syria in one majestic campaign. The enemy was still to be the Turk—if Ottoman and not Seljouk, yet still the same tough fighter in war, and hopeless maladministrator and waster of culture in time of peace. Palestine has not changed much since 1099—the dry limestone uplands, the waterless ravines, the thin-spread population, the blazing sun of summer, the pestilent torrents of the short rainy season, were the same in 1918 as the Crusading chronicler describes them as being in his day. But how changed the character of the combatants—the Crusaders' complaint was always that he lacked light cavalry—we swamped Palestine with Australian mounted infantry and Indian lancers, and cut off and surrounded the last Turkish army by the most beautiful cavalry manœuvre in recorded military history. In 1099 the Turk was

essentially a fighter on horseback—a mounted archer: in 1918 he had become an obstinate sticker to trenches, with no adequate cavalry arm at all! But I must not dwell on the last Eastward swing of the pendulum. That tale must serve for another day.

BRITISH AND ALLIED ARCHIVES DURING THE WAR

(Series II)

(*Communicated March* 11, 1920)

During the Session of 1918-19 a series of communications relating to the national archives of the British Empire and some Allied States was received and has been published in the last volume of the *Transactions*.[1] Since then a further series of communications on this subject has been arranged, and such of these as have come to hand are printed in the following pages.

The previous communications dealt with the public records of England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales, and the State archives of the United States of America, France, and Italy. In the present series the Council hoped to include notices of the archives of the British Dominions and Crown Colonies (including the Channel Islands), Belgium, Portugal, and Serbia,[2] together with a supplementary report on the French archives.

It is obvious that this list does not include all the archives of the Entente Alliance. Archives have always been reputed a national treasure; but the possession of historical archives is not one of the qualifications for admission to the League of Nations. Even where ancient archives exist, it does not follow that they are within the purview of English historical research. We are only now beginning to use the national archives of our

[1] Fourth Series, vol. i., pp. 20-58.

[2] Communications relating to the two last mentioned countries have not yet been received.

Indian Empire, and so we have not attained to the use of original sources for the History of Japan. Before the Great War, and during its earlier phase, the Society was in communication with workers in the Russian archives; but although a committee of experts was appointed early in 1917 to reorganise those archives, their present state is very precarious. Of the remaining archives, no information has been obtained from Greece; but a like confession was made by the inimitable authors of the *Archives de l'Histoire de France* (1891-3), and our historical interest there is rather in monuments than in documents; for the British School at Athens is not affiliated to the Archives. Doubtless a report on the Serbian Archives would prove instructive in several respects;[1] but we must not forget that the early archives of the modern kingdoms of the near East are associated with and largely absorbed by the over-lordship of Turkey.

The chief object which the Council had in view in laying these communications before the Society was to obtain some authentic intelligence as to the fate of the archives in countries which have been invaded and devastated during the war, or in which the exigencies of the war may easily have caused a disturbance of the usual conditions of custody. At the same time it will be found that some of these communications refer to the earlier history or vicissitudes of the archives; and such information has not been excluded, as the whole subject is of special interest at the present moment.

The state of the archives of the British Dominions and Colonies was carefully investigated by the Royal Commission on Public Records between 1911 and 1913, and the results of this inquiry are printed in the Commissioners' Second Report.[2] From this it appears that the method of custody is very satisfactory in the case of Canada and South Africa (where the archives have been

[1] See Proc. British Academy, December, 1917.
[2] Part ii. pp. 77 *sq.*, 119 *sq.*

organised as a special service under a chief archivist), but less satisfactory in the case of the Australasian archives which are not under such a central or expert control. In fact, we are almost tempted to attribute this distinction to the effects of political heredity; for whereas in Canada and South Africa the archives are kept as they would be in France or Holland, Australia follows the Anglo-Saxon tradition, which has always been averse from codes or canons and which eschews scientific or logical procedure. At the same time it must not be supposed that the purely Anglo-Saxon Dominions or Crown Colonies have no interest in their national archives. New South Wales in particular has transcribed and published much valuable material relating to old colonial days.[1] In spite of difficulties caused by want of a central system of archives administration, some interesting particulars have been supplied by the Department of Defence of the Australian Commonwealth,[2] and some general information has been received from the several States.

Further details of the condition of these and other Overseas Archives can be obtained from the sources mentioned in the Second Report of the Royal Commission on Public Records.[3] Information can also be obtained respecting the Records of the Channel Islands and Isle of Man from the same Report; but as these dependencies are under the departmental jurisdiction of the Home Department and not of the Colonial Office, they have been omitted from this survey which is not concerned with domestic archives.

FRANCE

An abstract of the official reports presented to the Minister of Public Instruction and Fine Arts on the Service

[1] Articles on the New South Wales and South African archives by the Director appeared in the *Athenæum*, August 5 and December 16, 1899, and *Quarterly Review*, July, 1900.

[2] Below, p. 17.

[3] Pp. 18-19 *n.*

of the French Archives for the years 1917-18 was prepared (in English) by the Director, and was read before the Society on the above date.

The report for 1917-18 has been printed in the *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes*, pp. 247-53, and that for 1918-19 in the *Journal Officiel*, June 7, 1919. Since this communication was made a further report (for 1919-20) has been published in the *Journal*. For the above Communication the Society is indebted to the Director of the French Archives Nationales, M. Ch. V. Langlois, Membre de l'Institut, and to M. Chas. Bémont, D.Litt. Oxon., Membre de l'Institut, a Corresponding Fellow of this Society.

The necessity for economising space has prevented the republication of these reports in the present volume of *Transactions*.

BELGIUM

(*Communicated by Dr. J. Cuvelier, Archiviste Général du Royaume*)

Les Archives belges peuvent être classées au point de vue administratif en quatre catégories. 1° Les Archives de l'Etat; 2° Les Archives provinciales; 3° Les Archives communales; 4° Les Archives des institutions privées et des particuliers.

Les Archives de l'Etat comprennent en règle générale, les titres de propriété de l'Etat remontant à l'Ancien Régime. Elles sont réparties en 9 dépôts correspondants aux 9 provinces du Royaume, avec dépôt central à Bruxelles, servant également de dépôt aux Archives de la province de Brabant.

A la tête de chacun de ces dépôts se trouve un Conservateur, assisté généralement d'un Conservateur-adjoint et d' un ou deux archivistes.

La Direction générale de l'Administration des Archives de l'Etat est confiée à l'Archiviste Général du Royaume qui a, en outre, la direction particulière des Archives de

la province de Brabant et est assisté de cinq chefs de section, quatre sous-chefs de section, et un certain nombre d'archivistes.

Tout ce personnel est scientifiquement formé : pour y être admis, il faut, avoir passé l'examen de candidat-archiviste, institué par arrêté royal du 14 juin, 1895. Les candidats-archivistes sont généralement porteurs du diplôme de docteur en philosophie et lettres (section des sciences historiques) mais même les docteurs sont assujettis à une épreuve pratique sur la paléographie, la diplomatique, la chronologie, l'héraldique et la sigillographie, le latin du moyen-âge, le vieux français et le vieux flamand, le flamand moderne, une des langues allemande, anglaise, italienne ou espagnole.[1]

Les Archives provinciales (ne pas confondre avec les Archives de l'Etat dans les provinces) ne contiennent que les documents à partir de la domination française.

Les Archives des villes renferment les titres des anciennes administrations et institutions communales. Toutes n'ont pas un service d'archives organisé, c'est à dire qu'elles n'ont pas un spécialiste à la tête de leurs archives : c'est peut-être bien à cela qu'il faut attribuer la formidable hécatombe d'archives communales qui fut faite par les armées allemandes en Belgique.

Enfin les Archives des Institutions privées, couvents, églises, hospices, etc. et celles des particuliers n'ont guère besoin d'être déterminées davantage quant à leur nature et à leur composition.

Lorsque la guerre éclata, je m'empressai de fixer l'attention des Archivistes de l'Etat sur leurs devoirs au sujet de la conservation des archives.

[1] Depuis la rédaction de cet article, un arrêté royal du 27 décembre, 1919, stipule que nul ne peut être nommé définitivement à un emploi scientifique dans les Archives de l'état, s'il n'a suivi avec fruit, pendant un semestre au moins, le cours d'Archivéconomie organisé aux Archives générales du Royaume.

Ce cours a été donné pour la première fois en 1920 par M. J. Cuvelier et a été suivi par cinq candidats archivistes.

A Bruxelles, je mis en lieu sûr les documents les plus précieux et je fis transporter les collections les plus importantes dans les sous-sols du dépôt où elles seraient plus à l'abri des atteintes d'un bombardement éventuel. Elles y restèrent près de six mois, au bout desquels l'humidité risquant d'y occasionner des dégâts, et tout danger immédiat paraissant écarté, je les fis remettre à leur place habituelle.

Lors de l'invasion, le dépôt de Liége, installé au palais des anciens Princes-Evêques, fut presque immédiatement occupé par les troupes allemandes. Elles expulsèrent brutalement la concierge et son mari, malade, de leur loge, et brisèrent tout leur mobilier. Quelques jours après, le Conservateur constata que la porte de son cabinet avait été enfoncée, que les meubles de son bureau, de celui du Conservateur-adjoint et de la salle du public avaient été fracturés, les armoires vidées, les livres de la Bibliothèque répandus à terre avec des documents d'archives, des papiers, des encriers, des plumes, le tout formant un amalgame d'objets hétéroclites. Les portes du dépôt même avaient été également enfoncées, des hommes y avaient logé, et avaient satisfait leurs besoins naturels dans tous les coins. Après avoir déposé plainte auprès du commandant du palais, les Archivistes tâchèrent de remettre, autant que possible, les choses en ordre. Le 20 août, un incendie éclata dans un local occupé par les soldats sous les bureaux des Archives. Heureusement la place était voûtée, ce qui permit aux pompiers, accourus en hâte, de circonscrire l'incendie et d'éviter la destruction totale des Archives, mais les dégâts occasionnés par l'eau n'en furent pas moins considérables. A la suite de ces évènements, l'accès des Archives fut interdit aux Archivistes pendant plusieurs jours. Lorsqu' ils purent y rentrer, ils trouvèrent leurs bureaux occupés par une administration allemande qui avait enlevé et détruit toutes les archives, les documents d'administration les catalogues, les notes personnelles des Archivistes, fruit

de nombreuses années de travail. Seule la salle du public resta à la disposition du personnel, tout le reste étant réservé à la police secrète allemande. Quelques mois après, la salle du public aussi fut enlevée aux Archivistes qui durent se réfugier dans le dépôt proprement dit. Enfin, en juin 1916, ils furent expulsés du dépôt même et ils durent chercher un refuge dans un auditoire de l'Université, au jardin botanique. A partir de ce moment, un archiviste pouvait aller chercher une fois par semaine, des documents que le personnel se mit à analyser et à indexer. Ce travail dura jusqu' à l'armistice. Quinze jours après, lorsque le dernier soldat allemand eût quitté Liége, les Archivistes purent reprendre possession de leurs locaux qui étaient vidés de tous leurs meubles et dans un état de saleté repoussante. Heureusement que le dépôt même pût être préservé lors de la retraite, ce qui fait que les pertes des Archives de l'Etat à Liége se bornent aux destructions des premiers jours de l'invasion.

Elles consistent principalement en quelques chartes du XIV^e^ siècle de l'abbaye de St.-Jacques à Liége, un précieux petit cartulaire du XIII^e^ siècle de l abbaye du Val-St.-Lambert, une charte de 1209 du même fonds, et plusieurs paquets de documents du XV^e^ au XVIII^e^ siècle. Dans le dépôt même disparurent des liasses de documents du duché de Limbourg, de la Cour de Hombourg, de la Chambre des comptes; du Tonlieu de la Massenge, des registres des cours de justice de Crisnée, Embour, Fraipont, Poulseur, Viemme, Voroux-Goreux, de la Collégiale St.-Denis à Liége, de la cathédrale de St.-Lambert, de la collégiale St.-Martin, des Célestines de Liége et quelques sceaux anciens avec des empreintes.

Les Archives de l'Etat à Arlon ne furent pas mieux traitées que celles de Liége. Lors de l'invasion, le 7 août, un officier y fit des perquisitions et vola une loupe. En 1915, le Gouverneur civil fit déloger les archives de l'une des salles pour y installer le ménage de son chauffeur.

L'année suivante, on installa un employé de l'administration civile dans une autre salle après en avoir démoli les corps de bibliothèque et expulsé les archives. La même année, l'autorité militaire s'empara d'une troisième salle. A partir de ce moment, les archives entassées dans les locaux restés disponibles devinrent inutilisables pour le public. Le Conservateur n'était pas encore au bout de ses peines. Le 7 octobre 1918, il reçut l'ordre de faire évacuer immédiatement tout le dépôt et de transférer les archives dans les combles du palais de justice. Le local fut alors occupé par divers services de l'armée. Lorsqu' il put être rendu à sa destination primitive au mois de novembre, il était dans un état de malpropreté défiant toute description.

Quant aux archives déposées au Palais de justice, elles reçurent, le 10 novembre 1918, la visite de la soldatesque allemande qui, après avoir brisé à coups de hâche la clôture d'accès, volèrent, lacérèrent et souillèrent les archives d'une manière vraîment ignoble. Les inventaires ayant été détruits ou volés, il n'est pas encore possible, à l'heure actuelle, de donner un relevé exact et complet de tous les documents disparus, mais on peut d'ores et déjà annoncer comme certaine la disparition de 2 registres des Greffes scabinaux de Latour, de cinq cartons de dénombrements de feux du XVI^e^ au XVIII^e^s., de 87 cartes et plans de la même époque, de cinq cartons remplis de chartes de l'abbaye de Clairefontaine du XIII^e^ au XVIII^e^ siècle, et enfin de la plus grande partie du magnifique chartrier de St.-Hubert, comprenant notamment 5 chartes du XI^e^ siècle, 25 du XII^e^, 120 du XIII^e^, autant du XIV^e^ etc. etc. A côté de ces pertes irréparables, les dégâts matériels, en meubles, livres, cartons, etc., sont peu de chose.

Les autres dépôts d'archives de l'Etat ont été moins éprouvés. Celui de Namur, installé au palais de justice, faillit être détruit par les bombes allemandes, lors du siége de la ville. Mais l'incendie qui éclata au palais put

être heureusement circonscrit. De même, le dépôt d'Anvers fut atteint, à la toiture, par une bombe. L'excellence des matériaux de construction de ce nouveau dépôt écarta le désastre. Enfin le dépôt de Bruges fut bombardé par des aviateurs, dans la nuit du 14 au 15 mai 1918. Une bombe éclata dans la salle du public et réduisit en miettes de nombreux documents très intéressants.

Dans les autres dépôts, Bruxelles, Gand, Hasselt et Mons, il n'y eut pas de dégâts, mais de multiples documents qui avaient été communiqués à des institutions ou à des particuliers furent brûlés ou volés.

C'est ainsi que les Archives Générales du Royaume déplorent la perte du portefeuille N° 1191[40] des Papiers d'Etat et de l'Audience contenant cent documents, qui avait été communiqué à Mr. Wils, archiviste de l'Université de Louvain et qui fut brulé dans son coffrefort, le 26 août 1914, lors du sac de Louvain. Un autre portefeuille du même fonds avait été communiqué au Conservateur de Liège : il n'en reste rien. De même des documents du Conseil des Finances, concernant le recensement dressé en 1738, des métiers et manufactures des Pays-Bas autrichiens, qui avaient été communiqués à Mr. le Professeur Huisman, directeur au Ministère des Affaires Etrangères, furent volés par les Allemands dans son cabinet où il les avait enfermés.

Le dépôt de Gand n'est pas encore rentré en possession d'un recueil d'annotations et d'un obituaire de l'Abbaye de Ninove, ainsi que d'une charte de 1188, qui avaient été communiqués au Bibliothécaire de l'Université de Göttingen, à l'usage de Mr. le professeur W. W. Rockwell de New-York.[1]

Le Conservateur des Archives de l'Etat à Hasselt avait communiqué le registre des reliefs de la Cour féodale de Diepenbeek de 1383 à 1444 et un registre aux

[1] Ces documents ont été restitués depuis lors.

Oeuvres des Echevins de la même localité de 1534 à 1549 à Mr. Huybrigts de Tongres, dont la maison, un vrai musée d'antiquités romaines et de tableaux de maîtres anciens, fut brûlée par les Allemands, le 18 août 1914, après un pillage préalable. Dans l'incendie de Louvain disparurent en outre un registre aux rôles criminels de Hasselt (1682-1725), un registre aux rôles de la Cour de Vliermael (1698-1702), deux registres aux rôles de Curange (1699-1725) qui avaient été communiqués à Mr. Janssens.

Enfin dans la province de Namur, les Allemands brûlèrent en août 1914 un registre aux Transports des Echevins de Namur (1554-1555) et 2 registres des Embrevures de la Cour du Feix (1443-1448) dans la maison de Mr. Douxchamps à Namur, et dans le presbytère de Dorinne de nombreux documents relatifs à la commune de Spontin et des cours de justice de Poilvache, Jassogne et Miannoye.

Telles sont les principales pertes que les Archives de l'État ont à déplorer. Sauf en ce qui concerne le dépôt d'Arlon, elles sont relativement minimes et l'Allemagne pourrait nous dédommager amplement par la restitution de toutes les archives belges qu'elle détient encore à l'heure actuelle, notamment 800 chartes de St.-Pierre à Louvain, conservées à Berlin et les archives de la Grande commanderie de l'Ordre teutonique des Vieux-Joncs (Limbourg belge), conservées à Düsseldorf.

Puisque aussi bien la Conférence de la Paix n'a pas admis nos revendications en matière d'archives belges, injustement détenues par l'Allemagne et l'Autriche-Hongrie[1] depuis plus d'un siècle, ce qui a provoqué une amère désillusion dans le monde des historiens belges, il faut bien que nous saisissions l'occasion qui s'offre à nous d'obtenir des dédommagements en archives de notre pays de la part de l'Allemagne, au moins pour les des-

[1] Voir à ce sujet la communication que j'ai faite à l'Académie Royale de Belgique. Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres (avril 1919).

tructions de documents anciens occasionnées par ses armées dans la présente guerre.

Ainsi l'Etat au moins pourrait combler quelque peu les vides de ses collections, mais les pertes subies par les Archives de nos anciennes villes sont vraiment irréparables. Il ne reste rien des belles Archives communales de Dinant, Namur, Herve, Visé, Aerschot, Termonde, Lierre. Rien surtout de cet admirable dépôt d'Ypres, qui contenait peut-être les plus belles archives du monde entier. Rien, ou peu de choses des Archives de Dixmude, Furnes, Nieuport, sans parler de celles de communes de moindre importance ou d'institutions comme l'ancienne abbaye de Messines.

Au début de 1915, lorsque la plupart des crimes avaient été perpétrés, le Gouvernement allemand chargea un de ses officiers, archiviste de profession, de faire une inspection dans le pays au sujet des mesures à prendre pour assurer la conservation des Archives. Sa tournée s'acheva par un procès verbal de carence. Les mesures de précaution avaient été prises partout. Ce qu'il aurait fallu faire c'était empêcher les troupes de s'installer dans les dépôts ou d'y mettre le feu. On a vu par ce qui précède, que les instructions de l'inspecteur allemand des Archives ne furent nullement suivies et que les autorités militaires continuèrent notamment à Liége et à Arlon, à considérer les institutions scientifiques comme de simples bureaux des administrations publiques.

Les Ministères aussi furent occupés par les autorités allemandes et les archives des administrations ne furent aucunement respectées. A la vérité, la faute en incombre un peu à l'Administration elle-même. Depuis des années, j'ai fait une campagne pour que les Administrations déposent leurs archives aux Archives de l'Etat. Içi on ne possède rien ou presque rien depuis 1830. Tous ces documents continuaient à s'entasser dans les greniers des Ministères sans aucune utilité pour personne. A diverses reprises, dans les congrès, j'ai démontré l'intérêt

qu'il y aurait pour les Administrations contemporaines à opérer aux Archives des versements périodiques de documents ayant par exemple plus de vingt-cinq années d'âge. Jamais on n'a rien fait dans ce sens et aujourd'hui on déplore la perte de presque toutes les archives postérieures à 1830.

En luttant pied à pied avec le pouvoir occupant, je parvins à sauvegarder l'indépendance de la plupart des dépôts du Gouvernement Général. C'est à peine, si, au moment de l'occupation de Bruxelles, la salle de lecture fut fermée au public pendant une huitaine de jours. Dès le 1 septembre, le service put être organisé à la satisfaction des travailleurs, bien que j'eusse été privé d'une grande partie de mon personnel, qui, par ordre de l'autorité occupante, fut mis en disponibilité avec les 2/3 du traitement. Les travaux de classement et d'inventaire furent continués et même les travaux d'impression, je ne dis pas de publication. Car, pour la publication, j'aurais dû passer par la censure allemande ce qui me répugnait. Je continuai donc à imprimer en cachette tout en faisant payer les travaux par l'occupant. Lorsque celui-ci fut parti, je pus faire procéder à la distribution des inventaires suivants, tous imprimés pendant l'occupation allemande.

BRUXELLES

1° Inventaire des chartes et cartulaires du Luxembourg. Tomes I à IV, par A. Verkooren. Bruxelles, Guyot. 4 vol. 8°.

2° Inventaire des Chartes et cartulaires des duchés de Brabant, de Limbourg et des Pays d'Outre-Meuse. Tomes VI-VII, par A. Verkooren. Bruxelles, Hayez. 2 vol. 8°.

3° Inventaire général des Archives Ecclésiastiques du Brabant. Tome II (Eglises paroissiales, cures, chapelles et bénéfices, bienfaisance), par A. d'Hoop. Bruxelles, Guyot. 1 vol. 8°.

4° Inventaire des Archives du Comité du commerce

maritime, par J. Mees. Bruxelles, Goemaere. 1 vol. 8°.

5° Chambre des comptes de Lille. Catalogue des chartes du sceau de l'Audience. Tome I, par H. Nélis. Bruxelles, Goemaere. 1 vol. in 8°.

6° Chambres des comptes de Flandre et de Brabant. Inventaire des comptes en rouleaux, par H. Nélis. Bruxelles, Goemaere. Un vol. in 8°.

Ces publications de même que celles qui suivent et qui concernent les Archives de l'Etat dans les provinces, complètent les listes d'inventaires publiés, indiqués dans notre travail paru quelques mois avant la guerre *Les Archives de L'Etat en Belgique, en* 1914 (Renaix, Leherte-Courtin, 8° de VII-537 pages).

Pour ce qui regarde les Archives de l'Etat dans les provinces, j'ai fait imprimer les inventaires suivants, dans les mêmes conditions :—

GAND

1° Inventaire sommaire des archives de la famille Vander Bruggen et de ses alliés, déposées aux Archives de l'Etat à Gand, par le Baron Maurice van der Bruggen.

2° Inventaire sommaire des archives de la famille de Kerchove déposées par Astère de Kerchove de Denterghem.

3° Inventaire sommaire des minutes des notaires.

4° Inventaire sommaire des archives déposées aux Archives de l'Etat à Gand, par Mr. le Comte Gaston de Lichtervelde.

5° Idem Idem, par Mr. H. Lippens, ancien bourgmestre de la ville de Gand.

6° Inventaire sommaire des archives seigneuriales et communales de Lokeren.

7° Inventaire sommaire des archives données à l'Etat par la famille de la Kethulle de Ryhove.

8° Inventaire sommaire des archives de la famille Mesdagh et ses alliés.

N.B.—Les huit inventaires susdits sont l'oeuvre de Mr. le Conservateur R. Schoorman.

MONS

Inventaire du fonds de la Cour des Mortemains du Hainaut, par L. Verriest.

HASSELT

Inventaire sommaire des Archives notariales, par A. Hansay.

NAMUR

1° Inventaire sommaire des archives des Fiefs et des Seigneuries de la province de Namur, par D. Brouwers.

2° Inventaire sommaire des archives de la famille Douxchamps, déposées aux Archives de l'Etat à Namur, par D. Brouwers.

3° Inventaire sommaire des archives des Cours féodales, par D. Brouwers.

Les destructions d'archives ont suscité l'intérêt de la population à nos vestiges du passé. Il en est toujours ainsi. Tant que l'on possède des trésors, personne ne s'en soucie. Le jour où, par suite d'un accident quelconque, ils viennent à disparaître, tout le monde y prend soudain un intérêt énorme.

La proposition que j'ai faite au Gouvernement d'assurer la conservation des archives des grandes oeuvres écloses pendant la guerre, et notamment celles de la *Commission of Relief for Belgium*, a été accueillie avec empressement. Mais pour donner un abri à ces archives qui, dans cent ans, présenteront un intérêt extraordinaire, il y aura lieu de donner une extension considérable à nos installations actuelles, tant à Bruxelles que dans les dépôts de province.

Dans la capitale les plans du Mont-des-Arts élaborés, par Mr. l'Architecte Caluwaers prévoient cette extension,

tant pour les Archives que pour la Bibliothèque Royale et le Musée de peinture. Il est à espérer que le Gouvernement fera bon accueil à ce projet, dans le plus bref délai possible, car à l'heure actuelle les institutions citées ci-dessus sont logées vraîment trop à l'étroit.

THE CANADIAN WAR RECORDS

(Communicated by H. P. Biggar, B.Litt., F.R.Hist.S., of the Canadian Archives)

Shortly after the arrival in England in October, 1914, of the first Canadian Contingent Sir Max Aitken, now Lord Beaverbrook, was appointed Canadian Eye-Witness and placed in charge of the Canadian War Records. These were stored, in the first instance, in a City office in Lombard Street, but as their volume increased the necessity arose for a safer place of deposit. It was also discovered that it would be necessary to complete the Canadian diaries by extracts from the diaries of British units going into action on the left and right of the Canadians. For these reasons an application was made to the Deputy Keeper for permission to remove these diaries to the Public Record Office, where the British war diaries were then stored. In the autumn of 1916 the Deputy Keeper was good enough to accede to this request, and to find accommodation in the Record Office both for the Canadian war diaries and also for the staff in charge of them. The diaries of the Medical units were kept separate and sent to the headquarters of the Canadian Medical Corps.

On the arrival of the war diaries every month, each was checked, omissions noted, and application was made to the unit for the missing portions. In many instances it was found impossible to fill the gaps owing to those who could have done so having become casualties or

through the destruction of all records at the unit's headquarters.

Upon the removal of the Canadian diaries to the Public Record Office permission was obtained to instal in the basement an American photostat. This machine can turn out a large number of negative photographs a day: on some days the number of the photographs reached one hundred. This photostat was especially useful in the reproduction of maps and plans.

Every diary was read through in order to obtain accurate material for the official history, and those portions which contained any such material were at once reproduced on the photostat. The original was then put away in a holder and only the photostat copy kept in use for the official history. Permission to see the originals themselves was only granted for some special reason. In this way every effort was made to preserve the original as carefully as possible.

By June, 1918, over 2000 diaries had been read, and of these some 1350 had been copied in whole or in part on the photostat. From these extracts was compiled the official Canadian narrative entitled *Canada in Flanders*, three of which volumes have already been published.

In addition to the war diaries the Canadian Government appointed in 1917 a War Activities Commission to investigate the work of every Canadian unit or centre not only in Canada but also in England and in France. From each centre a report was called for setting forth not only the nature of the work being performed, but also the extent of the files of the office and the care being devoted to their safe custody. These reports, which are now at Ottawa, as well as the Report of this Commission itself, should prove of great value to the future Canadian historian.

During the course of the war photographers and eventually cinematograph operators were permitted to

accompany the Canadian troops, even into action. These records which have been publicly exhibited in London and other cities should prove helpful in the reconstruction of the engagements in which the Canadian corps took part.

Well-known British and Canadian artists were also commissioned to paint pictures dealing with the activities of the Canadians, and a portrait gallery was also formed of the divisional and brigade commanders and of all the Canadian V.C's. These photographic and oil collections are now in Canada, and will prove of increasing interest and value as time goes on.

During the war the normal work of the Archives department was fairly well maintained. A list of the transcripts from Paris and London received at Ottawa down to the end of 1918 is printed in the *Report of the Public Archives of Canada for* 1918 which has recently been issued.

AUSTRALIA'S RECORDS OF THE WAR

(Communicated by the Secretary of the Department of Defence for the Commonwealth of Australia)

1. The first step towards the systematic collection of historical records relating to Australia's effort in the war was taken during the Gallipoli campaign in 1915 when units were instructed that their war diaries were to be kept in duplicate and the duplicate copy forwarded to the Department of Defence, Melbourne, for preservation. This measure was quite inadequate. For one thing, the most important part of a war diary is the appendices attached to it. In most cases only single copies of these were available, and thus the duplicate copy of the diary was lacking in this respect.

2. Towards the end of 1916 Mr. Bean, the Australian War Correspondent and now the historian appointed by the Commonwealth Government to edit the history of

the part played by the Australian Naval and Military Forces in this war, and to write the volumes dealing with Gallipoli and France, inspected the Canadian War Records Section. He found that the Canadian Government had obtained approval from the British Government to its receiving the original copies of the war diaries of its units, provided complete duplicates were handed over to the British Government. Mr. Bean immediately recommended that Australia should approach the British Government with a view to the same permission being granted the Commonwealth, and that an Australian War Records Section should be formed. This proposal received favourable consideration. The British Government agreed that Australia should receive its original war diaries on the same conditions as Canada. The Australian War Records Section was established in May, 1917.

3. Though at first confined to official documentary records—war diaries, maps, and air photographs, and old correspondence files—the Australian War Records Section was later called upon to extend its activities. By the middle of 1918 it was collecting, in addition to official documentary records, the following:—

(*a*) Photographs taken by Australian Official Photographers in France, Palestine, and the United Kingdom, and copies of those taken by private individuals in all theatres of war where Australian troops had been engaged.

(*b*) Pictures and sketches painted by Australian artists specially commissioned for this work, and by artists who had enlisted for service in the Australian Imperial Force.

(*c*) Trench papers issued in the field by Australian units, and publications and press cuttings referring to Australians, or to operations in which they had taken part, or published by Australians.

(*d*) Trophies and relics captured or acquired by Australian troops in the field.

4. One of the first duties of the War Records Section was to improve the war diaries of units. By means of constructive criticism of diaries sent in and the issue of circular memoranda, it succeeded in making the diaries of the Australian units at least equal to those kept by any other British force. Copies of all diaries have been supplied to the Historical Section Committee of Imperial Defence for preservation with the diaries of British and other Dominion units. The original diaries have been precised and indexed and bound. Copies of the diaries of British or other Dominion units fighting on the flanks of Australians and of the headquarters of higher British formations have also been obtained, in order that the Australian historians, in studying the operations of Australian troops, may see them in their true perspective.

5. A comprehensive collection of maps of the areas operated over by Australian troops, and a more general collection of maps of all fronts, have been obtained and indexed. Steps have been taken to mount on linen maps which might otherwise become damaged by handling, and in many cases sketches and maps hurriedly made in the field have been redrawn. Of maps likely to be of interest to Australian historians a large number of copies has been obtained in order that they may be issued as required to those who desire to obtain copies of them.

The War Records Section has also endeavoured to supplement the maps and diaries in its possession by a collection of air photographs of all fronts occupied by Australian troops. It was found that the photos issued in the field were improperly treated and were liable to fade or stain. Arrangements were therefore made with the Air Ministry for permanent prints to be supplied. These are being made up into mosaics covering the Australian front, to show the different phases in the operations in which Australians have been engaged. A

second copy of each air photograph is being filed according to the map reference of the area photographed.

6. The War Records Section has received and classified the correspondence files of all A.I.F. units and headquarters. In doing this, documents of no importance and duplicates have been destroyed. It has been found that these correspondence files frequently contain historical material of great value, particularly regarding administrative problems and experiences which may have extended over a period and thus have escaped reference in the war diary which is compiled daily. It may also be added that the Section obtained statements from all repatriated prisoners regarding the circumstances of their capture.

7. During the expedition to Gallipoli no Official Photographer served with the Australian Forces. Mr. Bean, the Australian Correspondent, from the date of the departure of the 1st Australian Contingent, had consistently taken photographs of events of importance, and will hand over this collection to the Australian Government for inclusion in its Historical Records. In addition, the War Records Section, after its formation, energetically canvassed the A.I.F. with a view to obtaining copies of photographs taken by members, and in this way secured for Australia a valuable collection of photographs dealing with the services of Australian Troops in the earlier years of the war. Towards the end of 1916 it was proposed to appoint an Australian Official Photographer for service on the Western Front. This was opposed, but subsequently agreed to, by General Headquarters, British Armies in France. The first Official Photographer was appointed in December, 1916. Towards the end of 1917 the staff of photographers was increased in order that one photographer might be available to take record photographs while the other obtained photographs of publicity value. Subsequently the staff was still further increased. The Australian collection of photographs numbers 15,000. It

is remarkably comprehensive, covering practically all theatres of war in which Australian troops have served and all aspects of service during the war. Special care has been taken to ensure that the descriptions of photographs are true and accurate, and that the unit, date, and place are invariably recorded. The photographs have all been carefully indexed. The direction of view and areas covered by Official Photographs have been marked on maps, thus enabling historians to refer to photographs which will assist them to visualise the conditions of the battlefield. Copies of Australian photographs have been supplied to the Imperial War Museum.

8. The Australian sketches and pictures of the war have been made partly by Australian artists resident in Great Britain who have been specially commissioned for this purpose and partly by artists serving in the Australian Imperial Force. The collection includes the sketches made in the field by these artists, and also large composition pictures of which the subjects are important incidents in the service of the Australian Naval and Military Forces, descriptions of which have been supplied to them by eye-witnesses. The artists are allotted subjects which their experienee in the field qualifies them to paint. The subjects of the composition pictures have been selected with a view to providing a complete pictorial record of the service of the Australian Naval and Military Forces.

9. The War Records Section has got together a fairly complete collection of the trench and transport papers and similar publications issued by Australian units. The collection is not absolutely complete, but in the circumstances, it could not well be otherwise, particularly as the number of copies of these papers published was limited and distributed immediately they were printed. The Section endeavoured to collect all publications written by Australians dealing with the operations of the Australian units or fighting in which they took part.

Press cuttings of a similar nature have also been collected. The publications and press cuttings collected have been drawn from all over the world. The Commonwealth Parliamentary Library has also been making a somewhat similar collection. It will doubtless be decided to amalgamate these collections.

10. As a result of the activities of the War Records Section the Australian nation now possesses a very complete collection of war trophies and relics. These have been collected from all theatres of war in which Australian troops have fought, they are accurately and fully described, and have been carefully indexed. The material not required for the Commonwealth War Museum will be distributed between the States.

11. The present intention is that the above records, pictures, photographs, trophies, relics, etc., will be housed in the Australian National War Museum which will be the Commonwealth's Memorial to its Naval and Military Forces. The Museum will consist of a Library, Picture Gallery, and Museum. It will be established at the seat of the Commonwealth Government.

12. From the foregoing paragraphs it will have been noticed that the greatest attention has been given to the collection of the records of the Australian Imperial Force. The collection of naval war records was not commenced until less than a month before the Armistice was signed. The collection of pictures, photographs, and museum material is, bearing in mind the late date at which the collection was commenced, as satisfactory as can be expected. The documentary records, such as the logs, etc., were placed in the custody of the Admiralty during the war with the intention of transferring them to the Navy Office, Melbourne, when H.M.A. Fleet returned to its own waters.

13. The arrangements for the collection of Historical Records amassed by the Australian Naval and Military Forces overseas were complete though made late. These

records have all been carefully preserved and indexed, and will be available to Australian historians. Copies of the more important records have been supplied to the British Government.

14. The Mitchell Library in Sydney has endeavoured to collect private diaries and other historical matter in the possession of private individuals. It has in this way succeeded in purchasing a fairly large number of valuable records.

THE UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

(Communicated by Mr. C. Graham Botha, Chief Archivist of the Union)

Cape Province

Up to 1908 this was under the care of a Keeper of Archives. The year following his retirement a Commission was established. This unpaid Commission controlled the records until 1912 when I was placed as Clerk in Charge and the Commission shortly after ceased to exist. In 1918 Government appointed another Commission consisting of the Hon. Sir James Rose-Innes, Chief Justice of the Union; the Right Hon. John X. Merriman, P.C., M.L.A.; J. de V. Roos, Controller and Auditor-General of the Union; Professor Eric A. Walker, M.A., History Professor, Cape Town University; Dr. S. F. N. Gie, Professor of South African History, Stellenbosch University; Messrs. A. C. G. Lloyd, Librarian, South African Public Library; J. C. van der Horst and C. Graham Botha to recommend steps necessary for the custody and improvement of the Cape Archives, supervise publications of any portion of the Archives, recommend from time to time what steps are necessary in connection with the collection, preservation, and distribution of all written matter, public or private, bearing on the past history and records of South Africa. Members

are appointed to hold office for five years. Towards the end of the past year Government created a new office of Chief Archivist for the Union, and I was honoured by receiving the post. My duties have not yet been fully defined, but it will entail the full control of the archives of the four provinces. Government proposes sending me to Europe during the course of this year to study the various systems of archives and obtain the latest and fullest knowledge relating to this work. I trust therefore that I will have the privilege of seeing you soon. Since I gave evidence in 1911 the number of volumes in the Cape Archives has increased considerably. Since I took over in 1912 I have added about four times the original number to the volumes of manuscript and they now total nearly thirty thousand. Broadly, the period covered is from 1652 to 1910. The nature of the records is defined in my *Brief Guide* on pages 7 and 8, in addition to which I have the records of the Governor and High Commissioner of Cape Colony up to 1872, Lt.-Governor of the Eastern Province of the Cape Colony, Prime Minister's Department, Native Affairs Department, and about six additional Magisterial districts to those enumerated on page 70. Referring to my evidence of 1911, vol. i. part iii. page 110: Our main and principal archives of the Government of the Cape Colony are in Cape Town. These consist of the various Government departments, commencing with the Colonial Secretary's Office and all departments created from time to time, and after 1872 the various ministerial departments. These are for the most part under my custody, and those not yet here will be collected as time permits. But such offices as the Surveyor-General and Deeds Office where title deeds, transfers, and mortgages of land are kept are not in my custody. The records of the Masters Office (similar to the Probate Registry, Somerset House) from 1833 and of Supreme Court from 1828 are still under their original charge. It will require legislation to have

these removed. Now with regard to the country records, these consist for the most part of those to be found in the Offices of the Resident Magistrate and Civil Commissioner of each district and comprise judicial and ordinary correspondence. The Civil Commissioner was, as it were, the representative of the head Government in the Capital. These are the records referred to in questions 2922-2925. Gradually from time to time they have been collected in our depository here, where in due course all such records will be housed.

Q. 2930. My records are kept in fireproof vaults in the basements of the Houses of Parliament and New Law Courts, and every precaution is taken against fire and theft.

Q. 2934. Most of the papers for the period 1795 to 1803 are wanting, that is the main correspondence between the Governor of the Colony and the Secretary of State, see my *Guide*, page 3. I do hope they will still be discovered somewhere in the Colonial Office section of the London Public Record Office, and maybe there are duplicate dispatches of them which we might procure.

Q. 2936. As well as the remarks in vol. ii. part ii. page 81 of the second report. How different is the position to-day! I have made every effort since assuming my duties here in 1912 to arouse public interest in our muniments, and since then every year has seen a great increase in the number of serious students who are now to be seen daily in the search room. Several of the University professors, students doing research work for a thesis for their M.A. degree, journalists, and many others now constantly use the records. The subjects of research are varied, but when the books and monographs have been published by these people they will add greatly to our knowledge. The value of the archives to elucidate many points of our history is becoming more widely known. On page 8 of my *Guide* I state briefly what facilities are given to students.

My staff at present is small, consisting of myself and an assistant whom I have had since March, 1918, but I hope when reorganisation takes place and steps are taken to co-ordinate and make uniform the four archives, it will be enlarged.

Transvaal Archives

As regards the contents and custody of these records the reports of 1913 and 1916 will give some indication. These archives are housed in spacious vaults in the basement of the magnificent Union Buildings in Pretoria. Until recently it was in charge of a Keeper with two assistants. The Keeper of the Transvaal Archives has recently died, and with my appointment as Chief Archivist no further steps have yet been taken as to the titles of the heads of the several archive depots.

Orange Free State and Natal

As to contents of these archives reference will be found in the 1913 and 1916 reports. Each of these offices is under a Clerk in Charge. In the 1916 report under Transvaal, page 18, it will be seen that the magisterial records of the Transvaal, Orange Free State, and Natal are being centralised in the depot at Pretoria.

General

I have tried to state briefly such facts as may be desired as supplementary to my evidence of 1911 and to my published *Guide*. As I have only just been appointed over the archives of the four provinces, and thus far no attention has been given to collaborate one with the other, I confess I do not know too much about the condition of the Free State and Natal Records. Those of the Transvaal I have seen personally. I am about to make a tour of inspection of these shortly. There are several other points which I might refer to, but I do not

want to give unnecessary details. In November, 1918, the Governor-General in Council approved of a scale of fees to be charged for searches in the four archives, which has made the four depositories uniform in this respect. The Cape Archives Commission have submitted to Government for approval a scheme of rules and regulations for the public use of the archives which have been based largely on those in vogue in the Public Record Office. They have also gone into the question of the accessibility of the records to the public and submitted a recommendation thereon. These are still under consideration, but they are most necessary steps for the carrying on of the archives. No doubt in course of time all this will be made uniform for the four Provinces.

I have prepared for the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge a manuscript on "Records for the Early History of South Africa," which it is proposed should be issued in pamphlet form uniform with the lines of same nature which they publish from time to time. The manuscript will shortly be forwarded for publication.

The South African War Records are in the custody of the Union Defence Department. It is hoped that these will be transferred to the Archives for preservation in due time.

THE VOYAGE OF PEDRO TEIXEIRA ON THE AMAZON FROM PARÁ TO QUITO AND BACK, 1637-39

By The Rev. G. Edmundson, M.A., Litt.D., F.R.Hist.S.

Read November 13, 1920

The first European to make acquaintance with the main stream of the mightiest of all rivers, the river of the Amazons, was the Spaniard, Francisco de Orellana. This man was one of the leaders of an expedition of discovery, which left Quito on Christmas Day, 1539, under the command of Gonzalo Pizarro. After the endurance of terrible hardships, Pizarro at length reached the banks of the river Napo. Here a brigantine was built, and as his men were starving in the pathless forests, the chief placed Orellana and fifty men on board with orders to descend the stream in search of provisions. Towards the close of the year 1540 Orellana started on his quest, and never returned. He reached the ocean on August 26, 1541. This adventurous voyage, the details of which have been preserved by Friar Gaspar Carvajal, one of the companions of Orellana, created a great sensation. When the news of it reached Madrid, Charles V gave Orellana a commission to conduct an expedition to take possession of the newly-discovered lands, of which he was appointed Governor. The attempt ended in utter disaster, and Orellana himself perished at sea. After his failure and death nearly a century passed before any other voyager traversed the Amazon from the mountains to the ocean. For a time the great river was known as the Orellana, but the name, which was given to it by

Orellana himself has prevailed, the River of the Amazons (from certain women-warriors that were supposed to inhabit its lower course); and although its principal affluent on the north bank has always been a Portuguese possession, it has continuously retained the Spanish appellation, Rio Negro, given to it by its first discoverer.

With the exception of the expedition sent under Pedro de Ursua in 1560 down the Ucayali into the Upper Amazon in search of the fabled El Dorado (which ended in the assassination of Ursua and the escape of the leader of the band of murderers, Lope de Aguirre, by an unknown route to the island of Margarita near the mouth of the Orinoco), no steps were taken to navigate or to explore the Amazon until the seventeenth century.

The Dutch were the pioneers. Already before the close of the sixteenth century, Dutch ships were in the habit of visiting the coasts of Guinea and then crossing the Atlantic to a point south of the mouth of the Amazon. After this, hugging the shore they entered the various river mouths for the purpose of traffic with the natives, as far as the salt-mines of Punta de Araya, a little beyond the mouth of the Orinoco, from whence they returned with cargoes of salt by the way of the West Indies. This course was dictated by the direction of the trade winds and the ocean currents, which always set strongly from East to West along the Guiana shore. According to the contemporary account of Jan de Lact,[1] some Flushing merchants in 1599 or 1600, not content with passing visits, erected two permanent fortified trading posts, named Orange and Nassau, on the left bank of the river Xingu, a southern tributary of the Amazon, which enters the main stream just before its division into many channels. The next effort, also from Flushing, was more ambitious. Flushing was one of the so-called "cautionary

[1] *Nieuwe Welt*, 1630. De Lact at the time he published this work was a Director of the West India Company and a very accurate historian.

towns" held by the English since 1585, as a security to Queen Elizabeth for repayment of the aid given by her to the United Provinces. In 1616, taking advantage of the pecuniary needs of James I, the Dutch statesman, Oldenbarneveldt, redeemed the cautionary towns by a cash payment. This same year, 1616, a body of settlers, consisting of 130 men, fourteen of whom took their families with them, set sail for the Amazon. A portion of these were English, many of the garrison having settled in Flushing. They pushed up the river and built a fort on the north bank of the Amazon, six leagues above the mouth of the Ginipape. This settlement appears to have flourished for some years, but in 1623 attacks by the Portuguese, who stirred up the native tribes against the intruders, compelled its abandonment. On the site the Portuguese afterwards erected a fort, named El Destierro. During this same period another settlement of Dutch and English was attempted still higher up the river, this time on the south bank at the mouth of the river Tapajos. It was not fortunate, for all the colonists were massacred.[1] This very same year 1623, a Dutch vessel, containing a number of French refugees seeking a convenient place for a settlement on one of the Guiana rivers, visited the mouth of the Amazon. They found there no less than six different trading posts on the shores of the islands: two Dutch; two English; and one Irish.[2]

Let us now turn from these early efforts by the Dutch

[1] The above accounts of Dutch Settlements rest upon the authority of Major John Scott in a MS. headed "History and Description of ye River of ye Amazone's," found by me among the Pepys' Papers in the Rawlinson MS. in the Bodleian Library. Scott's MS. was written 1669 or 1670. His information came from two eye-witnesses, one of whom may be identified with the famous Admiral De Ruyter, the other was a certain Captain Mattijs Matteson, of whom more later. Corroborative Portuguese and Spanish evidence exists.

[2] The narrative of this most interesting voyage, written by one of the French emigrants on board "The Pigeon" is in the British Museum Sloane MS. 179 B. An interesting sketch map shows the position of the six trading posts on the Amazon islands.

with their English companions to explore and exploit the mouth and lowest reaches of the Amazon to the time when the Portuguese and Spaniards awoke to the importance of the great river, which they had so long left untraversed and unknown. When the seventeenth century opened the Captaincy of Pernambuco was the most northern of the Portuguese governments in Brazil. In 1612 the occupation by a large French expedition of the Island of Marañon, and their foundation upon it of the town of St. Louis, was a direct challenge. When the Spanish Council of the Indies heard of this, orders were at once sent out to the Governor of Pernambuco, Gaspar de Sousa, that the intruders should be expelled, and possession taken of the Amazon and the adjoining lands. It was more easily said than done, for the French were strongly posted. Not till 1615 did a Portuguese force under Jeronymo de Albuquerque capture St. Louis. An expedition under Francisco Caldeira was then sent by him to make the conquest of Graõ Pará (big water), as the Amazon was called, and to eject the Dutch. A Spanish MS. in the British Museum gives a detailed account of this expedition by one who took part in it.[1] Entering the river Seperará, which he mistook for the main mouth of the Amazon, Caldeira laid the foundation of a town, to which he gave the name of *Nossa Senhora de Belem*, to be the capital of the new State of Grão Pará. As is frequently the case in Brazil the original name of the town became colloquially displaced, and Belem to be known as Pará. This was a great step in advance. Here Caldeira speedily heard of the activity of the Dutch, of their long established forts on the Xingu, and of an expedition with women proceeding up the river, the expedition, in fact, of 1616 which made a settlement near the mouth of the Ginipape. A force, however, under

[1] Add. MSS. 28461. The author, Captain Andrew Pareira, was deputed to carry the news to Spain.

Pedro Teixeira, sent to clear the river of the heretics, failed to effect its purpose through the hostility of the natives, and dissensions among the Portuguese themselves. After this there was a few years respite, but the resumption of the war between Spain and the United Provinces, when the Twelve Years' Truce came to an end in 1621, led to a determined renewal of Portuguese activity. In 1622 Bento Maciel Parente, a man of ruthless energy, was made Captain-Mor of Grao Pará and Luis Aranha Vasconcellos dispatched direct from Madrid as commander of a force for the exploration and the gradual conquest of the Amazon. Maciel and Aranha found the exit from the river Pará into the main stream of the Amazon blocked by a Dutch fort at Corupá. This was stormed, and a Portuguese fort built on the opposite side of the river. Next the two Dutch forts on the Xingu were destroyed. It was this onslaught that led to the final abandonment of the Ginipape Colony, and to the annihilation of the other settlement on the Tapajos. It was not till 1629, however, that a Portuguese force under Pedro de Teixeira and Pedro da Costa at last cleared the mouth of the Amazon of the foreign trading posts, and finally closed the river against the Dutch intruders.

Meanwhile the Spaniards had not been idle in the districts bordering upon the Andes, and more especially in their efforts to evangelise the native tribes dwelling upon the banks of the Napo, an affluent of the Upper Amazon whose sources were not far distant from Quito. During the period of which we have been treating, both Spain and Portugal were subject to the same ruler, and since the renewal of hostilities with the Dutch in 1621 the Council of the Indies had conceived the idea of opening out communications between Peru and the ocean by way of the Amazon, so as to avoid the necessity of crossing the Isthmus of Panama, and at the same time to

secure a shorter sea-route to Cadiz for the Silver Fleet. Philip IV had accordingly issued instructions both to the Portuguese Governor of Marañon and to the Spanish authorities at Quito and Cuzco to explore the river. The Portuguese, as we have seen, had succeeded by 1629 in clearing the lower reaches of the main stream of the Dutch and English settlers and traders, and had erected forts to check future incursions. From Cuzco (as we learn from certain MSS. in the British Museum)[1] a determined attempt was made by a Spanish official, Recio de Leon by name, to find a navigable route from Upper Peru to the Amazon. His geography is not easy to follow, but he appears to have finally descended the Ucayali to its junction with the Upper Amazon. From Quito fearless and devoted missionaries, Jesuits and Franciscans, endeavoured to carry the message of the Gospel, and with some success, to the native tribes on the river Napo and its affluents, but not till 1636 did any Spaniards follow the steps of Orellana and succeed in reaching the Amazon by this route. It happened in this way.

A certain Captain Juan de Palacios was sent with a body of thirty soldiers accompanied by five Franciscan missionaries to make a settlement amongst a tribe, who inhabited the left bank of the Rio Napo, known as the Encabellados (or Long-Haired Indians) and to convert them to Christianity. All went well for a time, but owing to the ill-treatment of one of their chiefs, the Encabellados attacked the Spaniards, and, though they were driven off, Palacios himself was killed. This caused much discouragement among the soldiers, and the great body of them, with three of the Franciscans, resolved to return to Quito. It appears, however, that among the Spaniards was a Portuguese sailor, Hernandez by name, who by tales of rich mines of gold to be found on the Amazon, persuaded five of his companions to descend the

[1] British Museum, 1324, K (6) and Add. MSS. 13977.

river with him in a large boat, and two Franciscan lay-brothers, Fr. Domingo de Brieva and Fr. Andres de Toledo, contrary to the orders of their Superior, resolved to accompany them. There are several contemporary accounts of this wonderful voyage, all of them very rare, two of them by Franciscans, who were anxious that the achievement of the two disobedient lay-brothers should redound to the glory of their order. These narratives cannot be relied upon as strictly truthful. The most detailed is that of Father Laureano de la Cruz[1] who was a witness of the departure of Brieva and Toledo, October 17, 1636. He tell us that his account of the voyage was written in 1653 by order of his Superiors in Madrid, and he naïvely confesses: "I do not write this narrative for all to believe, but for my Superiors to believe, and I believe they will believe it, since on the day that they bid me write it, they gave me assurance of their belief". Nevertheless though the actual miracles recorded may be discounted, the fact that the adventurers survived their journey of some 3500 miles down an unknown river thickly inhabited at that time by native tribes, all of them suspicious, and many of them hostile, and that they were all the time entirely dependent upon the food they could procure on the way is itself sufficiently miraculous. After nearly four months voyaging they reached at last the Portuguese fort of Corupá, February 5, 1638, where they were well received and furnished with clothes and food. From Corupá they were sent on by way of Pará to San Luis de Marañon, in which city the Governor, Jacomé Raimondo de Noronha, it is related, "showed them many kindnesses, praised them, and treated them with much affection".

The arrival of the Franciscans and their companions created great excitement at San Luis. There exists in

[1] *Nuevo Descubrimiento del Rio de Marañon*, 1653. Laureano de la Cruz himself descended the river in 1651.

the Archives at the Hague[1] a set of papers addressed to the Council of the West India Company in Holland by a certain Gideon Morris. This man of English descent had settled in Zeeland, and, while in the Dutch service, had been captured by the Portuguese and kept a prisoner for some eight or nine years at San Luis. These papers contain by far the most complete and accurate description of Marañon and Graõ Pará in the period 1631-42 that are in existence. One of them (bearing the date, February 3, 1640) contains a most interesting account of the effect of the coming of the Franciscans in stirring the Portuguese to prepare an expedition to emulate the great feat that had just been successfully accomplished. The Portuguese were in fact very jealous of the Spaniards having a monopoly of the knowledge of the course of the great river, a considerable portion of which fell within the Portuguese sphere of influence according to the delimitation of Pope Alexander VI, as defined by the Treaty of Tordesillas. Morris describes the preparations for sending up the river a really imposing expedition under the command of the experienced Pedro Teixeira, who by his exploits in clearing the mouth of the river of the Dutch forts and trading-posts, had already given proof of his great capacity for leadership. He started on his wonderful voyage, July 25, 1637,[2] accompanied by the Franciscan, Domingo de Brieva, as guide. His fleet consisted of 47 large canoes, manned by 70 white soldiers and 1200 Indians with their women as servants[3] For a single vessel carrying but a small number of persons to drift down-stream for some 3500 miles was so fraught with difficulties and dangers that its successful accom-

[1] *Secrete Notulen van de Vergadering van de Negeutien*, 1629-1645. One result of Morris' representations was the dispatch of a Dutch expedition which captured San Luis in 1641.

[2] Acuña, *Nuevo Descubrimiento*, says October 28. This is incorrect.

[3] Scott, on the authority of a certain Matthijs Matteson, who accompanied Teixeira, gives the number of Indians as 1460 and adds that there were 40 Flemings besides himself.

plishment was ascribed to the intervention of a special providence by the imagination of wondering contemporaries. But the task set before Teixeira of conducting so large a fleet up-stream against the current by force of rowing and to obtain the supplies absolutely necessary for the feeding of some 1500 persons might well have appeared insuperable. That Teixeira not only arrived at Quito, but that he brought back his expedition safely to Pará makes this double voyage of his, as a mere feat of human skill and endurance, quite apart from its great value, geographically and historically, worthy of special record.

The journey up-stream must have been much more arduous, and was probably far more full of adventure, than the return voyage, of which we possess such a full and admirable description from the pen of the Spanish Jesuit, Father Christoval d'Acuña, who was commissioned by the Spanish authorities to accompany the Portuguese expedition on its return, with instructions to write an account of all that he saw upon the voyage for the use of the Council of the Indies. To this narrative, which survives, we owe our first detailed knowledge of the Amazon, its affluents, its native tribes, and its products, but until recent years nothing practically was known of Teixeira's ascent of the river except the bare fact as related by the historian Berredo,[1] a century later, of his arrival at Quito. It is one of my objects in this lecture to draw attention to some recently discovered sources of information, which throw light upon the events of the voyage up-stream and indirectly upon the much disputed question, as to the position of the spot where Teixeira placed the boundary mark between the Spanish and Portuguese possessions.

The first of these sources is an anonymous MS. in the National Library at Madrid,[2] which was published

[1] *Ann. Hist. de Estado de Maranhão.* Lisbon, 1749, lio. x, p. 303.

[2] There is a copy in the National Library at Pará.

with an excellent introduction by Sr. Jimenez de la Espada in 1889. The editor has shown almost conclusively that this narrative, entitled, *Viaje del Capitàn Pedro Texeira, aguas arriba del Rio de las Amazonas*, 1638-39, was written by Padre Alonso de Rojas, Rector of the Jesuit College at Quito, from the information derived by him from Bento de Acosta, the chief pilot of the expedition. The following passage[1] makes this clear, and also shows that the voyage was one of very careful exploration and discovery :—

"The journey up to the arrival at Quito lasted so long a time (*i.e.* 10 months) because they came very slowly discovering the rivers and noting the ports. The said chief pilot who has measured all the days-marches and distances, says that one could navigate the river up-stream in two months. The whole of this river of the Amazons, in the islands, on the banks and the lands beyond, is peopled with Indians in such numbers that to signify its multitude, the chief pilot of this expedition, Bento de Acosta, a man experienced in these discoveries, who navigated the river and all those that enter into it, until the arrival at Quito, noting the land and observing its qualities that are so great and the Indians so numberless that if a dart were to fall from the air, it would strike the head of an Indian and not fall on the ground. And not only the river of the Amazons is so thronged with people, but also the rivers which flow into it, in which the said pilot navigated for 3 or 4 days and says that each one of these rivers is a well-peopled kingdom, and the main river is an entire world greater than has been discovered up till now in all America."

The interesting thing about this narrative is that it was actually written while Teixeira and his companions were staying at Quito, for Father Christoval de Acuña in his narrative, as official historiographer of the descent of the river, quotes textually and without acknowledgment no less than five sections of the "Rojas" document. It must therefore have been seen by Acuña before he started from Quito, and there can be little doubt that

[1] *Viaje del Capitàn Pedro Texeira*, p. 83.

much of the Jesuit Father's famous description of the river was derived, directly or indirectly, from Bento de Acosta.

I have myself had the good fortune to meet with three other MSS. dealing with Teixeira's voyage up-stream to Quito. Two of these are in the National Library at Lisbon. The earlier of the two contains a report of the existence of gold mines on the Amazon written in 1644 by Ignacio de Rego Barreto,[1] one of Teixeira's companions at the request of King Joaõ IV. Barreto writes :—

"What I gathered concerning this matter, when I was Chief Purveyor of your Majesty's revenue in the State of Maranham is that when Francisco de Carvelho was Governor thereof the King of Spain had ordered him to explore the Rio das Amasonas because he understood that it contained much riches, but the said Governor died without putting this exploration into execution. Jacomo Raimondo de Noronha, who succeeded him in the Government, immediately paid attention to it, and in the year 1637 sent a fleet of canoes from Pará, where the river forms a bay, with eighty old soldiers accustomed to the interior districts and a party of Indians required for rowing the canoes, and in this way they proceeded to mark out all the Rio das Amasonas and the remarkable things it contains, among which that which demanded the greatest consideration was that after a period of 50 days' journey, when they were resting themselves on the bank of this river in a native village, they found the greater number of the natives wore circlets and bracelets of gold and other objects after their custom, and when our people inquired where it was that they found this metal, a river was pointed out to them running into that of the Amasonas, wherein gold could be obtained by washing, coming from certain mines which are distant two days' journey up the river in canoes, and that there was such an abundance of this metal that if our men cared to load with it the canoes in which they journeyed, it would be very easy. A council was held upon this matter, and everybody was of opinion that these mines should be explored ; only the officer who was in command of

[1] MS. Bibl. Nac. de Lisboa. Archivo de Conselho Ultramarino Lembretes, 579.

our men, Pero Teixeira, now deceased, did not agree with this, because all he desired was to explore the source of the Rio das Amasonas, and on the return journey the said mines could be explored, leaving the spot marked out with the name Rio do Ouro—River of Gold. Our men, with bartering certain iron implements, obtained from the natives the golden articles which they possessed, and prosecuting the same journey also found gold higher up but not in such abundance. . . . The greater part of the men, who were employed in this exploration, continued in it and eventually got as far as the Kingdom of Quito in the Spanish Indies, where they were well received, and returning down the same river to Pará it was found impossible to undertake the exploration of the said mines of gold, not only because the greater part of our natives perished in the Kingdom of Quito, but also because our people rejected the idea amongst themselves."

The other Lisbon MS., from the pen of Felipe de Mattos, Teixeira's second in command, bears the date 1645.[1] Felipe de Mattos likewise dilates upon the stories that he heard from the natives of the *Aldea do Ouro* of the abundance of gold that was to be found four days' journey up a river which entered the Amazon on the opposite bank. He described the village as lying halfway—*meada viagem*—between Pará and the end of their journey. This statement will be found to have importance later.

The third document,[2] to which I have referred, rewarded my search among the Pepys' papers in the Rawlinson Collection in the Bodleian Library. It bears the title, *History and Description of the River of the Amazones*, and was written about 1669 by Major John Scott, who in 1668 obtained from Charles II. a patent creating him "Geographer to the King". Scott, in command of an English force, had in 1665 captured the Dutch Colony of Essequibo, and an earlier MS. of his

[1] MS. Bibl. Nac. de Lisboa. Archivo do Conselho Ultramarino, Lembretes, 579.

[2] Rawlinson MS., A. 175.

entitled, *A Description of Guiana*,[1] now in the Sloane Collection at the British Museum, is full of the most interesting material for the history of colonisation along the coast between the mouths of the Amazon and the Orinoco. Much of the information he has preserved in these MSS. was derived from a Flemish adventurer, Matthijs Matteson, whom he made prisoner in Essequibo. Matteson was then in the Dutch service, but his experiences had been of such a varied and remarkable character as to deserve a passing notice. A native of Ghent he became early in life a sailor in the Flushing vessels which frequented the Amazon and the Guiana coasts. In 1623 he was one of the crew of a Dutch vessel which was destroyed by the Portuguese in the Amazon. There are many references to the loss of this ship, Portuguese, Spanish, French, and Dutch,[2] and Father Rojas in his *Viaje de Pedro Texeira* tells us that among the prisoners was "the great pilot Matamatigo". Espada in his edition of the "Rojas" MS. asks in a note, "who is this great pilot Matamatigo?" Scott answers the question. He informs us that Mattiji Matteson, whose name can be easily recognised in its Spanish dress, was the pilot of Pedro Teixeira's vessel in its ascent of the Amazon, and that he afterwards spent forty years in the Portuguese service on the Amazon and the Spanish service on the Orinoco before returning to the Dutch service in Essequibo. The period between 1623, when he was captured by the Portuguese, to 1665, when he was taken prisoner by Scott, is exactly forty-two years. Matteson finally took service with the English, and perished in a hurricane with Lord Willoughby of Parham in 1666. Scott tells us that "he bought of this man

[1] Sloane M.S., 3662.

[2] Espada, *Viaje de Pedro Texeira*, p. 80. Brit. Mus. Add. MSS., 13977. Relação das Cousas de Maranhão pello Capitão Estacio de Silveira, 1624. Relação de varios sucessosa conteados no Maranhao e Gran Pará per Luis de Figueira, S.J. Brit. Mus. Sloane MS., 379 B. Journal de Vogage faict par les Pères de Famille, 1625, and elsewhere.

all his maps, carts, and journals, which he had made while he served the Spaniards and the Portuguese in the West Indies". A study of this valuable Matteson material enabled Scott to be the first to announce to the world the existence of the remarkable river Cassiquiare, which unites the Rio Negro and the Amazon with the Orinoco—the statement is perfectly definite—"a branch of this river (*i.e.* the Rio Negro) falls into the Orinoque".

Teixeira, as he advanced farther from his base, had much difficulty in preventing his Indians from deserting. He therefore sent on ahead eight canoes with picked crews under the command of Bento Rodriques de Oliveira, a man born in Brazil and brought up among the natives and speaking the Tupi language familiarly. He prepared the way for the rest of the fleet, and by constantly impressing on his followers that they were near the end of their journey, he succeeded in bringing them up the river Napo to the mouth of the river, where Palacios had made a settlement and was killed, and from whence the Franciscans had started on their journey down-stream. Here the main part of the fleet, under the command of Pedro da Costa Favella was left, July 3, to maintain itself as best it could. Teixeira himself with a few chosen companions pushed on to the first Spanish settlement on the banks of the river Payanimo, and from thence on foot to Quito. His reception was friendly and even enthusiastic, and his journal and maps were forwarded for the Viceroy, the Comt de Chincos' inspection at Lima. But Spanish jealousy was aroused by the presence of so many Portuguese in the province of Quito, and orders were sent from Lima that the expedition should return to Pará by the same route accompanied by two Spanish Jesuits, Fathers Cristoval de Acuña and Andres de Artieda, who had instructions to make a careful survey of the river, of the tribes that inhabited it, and of the rivers that flowed into it for the information of the Council of the Indies.

The return journey began, February 16, 1639, and

right glad, after eight months of severe hardships and much mortality among the crews, were Pedro da Costa and his men to see their leaders again and to start on their homeward voyage. That they remained so long patiently waiting is a proof of extraordinary loyalty. The choice of Acuña as historiographer was well made, for his narrative remains the standard authority for the state of the Amazon in 1639. His account of the tribes inhabiting the banks and islands is of special interest, as a century later Portuguese and Spanish slave-raiders had driven the remnant of them far inland and the shores of the Amazon were then almost deserted. The fault of Acuña is that he displayed a truly Castilian spirit of hostility to the Portuguese, his presence, indeed, with Teixeira's fleet was practically that of an official spy. There is one strange omission in his narrative. He makes no reference to the Solemn Act of Possession carried out by Teixeira at a chosen spot in the name of Philip IV. as King of Portugal. This setting up of a boundary mark between the Spanish and Portuguese possessions was a most important act. If Acuña assented to it, it ought to have been recorded; if he dissented, one would have expected a strong protest.

The expedition reached Pará, December 12, 1639, and Acuña and Artieda soon afterwards sailed for Spain to make their report. Acuña's narrative *El Nuevo Descubrimiento del gran rio de las Amazonas* was printed at Madrid in 1641, but before it had issued from the press the successful revolt of the Portuguese against Spanish rule took place, and orders were at once sent out for its suppression, lest the information it contained should be of value to the rebels. Four copies only are now known to exist; one is in the British Museum.

It only remains for me to discuss the question of the locality of Teixeira's *Act of Possession*, which excited a violent controversy which lasted for more than a century

and a quarter, and was only finally settled in the time of Pombal by the boundary treaty between Spain and Portugal in 1777. The following is a translation of the *Auto de Posse* from a copy now in the Municipal Library of Oporto:—

"In the year of our Lord Jesus Christ 1639, on the 16th day of August, before the mouths of the Rio do Ouro, Pedro Teixeira, Captain-Major for His Majesty in the expeditions and explorations of Quito and the Rio das Amazonas, being then present; and having just returned from the said explorations, ordered to appear before him the Captains, Ensigns and soldiers of his companies, and when all were present he stated and declared to them that he had received orders from the Governor of the State of Maranham, in accordance with the commands which he had from his Majesty, to select the best place he could find in the territory explored for establishing a settlement there, and whereas the place, where they then were, seemed to him suitable both on account of the gold of which he had information, and because there was food, good air, and lands for all kinds of crops, pasture, and cattle-breeding; he asked their opinion, as he had seen all the rest of the explored territory and the river. Then each and all said that in the whole extent of the explored territory, there was no better site or rivers suitable or adequate for this settlement than the one in which they were, for the reasons stated; and when the Captain-Major heard this he took possession in the name of the King, Philip IV, our Lord, for the Crown of Portugal of the said sites and the rest of the lands, rivers, streams and commerce, taking earth in his hands and throwing it into the air, crying with a loud voice he took possession of the said lands and site in the name of the King, Philip IV, our Lord, for the Crown of Portugal, that if any one had objection to make to such possession or knew of any impediments, he was to put it before him, for the Notary of the said expedition and exploration was there and would receive them; although Religious of the Company of Jesus, by order of the Royal Audience of Quito, came there and it is a remote country with many Indian inhabitants, there was no one on their behalf or from elsewhere to make objection to possession being taken."

The Portuguese afterwards claimed that this took place opposite the spot where the river Aguarico (frequently called the Rio del Oro from the richness of its sands in gold dust) enters the river Napo ; the Spaniards on the other hand assert that it was at the spot where the natives had been seen wearing gold ornaments opposite one of the mouths of the river Japura.

The question first became acute in the time of the famous Jesuit missionary from Quito, Samuel Fritz, who spent thirty-seven years (1682-1719) in preaching the Gospel to the native tribes of the Amazon. The Portuguese protested that Fritz was intruding upon their territory; Fritz[1] vehemently denied this. The Portuguese however, attacked and destroyed many of his mission stations and drove away the natives farther up the river. In his *Relation abregée d'un voyage de la rivière des Amazones* the great French scientist and explorer, De la Condamine, in 1742 after seeing the autograph copy of the original *Auto de Posse* at Pará stoutly defends the Spanish contention. He and Samuel Fritz were undoubtedly right.

Acuña tells us that the spot where Pedro da Costa and the main part of Teixeira's fleet remained during the absence of their chief at Quito was twenty leagues below the mouth of the Aguarico, and was the very place where Palacios had founded a settlement in 1636 and was killed. He also gives us the name of Pedro da Costa's second in command, Pedro Bayan. Now the names of these two men are to be found in the third and fourth place respectively among the signatures attached to the *Auto de Posse.* But according to Acuña neither of them were present with Teixeira, when he passed the mouth of the Aguarico. Again is it within the bounds of possibility that Teixeira, when accompanied officially by Acuña and Artieda and other Spaniards, should have taken possession in the name

[1] Fritz left a Journal of his work and travels, which was long lost. A copy of it was found by the writer in the Archiepiscopal Library at Evora in Portugal.

of the King of Portugal of a site that was twenty leagues farther up-stream than the Spanish Settlement where Palacios had lost his life? Of the mouth of the river Aguarico, Acuña says: "It is well known, both for its unhealthy climate and for the gold which is found in it; from which it has also taken the name of the *Rio del Oro*". But the place before the mouth of the river which Teixiera calls the *Rio do Ouro* is described by him "as being suitable, both on account of the gold of which he had information, and because there was good air[1] and land suitable for all kinds of crops, pasture, and cattle-breeding," and when he asked his officers for their opinions "each and all said that in the whole extent of the explored territory there was no better site or more suitable". It clearly could not be then the mouth of the Aguarico "well known for its unhealthy climate".[2] Again the date of the *Auto de Posse* is August 16. But as Teixeira and Acuña left Quito on February 16, they must have passed the Aguarico not later than the end of March. The date August 16 indeed points to a place about half-way in a voyage which ended December 12. Now all narrators of this expedition recount that the inhabitants of a village appropriately named by Teixeira on his upward voyage the Village of Gold (*aldea do Ouro*), situated a little to the west of the river Tefé and nearly opposite the mouth of the river Japura, wore gold ornaments, which they received from other natives, who brought them from a river called the Rio do Ouro. Felipe de Mattos, the second of the signatories of the *Auto*, in his official report of 1645 expressly says that this village was half-way (*meada a viagem*) between Pará and the sources of the Amazon. Barreto in his report of 1644 further tells of how Teixeira, wishing to push on, refused to delay while quests should be made for the reported mines, but to quote Barreto's words "he left the

[1] pelos boas ares.
[2] por su temple menos sano.

place marked with the name of the Rio do Ouro," Acuña himself shall be the last witness. After stating that the Portuguese in their ascent called a certain village "the Village of Gold" he proceeds "fourteen leagues from the village called Golden on the north side is the mouth of the river Japura, by which the Yquiari is entered, called also the River of Gold". Further he states that "all this territory is very high with beautiful plains and pastures for sheep . . . and a promise of many and great advantages to those who may settle in it". Language almost identical with that of the *Auto*. Perhaps some of my hearers may think that this investigations of the exact spot of the boundary mark set up by Teixeira in 1639 is waste labour, more especially as the disputed question was finally laid to rest, as far as regards Spanish and Portuguese claims and interests, by the treaty of 1777, which was a compromise, and fixed the boundary line about half-way between the controverted points, *i.e.* the mouths of the rivers Tefé and Aguarico. But to anyone like myself who has followed carefully the details of the long controversy from the time of the missionary Samuel Fritz at the close of the seventeenth century to the time of the elaborate reply of the Portuguese Governor, Ribeiro de Sampaio (in a diary that he published of his explorations in the years 1774-75 of the Upper Amazon and the Rio Negro), to the conclusions of the great French explorer, La Condamine, who as an impartial observer supported the views of Fritz, it has been a satisfaction to have been able to prove from contemporary evidence that Fritz and La Condamine were right. Nor has this been altogether a dead and buried question in our own days. In the boundary arbitration between Great Britain and Brazil concerning the southern frontier of British Guiana, 1901-04, there were a number of references[1] made in the

[1] The *Auto* of Teixeira is referred to in the Brazilian *Memoire*, pp. 17, 18, 55, 56, 105. The question is discussed in *Notes to the British Counter Case*, pp. 10-14.

documents placed before the arbitrator by the Brazilian Government to the *Auto* of Teixeira, and the arguments of Ribeiro de Sampaio were brought forward as a proof that in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the claims and influence of the Portuguese in the Amazon Valley were wide and extended. The Brazilians are the inheritors of the ancient Portuguese pretensions, which, though no longer affecting practical politics, have become a tradition, and tradition dies hard even when contemporary documentary evidence shows it to be historically baseless.

THE ENGLISH IN RUSSIA DURING THE SECOND HALF OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

By Miss Mildred Wretts-Smith, M.A., M.Sc. (Econ.)

Read 8 *January*, 1920.

The following paper contains the results of an independent study of an episode in the commercial history of this country which has been the subject of some important researches during recent years. The beginnings of mercantile adventure in Russia and other regions of Northern Europe and the Far East have been related by contemporary men of action, most of whose narratives have been carefully edited in the Hakluyt Series; but the political and economic environment of the Muscovy Company itself was still in need of elucidation from contemporary State Papers and other records. Some of these sources have been used by Madame Lubimenko, Dr. A. J. Gerson and Mr. O. T. Williams for special aspects of the subject; but a large mass of material of the first importance has remained untouched. This material has been examined by the writer of the present paper for the purpose of an exhaustive history of the Company's activities down to the end of the seventeenth century, and it has been utilized for the present paper to show, for the benefit of other students, how the recognized materials for the study of English Economic History can be supplemented by fresh information from the Archives which have not yet been described.

For this purpose the writer has attempted[1] to give an

[1] In this endeavour the writer has benefited by the advice and encouragement of Professor W. R. Scott, the greatest authority on the subject.

outline of the history of the Company in Russia during the Elizabethan period, based on printed works and obvious MSS. sources, filling in details or gaps from new sources which are indicated in the footnotes to this paper.[1]

Most of the Englishmen who visited or lived in Russia in the sixteenth century were connected in some way with the Muscovy Company. This famous trading association was established by royal charter in 1555,[2] following a voyage of discovery planned by Sebastian Cabot, and financed by many of the nobles, ministers of state, and most prominent merchants of England.[3] The aim of the voyage was the discovery of a route to China by the North-Eastern Seas, and, failing this, of any other country with which trade could be opened up by English merchants. One of the three ships which composed the expedition reached the White Sea, being probably the first to penetrate to those waters since the explorer Other, of Alfred the Great's time. Richard Chancellor, the pilot-general of the enterprise, travelled by sleigh to Moscow, and won from Ivan IV, then Tsar of Muscovy and Russia, valuable trading concessions.

Chancellor's success promoted the formation of the "Company for the discovery of New Trades," which received by royal charter, later confirmed by Act of Parliament,[4] the monopoly of such trade as they should establish by sailing north, north-east, or north-west from England, and the new company began to erect an elaborate trading system in Russia.

[1] The most important of these are the State Papers, Domestic and Foreign (1553-1613), the K.R. Customs Accounts (1553-1600), and the K.R. Port Books (1565-1600) at the Public Record Office; with various documents among the Lansdowne, Cotton, Hasleian, and additional MSS. at the British Museum.

[2] R. Hakluyt, *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, and Discoveries of the English Nation* (edition 1903), ii. p. 304; S.P. Dom., Mary, v. No. 4; Lansdowne MS. 141, No. 55; Cotton MS., Otho E, iii. ff. 51-63.

[3] List of members, S.P. Dom. Addenda, Mary. viii. No. 39.

[4] Hakluyt, iii. p. 83; 8 Eliz., c. 17: Lansdowne MS. 141, No. 56; Cotton MS., Otho E, iii. ff. 64-82.

Russia, or Muscovy as it was then generally styled, was emerging from its isolation as an inland State of Eastern Europe. Its ruler was the famous Ivan the Terrible, at this time an ambitious and energetic prince, who was engaged on almost continuous wars, both with the Tatars and other wild nomadic tribes of his eastern and southern borders, and with the Poles, Livonians, and Swedes on his western frontiers. His dominions were rapidly expanding in both these directions. He had just conquered Astrakhan on the lower Volga, thus expanding his rule, at least nominally, to the Caspian Sea, and a few years later he won the valuable port of Narva on the Baltic from the Teutonic Knights. This port became a considerable commercial outlet for Russian goods, until it was conquered by the Swedes in 1581.

Moscow, Ivan's capital, was by far the most important city in his country. Its houses were built chiefly of logs, and were rude, low, and roofed with shingle, but their number was forty thousand, and, as most of them were surrounded by spacious courtyards and herb-gardens, the city covered an extensive area.[1] The Tsar's citadel, the Kreml, was then being fortified by a wall of burnt bricks, built by Italian architects, but the city itself was without walls or fortifications. Along the banks of the River Moskva for five miles stretched a long row of houses interspersed with fields, where the smiths and other artificers who used fire, lived.[2] This precaution was essential since the wooden houses so easily caught fire, but it did not by any means prevent such catastrophes. The English and other foreigners often complained of the dirt of Moscow, the thick mud on the roads making it impossible to cross the city except on horseback. There was no

[1] S. von Herberstein, *Notes upon Russia* (1549), translated in the Hakluyt Society's Publications (1854), ii. pp. 4-5.

[2] R. Eden, *Of the North-East Frostie Seas*, edited by the Hakluyt Society (1854), ii. p. 224.

attempt at paving, and the melting snows in the spring made the roads almost impassable.[1]

In Moscow, under the direct patronage of the Tsar, the Muscovy Company opened one of its factories. Moscow was then almost the only place in Russia where any foreigners resided, and these lived together in the foreign quarter.[2] During their first years of residence the English lived in this part, but in 1567 Ivan IV gave them a house near the market-place, behind the Church of S. Maxim, and in the vicinity of his own palace.[3] Here, closely under the Tsar's protection, all the English in Moscow lived for many years, except the physicians or other experts in the Tsar's service and ambassadors visiting Moscow on a special mission. In this house, also, the Company's merchandise was stored and all their trade was carried on. They were allowed to have weights and measures on the premises, so that they were exempt from trading in the general market for foreign goods. This was a valuable concession, and placed them in a far more favourable position than other foreigners, giving them also some little security that they would not be turned out of the country at the Tsar's lightest caprice.

Moscow was not, however, the chief seat of the English trade in Russia. It was essential to have a factory there because Moscow was the residence of the Tsar and Court, with whom much of the trade was carried on. Moreover, it was often necessary for the English to address petitions to the Tsar, if they wished to keep their privileges, as the Tsar was their only protector against unfriendly nobles and merchants, and later they had Dutch and other rivals.[4] Far higher prices were de-

[1] Hakluyt, ii. p. 429. [2] S. von Herberstein, i. p. 113.

[3] Hakluyt, iii. p. 93-7. Privileges granted to the Muscovy Company by Ivan IV.

[4] The Dutch first began to use the White Sea route to Russia in 1578 (British Museum, Additional MS. 33837, ff. 70-81). During the sixteenth century they were, on the whole, less favourably treated than the English.

manded there, however, for Russian goods than in any other town,[1] and there was also the continual fear that their goods would be confiscated by the Tsar or his ministers. The members of the Russian Court could not be refused any merchandise they desired, and many rich goods had to be imported from England for their special benefit,[2] but the bad debts which resulted from these transactions mounted to many thousands of roubles in the Company's books.[3]

In these circumstances the company established several other factories at stages on the way from the White Sea to Moscow, and tried at least to buy the majority of their wares at cheaper marts than the capital. Arkhangelsk was not built till the end of the sixteenth century,[4] but the Company founded a factory for unloading and storing their goods on a small island, called by them Rose Island, in one of the mouths of the River Dvina, opposite the monastery of S. Nicolas on the mainland.

Queen Elizabeth, in a letter to the Tsar in 1598, thanked him for "retayning their [*i.e.*, the English Company's] residence in Mosko and other principal cities," while other foreign merchants were "sent and limited to the uttermost parts and confynes" of Russia, that is, to the northern sea-coast (S.P. For., Russia, i. ff. 56-9).

[1] Hakluyt, ii. p. 277; von Herberstein (*Notes upon Russia*, ii. p. 7) stated that the people of Moscow were more cunning and deceitful than other Russians, their honour being especially slack in business contracts.

[2] *See* below, p. 7

[3] "Means of Decay of the Russe Trade," by Christopher Burrough, Lansdowne MS. 52, No. 27 (printed in *Early Voyages and Travels to Russia and Persia*, Hakluyt Society, 1866, Vol. I, Introduction, p. cviii.).

[4] In 1584 the town was first built round the monastery of S. Michael (Hakluyt, iii. p. 346; *Early Voyages*, i. p. 190). The English were at first prohibited from trading there (1586, Hakluyt, iii. p. 352), but by 1596 the Company had built a house at Arkhangelsk (Hakluyt, iii. p. 443), and their privileges of 1598 mention their house at "St Archangell (S.P. For., Russia, i. ff. 66-8, and Cotton MS. Nero B, viii. ff. 29-31). The London Port Book for 1599 (Bundle 10) enters the Muscovy Company's fleet as sailing "versus St Michaells in Russia" (*i.e.* Arkhangelsk), but previously "versus St Nico in Russia" (*i.e.* Rose Island). K.R. Customs Account $\frac{17.8}{3.5}$, outward tonnage roll, London, 1596-7, also enters the fleet as sailing "versus St Nico," so the change of port probably occurred between 1597 and 1599.

After a six or eight weeks' journey of some hazard, in a small ship of perhaps a hundred and twenty tons,[1] with only the hardest biscuit and the saltest of meat as victuals, with the wild and desolate shores of Norway and Lapland under their lea, and buffetted by the monstrous waves of the northern seas, which were still full of ice, the crews must have felt much thankful joy in reaching this haven of safety. In July, when the voyage was completed, Rose Island was a most beautiful place, carpeted with sheets of violets, fragrant with the scent of myriads of roses "damaske and red," and shaded by groves of birch and fir. Here, beside "a faire spring," was built the most northerly house of the English,[2] and here, in the long summer days, the ships were unladen and laden again with cargoes of cables, wax, tallow, furs, tar and hides,[3] collected ready in the warehouses near the water's edge for the return voyage, which had to be made at the beginning of August, to avoid the early winter ice.[4] The mariners, meanwhile, turned eagerly to such surreptitious and illicit trading as they could carry on without the knowledge of the agents, for a "timber"[5]

[1] Ships of tonnages ranging from 60 tons to 120 tons are found in the London Port Books and K.R. Customs Accounts sailing to the White Sea in the sixteenth century. It is rare, however, to find them under 100 or over 160 tons, and an approximate average of 120 tons may be taken. The fleet varied from two to thirteen vessels, an average being possibly six ships of perhaps 700 tons burden yearly.

[2] Hakluyt, iii. p. 72.

[3] The London Port Books (1565-1600) show instances of the following imports:—cordage, cables, ropes, "untired" (untarred?) ropes, cable yarn, wax, tallow, tar, flax, "flax unwrought," train oil, train oil blubbers, sealskins, wolf-skins, "wolverings," mink, squirrel skins, coarse sables, "bever bellies, bever backs, bever wool," "rogesen downe," hides, cow-hides, tanned cow-hides, losh hides (Russian for elk), calf-skins "in the heare," goat skins, rough bristles, dry cow-hides, isinglass.

[4] S.P. Dom., James I, viii. No. 59: "The cuntrey of Russia is not to be sayled unto but only in the monethes of Maye and June and the shippes that then goe thither cannot make there aboade in those partes above a monethe or sixe weekes, unlesse they be frosen and lockt in for a whole yeare followinge".

[5] "Timber"—"a legal quantity of small skins, 40 or 50 packed between two boards" (*Early Voyages*, p. 207, *n.*).

of squirrels' furs or a few sables might yield them a considerable profit in England.[1]

From the port of Arkhangelsk, heavy flat-bottomed barges,[2] laden with English cloth, pewter and paper, and with jewels, rich silks, velvets and damask for the Court, or even a cargo of copper, lead and other munitions of war for the Tsar,[3] proceeding slowly up the River Dvina for seventy miles, sailing when there was wind enough, and at other times towed by men to Kholmogori.[4] Here the English had, with the Tsar's permission, built a house "surely the largest, tytest and fairest in all the Countrie and of warehouses, ambarres, and workhouses as well

[1] Nero B, xi. ff. 321-8 (printed in *Early Voyages*, pp. 206-25): "The marrinars bring every yeare excellent furres". But by 1584 the Company had made stringent provisions to prevent this practice: "The newe agent and assisstant . . . spie so here at the shipps that there dareth nether purser nor maryner trade . . . The masters are bound in two hundreth pownds to the contrarie and for to seem trustie agents to the Company, they alweis when they slepe they lye in their clothes" (Nero B, xi. ff. 360-2).

[2] Hakluyt, ii. p. 419; iii. p. 70.

[3] An early shipload of exports from England (K.R. Customs Account $\frac{99}{11}$ Tonnage and Poundage Roll, 4-5 Elizabeth) includes "folders plumbi . . . stanni opati . . . brassell . . . sulphur . . . croci . . . lignum vite . . . peces canvas striped wth goald and silver . . . panni Auri . . . crimesen Taffita . . . black velvet . . . crimesen damask . . . Raggad and seede pearle . . . Reames paper . . . wryting paper . . . figges corrupt . . . Raisens corrupt . . . vine corrupt" (*cf.* S.P. Dom., Eliz., cclv. No. 56, which recommends the sending of "corrupt wynes" to Russia, and also the selling for wine "sidar puting into it three or fower gallons of Bastard"). The above list, of course, excludes cloth, the staple export to Russia. It may be compared with a later list (Port Books, Bundle 10, 1599) which includes "plumbi iniacti . . . stanni opati . . . stanni in barres . . . copper . . . brymstone . . . Iron wyre . . . goades cottons manchesters . . . coarse Spanishe narrowe clothes . . . single bayes . . . Muscovie gloves . . . frauncomsence . . . Reames pott paper . . . Spanishe pap . . . demy pap . . . cotton wool . . . figges . . . grene ginger in syrup . . . Anny seedes . . . sugers . . . comfettes . . . synamone . . . vini Sackes . . . vini Allegant . . . vini Canaries . . . vini Moskadelles . . . vini Roin . . . vini Vascon". George Stoddard, a young English grocer, mentions also in his ledger "whyt sheuger candy" (Hubert Hall, *Elizabethan Society*, p. 53), and on the first voyage "English bookes of the Scriptures" (which met with no customer) (Hubert Hall, *History of the Customs Revenue of England*, i. p. 51). These lists, which include goods for the people, luxuries for the Court, and "warlike stores" for the Tsar of Russia, help towards forming an estimate of the influence of the English on Russia in the period.

[4] Sir Thomas Smith, *Voyages and Entertainment in Russia* (1605), D2.

accommodated,"[1] and established another factory. Kholmogori was, in the sixteenth century, a great mart for the northern districts of Russia. Lapps, Samoyedes, Karelians, Russians and Tatars came there to trade in fish, oil, furs and feathers.[2] It was a large town built of scattered wooden houses, and the Russian inhabitants were rude, homely and given to drinking.[3]

From Kholmogori the barges, having unladen the goods required for sale there, proceeded up the river for seven hundred miles to Vologda. Anthony Jenkinson, the famous traveller, mentions "great rocks of alabaster and pineapple trees lying along within the ground, which were there since Noah's flood," to be seen a little distance above Kholmogori.[4] "All the way," he continues in his account of the journey, "I went into no house, but lodged by the river side and carried provisions for the way. He who travels here should carry hatchets, timber box and kettle to make a fire and seethe meat".

Vologda, a large and important mart, had been selected for the site of an important factory of the Company.[5] Prices were only half as much as at Moscow, and the English had built a house and warehouses there, on land given them by Ivan IV.[6] Vologda, like the other towns, was built of fir-wood and extended over a considerable area, with a stone and brick-walled castle and many churches.[7] "The English house" said Sir Thomas Smith, "hath a great many rooms but the house itself is very old [*i.e.* in 1604] and stands with an humble body as though it would shortly kisse the earth". Most of the

[1] *Voyages and Entertainment in Russia*, i. 2.

[2] Hakluyt, ii. p. 276; *Early Voyages*, I. Introduction, lxi.

[3] Hakluyt, iii. p. 103.

[4] *Ibid.* ii. p. 418; Similarly Sir Thomas Smith describes this journey (D2) "straight pine, tall cedar or fyrre woods; Alabaster Rockes or the pleasantness of walkes in sweet Meadowes and fair pastures, then which for 1,000 vers [versts] cannot be more welcome in the whole world".

[5] *Ibid.* ii. p. 277. Vologda was "the resort of many rich merchants".

[6] Hakluyt, iii. pp. 93-7. Privileges, 1567.

[7] *Ibid.* iii. p. 104.

Company's apprentices and stipendiaries lived in this house, under the supervision of one of the agents.[1]

From Vologda the journey to Moscow had to be undertaken by land. In winter the Russian sledges provided a rapid and comfortable means of travelling, for the snow on the roads soon became hard and the sledges skimmed easily over the good surface.[2] At stages on the journey there were hostelries where post-horses could be changed, and the English had no difficulty in obtaining these while they were in the Tsar's favour, for they were always kept ready for his servants.[3] Though winter travel in Russia was thus more pleasant and speedy than in any other part of Europe,[4] the conditions were very different in summer. The pace was then slow and the journey fatiguing, for the roads were almost impassable with mud and the carts often stuck fast in the ruts, which were sometimes a yard deep, while walking was impossible.[5]

There was, however, another trade route used by the Company from Vologda, by water. Their barges could sail along various waterways to Yaroslavl, where the Company had a fifth factory in the latter part of the century.[6] Moreover, for over twenty years, from 1558-1583 the merchants passed down the Volga to the Caspian Sea, on their way to trade with Persia. Astrakhan, the last city in Russian territory, was a great disappointment to these early travellers. They mention the meanness of the houses, and the scarcity of bread and meat. The

[1] *Voyages and Entertainment in Russia*, H.

[2] Sir Thomas Smith (G. 2) describes the journey in winter as an "easy and pleasant passage in sleds, such a passage as this part of the world would wonder at, in which a man, though he go at a Hackney pace, may as easilye reade as slepe".

[3] *Notes upon Russia*, i. p. 108; S.P. Dom., Eliz., xliv. No. 11; Hakluyt, iii. p. 116.

[4] E. S. Bates, *Touring in* 1600, p. 293.

[5] Hakluyt, ii. p. 425. Sir D. M. Wallace, *Russia* (1905), pp. 14, 23, 30.

[6] Nero B, xi. ff. 360-2; *Russia at the Close of the Sixteenth Century* (Hakluyt Society, 1856), p. 227, Privileges obtained by Jerome Horsey, 1585-6.

beggarly inhabitants lived chiefly on sturgeon, and this was hung up in the streets to dry, attracting swarms of flies and giving off an abominable stench.[1] Here the English built boats in order to cross the Caspian, and their trade with Persia was most adventurous.[2] Pirates and land-robbers were a great and continual danger, and the voyage itself was most hazardous to men who knew very little of the squalls and shoals of this sea. In Persia itself the distrust and enmity of the population proved an added risk. In spite of all difficulties these daring merchants often succeeded in bringing home rich cargoes of raw and wrought silks, spices, turquoises and galls for dyeing, until the Turkish wars closed the route.

It was mainly in these four or five Russian cities, then, that the English servants of the Moscovy Company lived,[3] buying and selling their goods, trading from one town to another as ordered by their agents, and occasionally making wider prospecting journeys to discover, if possible, new marts for their goods.[4] The several agents of the Company were at the head of the entire commercial enterprises in Russia though subject to minute orders from the Governor of the Company in England. There was usually an agent at the head of each of the important factories, and these few men had an almost absolute authority over all the English connected with the Company in Russia, these being of two classes, apprentices and stipendiaries.[5] The former were young men newly arrived from England, sent to learn the trade. They re-

[1] Hakluyt, ii. p. 445; *Purchas, his Pilgrimes* (1905-7 edition), xii. p. 7.

[2] *See* accounts in Hakluyt, ii. and iii., *Early Voyages*, Calendar of East Indies, i.; and Joseph Hanway, *Historical Account of the British Trade over the Caspian Sea*, 1753; Vaughn, *English Trading Expeditions into Asia under the Authority of the Muscovy Company* (1912).

[3] S.P. Dom., James I, viii. No. 59.

[4] Hakluyt, ii. p. 383. *e.g.* Th. Southam and J. Sparke travelled in 1566 almost entirely by water from the White Sea to Novgorod the Great, to discover if this were a possible trade-route, without very satisfactory results. (Hakluyt, iii. pp. 73-82).

[5] Nero B, xi. ff. 321-8, *Early Voyages*, 2, 6.

ceived at first no wages, but served for clothing, meat, drink, and lodging,[1] and the strictest rules were laid down for their life and conduct by the Company at home,[2] rules which, however, they found it easy, at so great a distance from England, to evade. The apprentices usually became in time stipendiaries, and the best of these were employed as clerks, to keep the accounts, and to act as the agents' deputies whenever he was forced to be absent,[3] either at Rose Island, to superintend the unloading of the ships, or at Moscow transacting business with the Court, or trying to obtain redress of grievances from the Tsar. The stipendiaries, in addition to their ordinary duties of assisting in buying and selling within their own districts, were sent to other towns to buy up commodities at the most advantageous rates, or to attend markets, where the English goods might be displayed for sale.[4]

Except when on such trading journeys, all these factors were required to reside in the Company's house. They were not allowed to leave the house at night except with the agent's permission, and the agent had power to punish them for misbehaviour and to send them back to England if he found them incorrigible.[5] Among themselves, the English were permitted to keep their own law,[6] and the agent combined judicial and administrative functions with his commercial duties. In their houses the English were allowed by the Tsar to employ two or three native servants, but only for domestic service and not to help in the trade.[7] The company was also

[1] S.P. For., Eliz., cii. No. 1980. It appears, however, that it later became customary to give the apprentices wages. In 1584 it is stated (Nero B, xi. f. 360-2) that the company "augmented to every apprentis 5r more, so that nowe their wages is 15r" (*i.e.* 15 roubles). S.P. For., Russia, i. f. 133-4, also mentions a servant hired for meat, drink and wages, but this may have been a stipendiary. Christopher Burrough (*Early Voyages*, Intro., p. cix.) in 1587 said "Their wages and allowance is very small, or (if they bee apprentized) nothing at all".

[2] Hakluyt, ii. p. 282-4. [3] Lansdowne MS. 112, f. 136.

[4] Hakluyt, ii. p. 284. [5] *Ibid.* pp. 283-4, 406. [6] *Ibid.* iii. p. 118.

[7] *Ibid.*, iii. pp. 93-7; iii. pp. 109-18; S.P. For., Russia, i. ff. 66-8.

forbidden to employ Russians to go about the country to buy up goods for them.[1] A further restriction is notable in several of the later grants of privileges; this is that the English were only allowed to sell wholesale, and not retail as before.[2] The Tsars, although appreciating the value of this foreign trade to their country, took this precaution to prevent a closer intercourse between their subjects and the English colony. They feared lest the latter should gain too much knowledge of the government and state of the country, whilst they were equally afraid that their subjects might become unmanageable and rebellious if they imbibed foreign, and particularly Western, ideas of civilisation.[3] The condition of the lower classes in Russia became worse towards the close of the sixteenth century, making ready for the inauguration of serfdom early in the seventeenth century. Dr. Giles Fletcher, on his return from his visit to Russia in 1591 commented on the increasingly hopeless condition of the peasant class, who, he said, suffered such depression that they were able to produce yearly less and less commodities, so that the foreign merchants in the country found it impossible to obtain adequate supplies of Russian goods.[4]

The English in Russia had other difficulties in addition to these. The half-civilised Muscovites had a profound distrust of all foreigners. Although the first English to reach Russia, remembering Sebastian Cabot's advice, used all courtesy towards the people,[5] and although the company urged its servants to sell at moderate prices in Russia, and thus to win their confidence,[6] the good effects of their early endeavour to win popularity did not

[1] Hakluyt, iii. p. 349; Nero B, xi. ff. 363-74 (printed in *Russia at the Close of the Sixteenth Century*, Appendix II.)

[2] *e.g.* S.P. For., Russia, i. ff. 66-8 and unnumbered, following f. 132.

[3] *Russe Commonwealth* (Hakluyt Society, 1856), p. 63. Also partly printed in *Purchas his Pilgrimes* (ed. 1907), xii. pp. 499-633.

[4] *Russe Commonwealth*, p. 62.

[5] Hakluyt, ii. pp. 202, 249.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 389.

last for many years. The English, by careful and honest dealing, won at first a reputation for honourable trading and this was confirmed by a curious incident typical of the Russia of the time. It appears that the Russian merchants, eager to participate in the profits of foreign trade, wished to be allowed to sail to England in the Company's ships and transact business there. Their request was refused,[1] and consequently those who wished to sell their goods in England had, perforce, to entrust them to English merchants and accept their bond for payment when the next year's ships arrived in Russia. Since this involved a year's delay before the transaction could be completed, certain Russian merchants demanded that the agent's goods should be seized because their debt had not been paid. The claim was decided by the drawing of lots,[2] and by the agent's success the English secured, for a time, a reputation for honesty.[3] Later, however, the merchants became avaricious and lost their good reputation. An Englishman in Russia who was not a merchant speaks of "there garboyle, there stryvinge, there hating one another, there enterprising thinges unlawful, there discredytinge one another, ye and there gredye sekinge to rob one another.[4] By such means they became detested by a people prone to dislike even the most inoffensive foreigners.

These Early English residents in Russia complained of the cunning and prevarication of the Russians. Unless bills were set down in writing the Russians refused

[1] Later, however, it was thought expedient to allow any Russian merchants who wished to trade into England to do so (S.P. For., Russia, i. ff. 127-8; Nero B, xi. f. 339.) In consequence of this permission the Tsar sent two merchants to England to buy jewels and rich apparel for his treasury (Y. Tolstoi, *The First Forty Years of Intercourse between England and Russia*, No. 10), for which they were to exchange the wax and tallow they brought with them (S.P. Dom., Eliz., cvi. No. 61); Port Books, Bundle 4, 1567: "Stephano Twerdico et Theodor' Pogorell' de Russia mercator'".

[2] In several of the grants of privileges, justice by lot is mentioned, *e.g.* Hakluyt, iii. pp. 93-7, 109-18.; S.P. For., Russia, i. ff. 66-8.

[3] Hakluyt, ii. p. 411.

[4] S.P. For., Eliz., cxxiii. No. 362.

to pay,[1] and even when the bill was produced it was often impossible to recover the debt.[2] In course of time the English merchants, wishing to secure a larger profit, raised their prices very considerably, and thus incurred the resentment of their customers.[3] The Tsar's favour towards these envied foreigners provoked further distrust, and when, in 1569, Ivan IV took them under his special protection by placing their houses within the Oprichnina or crown lands, many even of his own courtiers intrigued against them.[4]

The Russians hated this protection of the despised foreigner, the more because the English were but merchants, and merchants in Russia had no caste—the Russian merchant himself being but a "moujik" or boor.[5] The fighting class, therefore, who were the powerful element in Russia, became antagonistic to the English, and, led by the Chief Secretary, Schelkalov, almost succeeded in turning them out of Russia at Ivan's death in 1584.[6] But Ivan's son, Feodor, succeeded to the crown, and his brother-in-law, Boris Godunov, soon became the real ruler of Russia. Boris favoured the English,[7] and, indeed, all foreigners, being exceedingly ambitious and anxious to secure as many friends as possible. To this end he corresponded at length with Queen Elizabeth and Burghley, and through the service of the English merchants accumulated a treasure of jewels, rich stuffs, and various metals, particularly copper, so necessary for munitions of war.[8]

[1] Hakluyt, ii. p. 391.

[2] The "desperate debts" of the English in Russia at times amounted to thousands of roubles (Hakluyt, iii. p. 329; S.P. For., Russia, i. No. 38).

[3] S.P. For., Eliz., xcviii. No. 1755; W. Camden, *Annales of Elizabeth*, iv. p. 105.

[4] Hakluyt, iii. p. 113; S.P. Dom., Eliz., liv. No. 7.

[5] *Early Voyages*, Introduction, p. 58.

[6] *Horsey's Travels* (Hakluyt Society, 1856), pp. 202-4; Tolstoi, No. 53.

[7] S.P. For., Russia, i. Bundle 2, No. 6. Boris is here, as in many other documents, spoken of as "a professed frende to her maties marchauntes".

[8] Tolstoi, No. 80; S.P. For., Russia, i. ff. 50 and 51; Calendar of the Marquis of Salisbury (Hist. MSS. Comm.), iii. p. 35, vii. p. 192.

In spite of this protection, however, the English had still to suffer greatly at the hands of the Russian populace. An English merchant remarked that "ye Russ . . . cannot forbear to spoile and fleece strangers now and then . . . if he suppose they gain by his country".[1] Accordingly, the Russians were continually seizing the merchants' goods. In 1589, when they were in great disfavour, no Russian was allowed to hire horses or boats to them, and their house at Kholmogori was fired by the crowd.[2] Russian merchants were accustomed to sell their goods at the coasts of the White Sea to the French and Flemish, and resented the loss of profits which resulted from the English privilege of trading up into the nterior.[3] Since they saw mainly the merchant-class of Englishmen, they regarded the whole nation as a "sordid people gaping after wealth,"[4] and, consequently, doubled and trebled their prices when trading with them.[5] This vindictiveness towards foreigners is shown by a quaint clause in one of the Tsar's grants of privileges. It was alleged that the Russians were accustomed to throw stolen goods over the Englishmen's palings into their backyards, causing the merchants to suffer at the hands of the law by the forfeiture of their goods, when such stolen property was found in their domain. A solemn grant was, therefore, made that they should not be brought to trial unless such articles were found under lock and key in their houses.[6]

The worthy merchants of London who formed the court of the honourable Muscovy Company were moved at times to dignified wrath against the dishonesty of their servants in Russia. For the view of his position taken by the typical stipendiary and even at times by the trusted

[1] *Early Voyages*, Introduction, cviii. (Lansd. 52, No. 27).
[2] *Russia at the Close of Sixteenth Century*, Appendix iv. (Lansd. 60, No. 59).
[3] S.P. For., Russia, i. ff. 133-4.
[4] Camden, *Annales of Elizabeth*, iv. 124-5.
[5] S.P. For., Russia, i. ff. 133-4.
[6] S.P. Dom., Eliz., xliv., No. 11. This privilege afterwards lapsed.

agent of the Company was this: he found himself condemned to spend the best years of his life in a most barbarous country, hated by the people, pierced by the cold, separated from his home by a dangerous voyage of some hundreds of miles, and with little prospect of getting his discharge from the Company;[1] and he was even forbidden to trade on his own account and to amass a fortune at the expense of those half-civilised drunkards, "the Russe". Some compensation, then, he must have, and he took what he could get. Since, as a rule, the agent was carrying on an illicit trade on his own account, he either winked at his junior's "privy trade" or went into partnership with him, using the Company's goods, money and credit for his own advancement.[2] Not only this, but the young stipendiary was sometimes tempted to provide himself from the Company's goods with rich satins and velvets, jewelled caps, and furred cloaks, and so, with a pouch of money in his belt, he set out to swagger among the young Russian nobles, as well appointed as the best.[3] He would also invite these new friends to the English house, and supply them with such rare wines, such raisins, prunes, and finely dressed meats as they could not enjoy even at the Court. After these carousals, as

[1] S.P. For., Eliz., xciii. No. 1214; *Queen Elizabeth and Her Times* (J. Wright), i. 420. Wm. Smith to Jas. Woodcoke, speaking of the Company's service, said, "a man may soon come into it, but cannot get out. I am hired but from year to year, and to give me one year's warning, but I have given warning for five years agone, and yet cannot get away."

[2] An amusing picture of the factors' privy trade is given by one of the most audacious of them, Richard Relph (Nero B, xi. ff. 360-2, 1584). He also described an attempt of the Company to reform such conduct: "The Company will have no servant to traveile any whether and mean to have their buziness done in Mosco, Yeraslaly and Vologda . . . further they mean to chaunge their servauntes every second or third yere and those which serve them must be sworne that they shall use no privie trade, nor no man for them".

[3] *Early Voyages*, Introduction, cviii. (Lansd. 52, No. 27); S.P. For., Eliz., cii. No. 1980, describes the Company's servants, who "after that they become factours fer of, and owt of sight, do gyve them selves owt to be gentlemen & principal merchauntes & in contynuance of tyme through libertie and lack of grace, bring their masters to ruyne and decay". The agent himself, Thomas Glover, had "used the Company's purse like a prince".

the anxious and reproving letters from the Company imply, English merchant and Russian noble would be amicably sprawling together on the rush-strewn floor. Such excesses provoked indignant protests from the careful solid merchants at home. They complained that their young servants dressed themselves "in velvets or silks and ride when we [*i.e.* their masters in England] goe afoote," and that their housekeeping expenses in Moscow had been doubled by tippling and extravagant and unnecessary hospitality "to giue wyne and meate to comers and goers to our houses". This prodigal entertainment, they observed, was not the custom of the country "except we have brought up this coruption". They threatened to send no more wines to Russia, and charged the agent to make a "frugall proportion of fare per man," and to keep accounts of such "achates" carefully.[1]

Finally, the members of the Company in England found it desirable to prescribe the necessary clothing to be supplied yearly to an apprentice, with the cost, down to a penny of each article.[2] These included "two vpper garments, buttons and stitching . . . one nether garment . . . furre for the same . . . one workday vpper garment without furre or stitching . . . three shirts . . . one pelch of furre which will serue 3 or 4 yeares . . . 1 Capp for holie dayes . . . 1 Capp for worke dayes . . . Girdle gloues and knives". The cost in all was estimated at thirteen roubles, twelve altines, six dengas,[3] or roughly £9 sterling for the first year, after which "the old apparel . . . wilbe sold ther againe for so much as will buy them newe for the next yeare".

[1] *Early Voyages*, pp. 206-25 (Nero B, xi. ff. 321-8). [2] *Ibid.* p. 226.

[3] von Herberstein (*Notes upon Russia*, p. 109) gives an account of Russian money. The only gold coins were foreign, and the currency consisted chiefly of silver coins, the "deng," 6 of which went to an "altin" and 200 to a rouble. John Hasse (Hakluyt, ii. p. 273) compared the "denga" to an English penny, the "altine" to a shilling, and the rouble to a pound, 6 dengas being worth an altine, and 23 altines 2 dengas a rouble.

These orders, however, had little effect. It needed greater influence than a letter or a brief visit from some "wise merchant" to reform a party of devil-may-care young Englishmen two thousand miles and three months' journey from home. They found further scope for extravagance,[1] keeping "dogges, beares and other superfluous burdens". Instead of the two or three Russian domestics allowed them by their privileges[2] they kept a considerable retinue of "bonde men and women attending upon them"; which last excess the Company especially reproved, since it "engendreth pride".

The harsh judgment passed on these young Englishmen was in its turn criticised by that capable and honourable agent, Christopher Burrough. He pointed out the difficult conditions and many temptations of this trying life.[3] Through lack of proper discipline, lack in particular, he thought, of the wise teachings of a chaplain, these young men, thrust into a profane and licentious society, "fell into the hands of sin". They spent the Company's money on their expensive and corrupt pleasures and on making and keeping the acquaintance of the Russian courtiers to protect themselves against the Company should their "privy trade" be discovered by their masters. Burrough blamed the Company for its parsimony in refusing to engage the services of a preacher, with the excuse of having "no great number of servants thear". He condemned the small wages and allowance of the factors, and asserted that this led to their embezzling the Company's stock. He submitted the remedy of allowing each factor a share in the stock, alleging that this would make him zealous in the trade and prevent his trading with the Company's goods to enrich himself, contrary to his oath. Service in Russia became a byword, im-

[1] *Early Voyages*, p. 215.

[2] Hakluyt, iii. p. 111; S.P. Dom., Eliz., liv. No. 7; S.P. For., Russia, i. ff. 66-8.

[3] *Early Voyages*, Introduction, cviii.-cxiii. (Lansd. 52, No. 27).

plying of necessity a factor's dishonesty towards his masters.[1]

Had Borrough's advice been taken, the Company would probably have enjoyed some alleviation from the pest of Interlopers. One of the greatest difficulties of this problem was that the Company's own servants so often joined with these Interlopers,[2] or even became Interlopers themselves,[3] and thus rivals who knew every secret of the trade. The Interlopers, apart from these factors, traded to Russia through the port of Narva, until it was taken by the Swedes in 1584, and were chiefly men of York, Hull, Yarmouth, Harwich, and London.[4] Their number seems to have been considerable,[5] though in what proportion to the Company's servants it is, as yet, impossible to say. When Narva was closed to the Russians the Interlopers, on the pretext of fishing in the waters of Vardö, which, as the northern outpost of Denmark, was just outside the Muscovy Company's monopoly, took their ships to the northern shores of Lapland, and drew thither trade from Kholmogori and the River Dvina, to the detriment of the Company's commerce.[6]

[1] S.P. For., Russia, i. ff. 133-4.

[2] Tolstoi, No. 16; S.P. For., Eliz., cii. No. 1780.

[3] S.P. For., Russia, i. ff. 46-7.

[4] S.P. Dom., Eliz., cviii. No. 16; R. G. Marsden, *Select Cases in the High Court of Admiralty*, ii. p. 149. These merchants, together with some of the Company's own servants, petitioned Ivan IV for a grant of privileges for themselves, which they obtained (S.P. For., Eliz., xciii. No. 1554; c. No. 2316).

[5] In Nero B, xi. f. 333, and Lansd. 60, ff. 157-60, thirty-five names of Interlopers of York and Hull, with the Company's servants who had joined them, are given—the list concludes, "and others". This, of course, was only one Company of Interlopers. In Lansd. 112, No. 37, it is stated that seventy English ships of Interlopers traded to Narva in 1566, with English, French, Dutch, and Scottish goods.

[6] S.P. Dom., Eliz., cviii. No. 16. It would not be possible here to attempt an account of the relations of the Interlopers with the Muscovy Company, but it is interesting to discover that information found in the Port Books and K.R. Customs Accounts appears to bear out this assertion, that the Interlopers gave out that they were trading to a port outside the Company's privilege, and then sailed to a Russian port. Until 1566 the port of Narva was not definitely included in the Company's monopolied area, but in this year it was so included by

Some of the English factors in Russia married Russian and Polish women,[1] and occasionally they forswore their own faith and became members of the Greek Church. An interesting story of one Wiseman,[2] a servant to Jerome Horsey, illustrates the life and hazards of the English in Russia. This Wiseman was in love with a Russian gentlewoman, and, to obtain her hand, he reported to the Tsar's Chief Secretary, Schelkalof, a conversation which he had overheard while waiting at table on his master and Dr. Fletcher, the English Ambassador.[3] Schelkalof, who was unfriendly to the English, and especially to Horsey,[4] held this conversation to be

Act of Parliament (*see* above, p. 1, note 3). In the Hull Port Books there are several notices of ships returning from Narva in 1566 and 1567, but after this date there is only one while Narva remained a Russian port, and that in 1579. Many of the same merchants' names, however, appear after 1567 in ships bound for Danzig and Riga, and some of these may (as is asserted in S.P. Dom., Eliz., cviii. No. 16) have traded to Narva. There are also, in the Port Books and K.R. Customs Accounts, several instances of ships either ostensibly sailing to Vardö with cloth, which could not have been sold at that fishing station, or returning with wax or train-oil, the price of which, the Company complained, was greatly raised by the Russians, who traded to Lapland from Kholmogori. "Edmonde Cooke," whom the Company complained to be the chief merchant of Hull and York, was probably the "Edward Cooke" of the K.R. Customs Accounts ($\frac{1}{8}\frac{8}{8}$ and $\frac{6}{2}\frac{7}{1}$) trading from Hull to Wardhouse" (Vardö) with cloth, and returning with train-oil. Merchants from Ipswich (Port Books, Bundles 589, 590, and 592) also declared that they were taking cloth "versus Wardhouse," and bringing wax and train-oil from thence, while merchants of Newcastle (K.R. Customs Accounts $\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{3}$) exported cloth and lead (a commodity in great demand in Russia) "towarde Wardehouse".

[1] Tolstoi, No. 13; S.P. Dom., Eliz., cviii. No. 16; S.P. For., Russia, i. ff. 48-9. It is uncertain whether there were any Englishwomen in Russia in the sixteenth century, though it is certain that in the first years of the seventeenth John Merrick's wife, an Englishwoman, was in Moscow (Sir T. Smith, *Voyages and Entertainment in Russia*, G. 3). Wives and children of English merchants in Russia are occasionally mentioned (*e.g.* S.P. For., Russia, i. ff. 48-9; Hakluyt, iii. p. 169), but it is not known whether these were English or Russian.

[2] S.P. For., Russia, i. ff. 103-4, and ff. 105-6; Nero B, xi. ff. 363-74 (printed in *Russia at the Close of Sixteenth Century*, appendix ii.).

[3] S.P. For., Russia, i. Bundle 2, No. 8. Horsey said that Tsar Feodor "was meeter to be a fryer than a king, and to bear a pair of beads than a sceptor".

[4] S.P. For., Russia, i. ff. 13-16.

treasonable. Wiseman was rewarded for his treachery by the gift of the lady's hand, with money and lands to live as became a Russian gentleman. Horsey, however, thanks to the support of Boris Godunov, was able to prove his innocence. Boris took the matter before the Tsar, and Wiseman was seized, deprived of his newly acquired goods, and re-baptised into the Anglican Church. One account says that he was sent home in disgrace,[1] another that he perished miserably, a beggar in the streets of Moscow.[2] In any case, his disgrace shows how precarious an Englishman's fortune in Russia might be.

Wiseman's master, Jerome Horsey, is a good example of a certain type of Englishman evolved by long service in Russia. According to his own account of himself, in his "Travels,"[3] he was a most brilliant and important personage in the Russia of his day, but other accounts depict him as a monster of infamy. At first an apprentice, he later became the stipendiary next in rank to the agent at Moscow,[4] and at the same time he secured the friendship of Boris Godunov,[5] with whom he exchanged a considerable correspondence.[6] An apt scholar, he mastered the Russian language, a feat by no means accomplished by all the English in Russia. He was soon employed as an envoy from the Tsar with letters to Queen Elizabeth.

On one occasion when Russia was at war with Poland, Horsey succeeded in making the arduous journey overland through hostile territory, with a letter from the Tsar to Elizabeth, requesting a load of ammunition from England.[7] He had concealed this letter in the false side of a wooden brandy bottle, covered by his horse's mane.

[1] S.P. For., Russia, i. ff. 105-6. [2] *Ibid.* ff. 103-4.

[3] Printed by the Hakluyt Society (1856) in *Russia at the Close of the Sixteenth Century*: edited by E. A. Bond.

[4] Lansd. 112, No. 40. [5] S.P. For., Russia, i. ff. 13-16.

[6] *Horsey's Travels*, p. 231-2; Nero B, xi. ff. 363-74, printed in *Russia at the Close of the Sixteenth Century*, appendix ii.; Tolstoi, Nos. 56, 60.

[7] *Horsey's Travels*, p. 189.

On receiving the letter the Queen complained of the fumes which still clung to it, although it had been sprinkled with fragrant essences previous to presentation. This was a fortunate mission for Horsey, for Elizabeth greatly admired his ready rendering of Russian into English, while in Russia he was the welcome bearer of a load of munitions of war, smuggled through Poland, the country against which they were to be used.[1]

On a later occasion Horsey took charge of another present for the Russian court,[2] including "lyons, bulls, doggs, guilt halberds, pistolls, peces [*i.e.*, muskets], armor, wynes, store of drugs of all sorts, virgenalls, musicions, scarletts, perrell chaines, plate of curious makinge." The musical instruments gave great delight to the Empress Irenia, the sister of Boris Godunov, and the English musician sent to play them was often admitted to the Court when no other of his countrymen could effect an entry. Horsey is here seen as the finished and successful courtier; he bragged of his influence at the Court, of how prisoners were liberated at his request, and of how his interest secured for some their fortune.[3]

The English at Moscow, however, saw another side of this versatile man. They told of how he deposed one agent and appointed another, favourable to himself, of how he called himself the "President" of the Company, and went about the house beating and flogging the factors to show his own power. He extended the Company's buildings at Moscow, merely for ostentation, and took many of the Company's goods for his own use.[4] Further,

[1] J. von Hamel, *England and Russia*, p. 236.

[2] *Horsey's Travels*, p. 217.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 182-3; appendix ii. p. 291.

[4] The agent, Robert Peacock, wrote to Walsingham (S.P. For., Russia, i., Feb. 8, 158⅘), that Horsey's misdemeanours were as "a sea that hath no bottome". There are many accounts of these misdemeanours, *e.g.* S.P. For., Russia, i. Bundle 2, Nos. 1, 7, 8, 9; Lansd. 112, f. 137, f. 133 (34 complaints against him), and Lansd. 62, f. 22. Most of these, or extracts from them, are printed in *Russia at the Close of the Sixteenth Century*, appendix iii.

he procured the imprisonment, sometimes with torture, of any of the English who resisted his pretensions. Even Boris, a Russian and like most of his countrymen of that date of a cruel disposition, was sickened to see the torture to which Horsey had put an innocent servant of the Company, "setting him on the pudkey".[1]

Horsey's triumph was short, for Boris seems to have tired of his arrogance,[2] and the Company, hearing of the vast debts he had accumulated in their name, petitioned Elizabeth most piteously to write to Feodor for his recall.[3] Horsey seems, however, to have won the Queen's ear, for no particular steps were taken against him, and when he returned to England for good about 1593, he became a squire in Buckinghamshire, a knight and a member of Parliament.[4]

As a contrast to such a character we have Sir John Merrick, the honourable and beloved agent of the Company, and afterwards royal ambassador. Merrick was respected more highly than any foreigner who had hitherto visited Russia.[5] Then there was Sir Francis Cherry, the capable merchant,[6] who gained his experience by

[1] S.P. For., Russia, i. Bundle 2, No. 9. This form of torture is here described—Hornby, the sufferer, was "tossed by the arms on a gubitt," his arms disjointed, and given 24 lashes with a wire whip. In another document (Lansd. 112, f. 133, printed in *Russia at the Close of the Sixteenth Century*, p. 316), Hornby was "put to the pudkey, where he was hanged by both his handes tyed behind him, and waightes to his feet, and had 24 lashes with a wyer whippe". In the 1589 grant of privileges, obtained by Dr. Fletcher, a clause was inserted that henceforward no Englishman should be tortured (*Russia at the Close of the Sixteenth Century*, p. 350).

[2] *Russia at the Close of the Sixteenth Century*, p. 359.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 326.

[4] *Horsey's Travels*, p. 266.

[5] Sir Thomas Smith (*Voyages and Entertainment in Russia*, G. 3) described him as "so honest and discreet an Agent, so well beloved by the Emperor, Prince and Nobility, so approoved of by the merchants . . . so thoroughly experienced in affairs, as well concerning their trade, as their customs and demeanure, having a mind and ability . . . for the benefit of the whole Company as never had nor will succeede a fitter man".

[6] S.P. For., Russia, i. ff. 21-2, "the travailes of Fraunces Cherrye whence were not the least" of "the good indevors of her [Queen Elizabeth's] marchauntes trading Russia"; Cal. Marquis of Salisbury (Hist. MSS. Comm.), vii. p. 504.

spending ten years of his boyhood at the Russian Court. It was largely due to Cherry's efforts that Russian cordage[1] came to be used almost exclusively by the English navy in the last decade of the sixteenth century.[2] The fleet that defeated the Spanish Armada was largely rigged with Russian cordage and cables.[3] Finally, mention should be made of Anthony Jenkinson, the famous traveller, who won the regard, not only of Ivan the Terrible, but of the Shah of Persia and the potentate of every Eastern State visited by him. Jenkinson must have possessed great natural dignity and charm, since, although he could not speak Russian, so capricious a monarch as Ivan should have repeatedly demanded his presence before he would grant any privileges to the English.[4]

In 1571, when the Tatars succeeded in entering and firing Moscow, the Muscovy Company sustained heavy losses in goods, money and buildings, but many of their resident servants, besides native Russians, took refuge in their cellars and so escaped. Still, the list of deaths among the English from this fire was serious, for twenty-five were counted "stifled in our beer-cellar".[5] Although the English were unpopular with the Russians, there are instances of their humanity towards their Russian neighbours found in their kindness towards one Nikita Romanov, the brother of Anastasia, Ivan's wife. Nikita was the neighbour of the English in Moscow, and when Ivan deprived him of his goods, his house and even his

[1] *See* below, p. 24.

[2] Cal. Marquis of Salisbury, vii. pp. 484, 504; xiii. p. 510.

[3] In 1587 more than a quarter of the whole expenses of the Navy, that is £3,351, was for rope bought from the Muscovy Company (S.P. Dom., Eliz., ccxvii. No. 72), and in the same year another £3,000 worth of cordage was ordered from the Company (Cal. S.P. Dom., 1581-90, p. 467).

[4] S.P. For., Eliz., cxxiii. No. 362, "Mr. Jenkinson, of whose cominge the Emperour (Ivan IV) lyked so well that . . . his maiestie hath grauntyd hym all he requestyd, unlesse it weare such goodes as weare taken in the tyme of his maities displeasure ageynste the merchauntes".

[5] Hakluyt, iii. p. 170.

clothing, the English, at the serious risk of the Tsar's displeasure, gave him coarse cotton robes to clothe himself and his children, and other relief.[1] Again, the Livonians from Narva, who lived outside Moscow, were clothed and revived by the English after they had been despoiled and cruelly treated by Ivan.[2]

English ambassadors in Russia[3] were usually fairly well treated, though the peculiar rules for their reception caused some bitter complaints. Their retinue sometimes consisted of as many as forty servants and young gentlemen eager to see the world,[4] and these were lodged with them at Moscow in the house specially set apart for ambassadors,[5] where the ambassador himself was "straightly kept" and neither allowed to visit, receive English visitors nor leave his lodging except for audiences with the Tsar or conferences with his ministers. This rule was conceived not, as so many ambassadors suspected, to do them dishonour, but with the almost Oriental idea that their rank should keep them aloof from the populace,[6] and also probably to insure that the English merchants in Moscow should not tamper with their mission or tell them of too many grievances. After his first audience with the Tsar, which was purely formal,

[1] *Horsey's Travels*, p. 194. Nikita was the grandfather of Michael, first Tsar of the Romanov dynasty.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 195.

[3] The English ambassadors sent to Russia in the reign of Queen Elizabeth were Thomas Randolph, the first royal ambassador to Russia from England (1568); Anthony Jenkinson (1571); Sir Jerome Bowes (1583); Dr. Giles Fletcher (1588); Sir Richard Lee (1601). There were also several envoys and messengers sent by Elizabeth to the Tsars. The Muscovy Company usually bore the expenses of the ambassadors. Sir Richard Lee was allowed £800 and his diet for himself and his followers, but he was to provide them and himself with suitable clothing (S. P. For., Russia, i. ff. 107-8.).

[4] Hakluyt, iii. p. 102.

[5] *Voyages and Entertainment in Russia*, E. 2.; Hakluyt, iii. p. 105. Accounts of the various embassies are found in Hakluyt, ii. and iii., *Russia at the close of the Sixteenth Century*, *Early Voyages*, *Voyages and Entertainment in Russia*, Nero B, xi. f. 400-2. All agree in descriptions of ceremonial and procedure.

[6] Sir Thomas Smith remarked (C. 4.) "the greatest glory for the greatest men is rather to be reported than seen".

the ambassador was usually invited to the Tsar's banquet.[1] The banquetting hall was large, though roughly ornamented and low-roofed, and in the middle there was a great stand, on which stood immense gold and silver jars and dishes, four of which were four feet in height.[2] The ambassador sat alone at a small table placed at a little distance in front of the royal throne, and received bread, meat and drink from the Tsar's own table.[3] From this time, until he received his dismissal, usually a period of some months, the ambassador received a daily allowance of food and wine for himself and his attendants.[4]

Dr. Willis, an envoy from Elizabeth in 1599, gave a somewhat soured account of his reception in Russia.[5] He travelled overland, and when he reached Ivangorod, the Russian frontier fortress, he was kept six hours outside the walls "standing in the open street" before he was allowed to enter any house. During the five days of his stay in this town he was only given "a piece of old beef sodden for dinner, and part of the same, beinge first sodden, rosted in a stove oven for supper". When he arrived at the outskirts of Moscow, he was "bestowed in a smoakie unsavorye shed," and though hungry and weary could get no meat or drink, and his only rest was

[1] Sir Thomas Smith cut short his description of the banquet with the excuse that if he described it at length, "Garlicke and onions must besauce many of my words, as then it did the most of their dishes" (G. 2).

[2] Hakluyt, ii. pp. 288, 421.

[3] In E. S. Bates' *Touring in* 1600, there is a description of the sequel to a Russian Imperial banquet by an Italian, Barberini, who visited Russia in Ivan IV's reign. After three hours' feasting, Barberini left the palace "picking his way through the outer rooms, pitch dark and strewn with courtiers in the weeping stage of drunkenness, down the stairs". Twenty yards from the foot of the stairs a crowd of servants was waiting with horses to take their masters home. Towards these they had to wade, knee-deep in mud, still in pitch darkness, and so continue a good part of the way home. No one was allowed to ride till out of the palace precincts (p. 157).

[4] Sir Jerome Bowes daily allowance (Hakluyt, iii. p. 476) included 7 sheep, 70 eggs, 20 hens, 10 lbs. of butter, 70 white loaves, the third of an ox, quantities of mead of various kinds, meal, vegetables, candles, provender for horses, and various other food-stuffs.

[5] Nero B, xi. ff. 400-2.

on a "bench in a smokie roome full of beggers and flies". At last, however, the English merchants brought him a good dinner, and the next day he was allowed to enter Moscow.[1]

Dr. Willis was only one of the many doctors who were sent from Elizabeth to serve Tsars. Ivan the Terrible had especially great faith in the skill of English doctors, and frequently requested the Queen to send them to him, offering large rewards to such as would serve him, especially to any who had won a wide repute in his profession.[2] Dr. John Dee was offered a salary of £2000 a year, and provision for his table, in addition, from the Tsar's own kitchen.[3] Elizabeth occasionally sent one of her own physicians[4]; but the post of physician to the Tsar does not seem to have been a popular one, for on one occasion a German doctor of doubtful repute, Dr. Elisius Bomel, who was imprisoned in England for practising sorcery, was offered his release if he would go to Russia to serve the Tsar.[5] This Bomel did, and was for some years high in Ivan's favour, as his arts were acceptable in Russia. He is supposed to have suggested to the Tsar the possibility of an alliance with England, and even of a marriage with Elizabeth, but when his prophecies came to nothing, Bomel was burnt to death by the Tsar's orders.[6] Dr. Willis was ignominiously dismissed from the Russian Court before he had even begun his duties, because his skill was doubted, as he arrived at Moscow without books or drugs. Unfortunately he had not been ready when the yearly fleet set out from England, so his luggage went before him in the ships, while he took the quicker overland route and arrived before it.[7]

[1] Unlike the liberal allowance accorded most ambassadors and messengers, the only gift Willis received was two rabbits, from the Chancellor. He added two more and "gave them to the messenger for his pains" (Nero B, xi. ff. 400-2).

[2] Cal. S.P. Dom., 1581-90, p. 354.

[3] Hakluyt, iii. p. 446.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 310.

[5] *Horsey's Travels*, p. 187.

[6] von Hamel, *England and Russia*, pp. 202-5; *Horsey's Travels*, p. 173.

[7] S.P. For., Russia, i. ff. 70-1; Cal. of Marquis of Salisbury, x. p. 237.

Surgeons and apothecaries were also sent to serve the Tsar,[1] and were greatly appreciated in Russia, receiving considerable salaries for the times, and being well treated at the Court. They complained, however, of the difficulty of obtaining leave to depart from Russia when they wished to return home, and therefore few could be induced to go to Russia, though the Tsars continually asked for them in their letters.[2]

Ivan also requested Elizabeth to send him architects and miners who could discover gold and silver,[3] and though there is no record of these miners being sent, Elizabeth dispatched architects to Russia, who built fortifications and castles for the Tsar. Various other craftsmen accompanied them, probably about twelve or fourteen in number, but they disliked their life in Russia, partly because of the hard and uncivilised conditions of life there, and partly because of their continual quarrels with the merchants.[4] As the artificers were held in high esteem in Russia and would not consider themselves under the command of the agents—an impossibility since the former served the Tsar—the agents "slandered and and belied them". However, most of them became greatly indebted to the merchants and were therefore in an awkward position, since they could not return home, having no money for the voyage, for the company would not allow them to use their ships until their debts were paid, and the journey overland was very expensive.[5]

[1] Hakluyt, ii. p. 383; S.P. For., Eliz., xcviii. No. 1755, and c. No. 2316.

[2] Tolstoi, Nos. 11, 42; S.P. For., Russia, i. ff. 52-5.

[3] Harleian MS. 296, No. 54; Tolstoi, No. 11. English Interlopers also supplied Ivan with artificers and workmen (Lansd. 16, No. 20). In 1599 Tsar Boris requested Elizabeth to send him "doctors, lerned men in secret artes, artificers". All were to be allowed to return home when they wished, and those who were willing to remain in his service "shall receave a worthie stipende according to their desertes and enioy ther freedome and liberty" (S.P. For., Russia, i. ff. 52-5.)

[4] S.P. For., Eliz., xcviii. No. 1755, c. No. 2316.

[5] Dr. Willis spent £80 on his overland journey, including the payment of guides (Nero B, xi. ff. 400-2).

Numbers of these craftsmen, as well as some of the company's servants who took service with the Tsar, because of the higher wages[1] and greater liberty, built galleys and brigardines for the Tsar at Narva,[2] and also at Vologda. Horsey mentioned that English artificers had built, in 1585, twenty ships for Feodor at Vologda, while another score were about to be built.[3] At Narva the English not only built ships, but were given command of them and their crews by the Tsar. They became captains and master gunners and were given good wages, with "fifteen pence a day for meat and drink and every man a house at the Emperor's charge". "Mariners," said a merchant in 1572 "bear all the sway now."[4]

In addition to these craftsmen, the Muscovy Company employed a number of both English and Russian ropemakers at their ropewalk at Vologda. At one time as many as a hundred men were engaged on the work, most of them being Russians,[5] though perhaps from a dozen to a score were English.[6] But since the Russians could be engaged at a much lower wage than the English,[7] they were employed in increasing proportions as they

[1] Humphrey Lock, an architect and engineer in the Tsar's service (S.P. For., Eliz., 1568, May No. 1757), stated that the doctor received 50 roubles, himself 40, and the other craftsmen wages varying from 15 to 30 roubles yearly.

[2] S.P. Dom., Eliz., cviii. No. 16; J. Wright, *Queen Elizabeth and Her Times*, i. p. 420; Wm. Smith to Jos. Woodcoke.

[3] *Horsey's Travels*, p. 185.

[4] J. Wright, *Queen Elizabeth and Her Times*, i. p. 420; S.P. Dom., Eliz., cviii. No. 16. In 1569, Ivan IV sent to Elizabeth requesting that English shipwrights and sailors might be sent to him (Tolstoi, No. 18; Camden, p. 86) and these were sent in 1571 (Tolstoi, No. 32). In 1568 (*Early Voyages*, ii. p. 263) it was reported to the company "that the Emperowre should requier a hundreth Englishemen to be his garde for sauegard of his person". This project was not realised, but in making it Ivan IV anticipated Peter the Great in desiring to employ English soldiers as a bodyguard. His evident desire for a fleet on the Western pattern and his anxiety for supplies of English munitions of war, also, are anticipations of Peter's ideas.

[5] Hakluyt, iii. p. 170.

[6] *Ibid.*, ii. p.395; *Early Voyages*, p. 208 (Nero B, xi. ff. 321-8), English ropemakers in 1567 were paid at rates varying from £5 to £9 a year.

[7] Hakluyt, ii. p. 395.

became proficient in the work.[1] Scarcely any Englishmen were employed in the work after 1584.[2] In this ropewalk the Russian cordage, which became so famous in England, being "tarred in the yarn" was made, and rivalled that of Danzig, previously unsurpassed in Europe.[3] This ropewalk became, at the end of the sixteenth century, a busy settlement,[4] for many hundreds of "ends" were sent yearly to England, from small ropes of one inch in thickness, through every grade up to great cables of fourteen and sixteen inches.[5]

The Muscovy Company also employed in Russia an English skinner to test the furs, English coopers to make casks for their valuable cargoes of train-oil, and occasionally another Englishman to work and cut yew suitable for bowstaves.[6] A maker of "poldavies" was also sent to Russia, and the company employed captives taken in the Russian wars to make this coarse sacking for the navy under his direction.[7]

The English colony in Russia consisted thus, not only of merchants and others directly connected with trade, but also of varying classes of professionals and craftsmen, who undoubtedly were the means of introducing several phases of Western European life into Europe. The doctors and musicians had, of course, an influence scarcely extending beyond the Court, but the craftsmen, whether architects, ropemakers or shipwrights, moved among the

[1] Hakluyt, ii. p. 395. [2] Nero B, xi. ff. 360-2.

[3] S.P. For., Russia, i. ff. 115-6; Cal. of Marquis of Salisbury, vii. p. 12; S.P. Dom., Eliz., clv. No. 83; William Borough, Comptroller of the Navy, described Russian cordage as "the best that is broughte into our countries."

[4] S.P. Dom., James I., viii. No. 59.

[5] S.P. Dom., Eliz., ccxl. No. 121, ccliv. No. 14. The Port Books show the amount of cordage brought into London by the company in a year, *e.g.* in 1587, 889 "ends" weighing 4839 cwts (Bundle 7.)

[6] Hakluyt, ii. p. 387.

[7] *Early Voyages*, p. 208; S.P. Dom., Eliz., xl. No. 93. This coarse canvas or sacking was originally made in Brittany, and the company declared that their promoting its manufacture in Russia was a public service, since it had become very scarce in England.

Russian populace and instructed some of them in their arts, being the first from Western Europe to mingle thus with the Russians. Such influences, together with examples of Western civilisation, including dress, food, wine and ships, and the even more penetrating effect of imports from the West, cannot have been without result. Though frankly disliked as foreigners, the English succeeded in visiting many of the larger towns of Russia and not a few of the smaller ones. In all of these they were able to leave some mark of their commercial enterprise upon the half-civilised life of the Russian populace of the sixteenth century, and to show the Russian that though in his country the merchant was a "boor," in England he was rich and under the especial care of a Queen who sent royal embassies with much state to Muscovy to protect the traders' interests. The opening up of the route to Russia through the White Sea was, indeed, an event of far greater importance to the Russians than to the English merchants who immediately profited by it.

UNPUBLISHED DOCUMENTS RELATING TO TOWN LIFE IN COVENTRY

BY MISS M. DORMER HARRIS

Read, April 8, 1920

THE subject of this paper is to be found in two volumes of correspondence from royal and private persons belonging to the city of Coventry, and in one other MS., the diary of Robert Beake, mayor of Coventry in 1655. Where the original of this latter MS. is I do not know; possibly it has perished; but a copy exists in the writing of the Rev. F. J. Eld, whose father was a former mayor of Coventry, and this copy still is in the son's possession.

The letters,[1] which include sign manuals and privy seals from kings and queens, addressed to the corporation of the city, were apparently scattered until Thomas Sharp, the antiquary, and George Eld in 1832-3 brought them together into two volumes. The earliest communication is from Joan, the Fair Maid of Kent, mother of Richard II, the last is from Mr. Butterworth, M.P. for Coventry in 1812. Usually the more exalted the quarter whence the writing comes, the less individual the style; the royal signature may be of interest, but the communication is usually couched in dull official form; exception must be made, however, to some post-Reformation documents of Henry VIII which have a peculiar unction, while James I adopts a tart, scolding tone in dealing with the Coventry Puritans. In an ordinary royal

[1] Coventry Corporation MSS. A. 79. An index made by Sharp to this collection has been printed in Poole's *History of Coventry*. *Cf.* The Sign Manuals of Southampton (Southampton Record Society). For the Coventry MSS. see Hist. MSS. Com. i. 100-2, xv. pt. x. 101-60.

missive the king or prince is to be seen pressing the claims of some dependent to an official place, or forwarding the cause of some suppliant; thus Edward IV recommends Thomas Whitchurch as jailer,[1] and Edward his son, sends from Ludlow, probably in 1479 or 1480, a bill of complaint, urging the mayor and officials to do justice to the "party plaintiff"[2] named therein. Humbler correspondents express themselves more freely; they deal with their own affairs, and record here and there some private information or personal opinion. Thus Sir Thomas White writes in sore straits beseeching the mayor and corporation to perform their undertaking with regard to his wife's jointure. "Else," he says, "I shall even cast my college (St. John's, Oxford) for ever . . . so am I utterly shamed in this world and the world to come";[3] or again Alderman King is informed (in 1675) that Mr. Ogilby's esteemed work, the first volume of *Britannia*, so highly valued by His Majesty, King Charles II, has been dispatched by the Kenilworth carrier, for presentation to the mayor;[4] while Lord Chancellor Ellesmere writes pepperily from York House in 1610 reproaching the mayor and corporation for the scruples they have displayed about surrendering some papers entrusted to their keeping by Sir Thomas Leigh.[5]

Several of the royal missives come from Yorkist and Tudor Princes of Wales, who kept their court and council in the Welsh marches, for Coventry, known as the "Prince's Chamber," had a special connection with the king's heir. Edward, afterwards Edward V, writes from "our Castle of Ludlow";[6] Arthur from "our manor of Bewdley,"[7] Henry, afterwards Henry VIII, from the town of Bridgnorth.[8] The last-named is a typical royal communication of the more expansive kind, and concerns a quarrel between a debtor and creditor wherein appeal

[1] Corp. MSS. A. 79, fol. 6 (Sign Manual).
[2] *Ib.*, fol. 7.
[3] *Ib.*, fol. 63.
[4] *Ib.*, fol. 276.
[5] *Ib.*, fol. *95.
[6] *Ib.*, fol. 7.
[7] *Ib.*, fol. 9.
[8] *Ib.*, fol. 10.

had be enmade to the prince's authority. A certain John Mucklow of Halesowen has complained that John Harris, tailor, of the same, not only refuses to pay the bill owing for cloth, but has assaulted and wounded his creditor into the bargain, and quitting the territory of the prince's council's jurisdiction, now dwells in Coventry. The mayor is urged to settle the affair either by his own authority or by ensuring the appearance of the culprit before the more exalted tribunal.

The letter runs :—

By the Prince.

Trusty and right welbeloued etc. And where hertofore vpon greuoux complaint made by oon John Muklowe of Halysowen in the countie of Salop as well vnto the late Prince Arthure, whom God p*ar*donne, as vnto vs sithens his decease, ayenste oon John Harryes, late of the same Town, Taylo*ur*, for that the said John Harryes was indebted vnto hym in a certain som of money for clothe; and vpon his demaunde of the same his dutye the said John hym sore hurte and wounded, putting [him] in greate jeop*ar*dye of lif, as he surmysethe; for the reformacyon wherof he had to hym directed boothe the said late princ*es* l*ett*res and also oures, which he hath obstinately reffused to obey, beyng inhabited nowe, as we be enfourmed in the Citie there; the poore man not beyng satisfyed of his, said dutye nes for his sore hurte and mayme, callethe vpon us for his remedy in that behalue: Whom we have remytted vnto you insomoche as the said John Harryes is auoyded oute of o*ur* auctorityes. Wherfore we desire and pray you to call affore you the said John Harryes in examynacion of the p*re*mysses, and therupon hauyng in respecte his disobeysaunce of the said late princes l*ett*res and also oures, to see that he recompens and content the said poore man, as ye shall seeme according to right and conscience, so as he have no cause eftesones to complayne vnto vs for his othr*e* remedy in that behalue, if by any meanes ye so canne. Or ells we woll ye putt hym vndre sufficient suerties of his apparance before vs incontynently vpon the same, to thentente we may thanne furthr*e* do therin as we shal seme conuenient and according to Justice and in yo*ur* thus doyngage shal singlerly pleas vs. Yeuen

vndre our signet at the Town of Bruggenorth the iiij day of Octobre [1502].

Another letter from a Prince of Wales, dated 1612, and signed Henry P., places the young son of James I in an amiable light. Prince Henry had been interested in a blind student brought to his notice by the governing body of Coventry, and writes accordingly :—

We have bin pleased to remember the promise wee made you touching the admittance of the poore blinde Scholler into some Colledg of the universitie ; wherein wee have taken that order with Dr. Prideaux, one of our Chaplains and Rector of Exeter Colledg in Oxford, that whensoever you shall think fitt to send him thither in our name he shall be receaved into the house and have such maintenance allowed him as maie enable him to goe forward in his studies.[1]

These letters, however, contain no note of the name of this protégé of the prince, or of his subsequent career.

The missives from queens and royal ladies include the earliest in this collection, hitherto always attributed to Isabella,[2] mother of Edward III, Coventry's early patroness. The heading "De par la Princesse," however arouses suspicion that the instigation of the writing was not a queen, and the place-date of "our manor of Bushey," points definitely to Joan of Kent, in whose possession Bushey then was. To the widow of the Black Prince then this letter,[3] a plea on behalf of the Friars Minors of Coventry, must now be assigned, the date of it lying sometime between the accession of Richard II ("nostre tres honoure fiz, le Roi") in 1377 and 1385, the year of Joan's death. No question concerning the identity of another correspondent, also mother of a reigning sovereign, has ever arisen. The Lady Margaret heads her somewhat peremptory letter to the mayor and his brethren about a "variance" within the city "By the

[1] Corp. MSS. A. 79, fol. 36.

[2] Sharp, *Antiquities of Coventry*, 197; Cordy Jeaffresson, *Cal. of Coventry Charters and Manuscripts*, 13; M. Dormer Harris, *Life in an Old English Town*, 130.

[3] Corp. MSS. A. 79, fol. 1.

kinges moder," and signs it "Margaret R." in right royal fashion.[1] Among other letters by, or on behalf of, queens may be numbered that from Anne Boleyn announcing the birth of Elizabeth,[2] and one from Elizabeth herself urging on the city officials the safe keeping of Mary, Queen of Scots.[3]

The interest of this last letter is manifest.[4]

Elizabeth R. By the Queene.

Trusty and welbeloued, we grete you well, fforasmuche as wee have for dyvers good considerations gyven ordere to our right trusty and right welbeloved Cousyns, the Earles of Shrewesbury and Huntington, to bring the Scottyshe Queene to that our towne of Coventrie, and here to see her safely kept and garded vntyll *our* pleas*ur* shall be otherwyse to determine, we let you witt *our* pleas*ur* and commaundment is that for the better assystance of our sayd Cousyns and either of them in this charge committed vnto them, you shall from tyme to tyme followe suche ordere and direction as shall for that purpose bee by them, or either of them, prescribed vnto you in suche wyse as they, or either of them, shall think fyt for the weale and furtherance of our service. Yeven vnder our Signet at *our* Castle of Wyndes*or* the xxvjth of Novemb*er*, the xijth yere of our Reigne.

To our trusty and welbeloud the Mayo*ur* of our Citie of Coventry and to his Brethern the Aldermen there.

Mary arrived at Coventry on November 25, 1569, having travelled all day from Ashby de la Zouch with a halt for food at Atherstone, in order that she might be out of the way of the Rising in the North under the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland. She left the city about a month later. Much to Elizabeth's indignation, the authorities lodged the Queen of Scots at first at the "Bull" inn, because the place named in the

[1] Corp. MSS. A. 79, fol. 12.
[2] *Ib.*, fol. 31; *Coventry Leet Book*, 716-17.
[3] Corp. MSS. A. 79, fol. 33.
[4] It has been printed in various Coventry histories.

royal warrant as appropriate for her detention, the castle —the old Cheylesmore palace must be meant—appears to have been little, if any, better than a ruin. The "Bull" was at least watertight. Later she was removed to some other lodging, not identified,[1] but, according to a persistent local tradition, a room leading off St. Mary's Hall.

Evidently Mary's conduct and correspondence during her Coventry imprisonment[2] gave the authorities some anxiety. A local man, Henry Goodyear, had some concern with the scheme for the Norfolk marriage. He is said to have furnished the duke with a cipher for his correspondence, an indiscretion which caused him to find lodgment for a time in the Tower. "Goodyear was," says Dugdale, "a gentleman much accomplished and of eminent note in this Countie whilst he lived having suffered imprisonment on behalf of that magnanimous ladie Marie, Queen of Scots, of whom he was a great honourer" boasting, according to the same authority, of the buttons of gold the queen gave him, which he wore on his cap and doublet as a keepsake. He is also remembered as a friend of Sydney and patron of Michael Drayton. His connection with Coventry is very clear. He was returned member of Parliament for the city in 1571. He had a town house in Much Park St.,[3] Coventry, where his daughter, Anne, celebrated in Drayton's sonnets as the fair Idea, was born.

A letter from Goodyear, dated from Polesworth, October 21, 1593, is included in this collection.[4] It concerns some client of his, one Wotton, who had offended the corporation and was anxious to be received back into favour. Though the main matter of the letter has small

[1] Hatfield Papers (Hist. MSS. Com.) 448. Shrewsbury and Huntingdon inform Cecil that they took the Queen the day before (December 3) to a house, "which was sometime the Lord Chief Baron's, where to be long will not be convenient, for the house is so straight of room". [2] *Ib.*, i, 455.

[3] Mrs. Stopes (*Shakespeare's Warwickshire Contemporaries*, 201) speaks of "Mich Park" as the locality of Goodyear's house. [4] Corp. MS. 79, fol. 82.

interest, a family detail mentioned therein is worthy of note. Goodyear thanks the corporation for their most friendly remembrance of him at his daughter's marriage. The daughter in question must have been Frances, Drayton's "good Panape," who married her cousin, Henry Goodyear the younger, the friend of Donne, Anne, Drayton's sonnet-mistress, being still unmarried at the time of her father's death.

Among king's letters—to return to royal missives—is a sign-manual from Richard III,[1] and a characteristic production of that careful King, Henry VII,[2] concerning a lost gold spoon and pieces of plate, recalling the Venetian traveller's assertion that there were more vessels of gold and silver in the London goldsmiths' shops at this time than in all those of Milan, Rome, Venice, and Florence put together.[3]

This sign-manual runs :—

By the King.

Trusty and welbeloued we grete you wele. And receiued yisterday *your lettre* by this berer *with* a spone of gold of ours, and also this day we have receyued by certain *our* subgiett*es* of that oure Citie a pair of knyves and a salt of gold to vs belonging, whiche were lately loste, and by the diligent serche of you and of *your* brethren founde and goten again. And for your and thair effectuell acquitaill*es* therin, we geve vnto you and theym our esp*e*cial thank*es*, whiche We shal remembre accordingly heraftre. Geuen vndre our Signet at *our* manoir of Langley, the xxvj day of Septembre.

To our trusty and welbiloued the Mair of *our* Citie of Coventrie.

In one of the several communications from Henry VIII that king remits some of the punishment due to Coventry rioters "at the contemplation of the remission, indulgence and pardon of this holy Jubilee, whereof our holy fader, the Pope, hath of his paternall zele and favour

[1] *Ib.*, fol. 8. [2] *Ib.*, fol. 22.

[3] Italian Relation of England quoted in Coulton's *Social Life in Britain* 334.

made us participaunt".[1] This was in 1526, naturally before the quarrel about the divorce. Another lays down the importance of impressing "in all our subjects hearts and minds" the high dignity of "the supremacie of our church wherewith," he says, "it has pleased God Almightie by his moost certain and undoubted worde to endowe and adorn our auctoritie and Coron emperiall of this our realm".[2]

One of Henry's successors was inclined to exert very strongly his authority of supreme head of the church. It came to the ears of James I that the Coventry people were reluctant to kneel on receiving the Sacrament. They sat or stood at the administration of the rite. The king, in 1611, informs the mayor and archdeacon of his dislike of this laxity, which he is no longer disposed to tolerate,[3] regarding it "an vnsufferable disorder in a well settled Church and State that any perticular society or Cytie professedly and publickly (especially in a religious accion) should do the contrary of that Church and State doe Commaund".

The citizens evidently caused some local minister to set forth the reasons of their Puritan custom, but James was not to be thus placated. Incidentally we learn from the controversy what a long time the ceremony of the administration of the Sacrament lasted in Tudor and Stuart days.[4] The Coventry men averred that in Edward VI's time the service was not over till "sometymes 2 or 3 of the Clocke in the afternoone and soe some vnreverentlie went home and dyned or walked in the fieldes, whilst others were receauinge in the churche". They urged that if the prescript form of words and gesture were used it would require more time to administer the Communion than will be spent in the reading of the whole book of Common Prayer, the number of communicants being six or seven thousand. Nothing that they

[1] *Ib.*, fol. 27.
[2] *Ib.*, fol., 29.
[3] *Ib.*, fol. 35; *Leet Book*, 834-5.
[4] *Ib.*, fol. 97.

could urge, however, availed to turn away the king's displeasure and he refused to grant a new charter to the city in 1621 until he had been satisfied of the conformity of the citizens in this matter of church observance.

The correspondence from private persons includes a letter from Thomas Mowbray, Earl of Nottingham, Earl Marshall, who in 1397 was created Duke of Norfolk. This was the duke who would have fought at Coventry with Harry Bolingbroke upon St. Lambert's, 1398, had not the duel been stayed by Richard II.[1] Another missive of about this date (1400) comes from John Preston, master of the Trinity Guild to John Marsh, the king's butler, asking him to remit by the bearer the money he owed the fraternity for his soul's health, as the master's account was due to the brethren and sisters of the guild. The writer also forwarded a "chaperon" (cap) part of the livery.[2] Among later correspondents may be noted Thomas, Marquis of Dorset, son of Elizabeth Woodville,[3] Fulk Greville (1592), father of the poet, Chief Justice Coke, member for Coventry, and Endymion Porter, who was concerned in developing the North Warwickshire coalfields.[4] Letters of scholastic note include one from John Eachard who writes from Catherine Hall, Cambridge, to Frankland, master of the Grammar School in 1676 upon educational matters, and urges that more time should be spent in translating out of English into Latin, and less in composing of themes and speeches.[5] "This is not, Sir," he says, "my opinion only, but of many others; but particularly of Mr. Milton; who, though he was a man of very vile principles, yet he was a great witt and scholar, and most accurate in the Latin tongue". Eachard goes on to fortify his precepts by example. "I lately met, Sir," he says, "in Suffolk with 3 young lads about 10 years of age (but indeed they had been very hard followed in their fathers houses), who would

[1] *Ib.*, fol. 52. [2] *Ib.*, fol. 51. [3] *Ib.*, fol. 54.
[4] *Ib.*, fols. *72, 114, 162. [5] *Ib.*, fol. 282.

read almost anywhere in the Bible, out of English into Latin, without studying or Dictionary, and commit very few mistakes, fewer I am sure than I should have done when I was admitted into Cambridge," a degree of scholastic accomplishment ensured no doubt by timely application of the rod!

Several letters in these Coventry volumes come from the pen of Robert Beake, a fact which links them to the other manuscript of which this paper deals—the diary of this mayor of the time of the Commonwealth. Beake was a major in the Parliamentary army, served as member for Coventry in 1654 and in subsequent parliaments under the Protectorate, and again in 1678. He lived to a great age, for in 1701 at one of Coventry's most stormy elections, "being an ancient man going to the Gallery to poll to avoid the crowd," he was pelted with stones and turnips by the Tory party. He was one of those who wished to urge upon the Protector in 1657, the terms contained in "The Humble Petition and Advice". In a letter to a Coventry friend, Leonard Piddock, dated March 28, 1657,[1] he says: "The souldiery by this are much disobleeged and great discontents there are in their spirits, but I hope God wil let his highness see that his interest lies as much in the preservation of laws and affection of his people as in a military power".

But the great interest of Beake lies in his diary, composed in 1655 the year of his mayoralty. This MS. gives us an idea of what the gay and flighty, the lovers of cakes and ale, suffered at the hands of the virtuous in Cromwellian times. Many of the items recorded by Beake in these pages explain the warmth of the welcome extended in after days to Charles II.

The diary begins November 12, 1655, the day after Beake became mayor. Day after day he gives the record of cases that came before him in his capacity as head magistrate of the city.

[1] *Ib.*, fol. 302.

The miscreants were mostly convicted of breaking the Sabbath, swearing a certain number of oaths—the number is frequently mentioned—or punished for some religious or moral offence.

The following selections show the character of Beake's journal :—

November 18.—A man travelling from Righton to Exhall to be a godfather was distrained and paid 10s. 6d.

November 19.—3 Quakers, for travelling on the Lord's day were set in the Cage. M[d] it grieved me that this poore deluded people should undergoe punishment of such a nature.

. . . . . .

November 27.—Goody Pywell sent to house of Correction for living idly.

. . . . . .

December 2.—3 Carriers men for loytering at the Inne in tyme of publique worship were sent to the stockes.

Next follows a question of precedence on which Beake shows himself a trifle sensitive. "Major Gen[l] Whalley being first in the church sate above me upon a mistake supposing he had given me the right hand."

December 7.—I released Goody Pywell out of Bridwel . . . her legs sweld that she could not worke.

. . . . . .

December 9.—The lady Archer send her man from Warwick to buy linkes [torches] to bury her son, who died last night of the pox and could not be kept longer than this night. Being the Lord's day, I was in doubt whether Wheler, her man, might not be punished for breach of the Sabboath, but consulting Mr. Piddock, Mr. Bassnet, and Dr. Grew they resolved I might let him pass.

5 carriers were brought before me for being in the Inn in time of publique worship and sitting by the fire. I dismissed them for present and after consultation had with Mr. Hopkins what the Law was in the case, I sent for them againe and putt two in the stocks. The other 3 hid themselves.

. . . . . .

January 6.—Being Lord's day John Haw brought one Brisco, who lives at Corley, to me for coming on foot hence;

he alleged that he came to church here and that ther was no sermon at Corley. Whereupon I tooke security from Ger. (?) Cooke, baker, that if Brisco proved there was no sermon at Corley then he should be free, otherwise to pay 10d.

. . . . . .

January 17.—Bourley, the constable of Stoke, informed that on January 4, being Sabath day, Wm. Hopkins and John Tayler, were at the house of Shoeman of Stoke in the midle of the Evening service where they had pie and other things before them and did run away from the constable, there being 2 more in company.

THE BLACK DEATH IN WALES

By William Rees, M.A., D.Sc., (Econ.) F.R.Hist.S. (Sometime Fellow of the University of Wales)

Read May 13, 1920

The epidemics of the fourteenth century have been the subject of much discussion by eminent scholars, whose investigations have been supplemented by detailed studies of various localities. No considered attempt, however, has been made to trace the course of the disease within Wales, which, by reason of its isolated position and mountainous character, is frequently regarded as having largely escaped the visitation. The study of the effects of such an agent upon a society predominantly pastoral offers a subject of special interest.

The obscurity of conditions within Wales during the years of the Pestilence is primarily due to the paucity of evidence available from the usual sources. Contemporary chronicles throw no light upon the situation with the exception of Geoffrey le Baker's reference to the spread of the disease to Wales by the year 1349. Ecclesiastical evidence, to which Cardinal Gasquet attributed much importance in dealing with England, is conspicuously lacking, while parliamentary and legal evidence is, as a rule, inapplicable beyond the border. We are therefore driven to examine documents of a fiscal nature, but the less adequate machinery of record in Wales, particularly in the lordships of the March, constitutes a further obstacle. Not only is evidence scanty, but the manner in which the information for a large part of the country is presented, makes it difficult to obtain definite statistics. This was due to the complex conditions, political, economic, and social, which had arisen in Wales after a conquest extending over some two hundred years. That conquest had the effect of creating a

number of distinct political units, lordships or baronies of the March, each comprising one or more subordinate lordships, based on the original Welsh divisions; but in the lands of the Crown and in other parts conquered during the last Welsh War, the old divisions continued to be known as commotes. Each lordship now came to be regarded theoretically as a manor, but was not necessarily a unit of cultivation.

Where conditions were favourable, agriculture was introduced and manors on the English model established. These naturally developed in the lowlands, the castle forming the nucleus of foreign settlement. The lands of the lord formed the demesnes, English followers together with the Welsh of the lowland "vills" being incorporated within the manor as Free or Customary tenants. This area, therefore, came to be administered as a distinct section of the lordship known as the "Englishry," the resources of which were directly drawn upon for the support of the new administration. In contrast, stood the upland "Welshry," the remaining portion of the lordship, whose inhabitants continued, in the main, undisturbed by the newer influences of the valleys, the lord contenting himself with receiving the dues and services which had formerly been rendered in accordance with tribal custom. In the Welshry, therefore, tribute based upon communal obligations continued to be paid, while the feature of the Englishry was the payment of rent or the performance of service in return for direct and individual tenure of land. Any attempt, therefore, to analyse the effects of the Death in Wales must take cognisance of this very real economic division.

Owing to the nature of the country, agriculture could only assume serious proportions along the border and on the coastal plains of the south where manorial development was most marked and where the Englishry often occupied the major part of the lordships. These conditions were also to be found inland along the valleys, but beyond the mountain rim the Englishries were of very limited extent. In West and North Wales particularly they were frequently confined to the immediate vicinity of the castle, but at more accessible points some features of a manor might be found on the limited de-

mesnes of the lord. Little or no development, however, is perceptible, and before the close of the thirteenth century even these few acres of demesne had usually been given over to the customary tenants to hold "at will" as rent-paying "gabularii". The commotes were mainly made up of free and unfree "trefs," each of which participated in the use of the extensive mountain wastes and rendered its quota to the ancient dues of the commote. Tribesmen here held their land according to kindred principles, but by the early fourteenth century disintegration was proceeding within the kindred system, leading to a gradual extension of the practice of individual tenancy. This was especially the case in South Wales and in those districts more closely in touch with English influences.

The large manors were making rapid progress during these years, but signs of coming change were not lacking. Hired labour was being substituted for the services of the customary tenants; the lord was becoming a stranger to his Welsh possessions so that the produce of the manor was less directly necessary. Portions of the demesne were therefore let to freemen or to customary tenants, making for a considerable class of "gabularii" on the manors of South Wales. Attempts were being made to bring the elaborate organisation of the manor within more moderate proportions and to make up the revenue by less burdensome methods. The expedients of renting and "farming" were being applied wherever opportunity offered. In spite of these incipient changes, however, the manor in the early part of the reign of Edward III was still flourishing in Wales, but the outbreak of epidemics after the middle of the century immediately arrested development and hastened dissolution.

The spread of the Black Death into Wales would seem to have been by way of the lower Severn valley into the border counties and into the lordships of the South-eastern March. Previous to the winter or spring of 1348-49, records betray no sign of any untoward happening. By March the plague was raging in the eastern, and indeed in the western, portion of the lordship of Bergavenny, the lord of the former district falling a victim early in the month. By the middle of

the following month almost wholesale destruction had been wrought among the inhabitants, the extent of which loss can best be gauged from an examination of the rents.[1] In each of the hamlets, an average of one-third only of the original rents could be obtained; at some of the villages, *e.g.*, Werneryth and Trefgoythel, much greater losses occurred, pointing to almost complete extinction.[2] In the manor of Penros, only £4 of a total of £12 could be collected "because many of the tenements lie empty and derelict for lack of tenants". So disastrous had been the effects through the whole lordship that the guardian of the heir petitioned for a reduction of £140 in a rent of £340, "by reason of the mortal pestilence lately so rife in these parts".[3] As a result of an enquiry arrears were allowed to the extent of £60, and £40 a year was deducted from the rents as permanent loss. The Prior of Bergavenny too, experienced serious financial difficulty at this time.

The neighbouring districts of Usk and Llantrissent, Trelech, Monmouth, Skenfrith, White Castle, and Grosmont were also very generally affected by what was termed the First or the "Great" Pestilence, the changes in the manor of Raglan necessitating a new rental.

Westward along the plain of Glamorgan the plague cannot be traced at this early date although a detailed inquisition was made in the spring of 1349 into the Glamorgan inheritance of Hugh le Despenser who had died on February 8 of that year. Northward, the epidemic spread through the border counties of Hereford, Shropshire, and the County Palatine of Chester, where it raged during the spring, summer, and early autumn. Of the border lordships north and west of Shrewsbury, Caus with its hamlets was seriously stricken,[4] the rents of assise of the freemen of Yokelton falling from £8 to

[1] Evidence of reduction in rents must necessarily be regarded as of doubtful value unless such reduction is recorded as being due directly to the pestilence. The writer has endeavoured to keep this in view throughout this paper.

[2] *E.g.*, Werneryth: *There used to be of rents of assise* £13 10*s.* 3½*d. and now remain* £1 14*s.* 6*d. because of mortality.*

Trefgoythel: *Rents of assize used to be* £3 10*s.* 6¾*d. but now only* 6*s. because of the mortality.*

[3] Rot. Orig. 24 E. III, mem. 8.

[4] Inq. p.m., C. Edw. III, File 96 (14).

£1 10s. The mills, it is said, were rendered valueless "for lack of grinding, because there was no suit, and this because of the Pestilence". At Harlegh, in the same manor, the demesnes could not be extended and no one wished to hire. A similar condition was to be found in the neighbouring manors of Whittington, Ellesmere, and Whitchurch, and at the smaller districts of Roughton, Sutton, Wrokwardine, Moreton Saye, La More, Aldenham, and Bradford.[1] Little or no revenue was available from such sources as the courts, the markets and fairs, while in one case only £7 could be collected of a possible sum of £40. The accounts of the manor of Chester for many years after the first outbreak are eloquent of the disastrous consequences in that region.[2] Large tracts of the demesne lands and escheated tenements in the various vills were allowed to remain uncultivated, and could not be let owing to lack of tenants.

It may be presumed that the pestilence extended by way of the three important routes into the lordships of the eastern March, but on this, information is somewhat unsatisfactory. Detailed record of the Bohun lands of Brecon and Huntington offers no direct evidence of its presence, though the receipts show greater fluctuations than in ordinary years.[3] Interest attaches to the visit of the lord and his lady to the castle of Brecon in the latter part of the year 1348, when elaborate preparations were made for a long stay. Little record is forthcoming to throw light on events in the adjoining lordship of Builth, a fact which is indeed true of the greater part of the Central March, including the extensive domains of the Mortimers.

We are more fortunate in respect of the lordships of North-eastern Wales, especially the districts on the coast route leading from Chester. The burgesses of Rhuddlan, because of the poverty of the people, were, in 1350, granted a rebate of one-fourth of their farm of £40 for certain

[1] Inq. p.m., C. Edw. III, Files 95 (7); 98 (2); 98 (3); *e.g.*, Whittington: *Michaelmas*, 1349, *two watermills, formerly worth £2, now only £1 yearly because the tenants are dead in the present pestilence. Rents of freemen formerly £3, now only £1.*

[2] Ministers' Accounts, Bundle 783, Nos. 1, 15, 16, 17, including Escheators' Accounts.

[3] Min. Acc., Bundle 671, Nos. 10810 *et seq.*

mills. This was raised to one-third for the following years "until the said mills were of more value". Many of the lead miners of Holywell died, the survivors refusing to work there. Debts of the courts of Flint could not be procured, and offices became difficult to farm.[1]

The lordship of Denbigh[2] seems to have experienced the full force of the plague. Even in 1354, the heirs of deceased tenants of the villatae of Barrok and Petrual (commote Uwchalet) were unable through poverty to obtain possession, the lord thereby losing "tunk" and other customary payments attaching to the lands. Similar entries are noted in the remaining commotes, while the escheators' accounts for the whole district continue to record long lists of tenements still vacant through death or poverty.

The unique collection of Court Rolls that have been preserved for the lordship of Ruthin,[3] makes it possible to follow the course of the disease there during the year of the outbreak as well as in succeeding years. In the first five months of the year 1349, the court proceedings are recorded in the usual manner, only an occasional death occurring, probably from natural causes. With extreme suddenness, however, in the second week in June, 7 deaths took place within the jurisdiction of the Court of Abergwiller. During the next fortnight, all parts of the lordship were seriously attacked. Within that brief period 77 of the inhabitants of the town of Ruthin died together with several of the "nativi" of the "maerdref" there; in the neighbourhood of Llangollen there were 10 deaths; in Llanerch 13, in Dogfelen there were 25, and in Abergwiller 14, figures which more than doubled in the next few weeks. Allowance, how-

[1] Min. Acc., Bundle 783, Nos. 1, 15, 16, 17; *e.g.*, Chelmondeston: *4s. 4d. issues of 1 place of land in the lord's hand because acquired without licence. Now the place lies uncultivated because of the pestilence, and is common.*

Min. Acc., Bundle 1186, Nos. 4, 5, 11, 23. Account of the Ringild of Hopedale: Park of Lloetcoet; £1 5s. 10d. *agistments of the Park, and no more because of the Pestilence in the previous year.*

[2] Min. Acc., Bundle 1182, Nos. 3, 5 *passim; e.g.*, Uwchalet Commote: Account of Griffith ap Madoc, Ringild. *Allowed £2 14s. 1d. from the customs of divers tenants of the "villatae" of Barrok and Petrual, in the lord's hands because the tenants died in the time of the Pestilence and their heirs are unable to pay for the inheritance.*

Min. Acc., Bundle 1183, No. 2, 3.

[3] Court Rolls, Portfolios 217, 218, 219.

ever, must be made for duplication in the entries in the few cases where tenants might have held more than one tenement. The epidemic somewhat abated by the last week of July or early August, but it broke out with renewed violence during the remainder of that month when the death-rate reached its highest. After this it fell rapidly although a few deaths were ascribed to this cause throughout the following winter. The ordinary business of the courts almost ceased at these troublous periods, and the Rolls were mainly given over to the enumeration of vacancies in the holdings of deceased tenants, and to the recording of transfers, the profits from such sources often amounting to large sums. In these writings of the courts, two brothers are stated to have taken advantage of the plague to rob stricken families of their household goods and even of their animals.[1]

Passing from the March into the Crown lands, we again find sufficient evidence of widespread mortality. It is difficult to determine whether infection was conveyed by land alone, or whether the sea also played a part. It may fairly be assumed that the latter is true in the case of Carmarthen where the two officials of the Staple were among the early victims—about the end of March. In fact, the Carmarthen district suffered severely at this first visitation, especially the small manor of Llanllwch,[2] where lay the main portion of the demesnes of the lord of Carmarthen—the Prince of Wales. These demesnes were held "at will" by a dozen gabularii, who all died, so that the tenements were left in the hands of the lord. By 1353, courts were still suspended and strangers were renting portions of the vacated lands, and had set up new tenements, though a large part "lay waste and unmeasured for lack of buyers". Miscellaneous revenues of the borough of Carmarthen, such as the mill-tolls and

[1] Court Rolls, Portfolio 218, No. 4. *Also the jurors say that Madoc ap Ririd and Kenwric his brother came by night in the Pestilence to the house of Aylmar after the death of the wife of Aylmar and took from the same house one water pitcher and basin, value* 1*s., old iron, value* 4*d. And they also present that Madoc and Kenwric came by night to the house of Almar in the vill of Rewe in the Pestilence, and from that house stole* 3 *oxen of John the Parker and* 3 *cows, value* 6*s.*

[2] *E.g.*, Min. Acc., Bundle 1158, No. 2.

fisheries, were seriously diminished and the fairs could not be held.

During the summer, the pestilence made serious ravages throughout the commotes of Ystrad Towy and Cardigan, but inasmuch as the communities were answerable in a body for the various dues, it is almost impossible to make any but very general statements with regard to these areas. Items of evidence do occasionally appear. In every district great difficulty was experienced in obtaining anyone to hire the local offices of beadle, reeve or serjeant. The advowry tenants and chensers, some of whom were to be found in most of the commotes, either died or fled. In the districts of South Cardigan, 97 of a total of 104 "gabularii" withdrew before midsummer for fear of the pestilence. The issues from escheated lands reached high totals; a marked rise is noted in the fees derived from the Chancery seal, and the various towns and bailiwicks were from this time forward very commonly farmed. Accounts continued for many years to record deficits.

The documents of the Principality of North Wales offer a more illuminating picture. It would seem that a heavier toll of victims was exacted here than was the case in the South. In the Anglesey commotes[1] very large numbers of escheated tenements were still in decay in the year 1351 either through death or through the poverty of the people. Thirty-three such entries are noted for the hamlets of Trefdisteinydd, Dyndrovel, etc., in the Commote of Malldraeth, equivalent to a total of £6 13s. 2d. in rent. In Llifon Commote the decay of rents (mainly from native land) amounted to £4 18s., in Talybolion, £9 8s. 3½d., and in Turkelyn £6 9s. 9½d. The demesnes of Beaumaris were let to townsmen.

[1] Min. Acc., Bundles 1149, 1150 *passim; e.g.*, Commote of Malltraeth: *Decay of rents of Davydd Moil of the vill of Trefdisteinydd* 5*s.* 4*d.; Gronow With* 3*s.* 4*d.; Turlach* 22*s.* 4*d.; Cadwgan ap Jak of Trefithon etc.* (30 *other like entries*) *whose land were in the lord's hands for lack of tenants and because the lord's tenants in the same vills are incapable* (*impotentes et insufficientes*) *of holding the said lands.*

Commote of Turkelyn: *Allowed* 11*s.* 6*d. part of* £2 12*s.* 1½*d. rents of the Villeins of Bodevyney in the extent of Bodenawyn because there are now only two tenants there—one "native" and one advowry.*

The Carnarvon records[1] also point to serious losses, particularly among the "advowry" tenants and "nativi," to the dearth of officials and to the higher receipts from the Seal. Almost all the villeins of Deganwy died, their lands being leased to a certain Glodyth for eight years. Tenements of the villein hamlets of Arllechwedd Isaf were, in the words of the account, "handed over to oblivion" and new tenements established. The little manor of Hirdref in Dinllaen was farmed for one year only, because assessment could not be made for a longer period owing to the great loss of tenants. Many escheated lands and tenements scattered throughout the various "vills" of the same commote were farmed with the manor of Bodefan and other lands in the county of Anglesey for a sum of £50. The villein hamlet of Redemknelyn in Eifionydd yielded after the pestilence only 5s. for its dues of oatmeal and butter, instead of £1 8s. as previously. The heavy decays of the Anglesey accounts are not repeated in all the commotes of Carnarvon, although in Commote Cafflogion the uncultivated lands of freemen dying without heirs showed a loss of over £4 a year.

By the end of the year 1349 the epidemic had very generally subsided, but from the Court Rolls we learn that in Ruthin a few deaths were still being attributed to the same cause in 1351 and 1354. These occurred only very occasionally during the period 1357-60. The winter of 1361-62, however, saw another, though a milder, outbreak referred to as the Second Pestilence.[2] The disease then almost disappeared until the summer of 1369, after which time it is seen to have spent its force.

[1] Min. Acc., Bundle 1171, *passim*. *E.g.*, Commote of Cruthyn (Creuddyn). Account of the Rhingyll of the Commote, Michaelmas, 24-5 Edw. III. *Advowry* 8*d.*—*Advowry of Blethin ap Madoc and David ap Madoc etc. . . . and no more because the remainder are dead by the Pestilence.*

Farm.—Farm of the Rhaglawry, used to be £2 3*s.* 4*d. before the Pestilence.—Nothing, because let by the Justice's Deputy and the Chamberlain to Madoc Blodeyth for* £1 6*s.* 8*d.*

Commote of Cafflogion. *Allowed* £8 2*s.* 2*d., viz.,* £4 2*s.* 2*d. for this year and the last two years for the lands of divers freemen lying empty and uncultivated.*

Arllechwedd Isaf. *Remittance of* 5*s.* 2*d. annual rent of the customs and services of the villeins of the king for* 13 *bovates of land with easements which were handed over to oblivion on the making of the extent.*

[2] Court Rolls, Portfolio 219/1. Ruthyn: *Edmund ap Madoc ap David qui tenuit unum Burgum in Novo Vico decessit in Secunda Pestilencia.*

The later epidemics are also traceable in the adjoining County of Flint,[1] in the lordship of Denbigh,[2] and to some extent in Anglesey and Carnarvon. One-third of the farm of the town of Montgomery, also, had to be remitted. Many tenements in the "patria" were vacant after 1361, and the "cylch" payment of the Commote of Teirdref was much reduced owing to fewness of inhabitants.[3]

On turning again to South Wales, we find that the plague of 1361 visited the plain of Glamorgan, especially the lordship of Ogmore and its "Welshry" of Eglwys Keynor. The manor of Caldecote had by this time lost about 4 gafolmen, 14 customary tenants, 19 cottars, and several holders of assart land, a loss which resulted in a deficit of rents of £3 2s. 9¾d. from that source alone, while the custom of serjeantry only brought in the sum of 4½d., as the tenants who had been responsible for this particular payment had died.

In the Upper Gwent area, on the other hand, the outbreak which was sufficiently severe to be known as the Second Pestilence was that of 1369, while important changes, reflected in the issue of new rentals, occur again as late as 1382. The epidemic of 1369 was generally severe in South-eastern Wales, but it is impossible to estimate its extent since the documents group the losses to the lord from this plague with those still outstanding from the previous "death". Trelech borough lost nearly one-third of its burgesses, and there was a corresponding diminution in the rents of the tenants of Llangwm. The manor of New Grange was badly affected, and certain of the customary tenants of Tisset died. This decay in the rents caused directly by the pestilence continued to be recorded for many decades later in Usk manor and borough, in Tregrug, Troye, Caerleon, and Edelegan, the losses in the manor of Llantrissen being particularly heavy.[4] Similar effects are seen in the lordships of Monmouth and the Three Castles. During the same year the customary tenants of Caldecote were further reduced to four and the lands let to strangers. This formerly

[1] Min. Acc., Bundle 1186, No. 23; Bundle 1187, Nos. 11, 12.
[2] Min. Acc., Bundle 1182, No. 5; Bundle 1183.
[3] Min. Acc., Bundle 1206, No. 3.
[4] Min. Acc., Bundle 928, *passim*.

flourishing manor had within tweny years been reduced to insignificance as a direct result of the plague.

Along the plain of Glamorgan the epidemic of 1369 is traceable at Leckwith, at Ogmore, and again at Llantwit, where 147 acres of villein land escheated to the lord.[1] The demesnes, before many years, were put to farm, as also were those of Oystermouth, Llandimore, and other Gower manors. The manor of Bronllys also shows traces of having been affected, certain of the customary services having lapsed owing to the death of villeins. Several of the advowry tenants, too, died, though in the neighbouring manor of Brecon in the same year few signs of the disease can be observed.

This brief survey of these years would lead us to believe that the pestilence did not attack with equal force all parts of Wales. It is on the manors that the effects are most clearly seen. The seriousness of the blow to many made even the semblance of recovery difficult. The appearance of the disease at the critical sowing season brought about a heavy reduction not only in the rents, but in the total receipts of the manor. The problem of obtaining a revenue at once presented itself to the lord, who accommodated himself to the new circumstances by renting out his lands. Consequently, in succeeding years, the revenue of the manor was again noticeably on the increase, and occasionally, within a brief period, the original totals were even exceeded. But agriculture was no longer developed. No expenditure was now incurred either in labour, implements, or in material. Sales of corn, stock, or miscellaneous products ceased. Such manors became solely units for the collection of rents. Others, less directly affected, were able to retain their organisation for the time, only to be involved in the economic disturbances which followed. The manors of Brecon, Bronllys, Roath, Llantwit, and Ogmore still continued cultivation on quite a considerable scale, the first-named maintaining a vigorous existence even after the two pestilences.

It is a matter of surprise that sheep-farming was not widely adopted as an alternative for meeting the new

[2] Inq. P.M., C. Edw. III, File 253.

situation that had arisen. This was possibly due to the fact that Welsh wool had a poor sale in the markets of the time. Only, therefore, in the lordships of the Middle-eastern March was there a considerable and rapid development in this direction, probably representing the expansion into Wales at this point of the wool-growing industry of Hereford and Salop. By the reign of Richard II the manor of La Royl and the neighbouring grange of Cybalfa in Elvael had between them a flock of over 1000 sheep belonging to the lord of Painscastle. The Bohun lordships of Brecon, Bronllys, Hay, and Huntington are particularly noticeable in this connection. The manor of Huntington had over 300 sheep, Hay had 335, and at Brecon a flock of nearly 1000 is recorded in 1373, more than 400 being purchased in that year alone, though agriculture still flourished in these manors. The chief sheep-farm was at Bronllys, which had over 1000 sheep distributed among the hill-farms of Gwenddwr, Troscoed, and Llaneglwys. These were formerly the grazing-grounds of the monks of Dore, but were now rented by the lord from the monks. The Bohun manors furnish the best examples in Wales at this time of the production of wool on a commercial scale, the amount derived from all the manors being considerable. It was either sold the same year or allowed to accumulate. In the year 1373 it reached the high total of 18,500 fleeces, 3000 of which were packed and sent to Blanche Appleton, 6000 were sold, and the remainder reserved for future sale.

During the succeeding years, notwithstanding the vitality thus displayed by certain manors, the practice of letting the demesne gained ground. Labour troubles were undoubtedly an important cause, but it is probable that the renting of the land proved both profitable and convenient. One by one the manors as agricultural "units" were being reduced to the same stage of decadence, and that by the rapid extension of those processes which are noted in their incipient stages at a much earlier date. The miscellaneous elements of the manor were among the first to be involved in the change. The courts were held less frequently and their perquisites were reduced. The garden was let out as pasture; the dove-

cote and the fish-stew remained unstocked or were farmed; the ferry-boat was hired out; the profits from pannage and timber declined, and the quarries were let. The letting of the mills became now almost universal, and these were often leased for life or for a period of years. In a lease of this character the suit of the customary tenants who remained was also transferred, and it was usual for the lord to undertake the heavier repairs to the building, to replace the millstones, and to reconstruct the weir in case of "grand-breach".[1]

The system of letting out the pastures was extended to every available plot for which offers could be obtained, including even the parks and old stubble or "frisc" land. The hay of the meadows was sold in the fields, or the meadows were leased often on condition of being enclosed. It is of interest to note that the prices at which these lands were let were, on the whole, the same as those which prevailed formerly. Presumably this was to avoid competing with the rents already ruling, so that land often lay idle for the year "for lack of hirers," though possibly it could have been let at a lower figure. Lands thus remaining vacant were not uncommonly given to manorial officers to supplement dwindling incomes. Far larger portions of the demesne soon came to be rented.[2] The demesnes of Hay were let in gross to a few of the enterprising townsmen; those at Penkelly were leased for twelve years to one man. At Dyveles they were let in plots to those tenants who wished to avail themselves of the same but on the neighbouring manor of Rumney they were rented for ten years to the whole body of villeins on condition that they maintained the buildings, walls, and ditches in an efficient state. The letting of the demesne did not necessarily include the services of the villeins or the buildings of the manor, both of which were often disposed of separately. The stock and implements were largely sold, and only in one instance, at Huntington, can reference be found to the expedient of

[1] *E.g.*, Grosmont: *£4-farm of the Mill of Grosmont let to William atte Hulle, from Michaelmas 36 Edw. III for 12 years, the lord to find the heavy timber, and millstones only for repairs and to pay half the expenses.*

[2] *E.g.*, Min. Acc., Bundle 1209, Nos. 5, 11, 12, 13, 14; Bundle 1236, Nos. 4, etc.

leasing the stock with the demesnes. In contrast with the above arrangements, whereby the manor was let in portions, stands the policy adopted by certain lords of farming out the whole manor as a unit at a fixed sum. The seignorial rights of the lord were not, however, included in such transactions, advowsons of churches and all royalties, including the perquisites of courts, being reserved by him.

The manor of Caldecote affords some interesting evidence during the years succeeding the Black Death. In spite of the great loss of life there, the demesne continued to be cultivated. Several of the servants were retained and a few customary services employed. Labour, too, was being hired and the stock was still considerable. By 1367 the value of the demesne land let, totalled about £6 13s., at which figure it remained until the second pestilence two years later, when it rose to £7 10s., and the whole of the demesnes were farmed some years later at about £8. Cultivation ceased and the numerous other issues of the manor were collected separately, the services of the few remaining "nativi" being sold. Early in the following century all the villeins are stated to have died, with the result that there was no one available to become reeve. The office was therefore replaced by that of a salaried bailiff whose work consisted solely in collecting the rents. The death of customary tenants on so large a scale presented a serious problem and resulted in further disintegration of the manor. An immediate effect was experienced in the lapse of the services and customary obligations of those who had died, for it was found difficult to revive the same in the case of new holders. Services were therefore only continued for those villeins who survived.[1] The disposal of the escheated land in villeinage figures largely in the business arrangements of the manor. Where possible it was relet, leased in tenements or broken up into smaller parcels, and sometimes a number of holdings were grouped and farmed as one tenement. Cases occur where freemen assumed villein status upon taking up a customary holding. It was far more common,

[1] *E.g.*, *2s. increased rent of 2 acres of "native" land late of Wm. Macy in decay, let to John Saith to be held freely by him and his heirs for ever.*

however, for the rent of the tenement to be approximately assessed at an increase on the original rental *plus* the value of the services, or the prices of the demesne land might be taken as the basis of estimate. In certain instances the lord allowed the holdings to be let at a lower rent, or for "lack of hirers" they remained vacant.

In view of the greatly increased supply of available land and the decrease in population, it would be reasonable to assume that the land would be obtainable at cheap rates. This was not the case. No one reading the records for South Wales can fail to mark the tremendous transfer of land that was proceeding within the manors, and that at increased prices. Portions of the demesne, as well as the tenements of deceased bond-tenants, were being acquired by freemen, by villeins and even by cottars and strangers, many tenements of considerable size being built up. The demesne itself might represent but one of several larger tenements and thus have lost its original character.

The release of so large a proportion of land, therefore, had the effect of creating a new position on the manor within a comparatively brief period. The distinction between the different classes of land was fast disappearing, as, moreover, was the distinction in practice between the classes of tenants. Bondage was becoming a less prominent feature, though the lord continued his hold on a substantial remainder of his villeins. It is evident that a greater degree of independence was being displayed by the villeins themselves. The customary tenants in Leweleston and Pelcam compelled the lord to remit for a money payment the obligation of any of them to become reeve, threatening to withdraw unless he complied with their request. Facilities for liberation, too, were once again beginning to offer themselves. Apart from the escheated villein land which was regranted as free land, many customary tenants were permitted on payment of an increased rent to hold their land freely, for the lord no longer required their services.[1] On certain manors a portion of the tenements came to be

[1] Rentals and Surveys. 13*s.* 8*d.* *Jenan ap Griffith holds* 4 *acres of free land by extent and when it was native land he rendered thence at Michaelmas* 1*s.* 2*d. and for works at Michaelmas* 10½*d.*

held by burgage tenure, whereby the holders were freed.[1] Villeins, too, were allowed on payment of a small fine (capitagium) to leave the lordship and dwell elsewhere.[2]

A section only of the tenantry, however, had been able to avail themselves of the opportunities thus opening up, but the large proportion must have felt keenly the difficulties of the period. Lack of cultivation had resulted in higher prices of foodstuffs, as, indeed, of all other commodities. The wages of the worker were slightly increased, but not in proportion to the cost of living, for while workers were fewer in number, the demand for labour had also fallen. The lord, the chief employer in the past, now that his demesnes were let, had little need of labour. The individual tenement holders who had taken his place, worked their own land with the aid of their families and hired as little labour as possible. Again many of the holdings having been converted into pasture required fewer workers. The labouring class was also receiving additions from the advowry tenants who were settling upon the manor at this time in increased numbers. The equilibrium of labour which had at first been disturbed by the Black Death was largely restored as a result of the policy of the lord in dissolving his demesne.

The consequences of the Black Death on the Welsh lands are more obscure. As in the case of the manor, the lord necessarily experienced immediate loss in rents and customs,[3] a loss for which he was, to a great extent,

[1] Min. Acc., No. 9056. 11½*d. increase of rent of Jenan Vachan for three parts of one rood of "native" land of his own land to hold for himself and heirs in one burgage.*

[2] Min. Acc., 924/18.

[3] *E.g.*, Min. Acc., Bundle 1182, No. 3; 1183, No. 2. Denbigh Lordship, Keymerch Commote: *Respited £1 4s. 6d. for this year and the two preceding years, viz.*, 8*s. 2d. a year, for customs and services of 7 nativi, viz., for each* 1*s. 2d., because they are included in the* 31 *"nativi" above, and there are only* 24. *Respited* 3*s. 4½d. for the services of 9 freemen, viz., for the same years,* 1*s. 1½d., because they are included in the* 45 *tenants and there are only* 36.

Uwchdulas: *Decay of rents and services of various "gavells" with other rents £4 17s. 5⅝d.*

Uwchalet: *Whence he allows (to the computor) for "tunc" and custom of butter from 2 "gavells" of land in Llechtalhaern, because they are in the lord's hands for lack of service of the tenants, £1 0s. 10d.*

Min. Acc., Bundles, 1149, 1150. Min. Acc., Bundle, 1171. Commote of Eifionydd: *In decay of rents of the "vill" of Redemknelyn which was in the hands of villeins, vacant since the Pestilence, extended at £1 8s. for 8 "crannogs" of oatmeal and 3 vessels of butter, for which the computor is charged*

compensated in other ways. Issues derived from miscellaneous sources show a decline in value but the practice of farming was now extended in many cases to include almost every item of the accounts.

Some reduction in revenue was caused by the death of chensers and advowry tenants, though the goods of those dying intestate became the property of the lord, and a fine was exacted from any who wished to withdraw from the district.[1] The most serious difficulty was experienced as a result of the death of the tenants. Welsh freemen, though still adhering very largely to tribal principles in their occupation of land, were officially assessed, on a quasi-feudal basis, as individual holders, the obligations of the holder being interpreted as the rent of the tenement, or "gavell". It must be understood that such an interpretation could only apply to the immediate share of the household in arable, and not to open wastes or pasture grounds of the kin. Death on so large a scale naturally resulted in the escheat of many tenements of this kind. The accustomed payments of "ebedw" from the goods of the deceased or the payment of relief by his heir, brought to the lord a considerable immediate return. When no heirs came forward or when they were too poor to pay the requisite fine, the holding was if possible rented to others, though lack of applicants often made this difficult. Expedients of agisting or of selling the herbage might then serve to diminish the loss in some measure.[2] It seems clear that

above 5s. Respited £1 18s. 1½d. part of £1 17s. 3½d. rents of lands and tenements of free tenants in the lord's hands because there are no heirs neither could anything be raised from the same.

[1] Min. Acc., Bundle 1171, No. 7. Carnarvon, Commote of Creuthyn: 8*d.* *advowry fine of Blethin ap Maddoc and David ap Maddoc . . . and no more because the remainder are dead by the Pestilence. Of the reliefs of "advowry" tenants dead, from whom the lord has from each half a mark, and from the goods of the same which the lord shall have if they die without heir.*

[2] Court Rolls, Portfolio 217, No. 14. Ruthin. Court of Colyan: *Llewelyn Seys who held English lands died in the Pestilence, from whose death came to the lord, 1 horse. And afterwards Jenan his son came and sought to be admitted to hold the said lands to whom it was granted, . . . saving the rights of the lord, and he paid for relief 9s. 2d. and for rent 9s. 7d. Jeuan ap Heylin who held from the lord hereditary lands and lands "in acres" died . . . from whom there came heriot and "gobrestin". (The nearest heir claimed and paid relief £1). David ap Maddoc who held from the Lord "native" land and 3 acres of free land in Wernlydyr died in the Pestilence. Because he has no heirs it was conceded that Wladus his widow should hold it for life, performing the various services due therefrom. And she pays no heriot or relief.*

here again as a general policy a strong effort was made to maintain the original rents in disposing of the escheated lands, and instances even occur where these figures were increased. In some commotes the community was able to establish their claim of common to certain escheated lands.[1]

The effects of the Black Death upon the revenue of the commotes of South Wales were much less marked. The totals of escheated lands were much lower, a fact that would lead us to suppose that the fatalities were few in comparison with those of North Wales. Again, notwithstanding that the chief rents such as the "Westva" and the Rents of Extent had come to be assessed in many cases upon smaller groups and even households, the commote was still responsible for the payment of the full amount. Indeed, the outstanding feature in these districts throughout the period is the persistence at the original figures of the old common assessments. Certain early evidence tends to show that tenements in decay were exempt from such rents, though the best testimony points to a contrary view, a condition which would impose a heavier burden upon survivors.

On all sides the unfree tenants of the Welsh lands suffered very real hardship as a result of the pestilence, and their villages were seriously depleted. This class of tenant held almost invariably by the tenure of "tref-gyfrif," according to which, upon the death of a holder the land was redistributed equally among the remaining members, who were responsible for all the dues of the "tref". The heavy death-rate, therefore, threw an almost insupportable burden on the remaining tenants of the vills compelling them in many cases to surrender their holdings and to join the ranks of the advowry. Such examples as the following are constantly found among the records of North Wales: "£2 13s. 4d., part of £6 13s. 4d. rents of the tenants of the villata of Cotimot . . . because five villeins are unable to hold the vill and can scarce pay the £4 os. 2d.".[2]

"Decay of land of Meredith Benhir, escheat in Llanbigail, 15s. 6d. because no *one* tenant could hold it."[3]

[1] *E.g.*, Min. Acc., Bundle 1182, No. 4. Talabryn.
[2] *E.g.*, Min. Acc., Bundle 1149, No. 1—Commote of Turkelyn.
[3] *Ibid.*—Commote of Talybolion.

In the Commote of Malltraeth, Anglesey, long lists of lands in certain of the vills are vacant "because the lord's tenants in the same 'vills' are incapable of holding the same and are *insufficient*".[1] Occasionally, tenants are seen to resume their tenement after an interval, as did a certain Llewelyn ap Madoc ap Howel, of whom it is said that "he left his land during the Pestilence on account of poverty, but now came (1354) and was admitted by the lord's favour to hold the said land by the service due from the same".[2] The position of some was temporarily relieved by respiting the rents, but the situation was so serious in the northern Principality that in July, 1352, a general order was issued by the advice of the Council of the Prince of Wales to the Justice's Deputy and Chamberlain of North Wales relieving the villeins and men of advowry of each commote from their obligation to contribute cattle for the munitioning of the castle (*staurum principis*). The terms of the order were retrospective, and were to continue until conditions improved.[3]

The reversion to the lord, not only of the land "in acres," assarted land and native land, but also of the "hereditary land," had important consequences. It enabled the lord to assume direct hold over the tenure of a far larger part of the lands of the commote. These lands were usually let on a yearly tenancy or on a lease to the

[1] Min. Acc., Bundle 1149, No. 1 (mem. 3)—Commote of Malltraeth.

Commote of Talybolion. "*Native*" *Land; 14s. 6d. herbage of Villein land in Aberalaw which Madoc ap Philip, Eynon ap Philip, and 3 others (named), nativi, held for £1 12s. 2d., because the nativi who were surviving after the Pestilence were not "sufficient" on account of their inability to hold the said lands.*

[2] Court Rolls, Portfolio 218, No. 4.

[3] Min. Acc., Bundle 1171, Nos. 7 and 8—Commote of Creuthyn.

Store of the Prince (*Staurum Principis*): *5s. 4d., received from half of the value of 2 cows which the community of the Commote (viz. the Villains and men of advowry) used to give to the lord's lardar for munitioning the castle of Conway —a cow appraised @ 5s. 4d. this year. Nothing received from half the value of one ox which the lord was accustomed to have from the community for the same store, because it was remitted owing to the poverty and fewness of the tenants. Sum 5s. 4d.*

Text of Remission: "*Edward, etc., Prince, to the Deputy of the Justice of North Wales and to the Chamberlain there.*

Because of our especial grace and by the advice of the Council, We have respited to our bond tenants and the people of our advowry, the money for which our Auditors of Accounts have charged them to find for the "garnestures" of our castles in your bailiwicks, since the time of the pestilence. We ask you to cease to levy the said money until further command.

Given under our privy seal, London, 30 July, 26, E. III."

highest bidder, although it is true that a proportion was still unoccupied even fifty years later.[1] As on the manors, however, much land changed hands about this time. Men who were able added to their own tenements or acquired others. New holdings were established, some on a considerable scale. Greater mobility is seen, and the opening up of opportunities for individual initiative seems to have encouraged the renting of larger tenements than had formerly been the custom, and members of kindreds frequently came to occupy lands irrespective of their fellows and additional to their kindred holding. The cumulative effect of such circumstances, therefore, is to be seen in the gradual breaking away from tribal customs and the establishment more and more of direct tenure and personal responsibility. The social cleavage between tribesmen and non-tribesmen based upon descent, was now giving place to an economic distinction. Greater inequality existed even among land-holders themselves, while the landless class was on the increase. That the latter experienced difficulty in obtaining employment may be gathered from references made to their leaving the "Welshries" in search of work. In the "Englishries" we are not able to trace any restrictions on wages, for English statutes did not apply over the border, but some restrictive measures had been in operation from the time of Edward I. in the Commotes of the Principality. Servants were not permitted to receive more than a certain wage "according to the Statute of the patria," and workers were from time to time fined in the commote courts for breach of the Statute. The whole community of servants of Mabelvew were on one occasion fined for this reason, but in the March lands no restrictions of such a nature appear. The renewed prominence given to the Statute in the late fourteenth century points to a rise in wages beyond the former limits, but the policy was hardly one of strict adherence to the regulation. The com-

[1] Ministers' Accounts and Court Rolls during these years record long lists of lands and tenements transferred.

Min. Acc., 1182/3. Isalet: *Allowed "Tunk" and other customs of ½ part of 1 "gavell" of land of Cadarn within the parts of Lewenny whch Thomas ap Lowarch held there and which came into the lord's hands. The lord gave it to John de le More to hold in the English manner for rent.*

munity of workers, upon payment of a fine, was tacitly permitted, at least in certain years, to break the Statute and wages would thus tend to find their natural level.

It cannot be supposed that the economic strain and a social upheaval, which frequently had the effect of estranging men from their inherited rights in land, could fail to give rise to serious unrest among a people subject to alien rule. Administrative evils and a system of exploitation but served to add to racial hostility, and before the effects of the Black Death had culminated in the new economy observable in the manors and "Welshries," the situation was seriously complicated by the outbreak of the Glendower rebellion, which was far more disastrous to the economic life of Wales than even the ravages of the Pestilence. The final consequences of the Black Death, therefore, are lost among the devastations of war.

THE COMMONS' JOURNALS OF THE TUDOR PERIOD

ALEXANDER PRIZE ESSAY, 1919

BY J. E. NEALE, M.A.

Read June 10, 1920

IN 1914 Professor Pollard read a paper before the Royal Historical Society on "The Authenticity of the Lords' Journals in the Sixteenth Century,"[1] in the course of which, by revealing how inadequate a presentation of the manuscript originals was contained in the printed journals, he showed that the original journals might be a valuable field for historical gleanings. In addition to Professor Pollard, Professor Maitland and Mr. L. O. Pike also examined the manuscript of an Elizabethan Lords' journal;[2] but in 1916 two American scholars, Professors Notestein and Usher, turned to the Commons' journals of the early seventeenth century, and in advocating a critical survey of the manuscript originals, challenged the conventional view of their authenticity which an uncritical edition of them has easily created.[3] The fact is, of course, that even an accurate edition of a document—and *a fortiori* an inaccurate one—may destroy valuable historical evidence if it convey no clear idea of the appearance of the original manuscript. It is one thing to visualise a large folio sheet of print: a materially

[1] *Trans. Roy. Hist. Soc.*, 3rd series, viii. 17.

[2] *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, xviii. 531. *Constitutional History of the House of Lords*, Pref. vii.

[3] "The Stuart Period: Unsolved Problems," by Professor W. Notestein; "Unsolved Legal and Institutional Problems in the Stuart Period," by Professor R. G. Usher; in *Annual Rep. Amer. Hist. Assoc.* (1916), i. 395, 403.

different impression may be obtained from the manuscript original. In common with the work of these English and American scholars, the present survey, dealing with the manuscripts of the Tudor Commons' journals, has been prompted by this canon of historical research. Its result will not be to impair the reliability of the printed journals in the way that Professor Pollard's paper did, if only because the manuscripts presented less opportunity for their editors to err. But cognate, as well as new, problems will be raised, and the research embodied in it will be found to be complementary to the work of Professors Pollard and Notestein in their different spheres.[1]

The original journals of the Tudor House of Commons that are extant are bound in two volumes, the first covering the years 1547-1566, and the second the years 1571-1580/1; whilst for the later Elizabethan Parliaments, from 1584-1601, the manuscripts are missing. The grouping of the surviving journals is necessitated by their size, but the division at 1571 coincides with a change in the clerkship of the lower house, and the volumes are quite distinct from subsequent journals in bearing the names of the two clerks as their titles. The earlier is known as "Seimour," a name by which it is referred to in the precedent books of the early seventeenth century;[2] and the later, "Onslowe," a title seemingly unknown to the compilers of those books, and probably given it by analogy with the "Seimour" volume, after the complete disappearance of Onslow's later Elizabethan journals. "Seimour" is only 6″ × 8″ in size, and is as surprising in internal, as in external, appearance. From 1547-1552 its journals are fair copies made from the notes taken in the House, but from 1552/3-1566 they are

[1] Professor Notestein's researches deal with the early Stuart Commons' journals, but have not yet been published. I am indebted to him for knowledge of his work and for the light which it has thrown upon my own studies.

[2] *Cf.* B.M. Harl. MS. 6283.

the notes themselves; a distinction which is made quite clear by a close examination of the manuscripts. Thus the earlier journals, which cover the first Parliament of Edward VI, are written in a fair hand with regular spacing between entries and days, contrasting markedly with the irregularity and distention of the entries after 1552. Their margins are ruled, so differing from the double fold of the quire which served later. The journals from 1552/3-1566 are, however, in a hurried, uneven hand that varied with the speed of writing. Different quills and ink have resulted in a patchwork appearance, the variations coinciding with fresh sittings of the House;[1] and where additions were made to the entries of a day at the next sitting, they can frequently be distinguished by the different shade of ink used on the second day, or by being cramped into an inadequate space.[2] Erasures and interlineations are numerous, and they, too, yield instructive evidence. Thus an entry recording the dispatch of certain Bills to the Lords is cancelled, and their transference noted again on a later day, no doubt because the messenger found the Lords risen on the first occasion, and so redelivered the Bills to the clerk.[3] As a rule each of the journals in this first volume, is headed only by the year in figures, but in 1558/9 and 1562/3 Seymour added his Christian name "Johannes". Bound in at the beginning and end of the volume are a number of leaves, some evidently the unused folios, and others, which are soiled, the outer sheets, of the journals whilst they were still

[1] From Oct. 1553 on, Seymour entered the word "assent" in the margin against Bills that received the royal assent. Being written at the close of a session, the word often seems foreign to a day's entries which were written in a different shade of ink. Probably for this reason the editors of the printed journals confused it with marginalia of the early seventeenth (?) century, added to facilitate the use of the journals for precedent purposes. Yet "assent" is an integral part of the manuscript journals.

[2] *Cf.* Seimour, fol. 133b, where the Bill, "that the Subjectes of this Realme shall not bring in foreign wares," clearly had the words, "of dyverse sortes" added, in accordance with the extended title given it on the following day (fol. 134a).

[3] Seimour, fol. 226a (Feb. 11), 227a (Feb. 15); *Lords Journals*, i. 590, 591.

unbound. They contain several notes. A quotation from the Vulgate is on the same page with a Parliamentary jotting,[1] and on the next folio appears an entry of a Member's licence of departure.[2] Two soiled sheets at the end of the volume contain, the one, "Amen per me Johannem," and the other, statistics on the decay of the navy probably taken down during a debate in 1562/3.[3] The second volume of journals, "Onslowe," which covers the years 1571-1580/1, requires but a brief description. It is 8″ × 13″ in size, and is in striking contrast with "Seimour". Its journals are all carefully finished manuscripts, the four margins of which are ruled, and they are free from the irregularities which distinguish and disfigure the earlier volume.

From the seventeenth century until the present day, conflicting views have been held regarding the origin of the Commons' journals. The one accepts the evidence of survival, and regards the 1547 journal as the first of its class. The record is so meagre, it urges, that anything more rudimentary is hard to conceive.[4] On the other hand, Coke[5] and Petyt[6] in the seventeenth century, and Harding[7] and May,[8] Parliamentary clerks of the

[1] Ecclesiasticus, cap. x. verse 17. "Leonard baryngton a wytnes for Mr. Mynne" (*cf. Commons Journals*, i. 44).

[2] Humphrey Bradbourne, knight for Derby County in 1552/3 and 1555 (*Official Return of Members of Parliament*, pt. i. 378, 393).

[3] "the decayes of the navy / in shippes and maryners / within xxty yeres in the cinque portes 258 now 69 shippes bot[toms ?] / Lyme xiiii now 2 for. [*sic*] / maryners 3c.c. [600] / grete shippes in englend for marchantes / London and Thamys xxvii maryners xxvm. [25,000] / 2c. [200] houses of religion besides celles fryers colleges femelyes of / bishops dyd eate fishe on wensdayes kept advent xviiim. iic. xlii [?] [18,242 ?] / fed xxxm. [30,000] people in those tymes." (*Cf. Commons Journals*, i. 68; S.P. Dom. Eliz., xxvii. No. 71.) The bars in the transcription denote the end of each line of writing.

[4] *Cf. Trans. Roy. Hist. Soc.*, 3rd series, viii. 27.

[5] *4th Institute* (1671), 23.

[6] *Jus Parliamentarium* (1680), 223-4.

[7] *Commons Journals*, xxiv. 263.

[8] *Parliamentary Practice* (9th ed.), 258. Sir R. F. D. Palgrave abandoned this view in editing the 10th ed. Also *cf.* Sir C. P. Ilbert, *Parliament* (Home University Library), p. 179, where an accurate statement based on the Act of 1515 conveys the impression of there having been earlier journals.

eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, have maintained that a journal was kept in the reign of Henry VIII, basing their assertions upon an Act passed in 1515 to regulate the departure of knights and burgesses from Parliament, wherein it was stipulated that licences granted to departing Members should "be enteryd of record in the booke of the Clerke of the parliament appoynted . . . for the Common house".[1] "The Clerk's Book and the Journals," said May, "were unquestionably the same."[2] The occasion serves to point an excellent moral, for this passage from the Act of 6 Henry VIII depends for its significance upon the connotation of the term Clerk's Book, and consequently the insertion of a title, "Journals," which is absent from the Tudor manuscripts, must be regarded as not least amongst the editorial errors of the printed Commons' journals. The journals were first referred to within their own pages as the clerk's "Book of Notes," and this in 1580/1;[3] whilst even in 1641 Hakewill was able to write of "the Clerkes booke or journal".[4] The first use of the modern term that I have found occurs late in Elizabeth's reign and then refers to the Lords' journals.[5] Of its being applied to the Commons' journals, I have discovered no instance in the Tudor period. Apparently the practice began under James I; and one of the two journals extant for 1604 is headed "Diarium," a title which does occur in the original manuscript.[6]

Yet I hope to show that the argument from the Act of 1515 to a contemporary journal, though it may be more valid than has perhaps been thought, is neither necessary nor accurate. A casual examination of even the printed journals, will disclose the fact that the journal of 1547 is quite distinct in its character. In the

[1] *Statutes of the Realm*, iii. 134 (6 Hen. VIII, c. xvi.).
[2] *Op. cit.* 258.
[3] *Commons Journals*, i. 116.
[4] *The Manner how Statutes are enacted . . .* 32.
[5] *Lords Journals*, ii. 195.
[6] *Commons Journals*, i. 933. Also *cf.* i. 385, vi. 117.

manuscript it is headed, "In Anno primo Regni Regis Edwardi Sexti, &c. A note of the Bylles when they were redde in the Commen House in the first Session"; and its title is descriptive of its contents. In only five instances is this limitation exceeded, when the names are added of Members to whom the clerk had temporarily committed certain Bills. It would surely be a distortion of terms to call this a "Journal of the House of Commons," which had no concern with a day whereon no Bill was read, and which quite consistently omits all mention of the opening days of the Parliament.[1] The change, then, is a fundamental one when the journal of the second session includes orders, privilege cases, and licences of departure, in addition to the readings of Bills. We have now a real journal of the proceedings of the House, and its scale, adopted for the succeeding journals, gives us entries of the dissolution of Edward's first Parliament at the close of its fourth session, and of the opening of his second Parliament in 1552/3.

There can be little doubt that this transition between 1547 and 1548 was due to the entry upon office of John Seymour, who on 10 May, 1548, succeeded Richard Ormeston as clerk of the House of Commons.[2] Hence the "note of the Bylles . . . redde . . ." may be regarded as the closest approximation of Ormeston to a Seymour journal. But if at the end of thirty-two years of service[3] he kept such a memorandum, it is practically certain that it was not unique, and that earlier manuscripts once existed. Indeed, memoranda showing the progress of Bills through the House became indispensable as the legislative activities of the Commons developed, and the three readings were stereotyped in procedure.[4] But

[1] 4 and 7 Nov., *cf. Lords Journals*, i. 293-4. [2] Pat. 2, Edw. VI, pt. v.

[3] Pat. 7, Hen. VIII, pt. ii. No. 12. *L. and P. Henry VIII*, ii. pt. i. No. 185.

[4] Under Burghley the clerk had periodically to furnish statements of the positions of Bills in the House on a given day. *Cf.* S.P. Dom. Eliz., cvii. Nos. 59, 63, 86; cxlviii. No. 1.

Ormeston must also have kept other types of memoranda. By the Act of 1515 he was compelled to make entries of licences granted to departing Members; whilst the exigencies of procedure must have led to notes, however rough, of any orders the execution of which devolved upon himself.[1] In all probability the sum of these separate memoranda differed only slightly from the total entries in Seymour's first journal. Nevertheless that journal was novel, its novelty consisting in a synthesis of the isolated and possibly unvalued notes that Ormeston kept, into a single memorandum in diary form. When once begun, a diary invites both expansion and preservation, and so the impetus was supplied which originated a new class of Parliamentary records.

Ormeston's memoranda do not survive, and it is improbable that any of them were deliberately preserved by him. His note of the readings of Bills in 1547 came into Seymour's hands, but was rewritten to introduce Seymour's own journals with some record of the first session of Edward VI's reign; and it survives as a transcript in the same hand as the three subsequent journals. Had a regular series of memoranda been inherited by Seymour, he would scarcely have duplicated the record of 1547, merely to serve as a preface to an enlarged continuation of this series.[2] The accession of Seymour, therefore, marks the taking of so definite a step to record the proceedings of the House of Commons, and his 1548 journal is so different from any memoranda that preceded it, that we may say that the Commons' journals originated, not with the journal of 1547, but with that of 1548. So far as one can tell, not only was Seymour the

[1] A stray, soiled sheet of paper, containing desultory jottings, is inserted in the MS. Lords Journals (ii. 130) before the journal of 3 Edw. VI. It illustrates the need of odd notes, of which the following may serve as examples. "Re To searche owt the acte for thuse of hand gonnes." "ii. bookes of regrating committed to Mr. Sollycitor."

[2] Hobart knew of no earlier "journal" than that of 1547 (*Reports*, (1678), p. 109).

instrument by which Ormeston's random notes were transformed into a journal, but the initiative was his. He certainly has preserved no order of the House instituting a record, and whilst it would be a dangerous expedient to argue from the silence of the early journals, one may turn to the appearance of the manuscripts for corroboration: for records so jejune, with the blemishes and peculiarities that have been described, cannot easily be considered official memoranda. They undoubtedly suggest a casual origin.

The thesis upheld by Coke, Petyt, and the Parliamentary clerks cannot, therefore, be maintained, for even Ormeston's sessional notes cannot be the Clerk's Book referred to in the Act of 1515, since their contents were the readings of Bills only. The argument, indeed, ignores the fact of evolution in a journal, and an Act of Parliament would probably not have taken cognisance even of Seymour's earlier journals. But the reference must be to some book, and the determination of the document is a matter of historical interest.

From Tudor, if not from earlier, times to the present, it has been the duty of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to prepare a list of the elected Members of Parliament from the writs and returns, and to certify a copy into the House of Commons, where it serves as evidence of a Member's return.[1] The lists are long, narrow quires, which, when originals, appear to have been of parchment and to have been indorsed, "Liber Parliamenti". At the Crown Office they are extant from Mary's reign onwards; but there is no reason to suppose that they did not once exist for earlier Parliaments, the more so as the records of this office seem to have been in jeopardy both in Tudor and in modern times.[2] In fact, a Hatfield manuscript is almost certainly such a list, dating

[1] *Cf. Commons Journals*, i. 51, 140; D'Ewes' *Journals*, 570a.

[2] Townshend, *Historical Collections*, 214-15; *Roy. Com. on Pub. Rec.* (1910), *2nd Rep.*, ii. pt. iii. 71-2.

from Edward VI's reign.[1] The copies certified into the House of Commons were used there for calling the Members at the opening and in the course of a session, and were spoken of as the "Clerk's Book". "After this," wrote a Member in 1592/3, "the house was called by the clarkes booke. . . ."[2] They were official in character, and the conclusion seems irresistible that licences issued to Members on departure before the close of the session were entered against their names in the "Liber Parliamenti"[3]: incidentally, subsequent callings of the roll would have been facilitated by such a procedure. It is unfortunate that the Commons' copies of the lists have not survived. Those earlier than 1625 were lost before the fire at Westminster Palace in 1834,[4] disappearing, perhaps, early in the seventeenth century.[5]

From the seventeenth century until the present day the Tudor Commons' journals have presented two historical problems. With the one, the origin of the records, I have just dealt. The other is concerned with the loss of the manuscripts for the years 1584-1601. Sir Simonds D'Ewes' collection of Parliamentary journals for Elizabeth's reign was compiled in the years 1629-30,[6] and as there was then no gap from 1584-1601 in the official Commons' journals, it includes a text of manuscripts that are now missing. D'Ewes' work is known in the version published by Paul Bowes in 1682. But the original is extant in the Harleian collection of manuscripts at the British Museum,[7] and it includes a prefatory table giving references to the folios of the official Commons' journals for

[1] *Hist. MSS. Com., Hatfield MSS.*, pt. i. 51. Mr. W. S. Dann transcribed this for a thesis, "Parliamentary Representation in the 16th Century," submitted for the University of London M.A. degree in 1911. The formulas of the manuscript are those of the Crown Office lists. Mr. Dann considers the list to be for the last session of Edward VI's first Parliament.

[2] Cotton MS. Titus F., ii. fol. 70b.

[3] Marginal comments were common: *e.g.* "mort" was entered against a deceased Member's name and the new Member's name added.

[4] *Roy. Com. on Pub. Rec.* (1910), *2nd Rep.*, ii. pt. ii. 106.

[5] *Cf. infra*, p. 24. [6] D'Ewes' *Autobiography*, i. 409, 436.

[7] Harl. MSS. 73, 74, 75.

each day's entries. This Bowes omitted in the published work, and he also abridged the preface, both of which contain much information concerning the official manuscripts extant in 1630. By checking the folio references with the two volumes, "Seimour" and "Onslowe," at Westminster, it is clear that they are the same volumes that D'Ewes used: although they have since been rebound. The missing journals, D'Ewes shows in his preface, were bound in a bulky, folio volume, along with a fragment of the 1580/1 journal, of which, however, a complete manuscript still exists in "Onslowe":—

> They were, he adds, "exceeding difficult to be read, and were certainly the very notes taken and entred into the said Volume by Fulk Onslowe . . . during the Continuance of the Parliament. . . . In all which the said Notes being written in a fast running hand, and in every Page almost much interlined, and sometimes enlarged by several Additions, disposed into such vacant places as the page afforded, often distant each from other, it required . . . much time to discover, . . . not only what was written, but also how each particular was to be disposed into its due place. . . ."[1]

The passage is clear in its meaning, and it is well that it is so, for its implications are important. There was a very real distinction between the clerk's rough *notes* and the *journal*.[2] The latter was the record: the former but the minutes taken in the House, out of which the record was compiled. And the journal might not, and did not, faithfully reproduce the notes. In his description of the manuscripts D'Ewes is explicit enough to prove the general truth of his statement; but its particular application to each of the documents is not so certain, and we must seek for corroborative evidence in his edition of them.

Fulk Onslow is in D'Ewes' work the chief victim of the editor's uncritical avidity for strictures. Charges

[1] D'Ewes' *Journals*, Pref.

[2] *Cf. Eng. Hist. Rev.*, xxviii. 533, and *infra*, p. 16, note.

against him of negligence are repeated *ad nauseam*. But these assume an entirely new significance when they are now found to be crowded into the later journals, for they are indicative of remarkable omissions and defects, which alone characterise the clerk's rough notes. The numerous omissions that D'Ewes points out, were, according to his comments, almost all denoted in the manuscript originals by blank spaces, often extending into pages. Speeches were frequently left out, or only partially reported, as when, for example, the opening only is given of a speech by Sir Walter Mildmay in moving for a committee of supply, and three blank pages left to mark the deficiency.[1] Reports to the House, embodying the deliberations of Committees or the substance of conferences, were often left incomplete, an instance of which is the following truncated entry: "Mr. Comptroller and the residue returning from the Lords, Mr. Secretary shewed that in the debate of the . . .".[2] Then, on one occasion, the names of a committee and the place and time of its meeting are omitted.[3]

We are perfectly familiar with the reporter's habit of relying upon written speeches where these are procurable. There is nothing essentially modern in the practice, and in all probability Onslow's irregularities are to be explained by his reliance upon manuscripts of speeches and orders, and other miscellaneous papers, which he acquired either on loan or as part of the routine memoranda of a session. A fact of wider interest is really involved here, for we should be helped in reconstructing the working of the House of Commons in an important century, if only we knew what its routine memoranda were; and the anxiety of the 1910 Record Commission to extract information concerning a class of Commons' Manuscripts

[1] D'Ewes' *Journals*, 431a. Also *cf.* in 1584/5, *ibid.*, 334a, 351-2; in 1586/7, *ibid.*, 392a, 418b; in 1588/9, *ibid.*, 429a, 454b, 455a; in 1592/3, *ibid.*, 470a.

[2] *Ibid.*, 584b (1597/8). Also *cf.* in 1584/5, *ibid.*, 352a; in 1586/7, *ibid.*, 402a; in 1588/9, *ibid.*, 452b, 454b; in 1592/3, *ibid.*, 478a.

[3] *Ibid.*, 337b. Also see *ibid.*, 451a (in 1588/9); *ibid.*, 508a (in 1592/3).

parallel with the Lords' Manuscripts, is witness to the interest of the question.[1] Unfortunately the sixteenth century papers, with the exception of the journals, did not survive even until the Westminster fire of 1834.[2] However, the journal of 1604, the first compiled by Onslow's successor, Ralph Ewens, is plentifully interleaved with miscellaneous papers, both originals and transcripts. Amongst the original papers are a warrant, a writ of habeas corpus, various letters and petitions; whilst amongst other papers similarly inserted in the journal, are precedents, decisions by Committees, a speech by the Speaker, and a list of the names of a Committee giving the time and place of its meeting. Probably the interleaving is in part strictly contemporaneous with the compilation of the journal; but certain of the papers, judging from their creases and soiled dorses, were pigeonholed for a considerable time before being incorporated in the journal, and were, perhaps, inserted after a review of the journal by a Committee in 1607.[3]

The value of Ewens' manuscript is not to show that Onslow initiated the practice of interleaving; probably he did not. It is to suggest that the omissions in Onslow's rough notes generally represent the existence of separate papers in his possession; and in point of fact, most, if not all, of the defects which D'Ewes has instanced, could have been made good by papers similar to those in Ewens' journal. Nor is it unlikely that such papers existed in the latter half of Onslow's clerkship. The same spirit which during Elizabeth's reign caused an increasing definition and formalisation of Parliamen-

[1] *Cf. Roy. Com. on Pub. Rec.* (1910), *2nd Rep.*, ii. pt. iii. 73. It is probably worth calling attention to a Landsdowne Manuscript (No. 553) in the British Museum, which is a calendar of the House of Commons' books and papers from 1547-1732. It is a substantial folio of 502 folios, and whilst all the Commons' books and papers referred to in the catalogue reprinted by the 1910 Record Commission (*2nd Rep.*, ii. pt. ii. 106) are not included, its detailed character makes it a useful supplement to that catalogue.

[2] *Ibid.*, *2nd Rep.*, ii. pt. ii. 106.

[3] *Commons Journals*, i. 390.

tary procedure, must have developed the practice of setting down reports, orders, speeches, and memoranda, in writing, for more accurate presentation to the House. Occasional references in the journals bear out this conclusion;[1] whilst the Mildmay and Sadler Papers which have survived,[2] along with other miscellaneous Parliamentary papers, show that it was customary for the more formal speeches, at least, to be written out in full.

Their omissions and deficiencies stamp the later Onslow journals which D'Ewes used, with the character of minutes. But one would expect such manuscripts, written in long-hand, to contain disjointed notes serving as reports of lengthy speeches. A speech of Sir Christopher Hatton's does, in fact, furnish an example.[3] Yet the result of a general search would be disconcerting were one not familiar with D'Ewes' standards of editorial accuracy and criticism. The text of his documentary sources was not sacrosanct to him, and he did not hesitate to make sense where he thought it lacking, or to frame fragmentary notes into a readable narrative. A detailed study of his journals reveals this very clearly, but for our immediate purpose we are not without confessions of his to revisionary work on disjointed reports. A long relation of the results of a conference, made to the House by the Treasurer, "is set down in the Original Journal-Book . . .," wrote D'Ewes, "in this (or rather a more imperfect) manner . . .":[4] and so, no doubt, many ill-reported speeches have been disguised in his edition of them.

For 1601, however, the only omission in the official manuscripts noted by D'Ewes is of the closing ceremonies

[1] *Cf.* D'Ewes' *Journals*, 296b, 417b, 479a. See *ibid.*, 559a, for a reference to a Committee list, and *cf.* an actual list from the House of Lords in S.P. Dom. cclxv., No. 18.

[2] B.M. MSS.: Sloane 326; Add. 33591.

[3] D'Ewes' *Journals*, 408. But even this has probably been retouched.

[4] *Ibid.*, 359b. Also 356a.

of the Parliament,[1] and against this deficiency must be set his comment upon the unusual fullness with which the opening ceremonies were recorded.[2] The truth is, he was so well served in this instance by an elaborate journal of Heywood Townshend's, that the occasions did not arise, if the defects existed, for editorial strictures upon the official manuscript; and consequently we must find other data for its classification. Now a clerk's rough notes, written daily, and into several distinct quires of paper, may be expected to have begun the entries of many more days with fresh pages in the manuscript, than did the journal which was a fair copy written as a single and continuous memorandum. An analysis of the table of folio references in the original manuscript of D'Ewes' work, fully establishes this distinction, as between the earlier Onslow journals from 1571-80/1, and the rough notes of 1584-97/8[3]: and as its evidence is conclusive also for the 1601 manuscript, we may safely classify this as the rough notes of the clerk. Indeed, Onslow's fair journals from 1571-80/1 offer so marked a contrast with the manuscripts of D'Ewes' description, that an exception of the 1601 manuscript would undoubtedly have been made, had it been a finished journal.

Thus D'Ewes' characterisation of the third volume of official manuscripts is confirmed. But the volume possessed two peculiarities which need to be mentioned, for they have a bearing upon the unfolding of our problem. The first concerns the manuscript of October-December, 1586. In a prefatory note to his table of

[1] Harl. MS., No. 75, fol. 293b. This note (like many others) was omitted by Bowes in publishing D'Ewes' work. The date, and an entry of the Act of Pardon, we learn, were the only entries for Dec. 19, in the official manuscript. A blank space denoted the omissions.

[2] D'Ewes' *Journals*, 622a.

[3] The following list gives the proportion of days which begin a fresh page, to days which do not.

Journals: For 1571, 24 : 20; 1575/6, 11 : 19; 1580/1, 21 : 31.

Rough Notes: For 1584/5, 18 : 6; Feb.-Mch. 1586/7, 15 : 10; 1588/9 42 : 4; 1592/3, 28 : 11; 1597/8, 56 : 2; 1601, 38 : 6.

folio references for this, D'Ewes remarks that "diuers daies are entred into two seuerall places out of boath which somtimes (when one place supplied anie matter defectiue in the other) the ensuing Journall was framed and therefore all the said Number-folios where the said double entrances were found though farr distant each from other are for the most parte extracted. . . ."[1] The table itself shows a strange confusion of pages before November 18, but as the data given do not allow of a reconstruction of the manuscript, it is possible only to conjecture that the superfluous entries were stray sheets from the actual *journal* for 1586, salvaged from a dispersal of the Commons' papers, and bound carelessly with the surviving rough notes.[2] The partial salvage is quite explicable if we assume that the journal was unbound at the time of its loss. Support for such a conjecture as this may be found in the second peculiarity of the volume. For the fragment of the 1580/1 journal which it contained, and which seems misplaced in a volume covering the years 1584-1601, was part of the rough notes of the

[1] Harl. MS. 73, fol. 17. I give the part of the table affected, adopting a columnar rearrangement which both simplifies and helps to explain the confusion.

31 Oct.			197a.
3 Nov.		176a.	197a, 198a. b.
4 Nov.	171a.	176b.	199a.
5 Nov.	171b, 172a.		
7 Nov.	172b, 173a, b, 174a.	177a.	
8 Nov.	174b, 175a,		
9 Nov.	175b.	177b, 178a, b, 182.	
		183a, b, 184a.	
10 Nov.		178b.	
11 Nov.		178b, 179a, b, 185, 186a, b.	
12 Nov.		179b.	
14 Nov.		179b, 180a, 188a, b.	
18 Nov.		189a, b.	
19 Nov.	etc., regular.		
2 Dec.			196a, b.
15 Feb.			200a, b.

And thereafter regular.

[2] This hypothesis would explain the two versions of the Norfolk election dispute, given by D'Ewes under different dates (*Journals*, 396, 398).

session.[1] It, too, was evidently salvaged, and on account of its character was bound in with the rough notes of the later Parliaments.

I have now postulated a finished journal, as well as the clerk's rough notes, for the Parliament of 1586, and in so doing have predetermined an important question. We have already seen that the official manuscripts from which D'Ewes compiled his Commons' journals for 1584-1601, were not, as is supposed, the journals themselves, but merely the rough notes of the clerk. If, then, we assume that Onslow did write up journals from his notes of these later Parliaments, we rediscover the existence of a set of Parliamentary manuscripts, hitherto unknown to modern scholars. They have left us no text, and had disappeared before the beginning of D'Ewes' labours in 1629. Much therefore depends upon whether we can be sure that Onslow completed his clerical duties in these years. It is incredible, however, that he did not. He wrote up journals from his rough notes consistently from 1571-1580/1, and as the surveillance of the House over their clerk was increasing, and not decreasing, a sustained lapse from 1584-1601 is highly improbable: whilst, as we have seen, there is reason for supposing that a finished journal existed for 1586. Apart from D'Ewes' uncritical disparagements, I know of no cause for thinking that Onslow was indifferent or negligent. The length of many of his draft entries in the later years, bespeaks a personal interest in Parliamentary affairs, and so, one imagines, does the word "better" which crept into his rough notes for 1580/1, and has been preserved by

[1] *Cf.* D'Ewes' *Journals*, 278a. D'Ewes embodied its additional information in his Commons Journal, and one can detect it by comparison with the official printed journal. It is inconsiderable, and ceases with January 28: but one cannot be sure that D'Ewes made exhaustive use of the fragment. An interesting feature is the insertion of Members' names several times in the rough notes, when they are omitted in the journal. Thus Paul Wentworth's name as that of the proposer of the motion for a public fast, is given in the rough notes only. (D'Ewes' *Journals*, 282b; *Commons Journals*, i. 118).

D'Ewes:[1] "the *better* side had the greater number," he wrote in recording the carrying of Paul Wentworth's motion for a public fast; and one must remember that Elizabeth wrathfully disapproved of the motion. However, direct evidence upon the question probably exists in one of the State Papers, which is a transcript, in a hand of the late sixteenth or early seventeenth century, of the Treasurer's report to the Commons, made after conference with the Lords on 29 March, 1589.[2] In D'Ewes' journals, which are in this case the clerk's notes, the report breaks abruptly off after a few lines: yet in the State Paper the complete transactions are given. Nor is this manuscript a transcript of the mere report that was probably written out by the Treasurer for

[1] D'Ewes' *Journals*, 283a.

[2] S.P. Dom. Eliz., ccxxiii. No. 34.

"A° 31° Eliz. Die Sat: xxix. Martis, 1589.

Mr. Threasurer in the name of the rest of the committees appointed for conference with the Lords this present forenoone sheweth that their Lordshipps haue ymparted (by the mouth of the lord Threasurer) unto the committees of this House the effect of a conference, which their Lordships haue had amongst them-selfes, and of their resolucion therin, which is, That (considering the great practizes, treasons, invasions, and attemptes (lately intended and pursued by the Pope the King of Spaine, and their adherentes for the subverting of true religion, her majestie, and the whole state of the Realme) as their said Lordships together with this House haue yealded, and granted unto her majesty an extraordynary and most liberall supply of theire treasure for the necessary defence of her said majesty's state, and kingdome against the like daungerous attemptes of such mighty enemyes. So likewise (for the causes aforesaid) haue their said Lordships not only upon the said conference resolued to offer unto her Highnes the expence, and ymploying of their landes and handes, But also of their bodyes, and lyues. And likewise for the more honorable performance of the same defence to become humble sutors unto her most excellent majestie (yf yt so shall seeme good unto her said highnes) for denouncing of warre, and for preuenting of like attemptes to use all honorable meanes aswell offensiue as defensyue against the said King of Spaine, and his adherentes, at such tyme and occasion, as to her highnesses wisedome and princely good pleasure shalbe thought conuenient. And that if yt stand with the good likeing of this house, to ioyne with their said Lordships in peticion unto her majestie for the same, And also that Mr. Speaker doe delyuer the same peticion in the name of the Lords and of this house in his oracion to her majestie in the upper house this afternoone ymmedyately after the offering and deliuerie of the graunt of the fifteenes, and subsedyes. And this upon the question was resolued to be accomplished accordingly." *Cf.* D'Ewes' *Journals*, 454b.

delivery in the House: it is couched in the form of a journal entry, and includes the subsequent decision of the Commons. In fact, the conclusion can hardly be avoided that the manuscript is a copy of an entry in the actual *journal* for 1588/9, made before its loss. The formal date heading seems to suggest an official transcript made for precedent purposes.

Two sets of manuscripts covering the years 1584-1601 have therefore disappeared, and as an initial step in determining the date and circumstances of the losses, it is necessary to trace the vicissitudes in the custody of the Commons' journals. The House of Commons was for a long period at a disadvantage, compared with the House of Lords, in storing its papers. In some measure this can be ascribed to the character of the mediæval Parliament, which had determined that the one Clerk of the Parliaments officiated in the Parliament chamber, which became later the House of Lords. When Parliament, in Henry VII's reign, able now to conceive of a more immediate repository for its records than the Chancery, retained the original parchment rolls of Acts in its own keeping, the custodian of those documents was the Clerk of the Parliaments. Accordingly, the allocation of the Stone Tower in Old Palace Yard as a Parliamentary repository was its allocation to this official, who, as clerk in the House of Lords, thus ensured the safe custody of the Lords' papers. On the other hand, the clerk in the House of Commons was simply "Subclericus Parliamentorum". His papers, probably inappreciable in bulk before Elizabeth's reign, were not comparable with the Parliamentary Acts for authority and importance; and his private residence had consequently to serve as the Commons' repository.

During the Tudor period the House of Commons apparently did not concern itself with the custody of its papers. But the first Parliament of James I began an agitation that was to continue intermittently throughout

the century before it attained its object. The Commons agreed in that Parliament to a motion for securing a room, which should serve as the clerk's office, and as a repository for "the Register, and Records, and Papers" of the House.[1] A warrant was signed by the Speaker, and the Earl of Dorset, then Lord Treasurer, was approached. Dorset issued a warrant to the Surveyor of Works ordering the preparation of a room, which warrant is now one of the interleaved papers of the 1604 journal: but what hitch prevented its fulfilment is not recorded. We only know that the motion for a repository was repeated in 1614, and in 1620/1.[2] The next entry of the raising of the question is in 1640 when a Committee was authorised to consider, not merely the matter of securing "some certain Place, for the constant keeping of the Records," but also the duty of the clerk towards their safe custody.[3] What eventuated we are not told. But in the following year a complaint that the clerk allowed journals and papers to be taken by Members from the table in the House, resulted in a ruling that he "ought not to suffer any Journal or Record to be taken . . . out of his Custody".[4] This, however, did not touch the real problem of their safe keeping. In 1645 and 1646 an effort was made to turn out the records of the Court of Requests from certain rooms near the House of Lords, and to house there the Commons' papers: but it appears to have foundered in the House of Lords.[5] The agitation was next renewed in January, 1648/9,[6] on the occasion of the transference of the House's papers to Henry Scobell, from Henry Elsyng who had resigned the clerkship. A committee was ordered to fit up a room, but it seems very doubtful whether the order was executed.[7] Perhaps the question

[1] *Commons Journals*, i. 215. [2] *Ibid.*, 465, 513. [3] *Ibid.*, ii. 22.
[4] *Ibid.*, ii. 337. [5] *Ibid.*, iv. 273, 522; *Lords Journals*, viii. 283.
[6] *Commons Journals*, vi. 108.
[7] *Ibid.*, 111. In 1650/1 the House was again taking order for a repository. *Vide infra*, p. 20, note 2.

lost its urgency on account of the abolition of the House of Lords in the following month, for the clerk in the upper house, John Browne, was thereupon dispossessed of office and of the Stone Tower in Old Palace Yard, with his adjoining official residencé, and these, with their documentary contents, were transferred to Scobell, now Clerk of the Parliament.[1] A temporary solution of the problem of housing the Commons' manuscripts was thus offered, which Scobell ultimately, if not immediately, grasped by moving his papers to his new and official residence.[2]

In January, 1657/8, Scobell ceased to officiate in the House of Commons, presumably because his services had to be given to the newly constituted second chamber;[3] and although, under the Rump, a return was made to a single chamber, it left him still in possession of the Stone Tower and dwelling-house, which he held by virtue of an Act of Parliament that was not abrogated before the Restoration.[4] Therefore, in January, 1657/8, the manuscripts belonging to the House of Commons resumed their peripatetic character. The Commons first thought of storing them in the room over their own House, and then in the "boarded House" within the Court of Requests;[5] but it is clear that they were in the clerk's private custody in May, 1659,[6] and in July, 1661, the Commons were once

[1] *Commons Journals*, vi. 168, 209.

[2] *Cf. ibid.*, vii. 588 (26 Jan. 1657/8). In 1650/1 the House ordered that the clerk should have the rooms "over the Parliament House" as a repository. It is difficult to say whether anything came of the order. When a room over the Parliament House was repaired in 1656, the records mentioned as there were those of the Common Bench. (*Commons Journals*, vi. 542, vii. 448; *Cal. S.P. Dom.*, 1656-7, pp. 147, 159, 199). Certainly the House of Commons, records were in the Stone Tower in January, 1657/8.

[3] *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum* (Firth and Rait), iii. p. [xxxvii].

[4] The Rump prepared an Act to effect this abrogation. It was engrossed, but not passed (*Commons Journals*, vii. 659, 752, 814). *Cf. Lords Journals*, xi. 3.

[5] *Commons Journals*, vii. 581, 587, 590.

[6] *Ibid.*, vii. 650. The presses mentioned in the Journals, for which Smythe was paid, were private ones, whereas the Surveyor of Works would have furnished any for rooms within the palace.

more attempting to secure a repository and an office.[1] It is remarkable how often they had been baulked; yet again they failed. For in 1671 Joseph Williamson was endeavouring to discover where the journals were, in the absence of the clerk from London;[2] and in January, 1673/4, the House of Commons was renewing its efforts and approaching the Lord Great Chamberlain for the use of the inner room of the Court of Wards.[3] No more is heard of this, the last recorded act in the agitation for a repository. If it failed, success could not long have been delayed, since in June, 1712, the House moved for improved accommodation, the old being "very strait and inconvenient" in consequence of the recent increase in the number of its records.[4]

In centring attention upon the custody of the Commons' manuscripts, we have undoubtedly discovered the main cause of the loss of the Elizabethan journals and rough notes. Their storage in the clerk's private residence, unguarded by close supervision and regulations, involved grave risks. It facilitated their loan, and so made it possible for documents to be missing at the death of a clerk, and to be irrecoverable for lack of a memorandum of the loan. When D'Ewes compiled his collection of Elizabethan journals, he found no difficulty in borrowing the official manuscripts from John Wright, his friend and Clerk of the House of Commons. More significant still, he thought it well to note in his *Autobiography* that on each occasion he had most faithfully restored them:[5] and Sir Robert Cotton's reputation is perhaps sufficient extenuation of this extreme caution of his contemporary. Again, it is quite likely that a clerk drew no sharp distinction between his private and his public papers, and the risk may thus have been increased of the two sets being confused at his death, and some of

[1] *Commons Journals*, viii. 310.
[2] S.P. Dom. Chas. II, ccxcii. No. 216.
[3] *Commons Journals*, ix. 295.
[4] *Ibid.*, xvii. 250, 266.
[5] *Autobiography*, ii. 53.

his public papers falling into the hands of executors. Even the growing concern of the House of Commons could not protect the manuscripts during the intervals when Parliament was not sitting. And if at first the journals were unbound, the danger of their loss must in this way also have been enhanced. Hakewill has an illuminating comment upon these risks in his treatise, *The Manner How Statutes are enacted . . .*, which was published in 1641.[1]

"If," he wrote, "there were some provision made . . . for the safe preserving of them [the journals] answerable to that which the Lords have, whose Clarke hath a house belonging to him, and his successors, where all their Records are kept to posterity; the Journalls and Records of the Commons house, would not (as now they may) come to the hands of Executors or Administrators, and bee removed to and fro in hazard of being lost, or corrupted and defaced, as is well knowne that some of them have beene, and that in passages of the greatest moment. . . ."

Turning now to the actual problem of the lost documents, it would seem that we shall best locate any dispersals of the Commons' manuscripts in the seventeenth century, by reviewing the changes in the clerkship of the lower house, at which times the occurrence of irregularities may have jeopardised the documents, and when, also, any losses that had taken place were likely to have been revealed. Employing this method, it is a simple matter to delimit the period within which the finished journals probably disappeared. The manuscripts which John Wright lent to D'Ewes were assuredly the ones which he received from his predecessor's papers, at his assumption of office on November 19, 1613.[2] This gives one extreme date, and the other is furnished by the death of Onslow on August 8, 1602,[3] when we may conclude that all his own journals were extant. After his death, an interval occurred before Ralph Ewens was appointed

[1] Pref. [2] Pat. 10, Jac. I, pt. viii.
[3] *D.N.B.*, *sub* "Onslow, Richard".

clerk on January 31, 1603.[1] But it is unlikely that the journals disappeared then, if only because it is most probable that they vanished at, or after, the death of Ewens in 1611. On August 30 in that year the Lord Chancellor, Ellesmere, wrote to the Earl of Salisbury as follows concerning Ewens' papers: "For the bokes and papers concernyng the lower howse, I gaue direccion this mornyng to william pynches, to whome the reuercion was graunted that he shulde calle for thym, and tak the care and charg of thym, for being now the officer in possession, to whome yt deth properlye perteyne, he ys to undertak yt. . . ."[2] But William Pynches apparently did not officiate as clerk. I have failed to discover any grant to him of the office or its reversion, and his name does not occur in the list of defunct clerks recited in later patents. No session of Parliament was held until April, 1614, and by then John Wright had succeeded to the office. Therefore the interval between Ewens' death and the accession of Wright, when no Parliament was in session, presented an opportunity for the dispersal of manuscripts that was unparallelled in this period. That some loss was suffered, may be inferred from the proceedings in the House of Commons when next it met. On April 15 Sir Edwyn Sandys renewed the motion for a repository for the journals and papers of the House, in order, as he said, that they might not "come into the Hands of Executors". On May 20 the subject was again before the House, and Sir Thomas Rowe declared "that Mr. Wilson is thought to have many of the Books and Papers belonging to this House, which came to my Lord Treasurer's Hands by Mr. Ewens' Will". Therefore he moved that Wilson might "be ordered, by the Committee for Privileges, to bring to them what he hath, and to discover what he knoweth about them"; but, unfortunately, the journals remain silent upon any further proceedings.[3]

[1] Pat. 45, Eliz., pt. viii.
[2] S.P. Dom. Jac. I, lxv. No. 90.
[3] *Commons Journals*, i. 465, 491.

However, these entries must reflect the disappearance of a number of manuscripts, and so we may conjecture that between August, 1611, and November, 1613, the finished journals for 1584-1601 were lost, probably along with many miscellaneous papers belonging to the House. The clerk's rough notes for those years were, however, saved, as also were a fragment of the notes for 1580/1 and perhaps a few leaves from the journal proper for 1586. Echoes of the catastrophe may probably be detected in the passage already quoted from Hakewill[1] and in the reference of the House of Commons in 1645 to "the Prejudice" its records had formerly suffered "by coming into the Hands of Executors upon the Death of former Clerks";[2] for, late as are both these statements, they do not refer to the event which has now to be traced, the loss of the volume of Onslow's rough notes.

John Wright, who lent D'Ewes this volume, was succeeded by Henry Elsyng in December, 1640,[3] whilst Parliament was in session; and as an alert House would not have remained inactive if its papers had fallen into strange hands, we may interpret the silence of the journals as implying the safety of the Commons' records. When Elsyng resigned his office on 1 January, 1648/9, a Committee was appointed "to take an Account, Where the Books and Records of this House are," and to prepare an inventory;[4] and the absence of further proceedings from the journals is presumption that the Committee was satisfied. Our advance is therefore secured to the next clerk, Scobell, whose clerkship in the House of Commons came to an end in January, 1657/8. At this date, the volume of rough notes was probably safe in his possession, and was transferred to the new clerk from its lodging in Old Palace Yard, where Scobell had kept both

[1] *Supra*, p. 22.
[2] *Commons Journals*, iv. 273.
[3] Pat. 15, Car. I, pt. xxii.
[4] *Commons Journals*, vi. 108.

Lords' and Commons' manuscripts.[1] It is, indeed, very probable that some of the Commons' manuscripts were overlooked in this transfer; and a Charles I journal, discovered by the Historical Manuscripts Commission[2] amongst the Lords' manuscripts, is probably a derelict of the occasion. But the House of Commons appointed a Committee to supervise the restoration of their papers, a vigilant body, as Burton's Diary shows.[3] Miscellaneous papers, or even a single journal, might have escaped the inventory; but a gap of six Elizabethan Parliaments, covering some twenty years, could surely not have been ignored.

From Scobell's custody the Commons' papers passed back to the old routine of private storage, with its normal risks greatly enhanced during two years of political confusion. Each Parliamentary assembly during these years appointed its own clerk. John Smythe served the Parliament of 1658, and was appointed again in 1659; Thomas St. Nicholas officiated for the restored Rump; and William Jessop for the Convention.[4] When it is added that no inventory of the papers was apparently taken at the dispossession of Smythe and St. Nicholas, and that for a few days pending the attendance of St. Nicholas, the assistant clerk also was responsible for them,[5] it will be clear that many possible factors of a loss were operative during these years. At no other period, so far as one knows, between 1630, when D'Ewes used

[1] *Supra*, p. 20. In 1656 Scobell published a treatise entitled, "Memorials of the Method and Manner of Proceedings in Parliament in passing Bills . . . Gathered by Observation and out of the Journal Books from the time of Edward 6. By H.S.E.C.P." (H. Scobell, Esq., Cler., Parl.). A collection of precedents, some of its illustrations are drawn from the period 1584-1601. But precedent books were as old as the century; by using previous collections he may have got his precedents only at second-hand "out of the Journal Books,"—although I doubt whether this was altogether so, even for 1584-1601: and one therefore hesitates to stress the implications of this treatise.

[2] *Rep.*, vi. pt. i., p. viii. The journal covers June 21-July 5, 1625.

[3] *Commons Journals*, vii. 588, 590; Burton's *Diary*, ii. 403-4.

[4] *Commons Journals*, vii. 578, 594, 650; viii. 1.

[5] *Ibid.*, vii. 652.

the volume of Onslow's rough notes, and 1682, when Bowes referred to their loss[1] in publishing D'Ewes' Journals, were conditions so favourable for the dispersal of bulky and important manuscripts.[2] There is needed, only, some such evidence that documents were actually missing, as that obtained for the earlier loss from the Parliamentary proceedings of 1614.[3] On this occasion it is probably implicit in the following order of May 11, 1660, which rehearsed a similar order issued three days earlier :—

"that all Acts, Ordinances, Journals, Records, Books, Papers, or Proceedings, belonging to this House, or concerning the same, or the Proceedings thereof as well in the Time it acted as a single House, as before, which are now in the Custody of Henry Scobell Esquire, Thomas St. Nicholas Esquire, or any others, or that hath come" into their hands "as Clerks of this House, be forthwith delivered to William Jessop Esquire, now Clerk of this House. . . ."[4]

However, it would be foolish to claim that in either case final results have been obtained in dating the two losses of manuscripts. In the absence of any direct evidence, the method adopted here has enabled one to select from the evidence available the two most probable occasions ; and

[1] In his dedication. The reference can only be to this loss. The only other gaps that *may* have occurred in the official manuscripts since 1630 are a few odd days in the Lords' journals of 1558/9 and 1597/8 (*Trans. Roy. Hist. Soc.*, 3rd series, viii. 21 ; *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, xxxiv. 587).

[2] An entry in the Journals of 1694/5 might seem to refer to an appreciable leakage of manuscripts after 1669, the probable date of some loose papers found in private custody (*Commons Journals*, xi. 255). Between April, 1661, however, and the date when we have evidence that the Onslow notes were missing, two clerks officiated, father and son, both named William Goldsborough (Pat. 13. Car. II, pt. xliv. No. 7 ; *Cal. S.P. Dom.*, 1673, 590; S.P. Dom. Car. II, CDV. No. 112). The risks attendant upon changes in the clerkship were thus eliminated. The son must have known of the gap in the Elizabethan Journals, and it is incredible that either he or his father was responsible for the loss. The researches of Professor Notestein, when published, will show that several Stuart Journals have also been lost, and whilst these may not have disappeared at the same time as the Onslow notes, it is quite feasible that they did. In either case the period of loss must have been one of lax supervision and unusual risks.

[3] *Supra*, p. 23. [4] *Commons Journals*, viii. 23-4.

perhaps in the earlier instance a higher degree of certainty has been achieved than in the later. The ultimate fate of the manuscripts is a mystery. They may be safe, but unrecognised, in some private collection.[1] Possessing no obviously official character by which the casual searcher might recognise them, their survival is quite probable: but for the very same reason destruction may have befallen them. If my hypothesis be sound, that a few stray sheets of the *journal* for 1586 were rescued from the earlier loss,[2] then that manuscript was probably destroyed, and its fate may have been shared by the other manuscripts which disappeared at the same time. The rough notes, however, were bound in a volume, and destruction, in their case, would not have been easy.

Records bear the impress of the life of the individual or body whose offspring they are, not merely in their verbal contents, but also in their own evolutionary history. In consequence, we are dealing in a documentary study of the Commons' journals with a subject that has a wider application in constitutional history; and in tracing the development of the journal, in this final section of the paper, we cannot ignore its relation to the evolution of the House of Commons, a subject still wrapt in a great deal of obscurity.

The scale on which Seymour began his Commons' journal was most exiguous, and its development painfully slow. One must contrast the privilege entries of 1548 with those of the first session in 1554, to be reassured that the seeds of expansion had in the meantime been active. But they were responding to two forces: the

[1] I have examined the Petyt MS. Collection at the Inner Temple, and certain journals in the possession of the Earl of Winchilsea (*cf. Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* xi., App. vii., 227, *sq.*; *Rep.* i., App. 31). Neither collection includes any of the missing official manuscripts. A Petyt MS., which Professor Firth thought to be one, is a copy of the anonymous Member's journal for 1592/3 used by D'Ewes (*cf. Roy. Com. on Pub. Rec.* (1910), 2nd *Rep.*, pt. ii., 107a; D'Ewes' *Journals*, 468).

[2] *Supra*, p. 15.

one was the need of evolving an adequate scale and form for the journal, the outgrowing, that is, of the diarist's immaturity in his art; the other, the pressure of an increasing interest which the proceedings of the House of Commons possessed. In the session of November, 1554, an innovation was the recording of the Speaker's petitions;[1] and Cardinal Pole's mission of reconciliation so far influenced the journal in the same session, that messages to the House were now noted for the first time.[2] The accession of Elizabeth was the beginning of a new epoch, even in the Lilliputian world of "Seimour": the opening proceedings of her first Parliament were more fully described than before, and the reply to the Speaker's petitions noticed as well as the petitions themselves;[3] the privilege case of John Smith was entered at greater length than any previous case;[4] and even the saying of the Litany was recorded.[5] In the journal of 1566 the relatively long account of Speaker Onslow's election would almost seem promise of a new scale:[6] but the fact is that Seymour's conventions and technique had allowed no very appreciable expansion upon the journal of 1558/9. His modest notes were easily written down in a readable form, and did not necessitate transcription. Consequently he failed to initiate the practice of taking rough notes from which to compile the fair journal:[7] and adopting a primitive procedure, he produced a primitive record.

[1] *Commons Journals*, i. 37. [2] *Ibid.*, i. 38. [3] *Ibid.*, i. 53.
[4] *Ibid.*, i. 55. [5] *Ibid.*, i. 54. [6] *Ibid.*, i. 73.

[7] This statement might seem at variance with the manuscripts of 1548-1552, which, along with Ormeston's memorandum of 1547, are fair copies (*supra*, p. 2). But they were not written separately at the close of each session, but were most probably all transcribed after the close of the fourth session of this first Parliament, in 1552. The proof of this is to be found in the fact that the sessions are keyed into one another in the manuscripts by the occurrence medially, and not terminally, of all such variations as denote the breaks in the labour of transcription. The transcription falls into the following sections: Nov. 1547—2nd entry, Feb. 23, 1548/9; 3rd entry on same day—3rd entry, Nov. 5, 1549; 4th entry on same day—date heading, Feb. 16, 1551/2; the single entry of same day —end of session. Conceivably the transcription marks the determination of Seymour in 1552 to preserve his memoranda as of more than ephemeral interest.

When a debate interested him, he abstained from a report of it in his journal, not on the principle which excludes debates to-day, but because he could not adapt his technique to so elaborate an entry; and accordingly he jotted it down, in more or less unintelligible notes, on the outside sheet of the journal.[1]

It is possible now to understand the importance in the evolution of the Commons' journal, of the accession of Fulk Onslow to the clerkship on December 22, 1570.[2] His extant journals are fair copies, and it was he who introduced the double process in the compilation of the journal, which has been followed until the present day. Probably he took such copious notes in 1571 that he found himself compelled to rewrite them: so personal a matter was the development of the Commons' record. The new procedure gave the journal great plasticity, so that it was now able to respond adequately to the activities of the House. Compared with Seymour's last manuscript, the first Onslow entries were amplified, and the journal noticeably extended by the new practice of giving complete lists of the names for a committee. The scale of the two following manuscripts remained that of 1571, but in 1580/1 there took place a notable expansion, which is accentuated in the manuscript by the use of larger folio sheets. Reports and motions were entered at considerable length; and a single day's proceedings in Hall's case, has filled four columns of the printed journals.[3] But its most noteworthy feature was the reporting of speeches. The modern journal is a record of the acts, and not of the speeches, of the House; but from 1580/1 until 1628, when the practice was declared unwarranted,[4] members' speeches were noted by the clerks. Further developments may have been effected by Onslow in his later journals, but what they were it is impossible now

[1] *Supra*, p. 4.
[2] Pat. 13 Eliz., pt. vi.
[3] *Commons Journals*, i. 125-7.
[4] *Ibid.*, i. 885.

to say, for, as I have already shown, the text preserved by D'Ewes is not that of the journals themselves.[1]

The "Seimour" volume provides an excellent corrective to exaggerated conceptions of the constitutional rôle played by the House of Commons, so late as the middle of the sixteenth century. It accords with its meagre proportions that the journal should have been, as I have suggested it was, a creation of the clerk's: but the regular entry of memoranda into orderly quires, must at last have led members who had sat in several sessions, to regard it as part of the customary procedure of the House; and its acceptance as such by the individual, was the prelude to its acceptance by the body of the Commons. One can be certain that this later stage had been reached by 1571, for John Hooker wrote a treatise from his experience in the Parliament of that year, wherein he made the following statement:—

"There is onely one Clark belonging to this house, his office is to sit next before the Speaker, at a Table upon which he writeth and layeth his books. He must make true entrie of the recordes and Billes of the House, as also of all the orders therof." [2]

The growth of control out of recognition of the journal was a question of time: but control was assured, if only because its extension, and the development of the competency of the House, were interdependent. The journal, in fact, served to consolidate new or disputed powers by registering decisions and proceedings, thus converting them into precedents, the citation of which was an excellent defensive and offensive weapon. Ostensibly a conservative habit, the Elizabethan Parliamentarians proved, what their Stuart successors were to reveal more strikingly, that the appeal to precedents might enforce, rather than stultify, progress: a selective activity

[1] *Supra*, p. 14.

[2] *The Order and Usage of the Keeping of a Parlement* . . . by John Vowel *alias* Hooker (? 1575), *sub tit.*, "Of the Clark of the lower house".

and false interpretation sufficed. Obviously, however, precedents lacked such potentiality when, in pre-journal days, they reposed only in the memories of experienced Parliament men. They were then but matter of opinion whilst the experienced and authoritative memories, no doubt, were chiefly official ones.[1]

The first recorded use of the journal for precedent purposes was in 1580/1. In the interval between two sessions the Speaker had died, and Sir Francis Knolles, the Treasurer, in discussing the procedure for securing a new Speaker, cited a similar occurrence in 1562/3, and offered the House a copy of the precedent. However, runs the entry, "because . . . the Clerk . . . had there his Original Book of Notes, out of the which the said Copy was taken, he was commanded to read" it out of "his Book. . . ."[2] References have survived to the use of precedents in deciding various questions.[3] Doubtless the most fertile were those concerning privileges and disputed elections, and the practice of appointing a standing committee for such cases, which originated in 1588/9, must have regularised their solution.[4] That committees occasionally failed in their search for precedents, one may be certain, and it is possible that they then ensured the entry of their own decisions, by securing an order to that effect from the House. Whether this surmise, however, be correct or not, the fact remains that the ordering of specific entries was the first stage in the establishment by the Commons of direct control over the compilation of the journal.[5] Beyond it they had not got by the close of Elizabeth's reign; and it was the work

[1] *Cf.* the following entry in the Colchester journal of 1485: "Than it pleased the Recorder of London for to shew the custume of the place. This was his seyeng: Maister Speker, and all my maisters, there hath ben an order in this place in tymes passed . . ." etc. (W. G. Benhan, *The Red Paper Book of Colchester*, 62a.) Or *cf.* the example of 1580/1 cited on this page.

[2] *Commons Journals*, i. 116.

[3] *Cf.* D'Ewes' *Journals*, 343a, 354a, 404a, 412b, 431b, 440b, 553b, 572a, 638a.

[4] *Ibid.*, 429b, 471a, 552a, 622.

[5] *Cf. Commons Journals*, i. 96, 126; D'Ewes' *Journals*, 399a, 417b.

of James' first Parliament to convert the partial control of the Tudor period into complete control. One can detect its approach in the first session, when an order of the House contained a ruling regarding the preparation of a journal: ". . . all Acts, Resolutions, and Judgments of the House," it stated, "which are there entered and registered by their common Servant, the Clerk, should be written and ingrossed in One fair Register Book. . . ."[1] But the machinery was lacking for supervision of the journal. This was evolved in 1607, when the general committee for privileges was ordered to review the entries of privilege cases during the first three sessions of that Parliament, and, as a result, the clerk was instructed to perfect his journal before the next session: "no matter," the House decided, "concerning Privilege, Order, or Matter of Message, or Conference, or Resolution of the House, proceeding thereupon, shall be of Record, or in Force, till such Time as the same be perused, and perfected, by a Committee to be chosen the next Session of Parliament . . .; and that from henceforth the Committee for Privileges do, every Saturday in the Afternoon, peruse and perfect the Book of Entries, in all such Matters as aforesaid. . . ."[2] Thus was initiated the procedure, which afterwards became customary, of appointing a standing committee each session to supervise the compilation of the journal:[3] and here at the consummation of the movement for control by the House we may leave the question of the evolution of the Commons' journal. It remains only to relate our survey more directly to the constitutional development of the House of Commons.

[1] *Commons Journals*, i. 215.

[2] *Ibid.*, i. 390, 392. The journals do not make it clear whether the committee was appointed in the next session; but probably it was, and the original journal of 1604 bears evidence of such an overhauling as was suggested (*supra*, p. 12).

[3] *Cf. Ibid*, i. 520, 575, 669, 673, 761, 818, 885, 924; ii. 4, 22; vi. 297; vii. 588; viii. 7; ix. 263.

It may seem strange that a review of the evolution of the Commons' journal suggests a House of Commons in 1548 with a very immature corporate sense. But before the appearance of a journal, the domestic history of the Commons is unreported and obscure, whilst to appreciate the expansion of their power in Tudor times, we must rid ourselves of modern constitutional conceptions in thinking of mediæval parliaments. The High Court of Parliament of the middle ages was not an assembly consisting of two more or less co-ordinate chambers; but its essence was the meeting in the parliament chamber, the core of which was the King in council.[1] The Commons withdrew from this meeting, usually to the Chapter House, for their own deliberations, and in the exercise of their rôle as petitioners. But their discussions were not *in* parliament, and were not recorded on the parliament roll. Moreover, since the Commons possessed no corporate identity as a distinct "House," they naturally produced no domestic record: their petitions, which were presented to the King in parliament, were no doubt regarded as adequate records of their deliberations.[2] In modern times, however, the original judicial character of Parliament has been quite overshadowed by its legislative work. An outgrowth of Parliament's jurisdiction as a court, this work involved a gradual extension of the rôle of the Commons, so that all Acts came eventually to be read by both Lords and Commons, and the familiar procedure of three readings was slowly defined.[3] In correspondence with the facts of this change, there must have arisen a consciousness

[1] *Cf.* Maitland, *Memoranda de Parliamento*, Intro. For this and succeeding statements, see also, McIlwain, *The High Court of Parliament*, and Pollard, *The Reign of Henry VII from Contemp. Sources*, Intro., xxviii. *sqq.*

[2] *Trans. Roy. Hist. Soc.*, 3rd series, viii. 27.

[3] In both cases procedure was fluid in the early Tudor period. For the assent of the Commons in legislation, *cf.* Pollard, *The Reign of Henry VII* . . . xxxi.-ii.; for an unusual number of readings, see the *Lords Journals* of Henry VIII's reign, *passim*, and the *Commons Journal* of 1547.

that the Commons constituted a chamber, parallel, if not co-ordinate with the assembly of Lords in the parliament chamber: and so the personification of the term "House" was made possible.[1]

As a rule, the chief interest in the development of a corporate body, as in that of an individual, is the growth of self-consciousness: and in the case of the House of Commons the increase in its competency was closely dependent upon the quickening of its corporate sense. It is pre-eminently to the sixteenth century that one must attribute this process; although in the very nature of things it is difficult to trace, especially in its initial stages before the appearance of a journal. The effect of the long Reformation Parliament on its development can be imagined rather than measured: but anyone who has paid close attention to the procedure of the House of Commons from 1547-1601, must be conscious of the important expansion which a study of Parliamentary procedure for this period will reveal. Or if we turn to the unofficial Parliamentary sources of the period, the journals, speeches, and memoranda, of individual Members, which are no less tokens of the new interest in itself that the House of Commons was developing; it is no accident that the stream of manuscript material trickles only at the opening of Elizabeth's reign, and gathers breadth and volume as the reign progresses. If we except a remarkable but very jejune example in 1485,[2] private journals commence in 1571,[3] and through several intermediate manuscripts, finally reach the fullness of Townshend's 1601 journal on the eve of the Stuart period.[4] Local researches, it is true, may bring other

[1] The earliest reference which has been traced to a "House" of Lords, is in 1544. Parry, *Parliaments and Councils of England*, xlii., referred to in Pollard, *op. cit.*, xxxiii.

[2] W. G. Benham, *The Red Paper Book of Colchester*, 60-4.

[3] *Cf.* D'Ewes' *Journals*, 155; and Hooker's Journal in *Trans. Devon. Assoc.*, xi. (1879), 442-92.

[4] *Historical Collections*, 173 *sqq.*

Parliamentary manuscripts to light, but the present chronological balance will not be materially redressed, for it depends upon the growth of self-consciousness in the House of Commons and not upon the ravages of time.

Now, in the stages by which the House entrenched upon the freedom of the clerk in making and preserving his journal, one may see a reflection, vague, no doubt, but suggestive, of the stages by which it became fully aware of its corporate identity and interests. With the inception of the journal, the Commons had probably nothing to do; but it argues a certain measure of self-concern that they came to regard its compilation as part of the customary procedure of the House, so that in 1571, Hooker, as a Member of the House, was able to consider it a duty of the clerk. So far as one can tell, it was a later step, as it was undoubtedly a maturer policy, to order specific entries to be made, so limiting the discretion left to the clerk by a mere assumption that they were made. The final stage was reached, when in 1604 the Commons began to concern themselves with the safe custody of the journal, and when in 1607 its compilation was completely subordinated to the wishes of the House, and machinery evolved to ensure that important proceedings should be properly recorded. That these two events, both so indicative of a highly developed self-regard, were practically coincident in date, is some assurance that the shadowy lines which I have assembled, and perhaps too exactly defined, are the reflection of a real growth. But they are too few and uncertain to be anything more than suggestive of the picture, which a careful study of sixteenth century Parliamentary procedure would no doubt reconstruct. When that study is completed, we shall, perhaps, have a more rational background to Stuart constitutional history.

INDEX.

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL, SESSION 1918-1919.

THE Council of the Royal Historical Society have the honour of presenting the following Annual Report to the General Meeting of the Fellows.

The annals of the Society are uneventful; we are happy in having little history of our own to record when the general history of the world has not yet realised the hopes of speedy peace and settlement in which we indulged at the opening of the last Report. It is a subject of natural pride, and of great gratification to the Fellows, to be able to record that our President, Professor Oman, has been elected Parliamentary Representative for the University of Oxford. To his constituency, and to the House of Commons, we take leave to offer congratulations for a choice which adds, if possible, to the honour of the former, and to the latter brings so valuable an accession of knowledge and practical ability. To our President himself our warmest congratulations are due.

Death has unfortunately been busy among our greatest names. The Venerable Archdeacon Cunningham died in the latter part of 1919. He was President of the Society from 1909 to 1913, and was an acting Vice-President till his death. Not only was he the greatest of our Economic Historians—he may be said to have almost created the study of his subject in Great Britain—but he was a writer of singular versatility and freshness of outlook in other fields. Not less to be deplored is the death of Professor Haverfield, an Honorary Vice-President, who leaves no one whose knowledge of Roman Britain can be compared with his own. The great work of Archdeacon Cunningham had been completed, though no doubt his ever fresh interest would have amplified it; but the gathering together of the results of Professor Haverfield's vast industry had been only partially accomplished, and the materials on which he worked are being continually increased by excavation, and must lack henceforth his co-ordinating genius for their elucidation.

Sir C. E. H. Chadwyck-Healey, Bt., K.C.B., etc., has also died

He was an Honorary Vice-President. His multifarious interests, in Ecclesiastical Law and in the Navy—he served, despite his age, in the R.N.R. in the war—lay a little outside our ordinary activities. But he was a careful local historian and antiquary, and has left behind him, almost completed, a comprehensive history of his own neighbourhood—Cranleigh, in Surrey.

Elections have been satisfactory in numbers and quality. The Society is strengthened by the Election of M. Emile Bourgeois as an Honorary Corresponding Fellow.

The Library continues to grow by Exchanges, and by gifts. The generosity of Dr. Prothero has added what amounts to almost a fresh historical library, several hundred volumes, to our shelves. The shelves themselves must be multiplied to hold them, and a new Library Catalogue is a need of the near future. These and other growing expenses make the efforts of Fellows to secure fresh additions of members, of suitable attainments, more than ever necessary.

We have given books, as well as received them. The ruined Universities of Belgrade and Louvain have received from us gifts of such volumes of Transactions and of the Camden Series as we could provide.

The Council are very glad to report that the Royal Numismatic Society have become our tenants for one of the upper rooms in the house. Their study is a handmaid to History, and several of our most distinguished Fellows are also Members of their Society. The officers responsible for the amenities of our house must indulge the pious wish that we might also be in a position to provide bookcases equal to the handsome cases which hold their valuable collections.

On July 6 a dinner was held at the Holborn Restaurant for Fellows and their friends. Several American scholars were entertained as guests of the Society. The President was in the chair, and speeches were delivered by the chairman, Dr. Maclean, U.S.A., Professor Howard Gray, U.S.A., Professor Fish, U.S.A., and by Dr. Prothero.

The Records Committee, appointed by the Society as mentioned in the last Report, has held preliminary meetings. The Third Report by the Royal Commission has lately been issued, and its labours concluded. The Society's Committee will continue to press the recommendations of the Royal Commission.

The following Papers were read in the course of the Session 1918-1919:—

'The Metropolitical Visitation of the Diocese of Worcester by Archbishop Winchelsey in 1301.' By Miss Rose Graham, F.R.Hist.S. (November 14, 1918.)

'The Relations of Henry, Cardinal York, with the British Government.' By W. W. Seton, M.A., D.Lit. (January 9, 1919.)

'The Whigs and the Peninsular War, 1808-1814.' By Godfrey Davies, M.A., F.R.Hist.S. (March 13, 1919.)

'Science in the History of Civilisation.' By Professor Sir R. A. Gregory, F.R.Hist.S. (April 10, 1919.)

'The Question of the Netherlands in 1829-1830.' By G. W. T. Omond, M.A., F.R.Hist.S. (May 8, 1919.)

Communications were read on December 12, 1918, from Corresponding Fellows and others on the subject of the condition of British and Allied Archives in War-Time (1914-1918), as follows:—

'England,' by the Director; 'Scotland,' by Professor R. K. Hannay, M.A., F.S.A.; 'Ireland,' by Herbert Wood, M.A., M.R.I.A.; 'Wales,' by John Ballinger, M.A.; 'United States of America,' by Dr. J. Franklin Jameson; 'Italy,' by Dr. Emilio Re; 'The Vatican Archives,' by H. E. Cardinal Gasquet, Hon. V.P., R.Hist.S.

At the Annual Meeting on February 13, 1919, the President, Professor C. W. C. Oman, delivered an address on the subject of 'National Boundaries and Treaties of Peace'.

The Alexander Medal was awarded to Miss E. F. White, M.A., for an Essay on 'The Privy Council in the Sixteenth Century'.

The above Papers with the President's Address and the lecture by Sir Harry Stephen on 'The Trial of Sir Walter Raleigh' are printed in *Transactions*, Fourth Series (Vol. II.).

In addition to the above volume of *Transactions*, the following volumes of *Publications* have been or will be immediately issued: Camden, Third Series, Vols. XXIX. and XXX., 'The Stonor Papers' (1290-1483), Parts I. and II. edited by C. L. Kingsford, M.A., F.S.A.; A Repertory of British Archives, Part I., 'England,' by Hubert Hall, F.S.A., assisted by Research Students of the University of London.

The last-mentioned work will be issued as a special publication, and extra copies will be available for distribution beyond the ranks of the Society. It is hoped that arrangements may be made for the issue of a further volume dealing with the 'Archives of Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and the Dominions or Colonies of the British Empire'.

In addition to the above publications, Vol. 63 of the Camden, New Series, 'Nicholas Papers,' Vol. IV., edited by Sir G. F. Warner, is almost ready in the Press.

The Records Committee, of which the origin and constitution were mentioned in the last Report of the Council, will now be able to take advantage of the publication of the Third Report of the Royal Commission on Public Records.

During the session lectures were also delivered before the Society on 'Poland,' by Professor Wilden-Hart, M.A., F.R.Hist.S., on June 27, 1919; and on 'The Territorial Question of Slesvig,' by Jon Stefansson (Copenhagen), on July 3, 1919.

At the last Annual General Meeting, February 13, 1919, G. W. Prothero, LL.D., D.Litt., and H. E. Malden, M.A., Vice-Presidents, retired in rotation under By-law XVII., and were re-elected. The following members of the Council: T. Seccombe, M.A.; C. L. Kingsford, M.A., F.S.A.; Professor F. J. C. Hearnshaw, M.A., LL.D.; A. G. Little, M.A., retired under the same By-law and, with the exception of T. Seccombe, were re-elected. The vacancy was filled by the election of G. W. T. Omond, M.A. The Annual Report for 1917-1918 was presented and adopted.

The Secretary reports that the total membership of the Society on October 31, 1919, including Honorary, Corresponding, Life, and Ordinary Fellows, and Subscribing Libraries, was 847. Of this number 12 were Honorary, 19 were Corresponding Members, and 88 were Life Fellows. The annual subscriptions are received from Ordinary Fellows paying £1 1*s.* under the old regulations; former members of the old Camden Society and Subscribing Libraries paying £1; and Fellows paying the statutory subscription of £2 2*s.*

There are 57 British and Foreign Societies which exchange *Transactions* with the Royal Historical Society.

The Treasurer reports that the Income of the past year exceeded the Expenditure by £67 7*s.* The value of the investments representing Life Subscriptions (see By-law IX.) and accumulated savings has been written down by £252 17*s.* 6*d.* in order to approximate more closely to current prices.

The Auditors report that they have examined the statement on Income and Expenditure, together with the Balance-sheet appended to this Report, and have certified the same to be correct from their inspection of the books and vouchers.

The publications mentioned in the last Report as about to be

issued are, some of them, still undistributed. The costs of printing, of paper, and of binding have not fallen, and the expenses of publication are very heavy. The Council will make every effort to keep up the volumes of the Society's output, which compares favourably with that of many Societies during and since the war. The Society owes a deep debt to the Treasurer, whose care has rendered this possible.

Honorary and Corresponding Fellows of Enemy Countries have been allowed to fall out of our list, silently, with no formal notice of removal. Foreign Fellows who have not paid their subscriptions during the war have thereby automatically ceased to be Members. This does not apply to Fellows of Allied Countries, who, like our own Fellows who have been on service, are free to be reinstated without payment of arrears.

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

I.—Income and Expenditure Account relating to the Year ending October 31, 1919.

Income.	£	s.	d.
Subscriptions of 1916: 2 at 20s. £2 0 0			
1917 2 „ 20s. 2 0 0			
„ 1918 7 „ 20s. 7 0 0			
„ „ 1 „ 21s. 1 1 0			
„ „ 13 „ 42s. 27 6 0			
£39 7 0			
Less amount estimated to be received in last year's accounts for subscriptions in arrear 20 0 0			
Subscriptions in arrear, received in excess of estimate	19	7	0
Subscriptions now in arrear estimated to be received	20	0	0
Subscriptions of 1919: 198 at 20s. 198 0 0			
„ „ 24 at 21s. 25 4 0			
„ „ 448 at 42s. 940 16 0			
	1164	0	0
Life subscriptions: 5 at £21 105 0 0			
Less proportion required by By-Law IX. to be invested (see Balance-sheet) 70 0 0			
	35	0	0
Dividends on Russian 4 % Bond (Alexander Trust)	0	0	0
„ Consols	12	5	0
„ India 3½ % Stock	22	1	0
„ Canada 3½ % Stock	8	8	0
„ War Stock 5 %	22	10	0
„ War Bonds 4 %	6	0	0
Interest on Deposit Account at Bank	11	6	10
Historical Association	12	15	0
British Archæological Association	30	0	0
American Historical Society	32	0	0
Surrey Archæological Society	2	17	6
Sundry small receipts	1	17	9

Expenditure.	£	s.	d.
Publications: Printing and Distributing £494 4 6			
Editing and Indexing 13 19 0			
£508 3 6			
Less received from Sales 28 2 6			
	480	1	0
Salaries of Director and Assistant Secretary and travelling expenses of Hon. Secretary £316 10 3			
Wages 94 14 0			
	411	4	3
Rent of Premises, 22 Russell Square	170	0	0
Coal	28	11	9
Electric Light, Gas, etc.	7	9	9
Rates (Parochial, etc., and Taxes)	93	1	3
General Printing and Stationery	26	6	1
Library: Books, Periodicals, and Binding	24	2	8
Postages, etc.	29	12	3
Sundries (Petty Cash payments)	41	5	0
Advertising	0	8	6
Insurance (Fire, National Health)	6	10	0
Monthly Meetings (cost of Refreshments)	7	13	1
Alexander Medal	6	15	6
£1,333	1	1	
Balance, being excess of Income over Expenditure for the year ending October 31, 1919, carried to Balance-sheet	67	7	0

II.—BALANCE-SHEET OF LIABILITIES AND ASSETS AT OCTOBER 31, 1919.

Liabilities.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Life subscriptions required to be invested as Capital Account (By-Law IX.): amount brought forward from last Balance-sheet	£1,486	0	0			
Proportion of Life subscriptions received in 1918 (see Income and Expenditure Account)	70	0	0			
				1,556	0	0
[Represented by Consols, India 3½ °/₀ Stock, Canada 3½ °/₀ Stock, War Stock 5 °/₀, and Cash on Deposit—see *contra*.]						
Alexander Trust Fund [Russian 4 °/₀ Bond—see *contra*]				98	17	6
Subscriptions received in advance				37	14	0
Amount due to Aberdeen University Press, not yet paid				250	0	0
Balance, being surplus of Assets over Liabilities at date, viz., Amount brought forward from last year	£2,761	8	2			
Add Excess of Income over Expenditure as shown by Income and Expenditure Account	67	7	0			
	£2,828	15	2			
Deduct amount written off Consols, India, and Canada Stocks to approximate more nearly to current value (see *contra*)	252	17	6			
				2,575	17	8
				£4,518	9	2

Assets.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Consols 2½ °/₀ £699 9s. 9d. valued at				350	0	0
India 3½ °/₀ Stock, £900 valued at				700	0	0
Canada 3½ °/₀ Stock, £300 valued at				230	0	0
Russian 4 °/₀ Bond				98	17	6
War Stock 5 °/₀, £450 at cost				410	8	9
War Bonds 4 °/₀, £150 at cost				152	5	0
[The current market value of the above investments, omitting the Russian Bond, is £1,717.]						
Cash at Bank: Current Account	£124	1	3			
,, Deposit ,,	429	13	2			
Petty Cash Balance in hand	3	3	6			
				556	17	11
Stock of Publications at Russell Square (value as insured)				100	0	0
Stock of Publications with Messrs. Spottiswoode, Ballantyne & Co., Messrs. W. H. Smith & Son (value as insured), and Aberdeen University Press				500	0	0
Library (value as insured)				1,000	0	0
,, Manuscripts (value as insured)				100	0	0
Furniture, etc. ,, ,,				300	0	0
Subscriptions in arrear estimated to be received (see Income and Expenditure Account)				20	0	0
				£4,518	9	2

(*Signed*) HENRY R. TEDDER, *Hon. Treasurer.*

AUDITORS' REPORT.

The above Statement of Income and Expenditure and Balance-sheet have been prepared from the Books and Vouchers, and we hereby certify the same to be correct.

(*Signed*) WM. PAGE,
J. FOSTER PALMER,
A. FORBES SIEVEKING, } *Auditors.*

18*th December*, 1919.

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

(INCORPORATED BY ROYAL CHARTER.)

OFFICERS AND COUNCIL—1919-20.

Patron.

HIS MAJESTY THE KING.

President.

PROFESSOR SIR C. W. C. OMAN, M.P., F.S.A., F.B.A.

Honorary Vice-Presidents.

PROFESSOR C. R. BEAZLEY, D.Litt., F.R.G.S.
THE REV. J. F. BRIGHT, D.D.
OSCAR BROWNING, M.A.
THE RIGHT HON. VISCOUNT BRYCE, O.M., F.B.A., D.C.L.
W. J. CORBETT, M.A.
THE RIGHT HON. EARL CURZON OF KEDLESTON, K.G., G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E. F.B.A., F.R.S.
THE RIGHT HON. H. A. L. FISHER, M.A., F.B.A.
THE RIGHT HON. LORD FITZMAURICE, F.B.A., M.A.
HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL FRANCIS AIDAN GASQUET, D.D.
THE VERY REV. THE DEAN OF GLOUCESTER, D.D.
FREDERIC HARRISON, Litt.D.
SIR HENRY HOWORTH, K.C.I.E., F.R.S.
REV. W. HUNT, D.Litt.
THE RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF ILCHESTER.
SIR SIDNEY LEE, Litt.D., F.B.A.
SIR HARRY POLAND, K.C.
THE RIGHT HON. SIR FREDERICK POLLOCK, BT., D.C.L., LL.D., F.B.A.
THE RIGHT HON. LORD ERNLE, M.V.O.
SIR JAMES H. RAMSAY, BT., M.A., F.S.A.
THE RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF ROSEBERY AND MIDLOTHIAN, K.T., K.G., F.R.S., D.C.L., LL.D., F.B.A.
PROFESSOR T. F. TOUT, M.A., F.B.A.
THE RIGHT HON. SIR G. O. TREVELYAN, BT., O.M., D.C.L., LL.D., F.B.A.
SIR PAUL VINOGRADOFF, F.B.A., D.C.L., LL.D.
SIR A. W. WARD, F.B.A., Litt.D., LL.D.

Vice-Presidents.

THE HON. SIR J. W. FORTESCUE, M.V.O., LL.D.
R. G. MARSDEN, M.A.
PROFESSOR A. F. POLLARD, Litt.D.
COLONEL E. M. LLOYD, R.E.
R. A. ROBERTS.
SIR G. W. PROTHERO, F.B.A., LL.D., Litt.D.
H. E. MALDEN, M.A.
J. F. CHANCE, M.A.
PROFESSOR C. H. FIRTH, Litt.D., LL.D., F.B.A.
SIR JULIAN S. CORBETT, LL.M.

Council.

PROFESSOR H. E. EGERTON, M.A.
G. T. LAPSLEY, M.A.
A. FORBES SIEVEKING, F.S.A.
REV. PROFESSOR J. P. WHITNEY, D.D., D.C.L.
PROFESSOR J. HOLLAND ROSE, M.A., Litt.D.
G. M. TREVELYAN, M.A.
G. P. GOOCH, M.A.
BASIL WILLIAMS, M.A.
C. L. KINGSFORD, M.A., F.S.A.
PROFESSOR F. J. C. HEARNSHAW, M.A., LL.D.
A. G. LITTLE, M.A.
G. W. T. OMOND, M.A.
H. W. V. TEMPERLEY, M.A.
ERNEST BARKER, M.A.
H. W. C. DAVIS, C.B.E.
MISS ROSE GRAHAM, M.A., F.S.A.
W. F. REDDAWAY, M.A.
D. A. WINSTANLEY, M.A.

Honorary Secretary.

H. E. MALDEN, M.A.

Director.

HUBERT HALL, Litt.D., F.S.A.

Treasurer.

H. R. TEDDER, F.S.A.

Auditors.

W. PAGE, F.S.A. J. FOSTER PALMER. A. FORBES SIEVEKING, F.S.A.

Assistant Secretary and Librarian.

MISS M. B. CURRAN.

Library and Offices.

22 Russell Square, W.C. 1.

Bankers.

Barclays Limited, 148 Holborn, E.C. 1.

STANDING COMMITTEES—1919-20.

Finance Committee.

J. F. Chance, M.A.
Sir Julian S. Corbett, LL.M.
Miss Rose Graham, M.A., F.S.A.
Professor F. J. C. Hearnshaw, LL.D.
C. L. Kingsford, M.A., F.S.A.
A. G. Little, M.A.
Colonel E. M. Lloyd, R.E.
R. G. Marsden, M.A.
G. W. T. Omond, M.A.
R. A. Roberts.
A. Forbes Sieveking, F.S.A.
Rev. Professor J. P. Whitney, D.D., D.C.L.
Basil Williams, M.A.
Professor Sir C. W. C. Oman, M.P., F.S.A., F.B.A., *President.*
Hubert Hall, Litt.D., F.S.A., *Director.*
H. R. Tedder, F.S.A., *Treasurer.*
H. E. Malden, M.A., *Hon. Sec.*

Library Committee.

J. F. Chance, M.A.
Sir Julian S. Corbett, LL.M.
G. P. Gooch, M.A.
Miss Rose Graham, M.A., F.S.A.
Professor F. J. C. Hearnshaw, LL.D.
C. L. Kingsford, M.A., F.S.A.
A. G. Little, M.A.
Colonel E. M. Lloyd, R.E.
R. G. Marsden, M.A.
G. W. T. Omond, M.A.
Professor A. F. Pollard, Litt.D.
R. A. Roberts.
A. Forbes Sieveking, F.S.A.
Rev. Professor J. P. Whitney, D.D., D.C.L.
Professor Sir C. W. C. Oman, M.P., F.S.A., F.B.A., *President.*
Hubert Hall, Litt.D., F.S.A., *Director.*
H. R. Tedder, F.S.A., *Treasurer.*
H. E. Malden, M.A., *Hon. Sec.*

Publication Committee.

J. F. Chance, M.A.
Sir Julian S. Corbett, LL.M.

Miss Rose Graham, M.A., F.S.A.
Professor F. J. C. Hearnshaw, LL.D.
C. L. Kingsford, M.A., F.S.A.
A. G. Little, M.A.
Colonel E. M. Lloyd, R.E.
R. G. Marsden, M.A.
G. W. T. Omond, M.A.
Professor A. F. Pollard, Litt.D.
R. A. Roberts.
A. Forbes Sieveking, F.S.A.
Rev. Professor J. P. Whitney, D.D., D.C.L.
Basil Williams, M.A.
Professor Sir C. W. C. Oman, M.P., F.S.A., F.B.A., *President*.
Hubert Hall, Litt.D., F.S.A., *Director*.
H. R. Tedder, F.S.A., *Treasurer*.
H. E. Malden, M.A., *Hon. Sec.*

LIST OF FELLOWS OF THE ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Names of Officers and Members of Council are printed in SMALL CAPITALS. *Those marked * have compounded for their Annual Subscriptions.*

Abbott, Rev. H. A., M.A., Palmers School, Grays, Essex.
Abram, Miss, D.Sc., 39 South Hill Park, Hampstead, N.W.
Adams, Professor E. D., Leland Stanford Junior University, California, U.S.A.
Adams, G. B., Litt.D., 57 Edgehill Road, New Haven, Conn., U.S.A.
Ady, Miss C. M., M.A., St. Hugh's College, Oxford.
Ainley, Rev. B. S., B.A., 42 Longshaw Lane, Blackburn.
Aiyangar, S. K., Sri Venkatera Vilas, Srivasam (Nadu Street), Mylapore, Madras.
Alexander, J. J. M.A., J.P., The Grammar School, Tavistock, Devon.
Allen, W. H., Bromham House, Bromham, near Bedford.
Alvord, Professor C. W., 56 Clarence Avenue, S.E., Minneapolis, Minn., U.S.A.
Ambruzzi, Rev. A., S.J., M.A., St. Aloysius' College, Mangalore, India.
Amherst, The Earl, Montreal, Sevenoaks, Kent.
Anderson, A. K., M.A., St. Andrew's College, Papanui Road, Christchurch, New Zealand.
* Anderson, R. C., M.A., Bassett Wood, near Southampton.
Anscombe, A., 30 Albany Road, Stroud Green, N.
Armstrong, Edward, M.A., Queen's College, Oxford.
Arundale, G. S., M.A., LL.B., 82 Drayton Gardens, S.W.
Astley, Rev. H. J. Dukinfield, M.A., Litt.D., F.R.S.L., East Rudham Vicarage, King's Lynn.
Atkinson, C. T., M.A., Exeter College, Oxford.
Atkinson, E. G., Ashburnham, Shortlands, Kent.
* Auden, Miss Henrietta M., Alderdene, Church Stretton, Salop.

Baker, A. E., Public Library, Taunton.
Bales, P. G., B.A., The Grammar School, Doncaster.
Bancroft, Miss D., Liverpool Institute, Liverpool.
Banks, Mrs. M. M., Hornton Cottage, Hornton Street, W. 8.
BARKER, E., M.A., Master of King's College, Strand, W.C.
Barnard, E. A. B., F.S.A., The Lodge, Evesham.
* Barrett, T. Squire, M.A.I., F.Z.S., F.S.S., F.R.B.S., 58 Millfield Road, Appleton-in-Widnes.
* Bartolo, Augusto, LL.D., B.Litt., 55 Strada Teatro, Valletta, Malta.
Barton, The Hon. Sir Dunbar P., K.C., 19 Clyde Road, Dublin.
Baskerville, G., M.A., Crowsley Park, Henley-on-Thames.
Bavanandam, S., Beaconsfield, Poonamalli Road, Vepery, Madras.
Bayley, A. R., B.A., St. Margaret's, Imperial Road, Great Malvern.

Beale, O. C., Llanarth, Burnwood, Sydney, New South Wales.
Beatty, H. M., M.A., LL.D., 32 Elers Road, West Ealing, W.
Beaven, Rev. A. B., M.A., Beech Lawn, Leamington.
Beaven, M. L. R., B.A., 5 Mackenzie Crescent, Sheffield.
Beazley, Charles Raymond, D.Litt., F.R.G.S., The University, Edmund Street, Birmingham.
Bellamy, C. H., F.R.G.S., 7 Rue de l'Epidème, Tourcoing (Nord), Paris.
Benson, Arthur Christopher, LL.D., C.V.O., Master of Magdalene College, Cambridge.
Bethell, G., 11 Chandos Street, Cavendish Square, W.
Betts, Arthur, 7 Caroline Place, W.C. 1
Bickmore, H. C., M.A., 44 Edwardes Square, Kensington, W.
Biggar, H. P., B.Litt., Public Record Office, W.C. 2.
Bishop, E. W., B.A., 2A Lansdowne Road, Tonbridge, Kent.
Blake, A. H., M.A., Authors' Club, 2 Whitehall Court, S.W.
Block, Sir Adam S. J., K.C.M.G., Constantinople.
Bolam, Rev. C. E., St. Mary Magdalene Rectory, Lincoln.
* Brackenridge, George Washington, San Antonio, Texas, U.S.A.
Bremner, A., Airlie Lodge, Surbiton.
Brendon, J. A., B.A., Wistaria House, Stevenage, Herts.
Bright, Rev. James Franck, D.D., Hollow Hill, Ditchingham, Norfolk.
Briscoe, John Potter, F.R.S.L., 38 Addison Street, Nottingham.
Brocklebank, Mrs. T., 38 Cornwall Gardens, S.W. 7.
Brooke, Z. N., M.A., Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.
Brown, A. E., B.A., LL.B., Cotton College, Glanhate, Assam, India.
Brown, G. C., M.A., Worcester College for the Blind, Worcester.
Brown, Mrs. Burton, Prior's Field, Godalming.
Browne, Right Rev. Bishop G. F., 2 Campden House Road, Kensington, W.
Browning, Oscar, M.A., King's College, Cambridge.
Bruce, Professor H., M.A., University College, New Buildings, Cathays Park, Cardiff.
Bryce, Right Hon. Viscount, O.M., F.B.A., Hindleap Forest Row, Sussex.
Buchan, John, M.A., 76 Portland Place, W.
Buick, T. L., J.P., United Press Association, Wellington, New Zealand.
Bullen, G. E., 6 Market Place Chambers, S. Albans.
Burd, L. A., M.A., Repton School, near Burton-on-Trent.
Burfitt, C. T., Norwich Chambers, Hunter Street, Sydney, New South Wales.
Burghclere, Lady, 48 Charles Street, W.
Burton, The Very Rev. Canon E. H., D.D., St. Margaret's House, Wellington Road, Hampton Hill, Middlesex.
* Busher, Rev. T. Story, M.A., F.C.S., Carisbrooke Vicarage, Isle of Wight.
Butler, Sir Geoffrey, K.B.E., M.A., Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.
Butler, H. B., C.B., M.A., International Labour Office, Geneva, Switzerland.
Butler, J. R. M., M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
* Butt, Arthur N., 27 Adelaide Road, Hampstead, N.W.

* Callender, G. A. R., M.A., Royal Naval College, Osborne, Isle of Wight.
Calthrop, Miss M. M. C. 36 Southampton Road, N.W. 5.
Cam, Miss H. M., M.A., Royal Holloway College, Englefield Green, Surrey.
Cape, H. J., M.A., Royal Grammar School, Colchester.

Carlyle, Rev. A. J., University College, Oxford.
* Carlyle, E. I., M.A., Lincoln College, Oxford.
Carrier, Miss E. H., M.A., Southlands College, Battersea, S.W.
Carruthers, Mrs., 8 Gower Street, W.C. 1.
Cartlidge, Rev. J. E. G., 117 Wednesbury Road, Wallsall.
Cater, W. A., F.S.A., 41 Haringey Park, Crouch End, N.
* Cecil, Algernon, M.A., 111 Eaton Square, S.W.
Chadwyck-Healey, Sir G. E., M.A., 66 Warwick Square, S.W.
Chamberlin, Frederick, LL.B., F.R.G.S., M.R.I., F.S.A., F.R.A.S., Villa Bella Vista, Calle de José, Villalonga, Terreno, Spain.
* Chance, James Frederick, M.A., 30 Lennox Gardens, S.W.
* Chancellor, E. Beresford, M.A., The Gladdy House, Wargrave, Berks.
Chapman, Miss A. B. W., D.Sc., 57 Priory Road, West Hampstead, N.W.
* Charleston, S. J., M.A.
Charnwood, Lord, M.A., 108 Eaton Square, S.W.
Charteris, Hon. Evan, 3 Pump Court, Temple, E.C. 4.
* Church, George Earl, F.R.G.S., 216 Cromwell Road, S. Kensington, S.W.
Church, Rev. L. F., 47 Adolphus Road, Finsbury Park, N. 4.
Churchill, E. F., M.A., D.Litt., 32 Eversleigh Road, East Ham, E.
Churchill, Miss I. J., Fircroft, Shortlands, Kent.
Clapham, J. H., M.A., King's College, Cambridge.
Clark, G. N., M.A , Oriel College, Oxford.
Clark, Rev. Henry W., D.D., Charisma, Harpenden, Herts.
Clayton, J., Prospect House, Hampstead, N.W. 3.
Clifford of Chudleigh, Lord, B.A., D.L., 67 Madeley Road, Ealing, W.
Cobb, Sir Cyril Stephen, B.C.L., M.A., F.R.G.S., 5 Cornwall Terrace, Regent's Park, N.W.
Cockle, M. J. D., Wheatfen Broad, Surlingham, Norwich.
Colby, Professor C. W., M.A., Ph.D., McGill University, Montreal, Canada.
* Colgrove, Miss H. M., Swanbourne, Winslow, Bucks.
Collinson, F. J., Authors' Club, 2 Whitehall Court, S.W.
Colvin, Ian D., Wellfield Cottage, Wellgarth Road, Hampstead, N.W.
Corbett, Sir Julian S., LL.M., F.S.A., 3 Hans Crescent, S.W.
* Corbett, William J., M.A., King's College, Cambridge.
Cornelius, Rev. W. J. J., M.A., B.W., All Saints' Vicarage, North Peckham, S.E. 15.
Cotterell, H. H., F.R.S.A., The Hermitage, Buchanan Road, Walsall, Staffs.
Cozens-Smith, E., F.S.S., 16 Kensington Square, W.
Cronin, Rev. H. S., M.A., Willowbrook, Chaucer Road, Cambridge.
Cross, A. L., Ph.D., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, U.S.A.
Crowe, F. J. W., F.R.A.S., St. Peter's House, Chichester.
Cullen, P. L., B.A., Rockhill, Margaret Street, Greenock.
Cunningham, Miss Audrey, 2 St. Paul's Road, Cambridge.
Curzon of Kedleston, The Right Hon. Earl, K.G., G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., F.B.A. F.R.S., Hackwood, Basingstoke.
Cuthell, Mrs., 43A Lexham Gardens, W. 8.

Das, Harihar, Sidhipasa, Jessore and Khulna, Bengal, India.
Davenport, Miss Frances G., Ph.D., Carnegie Institution, 1140 Woodward Buildings, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

Davey, G. M., 20 Essex Street, Strand, W.C. 2.
* Davids, T. W. Rhys, LL.D., Cotterstock, Chipstead.
* Davies, Rev. D. J., M.A., Moore College, Sydney, N. S. Wales.
Davies, G., M.A., 2 Savile Road, Oxford.
Davies, J. C., B.A., Government Hospitality Fund, 9 Queen Anne's Gate, S.W. 1.
Davies, W. T., B.A., Glan House, Plasycoed, Morriston, Swansea.
Davis, Rev. F. N., B.A., B. Litt., Rowner Rectory, Gosport, Hants.
Davis, H. W. C., C.B.E., Balliol College, Oxford.
Dawson, Rev. W., M.A., Susancourt, Loughton, Essex.
Day, P. W., 100 South Street, Bishop's Stortford, Herts.
Deacon, J. L., 26 High Street, Rye, Sussex.
Dealy, T. K., 19 Rue Voltaire, Grenoble, France.
Deas, J. A. C., Public Library, Sunderland.
Deedes, Rev. Prebendary Cecil, M.A., The Rookery, Frensham, Farnham.
Denham, Edward, 128 School Street, New Bedford, Mass., U.S.A.
Dilks, T. B., B.A., East Gate, Bridgwater.
* Dimelow, John Gartside, Landsmere, Palatine Road, Didsbury, Manchester.
Ditchfield, Rev. P. H., M.A., F.S.A., Barkham Rectory, Wokingham, Berks.
Dodderidge, Rev. S. E., Thornbury Rectory, Bromyard, Worcester.
Dodwell, H. H., M.A., The Record Office, Egmore, Madras.
Doncaster, J. H., Birchfield, Abbeydale, Sheffield.
Dowse, Lieut.-Colonel E.C., 42 Lansdowne Crescent, Cheltenham.
Duchesne, A. E., 235 Barcombe Avenue, Streatham Hill, S.W.
Dudden, Rev. F. H., M.A., Holy Trinity Rectory, Sloane Street, S.W.

Easterling, Miss R. C., M.A., Coedfryn, Bangor.
Eastwood, R. A., LL.B., 106 Brunswick Street, C.-on-M., Manchester.
* Eayrs, Rev. George, 28 Laburnam Avenue, Wallsend, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Eckersley, James Carlton, M.A., F.R.G.S., F.S.S., Carlton Manor, Yeadon, Leeds.
* Edminson, F. J., M.A.
Edmundson, Rev. G., D.Litt., 147 Ashley Gardens, S.W.
Edwards, J. P., 20 Prince Street, Halifax, Nova Scotia.
Eeles, F. C., 202 Grange Loan, Edinburgh.
Egerton, Professor H. E., M.A., 14 St. Giles, Oxford.
Ernle, The Right Hon. Lord, M.V.O., 3 Cheyne Walk, Chelsea, S.W.
Esher, Viscount, G.C.B., LL.D., The Roman Camp, Callander, N.B.
Evans, C. J., 1 Westward Rise, Barry, Glam.
Evans, F., Ty Cynwyd, Llangynwyd, Bridgend, Glam.
Evans, Sir E. Vincent, 63 Chancery Lane, W.C. 2.
* Ezard, Edward Henry, M.A., M.D., D.Sc., Clare Cottage, Castle Street, Cambridge.

Fahim, Mohammad, Khedivia Secondary School, Cairo, Egypt.
Fanshawe, H. C., I.C.S., 72 Philbeach Gardens, S.W.
Felce, Ernest, 2 Cambridge Road, Prenton, Birkenhead.
Fenwick, Miss Susan F., 64 Kensington Park Road, W.
Ferris, C. E., Southall School, Hamilton, New Zealand.
Firth, Professor Charles Harding, M.A., LL.D., F.B.A., Litt.D., 2 Northmoor Road, Oxford.

Fish, Professor, C. R., Ph.D., The University, Madison, Wisconsin, U.S.A.
Fisher, The Right Hon. H. A. L., M.A., M.P., Board of Education, S.W.
Fitzmaurice, The Right Hon. Lord, Leigh House, Bradford-on-Avon, Wilts.
Fitzmaurice-Kelly, J., 1 Longton Avenue, Sydenham, S.E. 26.
Flenley, R., M.A., B.Litt., 164 Anfield Road, Liverpool.
* Fletcher, John S., Bryony Hill, Hambledon, Surrey.
* Ford, Workington C., Massachusetts Historical Society, Fenway, Boston, U.S.A.
Forrest, Sir George W., LL.D., C.I.E., Rose Bank, Iffley, Oxford.
* Fortescue, Hon. Sir J. W., M.V.O., LL.D., Admiral's House, Grove Road, Hampstead, N.W.
Foster, Rev. Canon C. W., M.A., F.S.A., Timberland Vicarage, Lincoln.
* Fotheringham, J. K., M.A., 6 Blackhall Road, Oxford.
Fowler, R. C., O.B.E., F.S.A., Public Record Office, W.C.
Fowler, W. Warde, M.A., Lincoln College, Oxford.
Fox, J. C., Master of the Supreme Court, 173 Oakwood Court, Kensington, W.
Frazer, Sir James G., F.B.A., D.C.L., LL.D., 1 Brick Court, Middle Temple, E.C.
Frazer, N. L., M.A., The Grammar School, Ilkley, Yorks.
Free, Rev. Richard W., M.A., St. Clement's Vicarage, Fulham, S.W.
* Freeman, Arnold, M.A., B.Litt., 6 Woodberry Down, N.
Freeman, J. J., Shepperton-on-Thames.
Fullerton, W. Morton, 8 Rue du Mont Thabor, Paris.

Gardner, Miss Alice, 8 Canynge Road, Clifton, Bristol.
Garrett, Professor H. L. O., M.A., I.E.S., Government College, Lahore, India.
Gasquet, His Eminence Cardinal F. A., Palazzo de Calisto in Trastevero, Rome.
Gee, The Very Rev. Henry, D.D., F.S.A., The Deanery, Gloucester.
Gerrans, H. T., M.A., 20 St. John's Street, Oxford.
* Gibbons, H. A., 120 Boulevard du Montparnasse, Paris.
Gill, Rev. A. A. R., M.A., The Vicarage, Market Weighton, E. Yorks.
Gingell, W. H., M.A., 8 East Parade, Leeds.
Giuseppi, M. S., F.S.A., Public Record Office, W.C. 2.
Godley, The Hon. Eveline, South Hatfield, Coleman's Hatch, Sussex.
* Gooch, G. P., M.A., South Villa, Campden Hill Road, W.
Graham, Miss Rose, M.A., F.S.A., 12 Ladbroke Gardens, Notting Hill, W.
Graham, Rev. W., M.A., St. Luke's Vicarage, Dukinfield, Cheshire.
Grant, Arthur J., M.A., 1 Welburn Avenue, Far Headingley, Leeds.
Gray, Rev. E. D. McQueen, M.A., 19 Shirley Road, Southampton.
Green, J. E. S., M.A., Trinity Hall, Cambridge.
Green, James, 702 State Mutual Buildings, 340 Main Street, Worcester, Mass., U.S.A.
Green, Mrs. J. R., 90 Stephen's Green, Dublin.
Green, W. D. Huntley, Bishop's Teignton, S. Devon.
Greene, C. H., M.A., The School House, Berkhamsted, Herts.
Greene, Professor E. B., 315 Lincoln Hall, Urbana, Ill., U.S.A.
Greene, G. A., Litt.D., 2 Tanfield Court, Temple, E.C.
Greenwood, Miss A. D., 21 Dalebury Road, Wandsworth Common, S.W.
Gnanaviran, S. S., 7 St. Mark's Crescent, Regent's Park, N.W.

Habell, Rev. Mark, B.A., Hambledon View, Tunstall Road, Sunderland.
Haigh, W. E., 13 Wormald Street, Almondbury, Huddersfield.
* Hailstone, Edward, 16 Rue Boursault, Paris.
Hales, G. T., 1 Oppidans Road, Primrose Hill, N.W.
* Hall, C. S., Holywell House, Watt Lane, Ranmoor, Sheffield.
Hall, D. G. E., M.A., Bedale's School, Petersfield, Hants.
Hall, Hubert, Litt.D., F.S.A., *Director*, 26 Old Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C. 2.
Hall, Colonel, Sir John, Bt., 21 Dorset Square, N.W.
Hammerton, J. A., Kenmore, Shepherd's Hill, Highgate, N.
Harding, W. G., St. George's School, Windsor Castle.
* Harrison, Frederic, Litt.D., 10 Royal Crescent, Bath.
Hasluck, E. L., B.A., 8 Golders Gardens, N.W. 4.
Hassall, A., M.A., Christ Church, Oxford.
Havinden, Eric, M.A., Baroona Dale Road, Purley, Surrey.
Hay, James A. C., C.E., M.R.S.G.S., 12 Copers Cope Road, Beckenham, Kent.
Hazeltine, H. D., M.A., West Lodge, Downing College, Cambridge.
* Hearnshaw, F. J. C., LL.D., 28 Spencer Hill, Wimbledon, S.W.
Heatley, D. P., West Mains, Mayfield, Edinburgh.
Heaton, R. W., M.A., Government Library, Pretoria, S. Africa.
Heaton, Rev. W. J., B.D., 33 Cornwallis Crescent, Clifton, Bristol.
Hensman, E. W., M.A., 40 Crockerton Road, S.W. 17.
* Hereford, The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of, The Palace, Hereford.
Hewlett, Maurice, Elm Tree Farm, West Withering, Chichester.
Hill, J. J. T., The School House, Deane, Bolton, Lancashire.
Hill, Lady, Leighton House, near Heston, Cheshire.
Hoare, E. G., B.A., The Vicarage, Aylsham, Norfolk.
Hoare, Sir S. J. G., Bt., Sidestrand Hall, Cromer.
Hockaday, F. S., Highbury House, Lydney, Glos.
Hodges, H. W., M.A., Royal Naval College, Dartmouth.
Hoggarth, A. H. G., M.A., St. Abbs, Kendal.
Holmes, T. Rice, Litt.D., Avonmore, Umbria Street, Roehampton, S.W.
Hood, Mrs. Ivo, Sidestrand Hall, Cromer.
Hopkins, Rev. C. E., M.A., Grafton Underwood Rectory, Kettering.
Hopwood, C. H., F.S.A., Ravenswing, Rookwood Road, Stamford Hill, N. 16.
Horne, Rev. W., St. Luke's Vicarage, Wilton, Blackburn.
* Horrocks, J. W., M.A., D.Litt., Gill Terrace, Moston Lane, Blackley, Manchester.
Horsburgh, E. L. S., B.A., St. Helen's, near Ryde, Isle of Wight.
Hotblack, Miss K., B.A., 45 Newmarket Road, Norwich.
Howard-Watson, J. A., F.R.G.S., F.R.S.L., 1 Eaton Bank, Crosby Road, North Waterloo, near Liverpool.
Howorth, Sir Henry, K.C.I.E., F.R.S., 45 Lexham Gardens, S.W.
Hughes, D'Arcy W., B.A., The Grammar School, Rishworth, near Halifax, Yorkshire.
Hunt, Rev. William, M.A., D.Litt., 24 Phillimore Gardens, Campden Hill, W.
Hyamson, A. M., The White House, College Road, Cheshunt, Waltham Cross.
* Hyde, J. H., B.A., 38 Rue Barbet de Jouy, Paris.
Hyslop, R., F.S.A. (Scot.), 5 Bellevue Crescent, Sunderland.

I'Anson, W. M., F.S.A., Bardencroft, Saltburn-by-the-Sea.
ILCHESTER, Earl of, Holland House, Kensington, W.
Ingham, Alfred, One Ash, Brooklands, Cheshire.
Innes, A. D., M.A., Intelecote, Marsham Way, Gerrard's Cross.
Iyengar, T. R. Sesha, M.A., 65 Coral Merchant Street, Madras, India.

Jackson, Rev. E. H., 2 Upgate, Louth, Lincs.
Jackson, Rev. Canon F. J. Foakes, D.D., Jesus College, Cambridge.
Jackson, Rev. H. Latimer, D.D., Little Canfield Rectory, Dunmow, Essex.
Jarmin, A. M., 15 East Hill, Colchester.
Jeffery, R. W., M.A., Brasenose College, Oxford.
Jenkinson, Hilary, B.A., F.S.A., 29 Cheyne Row, Chelsea, S.W.
Jeudwine, J. W., 7 Riverview Gardens, Barnes, S.W. 13.
Jocelyn, Colonel J., 157 Cromwell Road, S.W. 5.
Johnson, C., M.A., 10 Well Road, Hampstead, N.W.
Johnston, D. Hope, M.A., Royal Colonial Institute, Northumberland Avenue, W.C.
Johnston, Rev. J. B., M.A., B.D., St. Andrew's Manse, Falkirk.
Johnston, Miss K. L., M.A., 172 Hanover Road, Brondesbury Park, N.W.
Johnston, Miss Hilda, M.A., 28 College Court, Hammersmith, W.
Jones, Right Hon. Sir David Brynmor, K.C., LL.B., 27 Bryanston Square, W.
Jones, E. A. (Hon.), M.A., Royal Societies Club, St. James Street, S.W.
Jones, Professor Guernsey, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb., U.S.A.
Jones, Miss M. E. Monckton, M.A., Barton, Cambs.
Jones, Miss M. G., M.A., Girton College, Cambridge.
Jones, W. G., M.A., Elm House, 10 Ashville Road, Birkenhead.
Jourdan, Rev. G. V., D.D., St. Mary's Shandon Rectory, Cork.

* Kay, H., M.A., 14 Ackroyd Avenue, Gorton, Manchester.
Kelway, A. C., 96 Gower Street, W.C.
Keyser, C. E., M.A., Aldermaston Court, near Reading.
Khan, Shafaat Ahmad, B.A., Litt.D., 14 Drayton Road, Leytonstone, E.
KINGSFORD, C. L., M.A., F.S.A., 15 Argyll Road, W. 8.
* Kirkpatrick, F. A., M.A., Grantchester, Cambridge.
Knight, A. C., 2 Stone Buildings, Lincolns Inn, W.C.
Knight, L. Stanley, M.A., Stepney House, Cwmbwrla, Swansea.
Knowles, Mrs., Litt.D., 47 St. Mary's Mansions, Paddington, W.
Krishnamachasi, T. M., H.H., The Maharajah's College, Trivandrum, S. India.

* Lambert, U., J.P., South Park Farm, Bletchingley, Surrey.
Langhorne, W. B., Knollside, Uplime, Devon.
* Langley, Rev. A. S., 64 Aswell Street, Louth, Lincs.
LAPSLEY, G. T., M.A., Ph.D., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Lardelli, Miss M. L., Girls' High School, Brigg, Lincs.
Law, Miss A., The Old Parsonage, Altham, Accrington.
Lawrence, R. V., M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Layton, W. T., 313 Friern Road, Dulwich, S.E. 22.
Leaf, Walter, Litt.D., 6 Sussex Place, Regent's Park, N.W.
Leathley, Rev. S. A., D.D., LL.B., Kersal School, Manchester.

Lega-Weekes, Miss Ethel, Sunny Nook, Rugby Mansions, West Kensington, W.
* Leonard, Miss E. M., 1 Lindfield Gardens, Hampstead, N.W.
* Lepper, R. S., LL.M., Elsinore, Crawfordsburn, Co. Down.
Leslie, Lieut.-Colonel J. H., R.A. (retired list), Gunnersholme, Melbourne Avenue, Sheffield.
Lethbridge, Alan B., Stockwood House, Keynsham, Som.
Lewin, P. E., Royal Colonial Institute, Northumberland Avenue, W.C.
Lewis, Professor E. A., M.A., D.Sc., University College of Wales, Aberystwyth.
Leys, Mrs., c/o K. K. M. Leys, Esq., University College, Oxford.
Limbrick, Rev. W. A., The Tan Office, Shalford, Braintree, Essex.
* Lipson, E., M.A., New College, Oxford.
Little, Andrew G., M.A., Risborough, Vine Court Road, Sevenoaks.
Lloyd, Colonel E. M., R.E., Glenhurst, Brighton Road, Sutton.
Lloyd, H. I., M.A., 267 King's Road, Chelsea, S.W.
Lloyd, Professor J. E., M.A., Gwaen Deg, Bangor.
* Lobb, John, F.R.G.S., 40A Emmanuel Road, Telford Avenue, Streatham Hill, S.W.
Lock, Major H. D., 53 High West Street, Dorchester.
Lockhart, Arthur W., Cartret, 64 Park Road, West Cliff, Southend-on-Sea.
Lockitt, C. H., M.A., The Grammar School, Bungay, Norfolk.
Lodge, Miss E. C., M.A., Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford.
Lodge, Senator H. C., United States Senate, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.
* Lodge, Sir Richard, M.A., Litt.D., 25 Hope Terrace, Edinburgh.
Lomas, Mrs. S. C., Rosslyn, Upper Sydenham, S.E.
Lord, R. H., 22 Westrunly Court, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.
Lucas, Frank W., Ferndale, Westcombe Park Road, Blackheath, S.E.
Luck, H. Courtenay, F.R.G.S., J.P., Courtenay, Zillmere, Brisbane, Queensland.
Lybyer, Professor A. H., University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill., U.S.A.
* Lydall, John French, 37 John Street, Bedford Row, W.C.
Lyell, J. P. R., J.P., Inchyra, West Heath Drive, Hampstead, N.W.
* Lyle, Thomas, M.A., The Hollies, 41 Beckenham Road, Beckenham, Kent.

* Macfadyen, Rev. Dugald, Chembong, Lytton Avenue, Letchworth.
McIlwain, C. H., Standish Hall, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.
Mackie, J. D., M.A., Kilmallie, St. Andrews, Fife.
McLaughlin, Professor A. C., The University, Chicago, U.S.A.
McNamara, W. H., 29 Campbell Road, Walthamstow.
Magrath, C. J., M.A., Hon. D.Litt., 119 Piccadilly, W.
Mainwaring, J., Fy Gwyn, Tipton, Staffs.
Malden, Rev. E. E., M.A., M.B.E., 2 Brixton Road, Mt. Roskill, Auckland, N.Z.
Malden, Henry Elliot, M.A., *Hon. Sec.*, 17 Rose Hill, Dorking.
Malden, Rev. R. H., M.A., The Vicarage, Headingley, Leeds.
Marriott, W. K., 8 Crauley Gardens, S.W. 7.
Marsden, E., B.A., F.R.G.S., 12 Ellerdale Road, Hampstead, N.W.
* Marsden, R. G., M.A., 13 Leinster Gardens, Lancaster Gate, W.
Marsh, G. W. B., B.A., St. Kilda, 30 Dennington Park Road, N.W. 6.
Marshall, Rev. R. L., M.A., LL.D., The Manse, Maghera, Co. Derry.
Marshall, T. H., M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
* Marten, C. H. K., M.A., Eton College, Windsor.
Marvin, F. S., M.A., H.M.I., The Dyke, Berkhamsted, Herts.

* Mason, Rev. W. A. Parker, M.A., The Hulme Grammar School, Alexandra Park, Manchester.
* Mathur, Tikait Narain, B.A., 63/9 Chili-end Road, Agra, India.
Mayo, Rev. Canon C. H., M.A., Lime Tree House, Gillingham, Dorset.
Mercier, Miss W. L., Whitelands College, Chelsea, S.W. 3.
Merriam, C. P., 52 Harley House, N.W. 1.
Merriman, Professor Roger B., M.A., 175 Brattle Street, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.
Methley, Miss V. M., 9 Royal York Crescent, Clifton, Bristol.
Milward, V. G., 77 Colmore Row, Birmingham.
Montague, Professor F. C., 177 Woodstock Road, Oxford.
Moon, Zebedee, Public Library, Leyton.
* Moore, Norman, M.D., 67 Gloucester Place, Portman Square, W.
* Morison, Professor J. L., M.A., Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada.
Morris, A., Gwynfa, Gold Tops, Newport, Mon.
Morris, G. J., M.A., Bangalore, 2 Harrington Road, Brighton.
Morris, J. E., D.Litt., 2 Rothsay Gardens, Bedford.
Morrison, Ven. Archdeacon G. W., M.A., 2 Gellatly Road, New Cross, S.E. 14.
Morrison, Hew, LL.D., Public Library, Edinburgh.
Mullens, W. H., Westfield Place, Battle, Sussex.
Mumby, F. A., 135 Foxley Lane, Purley, Surrey.
Munich, Charles J., 8 Achilles Road, N.W. 6.
Munro, J. J., 153 Preston New Road, Blackburn.
Myres, Rev. M. W., M.A., The Vicarage, Frodsham, Cheshire.

Neve, A. H., Pinnacles, Tonbridge.
Newett, Miss Margaret, San Vio 584, Fondamenta Bragadin, Venice, Italy.
Newton, A. P., M.A., B.Sc., F.S.A., King's College, Strand, W.C.
Nijhoff, Martinus, The Hague, c/o Dawson & Son, St. Dunstan's House, Fetter Lane, E.C.
Nind, J., M.A., 1 Silverdale Street, Knutton, Newcastle, Staffs.
Noakes, Miss J., The Wilderness, Salisbury.
Norgate, Rev. T. T., F.R.G.S., The Church House, Westminster Abbey, S.W.
Notestein, Professor Wallace, Ph.D., The University, Minneapolis, Minnesota, U.S.A.
Nuttall, J. R., Thornfield, Lancaster.

O'Connor, Major G. B., Illane Roe, Rochestown, Co. Cork.
Odgers, W. Blake, M.A., LL.D., K.C., 15 Old Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
Oke, A. W., B.A , F.S.A., 32 Denmark Villas, Hove, Sussex.
Oman, Professor Sir C. W. C., M.P., F.B.A., F.S.A. (*President*), All Souls College, Oxford.
Omond, G. W. T., M.A., White Cottage, Mitcham, Surrey.
O'Regan, J. R. H., M.A., Marlborough College, Wilts.
Osborn, J. Lee, Bevis, Great Somerford, near Chippenham, Wilts.
Owen, Hugh, M.A., Llys Caradog Llangsfin, Anglesey, N. Wales.
Owen, R. K. W., M.A., Highfield, 19 Upper Maze Hill, St. Leonards-on-Sea.

Page, W., F.S.A. (*Auditor*), Frognal Cottage, Frognal, Hampstead, N.W.
Palmer, James Foster, M.R.C.S.E. (*Auditor*), 3 Oakley Street, Chelsea, S.W.
Pape, F. J., Cockermouth, Cumberland.
Parker, Captain H., F.R.G.S., 12A Berkeley Street, Piccadilly, W. 1.
* Parker, L. N., F.R.A.M., 3 Pembroke Road, Kensington, W.
Parkin, Thomas, M.A., F.R.G.S., Fairseat, High Wickham, Hastings.
Patterson, James K., Ph.D., LL.D., President of the State University, Lexington Kentucky, U.S.A.
Paul, J. N. W., B.A., Robertson College, Jubbulpore, C.P., India.
Peel, Rev. Albert, M.A., B.Litt.D., Great Harwood, Lancs.
Peel, Rev. J. K., M.A., Spalding, Lincs.
Pemberton, Colonel E. St. C., Pyrland Hall, Taunton, Somerset.
Penn, C. D., M.A., 62 Sandmere Road, Bedford Road, Clapham, S.W. 4.
Penney, Arthur Paul, 75 Goldington Avenue, Bedford.
Penney, Norman, F.S.A., Devonshire House, Bishopsgate, E.C.
Perkins, Rev. J., M.A., 4 Dean's Yard, Westminster, S.W.
* Perry, Colonel Ottley, J.P., F.R.G.S., F.S.A., Roxwell, Northwood, Middlesex.
Petrie, C.A., B.A., Oxford and Cambridge Club, Pall Mall, S.W.
* Phelps, Rev. P. B., M.A., Calanda Club, 35 St. George's Square, S.W. 1.
Phillips, T. W., 97 Croxted Road, Dulwich, S.E. 21.
Phillips, Professor U. B., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., U.S.A.
Phillpotts, Miss B. S., D.Litt., O.B.E., Westfield College, Hampstead, N.W.
Pierce, Rev. Canon F. Dormer, M.A., The Vicarage, Southend-on-Sea.
Piggott, Sir F. T., M.A., LL.M., 14 Old Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
* Pike, Rev. Clement E., 13 Taunton Road, Bridgwater.
Poland, Sir Harry, K.C., 28 Sloane Gardens, S.W.
* Polignano, Duke of, Manor House, Brampton, Huntingdon.
* Pollard, Professor A. F., Litt.D., Branksea, 7 St. Mary's Grove, Barnes Common, S.W.
Pollock, Right Hon. Sir F., Bt., LL.D., F.S.A., F.B.A., 13 Old Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
Pond, P. J., The Grange, Alexandra Road South, Manchester.
Pope, F. J., 17 Holland Road, Kensington, W.
* Porges, Theodore, F.R.G.S., 17 Avenue Friedland, Paris.
Potter, Rev. E. C., M.A., 6 Park Road, Brentwood, Essex.
Powell, Ellis T., LL.B., D.Sc., Rosedene, Brondesbury Park, N.W.
Powell, Miss H. L., 44 Foxley Road, S.W.
Power, Miss E. E., M.A., Girton College, Cambridge.
Powicke, Professor F. M., M.A., 25 Ladybarn Road, Fallowfield, Manchester.
Powley, E. B., B.A., 50 Coulston Road, Lancaster.
Pratt, A. T. C., Westward Ho! Hotel, Westcliff-on-Sea, Essex.
Prestage, Edgar, Travessa Sta. Catharine II, Lisbon, Portugal.
* Previté-Orton, C. W., M.A., 55 Bateman Street, Cambridge.
Prothero, Sir G. W., F.B.A., Litt.D., LL.D., 24 Bedford Square, Bloomsbury, W.C.
Prothero, M. E. D., M.A., 4 Gordon Place, Campden Hill, W. 8.
Purnell, E. K., M.A., North Hill, Windlesham.
Putnam, Miss B. H., Ph.D., Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass., U.S.A.

Raby, F. J. E., B.A., 4 Cyril Mansions, Prince of Wales Road, S.W. 11.
Radford, Lady, 2 Pennsylvania Park, Exeter.
Radice, Mrs. Charles, The Manor House, Frimley.
Ragg, Rev. F. W., M.A., The Manor House, Lower Boddington, Byfield, R.S.O.
Rait, Professor R. S., M.A., 31 Lilybank Gardens, Glasgow.
RAMSAY, Sir JAMES HENRY, Bt., F.B.A., Bamff, Alyth, N.B.
Rangaswami-Aiyangar, Rao Bahadur, K. V., M.A., H.H. Maharaja's College, Trivandrum, Travancore.
Rankin, J. R. Lea, Walterstone, Abergavenny.
* Rashdall, Very Rev. H., M.A., The Deanery, Carlisle.
Ravenshaw, J., B.A., 10 West Hill, Highgate, N.
Rawlinson, H. G., M.A., The Principal, The Karnatak College, Dharwar, India
Ray, J. E., 41 Havelock Road, Hastings.
* REDDAWAY, WILLIAM F., M.A., King's College, Cambridge.
Redstone, V. B., Mill Hill, Woodbridge.
Rees, Rev. T. Mardy, 24 Rugby Avenue, Neath, S. Wales.
Rees, W., M.A., University College, Cathays Park, Cardiff.
Reichel, Sir H. R., M.A., Principal, University College, Bangor.
Reid, Miss R. R., M.A., D.Litt., 4 Grange Road, Gunnersbury, W.
Renshaw, Walter Charles, K.C., Sandrocks, Haywards Heath.
Rice-Oxley, Captain L., M.A., 5 Prince of Wales Terrace, W. 8.
Richardson, Miss E. M., B.A., Vyne House, near Basingstoke.
Richardson, H. G., M.A., B.Sc., Fairmead, Bayham Road, Sevenoaks.
Rickword, G., 38 Wellesley Road, Colchester.
Riddell, Hon. Mr. Justice W. Renwick, B.Sc., LL.D., Hon. L.H.D., Osgoode Hall, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
Rimmer, Rev. J. S., B.D., The Rectory, Ulverston.
* Roberts, J. H., Bryntirion, Eaton Grove, Swansea.
ROBERTS, R. A., The Athenæum, Pall Mall, S.W.
Robertson, C. Grant, M.A., All Souls College, Oxford.
Robinson, Miss E. M., Moylena, 80 Underhill Road, S.E. 22.
Robinson, Rev. Paschal, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.
* Robinson, Wilfrid C., 1 St. Luke's Road, Bayswater, W. 11.
Ropes, Arthur Reed, M.A., 13 Campden Grove, Kensington, W.
ROSE, Professor J. HOLLAND, Litt.D., Walsingham, Millington Road, Cambridge.
* ROSEBERY, Earl of, K.T., K.G., F.R.S., 38 Berkeley Square, W.
Rose-Troup, Mrs. Frances, Bradlegh End, Ottery St. Mary, Devon.
* Routh, Miss E. M. G., Fairpark House, Exeter.
Routledge, F. J., M.A., 12 Chesterfield Road, Great Crosby, Lancs.
* Routledge, Mrs. Scoresby, M.A., 9 Cadogan Mansions, Sloane Square, S.W. 1.
Rushmore, F. M., M.A., St. Catharine's College, Cambridge.

Sadler, H. W. W., The High School, Swindon.
* Safford, John Burham, F.G.S., 18 Elgin Road, Wallington, Surrey.
St. Cyres, Viscount, Pynes, Exeter.
* Salter, F. R., M.A., Magdalene College, Cambridge.
Samaddar, J. N., Patna Government College, Moradpur P.O., Patna, India.
Saunders, H. W., M.A., The Training College, Sarisbury Court, Near Southampton.
Sanaveratue, John M., Sindurnwana, Maligakanda, Colombo, Ceylon.

Scholefield, G. H., O.B.E., Otaki, New Zealand.
Scofield, Miss Cora L., College Club, 40 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.
Seccombe, Thomas, M.A., Glencairn, Camberley.
* Seebohm, Hugh Exton, Poynders End, Hitchin.
Sefton-Jones, Mrs., 18 Pembroke Gardens, W. 8.
Sedgwick, R. R., M.A., 69 Egerton Gardens, S.W.
* Seton, W. W., M.A., University College Hall, Ealing, W.
Shaw, W. B., 56 Sandy Lane, Stretford, Manchester.
* Shawcross, G. W., M.B.E., Lakelands, Rivington, Lancs.
Shawcross, Rev. J. P., M.A., Bengeworth Vicarage, Evesham, Worcs.
Shelley, Sir J. C. E., Bt., Avington, Alresford, Hants.
Shelley, R. J. A., Denbie House, Formby, Lancs.
Sherren, John Angel, J.P., Penn Hill Avenue, Parkstone, Dorset.
Shirley, F. J., B.A., Framlingham College, Suffolk.
Sieveking, A. Forbes, F.S.A. (*Auditor*), 12 Seymour Street, Portman Square, W.
Silvester, Rev. J., M.A., The Vicarage, Clacton Magna, Essex.
Simon, A. L., 24 Mark Lane, E.C.
* Simpson, F. A., M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Skeel, Miss C. A. J., Litt.D., Holly Hedge Cottage, Well Road, Hampstead, N.W.
Skipton, H. P. K., 9 Crescent Road, Beckenham, Kent.
Skrine, F. H., 147 Victoria Street, S.W.
Slater, Professor Gilbert, M.A., The University, Madras, India.
Smart, F. W. B., Charterhouse, Godalming.
Smith, A. D., The Ivies, Willingham, Cambridge.
Smith, A. L., M.A., Master of Balliol College, Oxford.
* Smith, Miss M. Howes, County High School for Girls, Altrincham, Cheshire.
Smith, Samuel, Public Libraries, Sheffield.
Smith, S. H., B.A., The Priory, Windermere.
Smith, W. Owston, M.A., I.E.S., Holkar College, Indore, India.
Smythe, David M., Methuen Castle, Perth.
Snowball, F. C., M.A., Hele's School, Exeter.
Soper, H. T., 4 Martin's Lane, Exeter.
Sotheran, H. C., Southover Old House, Lewes.
Southam, Lionel Arthur Clement, Rodney House, Malvern Link.
Spens, H. B., B.A., 25 Park Circus, Glasgow.
Sprules, Miss D. W., Haberdashers' Aske's Girls' School, Creffield Road, Acton, W.
* Stampa, L., M.A., 33 High Street, Oxford.
Stebbing, Miss L. S., M.A., 46 Belsize Park, N.W. 3.
Stenton, Professor F. M., M.A., University College, Reading.
Stewart, Murray, Conservative Club, St. James's Street, S.W.
Sturdee, Rev. R. J., M.A., St. Peter's Vicarage, Loughborough.
* Swift, F. D., M.A., Denstone College, Stafford.

Talboys, R. St. Clair, M.A., Wellington College, Berks.
Tanner, Miss E. M., M.A., Locksbrook, Nuneaton.
Tanner, J. R., M.A., Litt.D., St. John's College, Cambridge.
Tate-Stoate, Rev. W. M., M.A., M.R.I.A., Pebworth Vicarage, Stratford-on-Avon.

Tawney, R. H., M.A., 28 Parliament Hill Mansions, Highgate Road, N.W. 5.
* Taylor, E. R., F.S.A., Norfolk House, Norfolk Street, Strand, W.C. 2.
Tedder, H. R., F.S.A. (*Treasurer*), The Athenæum, Pall Mall, S.W.
* Temperley, H. W. V., M.A., Peterhouse, Cambridge.
Thayer, W. R., LL.D., Litt.D., 8 Berkeley Street, Cambridge, Mass, U.S.A.
Thistlethwaite, B., 14 Bath Road, Buxton, Derbyshire.
Thomas, Roland, 3 Harp Terrace, Brecon.
Thompson, Miss A. D., Queen Ethelburga's School, Harrogate.
Thomson, Miss C. L., 6 Ingoldsby Mansions, Addison Bridge, W.
Thomson, Miss G. Scott, 18 New Inn Hall Street, Oxford.
Thornton, Rev. Canon F. S., Shudy Camps Hall, Bartelow, Cambs.
Thorp, John T., F.R.S.L., Brunswick House, 54 Princes Road, Leicester.
Titcombe, Rev. J. C., Seckford Hospital, Woodbridge.
Toller, T. Northcote, M.A., D.Litt., Lansdowne House, Didsbury, Manchester.
Torr, Herbert James, Morton Hall, Swinderby, Lincs.
Tout, Professor T. F., F.B.A., M.A., 1 Oak Drive, Fallowfield, Manchester.
Toynbee, Paget, M.A., D.Litt., Fiveways, Burnham, Bucks.
Toyne, S. M., M.A., St. Peter's School, York.
* Trevelyan, G. M., Penrose, Berkhamsted, Herts.
Trevelyan, Right Hon. Sir G. O., Bt., O.M., D.C.L., LL.D., F.B.A., Welcombe, Stratford-on-Avon.
Turner, Professor E. R., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., U.S.A.
Turner, Fred A., Killarney, Windmill Road, Brentford, W.
Turral, J., B.A., 37 Raikes Parade, Blackpool.
* Turton, Robert Bell, Kildale Hall, Grosmont, Yorks.

Unwin, Professor G., M.A., 47 Heaton Road, Withington, Manchester.

Van Tyne, Professor C. H., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., U.S.A.
Vaughan, W. W., M.A., Wellington College, Berks.
Ventura, M., 17 Coleman Street, E.C.
Verney, Lady, Rhianva, Menai Bridge.
* Vickers, K. H., M.A., 5 Tankerville Terrace, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Vinogradoff, Professor Sir Paul, F.B.A., LL.D., 19 Linton Road, Oxford.

Wade, C. E., M.A., 7 St. John's Wood Road, N.W. 8.
Wade, The Hon. Sir C. G., K.C., c/o Premier's Department, Sydney, N.S. Wales, Australia.
* Wagner, Henry, F.S.A., 13 Half Moon Street, Piccadilly, W.
Wake, Miss Joan, The Manor House, Weston Turville, Aylesbury.
Wale, W., 112 South Hill Park, Hampstead, N.W.
* Walker, Rev. J. M., D.D., The Vicarage, Newark, Notts.
* Walker, Robert, F.R.G.S., Westry, Combe Down, Bath.
Wallace, Malcolm W., 91 Walmer Road, Toronto, Canada.
Walston, Sir Charles, Litt.D., Ph.D., Newton Hall, Newton, Cambridge.
Ward, Sir Adolphus William, F.B.A., Litt.D., LL.D., Master of Peterhouse, Cambridge.
Watson, E. J., St. John's Arch, Bristol.
Watson, G. Léon de St. M., 11 Church Row, Hampstead, N.W. 1.
Watson, W. G. Willis, Single's Lodge, Pinhoe, Exeter.
* Watt, James, F.S.A. [Scot.], 24 Rothesay Terrace, Edinbugh.

* Watts, Rev. Herbert C., Kinross, Oxford Road, Burnham-on-Sea, Som.
Weaver, F. J., Coggeshall Road, Braintree, Essex.
Webb, Sidney, LL.B., 41 Grosvenor Road, Westminster, S.W.
Webb, T., 45 High Street, Andover.
Webster, Professor C. K., M.A., 9 Belvidere Road, Prince's Park, Liverpool.
Weil, Commandant M. H., 3 Rue Rabelais, Paris.
Weiner, A., M.A., 40 Burghalt Crescent, Amherst Park, N. 16.
Welldon, Right Rev. Bishop, D.D., Dean of Durham.
Wesley, E. F., 28 Essex Street, Strand, W.C.
Whale, George, 18 Vanbrugh Park, Blackheath, S.E.
* Whatton, J. S., M.A., Hennapyn House, Torquay.
Wheeler, H. F. B., Hartlebury, Roy Road, Northwood, Middlesex.
Whitear, W. H., 10 Fairlawn Court, Chiswick, W. 4.
Whitehead, A. W.,
Whiteley, J. G., 223 West Lanvale Street, Baltimore, U.S.A.
Whitfield, A. S., Bentley Moor, Walsall, Staffs.
Whiting, Rev. C. E., M.A., B.D., B.C.L., St. Chad's Hall, Durham.
Whitley, Rev. W. T , LL.M., LL.D., The Elms, 2 Ombersley Street, Droitwich.
Whitney, Rev. J. P., M.A., B.D., D.C.L., 6 St. Peter's Terrace, Cambridge.
Whittuck, E. A., M.A., B.C.L., J.P., 77 South Audley Street, W. 1.
Whitwell, Robert J., B.Litt., Fairfield, Kendal.
Wilberforce-Bell, Major H., c/o Messrs. Cox & Co., Hornby Road, Bombay, India.
Wilden-Hart, Professor B. J., M.A., Overseas' Club, Aldwych, W. 2.
Wilkinson, M., M.A., Singletree, Old Botley, Oxford.
Willard, Professor J. F., University of Colorado, Boulder, Col., U.S.A.
Willcock, Rev. J., D.D., D.Litt., St. Ringan's Manse, Lerwick.
Williams, A. J., M.A., Burton Bank, Mill Hill, N.W.
Williams, Rev. A. T. P., M.A., Second Master's House, The College, Winchester.
Williams, Basil, M.A., Savile Club, 107 Piccadilly, W.
Williams, G. D., Etchingham, Crowstone Road, North Westcliff-on-Sea.
Williams, J. W., Inglewood, St. Andrews, N.B.
Williams, R., M.A., The University, Allahabad, India.
Williams, W. L., M.P., K.C., 111 Ashley Gardens, S.W.
Williams, W. W., Constable Lee C. E. School, Burnley Road, Rawtenstall, Lancs.
Wills-Sandford, Miss Mary, 40 St. Giles, Oxford.
Wilmot-Buxton, Miss E. M., St. Christopher's, Storrington, Sussex.
Wilson, A. E., M.A., 101 Westminster Road, Handsworth, Birmingham.
Wilson, H. W., 203 Elgin Avenue, W.
* Wilson, Rev. S. G. F., Gordon Lodge, South Benfleet, Essex.
Winstanley, D. A., M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Wood, William, 1 Myrtle Villas, Polperro, Cornwall.
Wordsworth, Rev. Prebendary C., M.A., Sub-Dean of Salisbury, St. Nicholas's Hospital, Salisbury.
* Worsfold, Thomas Cato, M.A., F.R.S.L., LL.D., M.P. (*Hon. Solicitor*), Hall Place Mitcham, Surrey.
Wotton, Miss M. E., 36 Buckingham Gate, S.W. 1.
Wrong, E. M., M.A., 7 Northmoor Road, Oxford.
Wrong, Professor G. M., M.A., The University, Toronto, Canada.

Yorke, Philip Chesney, 98 Addison Road, W.

HONORARY FELLOWS.

Dana, Edward S., Ph.D., New Haven, Connecticut, U.S.A.

* Hewins, W. A. S., M.A., M.P., 98 St. George's Square, S.W.

Kenyon, Sir F. G., K.C.B., D.Litt., Ph.D., P.B.A., Director and Principal Librarian, British Museum, W.C.

Lee, Sir Sidney, Litt.D., F.B.A., 108 Lexham Gardens, W. 8.

Liversidge, Professor A., F.R.S., LL.D., Fieldhead, George Road, Coombe Warren, Kingston, Surrey.

* Lyte, Sir H. C. Maxwell, K.C.B., M.A., F.B.A., Deputy Keeper of the Public Records, 61 Warwick Square, S.W.

Montelius, Dr. Oscar, Society of Antiquaries, Stockholm, Sweden.

Montjau, M. Edouard de, Society of Ethnography, Paris.

* Poole, R. L., LL.D., Litt.D., F.B.A., Keeper of the Archives, The Museum House, Oxford.

Slafter, Rev. Edmund F., A.M., D.D., 249 Berkeley Street, Boston, U.S.A.

Thompson, Sir Edward Maunde, G.C.B., I.S.O., D.C.L., LL.D., Litt.D., F.B.A., Mayfield, Sussex.

Udal, His Honour John Symonds, F.S.A., 2 Marlborough Hill, N.W.

* Honorary Life Fellows under By-law IV. (since repealed).

CORRESPONDING MEMBERS.

Adams, Professor George Burton, Ph.D., 57 Edgehill Road, New Haven, Conn., U.S.A.
Andrews, Professor C. M., Ph.D., Yale University, New Haven, Conn., U.S.A.

Bémont, Chas., Directeur-Adjoint à l'Ecole des Hautes-Etudes, 14 Rue Monsieur le Prince, Paris (VIe).
Blok, Professor J., The University, Leiden.
Botha, Graham, Archive Department, Cape Town, South Africa.
Brock, R. A., 517 West Marshall Street, Richmond, Virginia, U.S.A.
Broglie, Le Duc de, Rue de Solférino, Paris.
Bourgeois, Professor Emile, Manufacture Nationale de Porcelaine, Sèvres (Seine et Oise), France.
Bugge, Alexander, Ph.D., Christiania, Sweden.

Cuvelier, J., Archives Génèrales du Royaume, Brussels, Belgium.

Delachenal, Professor R., 4 Rue de Babylone, Paris (VIIe).
Doughty, A. G., M.A., Archive Department, Ottawa, Canada.

Freire, B. Braamcamp, rue do Salitre, 146, Lisbon.

Halévy, Professor E., La Maison Blanche, Sucy en Brie, S. et Oise.
Haskins, Professor C. H., Ph.D., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

Jablonowski, Professor A., The University, Warsaw.
Jameson, Professor J. F., Ph.D., LL.D., Department of Historical Research, Carnegie Institution, Washington, U.S.A.

Pirenne, Professor H., 126 Rue Neuve St. Pierre, Ghent.

Ravenell, H. E., Spartanburg, South Carolina, U.S.A.
Re, Emilio, Cav. Dr. Archivio di Stato, Rome.

Sarolea, Prof. Charles, Belgian Consulate, Edinburgh.

Theal, G. McCall, LL.D., c/o Colonial Secretary, Cape Colony, South Africa.

Villa Urrutia, His Excellency the Marquis de, G.C.V.O., Foreign Office, Madrid.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBING LIBRARIES.

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

Abbaye St. Pierre de Solesmes, Quarr Abbey, Ryde, I.W.
Aberdeen University.
Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales.

Belfast, Queen's College.
Birkenhead Public Library.
Birmingham Library, Margaret Street.
Central Free Library, Ratcliffe Place, Birmingham.
University.
Bolton Central Reference Library, Town Hall Square.
Bradford Public Library, Darley Street.
Brighton Public Library, Royal Pavilion.
Bristol Central Library.

Cambridge, Girton College.
King's College.
St. Catharine's College.
St. John's College.
Trinity College.
University Library.
Canterbury, Dean and Chapter Library.
Cardiff Public Library.
Carlisle Public Library, Castle Street, Carlisle.
Chiswick Public Library, Duke's Avenue.

Dewsbury Public Library.
Dublin, King's Inn Library.
National Library of Ireland, Kildare Street.
Royal Irish Academy, 19 Dawson Street.
Trinity College.
Durham University.

Edinburgh, Advocates' Library.
Library of the Writers to the Signet.
University.

Glasgow, Baillie's Institution, 153 West Regent Street.
Faculty of Procurators Library, 62 St. George's Place.
Mitchell Library.
University Library.
Gloucester Public Library, Brunswick Road.
Grimsby Public Library.

Hawarden, St. Deiniol's Library.
Hove Public Library.

Ireland, National Library of (*see* Dublin).

Leeds Church Institute.
Library, Commercial Street, Leeds.
The University.
Leicester Municipal Library, Wellington Street.
Permanent Library, Gallowtree Gate.
Lincoln, Dean and Chapter Library.
Liverpool, Athenæum Library, 40 Church Street.
Public Library.
University.
London, The Admiralty, S.W.
The Athenæum Club.
Battersea Public Libraries, Lavender Hill, S.W.
Birkbeck College, Bream's Buildings, Chancery Lane, W.C.
British Museum.
Chelsea Public Library, Manresa Road.
Fulham Public Library, 598 Fulham Road, S.W.
Gray's Inn.
Guildhall Library.
Hammersmith Carnegie Central Library.
House of Commons.
Inner Temple.
Kensington Public Library, High Street.
The Law Society, Chancery Lane.
Lincoln's Inn.
London Library, St. James's Square, S.W.
London University, South Kensington, S.W.
Middle Temple.
National Portrait Gallery.
New University Club, St. James's Street, S.W.
The Oratory, South Kensington, S.W.
Oxford and Cambridge Club, c/o Harrison, 45 Pall Mall.
Public Record Office, c/o Wyman.
Reform Club, Pall Mall, S.W.
Royal Institution, 21 Albemarle Street, W.
Royal Societies Club, 63 St. James's Street, S.W.
St. George's Public Library, Buckingham Palace Road, S.W.
Shoreditch Public Library, Pitfield Street, N.
Sion College Library, Victoria Embankment, S.W.
Southwark Central Library, Walworth Road, S.E.
United University Club, 1 Suffolk Street, S.W.
University College, Gower Street, W.C.
Westfield College, Hampstead, N.W.
Dr. Williams's Library, Gordon Square, W.C.
St. Paul's Cathedral Library, E.C.

Manchester, The John Rylands Library.
Public Libraries.
Middlesbrough Free Library, Municipal Buildings.
Mirfield, House of the Resurrection.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne Literary and Philosophical Society.
Public Library.
Newport (Mon.), Public Library.
Norfolk and Norwich Library, Norwich.
Nottingham Public Reference Library.

Oldham, Union Street Library.
Oxford, All Souls College.
Balliol College.
Bodleian Library.
Exeter College.
Keble College.
Magdalen College.
Manchester College.
Merton College.
Queen's College.
St. John's College.
Union Society.

Preston Library (Dr. Shepherd's).

Reading Free Public Library, Blagrave Street.
Ryde, I.W., Abbaye St. Pierre de Solesmes, Quarr Abbey

St. Andrews University.
Southport Free Library.
Stafford, William Salt Public Library.
Stonyhurst College, Whalley, Lancs.

Wimbledon Public Library.
Windsor Royal Library, Windsor Castle.
Workington Public Library.

York Public Library.
Yorkshire Architectural and Archæological Society, c/o G. Benson, Esq., Nunthorpe Road, Scarcroft, York.

BRITISH DOMINIONS AND INDIA.

Adelaide (South Australia), Public Library.
Adelaide (South Australia), University, Library.
Allahabad (India), University Library.

Bombay (India), University Library.
Brisbane (Queensland), Public Library of Queensland.
Brisbane (Queensland), University of Queensland.
Bulawayo (South Africa), Public Library.

Calcutta (India), Imperial Library.

Dunedin (New Zealand), Otago University Library.

Grahamstown (South Africa), Rhodes University College, Library.

Halifax (Nova Scotia), Legislative Library.

Johannesburg (South Africa), Public Library.

Lahore (India), University of the Punjab.

Melbourne (Victoria), Public Library.

Ottawa (Canada), Library of Parliament.

Patna (India), Patna College Library.
Perth (West Australia), Public Library.
Pretoria (South Africa), State Library.

Sydney (New South Wales), Public Library of New South Wales.
Sydney (New South Wales), University Library.

Toronto (Canada), Legislative Library of Ontario.
Toronto (Canada), Public Library.

Victoria (British Columbia), Provincial Library.

Wellington (New Zealand), General Assembly Library.

FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

BELGIUM.

Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale.

DENMARK.

Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliothek.

FRANCE.

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale.
Institut de France.
Université de Paris.
Strasburg, Université de.

SWEDEN.

Stockholm, Kungl. Biblioteket.

UNITED STATES.

Albany (N.Y.), New York State Library.
Amherst (Mass.), Amherst College Library.
Ann Arbor (Mich.), Michigan University Library.

Baltimore (Md.), Enoch Pratt Library.
John Hopkins University Library.
Peabody Institute Library.

Berkeley (Cal.), California University Library.
Bloomington (Ind.), Indiana University Library.
Boston (Mass.), Athenæum.
Public Library.
Brunswick (Me.), Bowdoin College Library.
Bryn Mawr (Pa.), Bryn Mawr College Library
Buffalo (N.Y.), Grosvenor Public Library.

Cambridge (Mass.), Harvard College Library.
Chicago (Ill.), Chicago Public Library.
Newberry Library.
University Library.
Cincinnati (Ohio), Public Library.

Detroit (Mich.), Public Library.

Grand Rapids (Mass.), Public Library.

Hanover (N.H.), Dartmouth College Library.

Ithaca (N.Y.), Cornell University Library.

Jersey City (N.J.), Free Library.

Lansing (Mich.), State Library.
Lawrence (Kans.), Kansas University Library.
Lincoln (Neb.), Nebraska University Library.

Madison (Wis.), State Historical Society of Wisconsin.
Milwaukee (Wis.), Public Library.
Minneapolis (Minn.), Athenæum Library.
Minnesota University Library.
Newark (N.J.), Free Public Library.
New Haven (Conn.), Yale University Library.
New Orleans (La.), Howard Memorial Library.
New York, Columbia University Library.
General Theological Seminary Library.
Public Library.
University Club Library.

Philadelphia (Pa.), Pennsylvania University Library.
Library Company of Philadelphia.
Pittsburg (Pa.), Carnegie Library.
Poughkeepsie (N.Y.), Vassar College Library.
Princeton (N.J.), Princeton University Library.
Providence (R.I.), Brown University Library.

Richmond (Va.), Virginia State Library

Stanford (Cal.), University Library.
St. Louis (Mo.), Public Library.
San Francisco (Cal.), Public Library
South Bethlehem (Pa.), Lehigh University Library.

South Hadley (Mass.), Mount Holyoke College Library.
Springfield (Mass.), City Library.

Terre Haute (Ind.), Indiana State Normal School Library.
Topeka (Kans.), Kansas State Historical Society.

Urbana (Ill.), Illinois University Library.

Washington (D.C.), Catholic University of America.
Wellesley (Mass.), Wellesley College Library.
Williamstown (Mass.), Williams College Library.

HISTORICAL SOCIETIES IN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

WHICH EXCHANGE TRANSACTIONS WITH THE ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Society of Antiquaries, Burlington House, London, W.
Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, Queen Street, Edinburgh.
The Hon. Society of Cymmrodorion, 63 Chancery Lane, W.C.
Surrey Archæological Society, Guildford.
Jewish Historical Society, Mocatta Library, University College, Gower Street, W.C.
The University, Manchester.

HISTORICAL SOCIETIES ABROAD

WHICH EXCHANGE TRANSACTIONS WITH THE SOCIETY.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

Kaiserl. Akad. der Wissenschaften, Vienna.
Königl. böhmischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Altstadt, c. Nr 562, Prague.

BELGIUM.

Académie Royale des Sciences, des Lettres et des Beaux-Arts, Palais des Académies, Brussels.
Académie Royale d'Archéologie de Belgique, Rue du Transvaal 53, Antwerp.
Société d'Archéologie de Bruxelles, 11 Rue Ravenstein, Brussels.

CANADA.

Toronto University.
Archives of the Department of Agriculture, Ottawa.

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE.

South African Library, Cape Town.

DENMARK.

Société Royale des Antiquaires du Nord, Copenhagen.

FRANCE.

Bibliothèque de l'Université de Toulouse, 2 Rue de l'Université, Toulouse, Haute-Garonne.
Revue des Etudes Napoléoniennes, 108 Boulevard St. Germain, Paris.
Société de l'Histoire de France, 60 Rue des Francs-Bourgeois, Paris.

Société d'Histoire Diplomatique, 18 Rue Vignon, Paris.
Société de l'Ecole Nationale des Chartes, 17 Rue de la Sorbonne, Paris.
Société des Antiquaires de l'Ouest, 20 Rue de l'Est, Poitiers.

GERMANY.

Historische Litteraturgesellschaft, Friedensstrasse 11, Berlin.

HOLLAND.

Commissie van Advies voor Rijks Geschied-kundige Publicatien The Hague.
Historisch Genootschap, Utrecht.

ITALY.

Reale Academia dei Lincei, Rome.
Reale Academia Lucchese di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti, Lucca.
R. Società Romana di Storia Patria, Rome.
Società di Storia Patria per la Sicilia Orientale, Catania, Sicily.

MEXICO.

Museo Nacional, D.F., Mexican Republic, Mexico.

NOVA SCOTIA.

The Nova Scotia Historical Society, Halifax, N.S.

PORTUGAL.

Academia Real das Sciencias, Lisbon.
Socieda de Portuguesa dos Estudos Historicos, Lisbon.

ROUMANIA.

Academia Romana, Bucharest.

SOUTH AMERICA.

Academia Nacional de la Historia, Carácas, Venezuela.

SPAIN.

Real Academia de la Historia, Calle del Leon 21, Madrid.

SWEDEN.

K. Universitets Biblioteket, Lund.
Kongl. Vitterhets Historie Antiquitets Akademien, National Museum, Stockholm.
The Royal Society of Antiquaries of Sweden, Stockholm.
The University, Upsala.

SWITZERLAND.

Allgemeine Geschichtsforschende Gesellschaft der Schweiz, Stadt, Bibliothek, Berne.
Historische und Antiquarische Gesellschaft, Basel, Sonnenweg, 15.

UNITED STATES.

The American Jewish Historical Society, c/o A. M. Friedenberg, Esq., 38 Park Road, New York.
The Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

New England Historic-Genealogical Society, 9 Ashburton Place, Boston, Mass.
The New York Historical Society, 170 Second Avenue, New York.
The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1300 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
The Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, Mass.
The Rhode Island Historical Society, Providence, R.I.
The Virginia Historical Society, 707 East Franklin Street, Richmond, Va.
The Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore, Md.
The South Carolina Historical Society, Charleston, S.C.
The New Jersey Historical Society, West Park Street, Newark, N.J.
The New Hampshire State Library, Concord.
The Connecticut Historical Society, Hertford, Conn.
American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, Mass.
Texas State Historical Society, Austin, Texas.
Illinois Historical Society, Springfield, Illinois.
Maine Historical Society, Portland, Maine.

The Council are not responsible for the accuracy of the foregoing list, but they request that any inaccuracy or omission may be pointed out to the Secretary, and that all changes of address may be notified to him, so that delay in forwarding communications and the Publications of the Society may be avoided.

TRANSACTIONS AND PUBLICATIONS

OF THE

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.*

Transactions. Old Series. Vols. 1 to 10 † (vols. 2 and 3 *out of print*).

Transactions. New Series. Vols. 1 to 20.
Third Series. Vols. 1 to 11.
Fourth Series. Vol. 1, 2. (Vol. 3 *in the press.*)

England and Napoleon in 1803. Being the Despatches of Lord Whitworth and others. Edited by Oscar Browning, M.A. 8vo. 1887. 5*s.*

Walter of Henley's Husbandry, together with an anonymous Husbandry, Seneschaucie, and Robert Grosseteste's Rules. Edited by E. Lamond and W. Cunningham, D.D., Litt.D. 4to. 1890. 12*s.*

The Domesday of Inclosures, 1517-1518. Edited by I. S. Leadam, M.A. 2 vols. 1897. 30*s.*

Bibliographies of the Right Hon. and Right Rev. Mandell Creighton, Bishop of London, the Right Rev. William Stubbs, Bishop of Oxford, Dr. S. R. Gardiner, and the Right Hon. John, Baron Acton. Edited by W. A. Shaw, Litt.D. 8vo. 1903. 5*s.*

Domesday Commemoration, 1886. Notes on the Manuscripts, etc., exhibited at H.M. Public Record Office. Vellum, 4to. 5*s.* per volume.

Gibbon Commemoration, 1894, Proceedings of the. Vellum, 4to. 5*s.*

Catalogue of the Library of the Royal Historical Society, 1915.

German Opinion and German Policy before the War. By G. W. Prothero, LL.D., Litt.D., F.B.A., V.-P. R.Hist.S. 1916. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Magna Carta Commemoration Essays. With Preface by the Right Hon. Viscount Bryce, O.M., F.B.A. Edited by H. E. Malden, M.A. 25*s.*

A Repertory of English Archives. Compiled by Hubert Hall, Litt.D., F.S.A., *Director*, assisted by Research Students of the University of London. [*In the press.*]

* These are only issued to Fellows and Subscribing Libraries, but copies of the Magna Carta Commemoration Essays and the Repertory of English Archives will be supplied on application. The price of the current number of the *Transactions* is 15*s.* Back numbers, Fourth Series, 10*s.*; Third Series, 10*s.*; New Series, 10*s.*; Old Series, 7*s.* 6*d.* Applications together with the postage should be addressed to the Librarian, Royal Historical Society, 22 Russell Square, W.C. 1.

† The earlier volumes of this Series were issued to Fellows in unbound parts. Any discrepancies in the lettering of bound volumes during this period are doubtless due to this circumstance.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE LATE CAMDEN SOCIETY,

CONTINUED (FROM 1897) AS THE CAMDEN SERIES OF THE ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.*

OLD SERIES.

1. Historie of the Arrivall of Edward IV. in England (1471). Edited by J. Bruce. (*Out of print.*)
2. Kynge Johan. A Play in two Parts. By John Bale. Edited by J. P. Collier. (*Out of print.*)
3. Alliterative Poem on Deposition of Richard II.; Ricardi Madiston de Concordia inter. Ric. II. et Civitatem London. Edited by T. Wright. (*Out of print.*)
4. Plumpton Correspondence. Letters written in the reigns of Edward IV., Richard III., Henry VII., and Henry VIII. Edited by Stapleton. (*Out of print.*)
5. Anecdotes and Traditions, illustrative of Early English History and Literature. Edited by W. J. Thoms. (*Out of print.*)
6. The Political Songs of England, from the reign of John to Edward II. Edited and translated by T. Wright. (*Out of print.*)
7. Annals of the First Four Years of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, by Sir J. Hayward. Edited by J. Bruce. (*Out of print.*)
8. Ecclesiastical Documents: viz.—1. A Brief History of the Bishoprick of Somerset from its Foundation to 1174. 2. Charters from the Library of Dr. Cox Macro. Published by the Rev. J. Hunter.
9. Speculi Britanniæ Pars: an historical and geographical Description of Essex, by John Norden, 1594. Edited by Sir H. Ellis. (*Out of print.*)
10. A Chronicle of the First Thirteen Years of the reign of Edward IV., by John Warkworth, D.D. Edited by J. O. Halliwell. (*Out of print.*)
11. Kemp's Nine Daies Wonder, performed in a Daunce from London to Norwich. Edited by Rev. A. Dyce. (*Out of print.*)
12. The Egerton Papers. Temp. Elizabeth and James I. Edited by J. P Collier. (*Out of print.*)

* These are only issued to Fellows and Subscribing Libraries whose subscriptions are fully paid at the following prices:—

Old Series, from 6*s.*
New Series, from 7*s.*
Third Series, from 10*s.*
Current volumes, 15*s.* each.

13. Chronica Jocelini de Brakelonda, de rebus gestis Samsonis Abbatis Monasterii Sancti Edmundi. Edited by J. G. Rokewode. (*Out of print.*)

14. Narratives of the Contests in Ireland in 1641 and 1690. Edited by T. C. Croker. (*Out of print.*)

15. The Chronicle of William de Rishanger, of the Barons' Wars, and the Miracles of Simon de Montfort. Edited by J. O. Halliwell. (*Out of print.*)

16. The Latin Poems commonly attributed to Walter Mapes. Edited by T. Wright. (*Out of print.*)

17. The Second Book of the Travels of Nicander Nucius, of Corcyra. Edited by Rev. J. A. Cramer.

18. Three Early English Metrical Romances. Edited by J. Robson.

19. The Private Diary of Dr. John Dee, and the Catalogue of his Library of Manuscripts. Edited by J. O. Halliwell.

20. An Apology for Lollard Doctrines, attributed to Wicliffe. Edited by J. H. Todd. (*Out of print.*)

21. Rutland Papers. Original Documents illustrative of the Courts and Times of Henry VII. and Henry VIII. Edited by W. Jerdan.

22. The Diary of Dr. Thomas Cartwright, Bishop of Chester, from August, 1686, to October, 1687. Printed from the original MS. of the Rev. J. Hunter.

23. Original Letters of Eminent Literary Men of the Sixteenth, Seventeenth, and Eighteenth Centuries. Edited by Sir H. Ellis.

24. A Contemporary Narrative of the Proceedings against Dame Alice Kyteler, prosecuted for Sorcery in 1324, by Richard de Ledrede, Bishop of Ossory. Edited by T. Wright.

25. Promptorium Parvulorum sive Clericorum, Lexicon Anglo-Latinum Princeps auctore fratre Galfrido Grammatico dicto, e Predicatoribus Lenne Episcopi, Northfolciensi, A.D. circa 1440. Edited by A. Way. Part I. (*Out of print.*) (*See* Nos. 54 and 89.)

26. Three Chapters of Letters relating to the Suppression of Monasteries. Edited by T. Wright. (*Out of print.*)

27. Correspondence of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leycester, 1585 and 1586. Edited by J. Bruce.

28. The French Chronicle of London. Depuis l'an 44 Hen. III. jusqu'à l'an 17 Edw. III. Edited by G. J. Aungier.

29. Three Books of Polydore Vergil's English History, comprising the Reigns of Henry VI., Edward IV., and Richard III. Edited by Sir H. Ellis.

30. The Thornton Romances. The Early English Metrical Romances of Perceval, Isumbras, Eglamour, and Degravant. Edited by J. O. Halliwell.

31. Verney Papers. Notes of Proceedings in the Long Parliament, temp. Charles I. Edited by J. Bruce.

32. The Autobiography of Sir John Bramston, K.B., of Skreens, in the Hundred of Chelmsford. Printed from the MS. of T. W. Bramston.

33. Letters from James, Earl of Perth, Lord Chancellor of Scotland, etc., to his Sister the Countess of Erroll, and other members of his Family. Edited by W. Jerdan.

34. De Antiquis Legibus Liber. Cronica Maiorum et Vicecomitum Londoniarum, 1178 to 1274. By. T. Stapleton.

35. The Chronicle of Calais, in the reigns of Henry VII. and Henry VIII., to 1540. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

36. Polydore Vergil's English History, prior to the Norman Conquest. Edited by Sir H. Ellis.

37. A Relation, or rather a True Account, of the Isle of England, about 1500. Translated from the Italian by Charlotte Augusta Sneyd.

38. Documents relative to the Foundation and Antiquities of the Collegiate Church of Middleham, Co. York, and notices of the Castle and Town. Edited by Rev. W. Atthill.

39. The Camden Miscellany. Vol. I.: 1. Register and Chronicle of the Abbey of Aberconway. Edited by Sir H. Ellis. 2. Chronicle of the Rebellion in Lincolnshire, 1470. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 3. Bull of Pope Innocent VIII., on the Marriage of Henry VII. with Elizabeth of York. Communicated by J. P. Collier. 4. Journal of the Siege of Rouen, 1591. By Sir T. Coningsby. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 5. Letter from George Fleetwood to his Father, giving an account of the Battle of Lutzen. Edited by Sir P. de Malpas Grey Egerton, Bart. 6. Diary of Dr. Edward Lake Archdeacon and Prebendary of Exeter, etc., in 1677 and 1678. Edited by G. P. Elliott.

40. A Commentary of the Services and Charges of William Lord Grey of Wilton, by his son Arthur Lord Grey of Wilton. Edited by Sir P. de Malpas Grey Egerton, Bart.

41. Diary of Walter Yonge, Justice of the Peace, and M.P. for Honiton, 1604 to 1628. Edited by G. Roberts.

42. The Diary of Henry Machyn, Citizen and Merchant Taylor of London, from 1550 to 1563. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

43. The Visitation of the County of Huntingdon under the authority of William Camden, Clarenceux King of Arms, 1613. Edited by Sir H. Ellis.

44. The Obituary of Richard Smyth, Secondary of the Poultry Compter, London 1627 to 1674. Edited by Sir H. Ellis.

45. Certaine Considerations upon the Government of England. By Sir Roger Twysden, Kt. and Bart. Edited by J. M. Kemble.

46. Letters of Queen Elizabeth and James VI. of Scotland. Edited by J. Bruce.

47. Chronicon Petroburgense. Edited by T. Stapleton.

48. The Chronicle of Queen Jane, and two years of Queen Mary. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

49. Wills and Inventories, from the Registers of the Commissary of Bury St. Edmunds and the Archdeacon of Sudbury. Edited by S. Tymms.

50. Gualteri Mapes de Nugis Curialium Distinctiones quinque. Edited by T. Wright.

51. The Pylgrymage of Sir Richard Guylforde to the Holy Land, 1506. Edited by Sir H. Ellis.

52. Moneys received and paid for Secret Services of Charles II. and James II., 1679 to 1688. Edited by J. Y. Akerman.

53. Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London. Edited by J. G. Nichols. (*Out of print.*)

54. Promptorium Parvulorum. Vol. II. (*See* Nos. 25 and 89.)

55. The Camden Miscellany. Vol. II.: 1. Account of the Expenses of John of Brabant and Henry and Thomas of Lancaster, 1292-3. Edited by J. Burtt. 2. Household Expenses of the Princess Elizabeth at Hatfield, 1551-2. Edited by Viscount Strangford. 3. The Request and Suite of a True-hearted Englishman, written by William Cholmley, Londyner, in 1553. Edited by W. J. Thoms. 4. The Discovery of the Jesuits' College in Clerkenwell in March, 1627-8. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 5. Trelawny Papers. Edited by W. D. Cooper. 6. Autobiography and Anecdotes, by William Taswell, D.D. Edited by G. P. Elliott. (*Out of print.*)

56. Letters and Papers of the Verney Family, to the end of 1639. Edited by J. Bruce. (*Out of print.*)

57. The Ancren Riwle. Rules and duties of Monastic Life. Edited by J. Morton, B.D. (*Out of print.*)

58. Letters of the Lady Brilliana Harley. Edited by T. T. Lewis.

59. Household Expenses of Richard de Swinfield, Bishop af Hereford, 1289-90. (*Out of print.*) (*See* No. 62.)

60. Grants, etc., from the Crown during the reign of Edward V. and two Speeches for opening Parliament, by John Russell, Bishop of Lincoln, Lord Chancellor. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

61. The Camden Miscellany. Vol. III.: 1. Papers relating to Proceedings in Co. Kent, 1642-1646. Edited by R. Almack. 2. Ancient Biographical Poems, on the Duke of Norfolk, Viscount Hereford, the Earl of Essex, and Queen Elizabeth. Edited by J. P. Collier. 3. A Relation of some Abuses which are committed against the Common-Wealth, 1629. Edited by Sir F. Madden, K.H. 4. Inventories of the Wardrobes, etc., of Henry FitzRoy, Duke of Richmond. And of Katherine, Princess Dowager at Baynard's Castle. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

62. Household Book of Bishop Swinfield. Vol. II. (*See* No. 59.)

63. Letters of Charles I. to Queen Henrietta Maria. Edited by J. Bruce.

64. An English Chronicle of the reigns of Richard II., Henry IV., Henry V., and Henry VI. Edited by Rev. J. S. Davies, M.A.

65. The Knights Hospitallers of England, 1338. Edited by Rev. L. B. Larking, M.A. (*Out of print.*)

66. Diary of John Rous, Incumbent of Santon Downham, Suffolk, from 1625 to 1642. Edited by Mary Anne E. Green.

67. Trevelyan Papers prior to 1558. Edited by J. P. Collier. Part I. (*See* Nos. 84 and 105.)

68. Journal of the Very Rev. Rowland Davies, LL.D., Dean of Ross, 1688-1690. Edited by R. Caulfield, B.A.

69. The Domesday of St. Paul's, 1222; or Registrum de Visitatione Maneriorum per Robertum Decanum, etc. Edited by W. H. Hale.

70. Liber Famelicus of James Whitelocke, a Judge of the King's Bench in the reigns of James I. and Charles I. Edited by J. Bruce. (*Out of print.*)

71. Savile Correspondence. Temp. Charles II. and James II. Edited by W. D. Cooper.

72. The Romance of Blonde of Oxford and Jehan of Dammartin. By Philippe de Reimes, a Trouvère of the Thirteenth Century. Edited by M. Le Roux de Lincy.

73. The Camden Miscellany. Vol. IV.: 1. A London Chronicle during the reigns of Henry VII. and Henry VIII. Edited by C. Hopper. 2. The Expenses of the Judges of Assize riding in the Western and Oxford Circuits, 1596-1601. Edited by W. D. Cooper. 3. The Skryvener's Play, The Incredulity of St. Thomas. Edited by J. P. Collier. 4. The Childe of Bristowe, a Poem by John Lydgate. Edited by C. Hopper. 5. Sir Edw. Lake's Account of his Interviews with Charles I. on being created a Baronet. Edited by T. P. Langmead. 6. The Letters of Pope to Atterbury, when in the Tower of London. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 7. Supplementary Note to the Discovery of the Jesuits' College in March, 1627-8. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

74. Diary of the Marches of the Royal Army during the great Civil War, kept by Ric. Symonds. Edited by C. E. Long.

75. Original Papers illustrative of the Life and Writings of John Milton. Edited by W. D. Hamilton.

76. Letters of George Lord Carew to Sir Thomas Roe, Ambassador to the Court of the Great Mogul, 1615-1617. Edited by J. Maclean. (*Out of print.*)

77. Narratives of the Days of the Reformation. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

78. Correspondence of James VI. of Scotland with Sir Robert Cecil and others in England, temp. Elizabeth. Edited by J. Bruce.

79. Letters written by John Chamberlain during the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Edited by Sarah Williams. (*Out of print.*)

80. Proceedings, principally in Co. Kent, in connection with the Parliaments called in 1640. Edited by Rev. L. B. Larking.

81. Parliamentary Debates in 1610. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D.

82. Lists of Foreign Protestants, and Aliens, resident in England, 1618-1688. Edited by W. D. Cooper.

83. Wills from Doctors' Commons, 1495-1695. Edited by J. G. Nichols. (*Out of print.*)

84. Trevelyan Papers. Part II. 1446-1643. Edited by J. P. Collier. (*See* Nos. 67 and 105.)

85. The Life of Marmaduke Rawdon of York. Edited by R. Davies.

86. Letters of Queen Margaret of Anjou and Bishop Beckington, and others. Temp. Henry V. and Henry VI. Edited by C. Monro.

87. The Camden Miscellany. Vol. V.: 1. Five Letters of Charles II. Communicated by the Marquis of Bristol. 2. Letter of the Council to Sir

Thomas Lake. 3. Documents relating to Sir Walter Raleigh's last vayage. Communicated by S. R. Gardiner. 4. A Catalogue of Early English Miscellanies formerly in the Harleian Library. Edited by W. C. Hazlitt. 5. Letters selected from the collection of Autographs in the possession of William Tite, Esq. 6. Sir Francis Drake's Memorable Service done against the Spaniards in 1587. By Robert Leng, one of his co-adventurers. Edited by C. Hopper. 7. Inquiry into the Genuineness of a Letter dated February 3rd, 1613, signed "Mary Magdaline Davers". (*Out of print.*)

88. Letters from Sir Robert Cecil to Sir George Carew. Edited by J. Maclean.

89. Promptorium Parvulorum. Part III. (*Out of print.*) (*See* Nos. 25 and 54.)

90. Letters and other Documents illustrating the Relations between England and Germany at the commencement of the Thirty Years' War. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D. (*See* No. 98.)

91. Registrum sive Liber Irrotularius et Consuetudinarius Prioratus Beatæ Mariæ Wigorniensis. By W. H. Hale.

92. Pope Alexander VII. and the College of Cardinals. By John Bargrave, D.D. Edited by J. C. Robertson.

93. Accounts and Papers relating to Mary Queen of Scots. Edited by A. J. Crosby and J. Bruce.

94. History from Marble. Compiled in the reign of Charles II. by Thomas Dingley. Printed in Photolithography by Vincent Brooks. Edited by J. G. Nichols. Vol. I. (*Out of print.*) (*See* No. 97.)

95. Manipulus Vocabulorum. A Dictionary of English and Latin Words, by Peter Devins, 1570. Edited by H. B. Wheatley.

96. Journal of a Voyage into the Mediterranean, by Sir Kenelm Digby, 1628. Edited by J. Bruce.

97. History from Marble. Vol. II. (*Out of print.*) (*See* No. 94.)

98. Letters and other Documents illustrating the relations between England and Germany at the commencement of the Thirty Years' War. Second series. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D. (*See* No. 90.)

99. Diary of John Manningham. 1602-3. Edited by W. Tite.

100. Notes of the Treaty carried on at Ripon between Charles I. and the Covenanters of Scotland, 1640, taken by Sir John Borough, Garter King of Arms. Edited by J. Bruce. (*Out of print.*)

101. El hecho de los Tratados del Matrimonio pretendido por el Principe de Gales con la serenissima Infanta de España Maria, etc. Narrative of the Spanish Marriage Treaty. Edited and translated by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D. (*Out of print.*)

102. Churchwardens' Accounts of the Town of Ludlow, in Shropshire, from 1540 to the end of the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Edited by T. Wright.

103. Notes of the Debates of the House of Lords. By Henry Elsing, Clerk of the Parliament, 1621. Edited by S. R. Gardiner.

104. The Camden Miscellany. Vol. VI.: 1. Life of William Whittingham, Dean of Durham. Edited by Mary Anne E. Green. 2. The Earl of Bristol's Defence of his Negotiations in Spain. Edited by S. R. Gardiner

LL.D. Journal of Sir Francis Walsingham, December, 1570, to April, 1583. Edited by C. T. Martin.

105. Trevelyan Papers. Part III. Edited by Sir Walter and Sir Charles Trevelyan. (*See* Nos. 67 and 84.)

NEW SERIES.

1. The Fortescue Papers, principally consisting of letters on State affairs, collected by John Packer, Secretary to George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D. Consists chiefly of a miscellaneous collection of letters which were apparently thrown aside by the Duke of Buckingham after he had read them. One Paper is of peculiar importance as relating to Raleigh's trial.

2. Letters and Papers of John Shillingford, Mayor of Exeter, A.D. 1447-1450, Edited by Stuart A. Moore. Valuable as throwing light on the practical working of our institutions and the administration of the law in the reign of Henry VI.

3. The Cheque Book of the Chapel Royal from the Reign of Elizabeth to the Accession of the House of Hanover. Edited by Dr. Rimbault. Full of notices of English Musicians connected with the Chapel, and of minute particulars of royal ceremonies, funerals, coronations, churchings, baptisms, marriages, etc. (*Out of print.*)

4. A True Relation of the Life and Death of William Bedell, Lord Bishop of Kilmore. Edited by Thomas Wharton Jones, F.R.S. Interesting not only for the light it throws on the working of the Church of Ireland at a most important period in its history, but also for the personal character of Bishop Bedell himself.

5. The Mayor of Bristol's Calendar, by Robert Ricart, Town Clerk of Bristol, temp. Edward IV. Edited by L. Toulmin Smith. Illustrative of municipal antiquities. (*Out of print.*)

6. Notes of Debates in the House of Commons in 1625. Edited from a MS. in the Library of Sir Rainald Knightley, Bart., by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D. Throws additional light on the quarrel between Charles I. and the House of Commons, and contains new facts relating to Sir John Eliot. (*Out of print.*)

7. A Military Memoir of Colonel Birch, Governor of Hereford during the Civil War. Edited by the late Rev. John Webb, M.A., F.S.A., and the Rev. T. W. Webb, M.A. A storehouse of curious facts relating to the period of the Civil War.

8 and 9. Letters addressed from London to Sir Joseph Williamson while Plenipotentiary at the Congress of Cologne in the year 1673. Edited by W. D. Christie, C.B. Two vols. Full of news from the Court of Charles II.

10. Account of the Executors of Richard, Bishop of London, 1303, and of the Executors of Thomas, Bishop of Exeter, 1310. Edited by the late Venerable W. H. Hale, M.A., and the Rev. H. T. Ellacombe, M.A., F.S.A. Full of curious details on the household and ecclesiastical furniture of a bishop of the fourteenth century.

11. Wriothesley's Chronicle of English Affairs from the Accession of Henry VII. to the First Year of Queen Elizabeth. Edited from a MS. in the possession of Major-Gen. Lord Henry Percy, by W. D. Hamilton, F.S.A. Two vols. Contains particulars not in other chronicles of the period. The Editor has printed in an Appendix to the First Volume the records of the trial of Anne Boleyn. (*See* No. 20.) (*Out of print.*)

12. Documents relating to the Quarrel between the Earl of Manchester and Oliver Cromwell; with Fragments of a Historical Preface by the late J. Bruce. Annotated and completed by Professor Masson. Gives information about the proceedings of Manchester and Cromwell from the battle of Marston Moor till after the second battle of Newbury, and also the arguments on both sides of the dispute which ensued.

13. Autobiography of Lady Halket, in the reigns of Charles I. and Charles II. Edited by the late John Gough Nichols, F.S.A. The subject is a pious lady of the days of the Commonwealth and the Restoration.

14. The Camden Miscellany, Vol. VII., containing: 1. Two Sermons preached by the Boy-Bishop. Edited by the late J. G. Nichols. With an Introduction by Dr. Rimbault. 2. Speech of Sir Robert Heath in the case of Alexander Leighton. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, with a Preface by the late J. Bruce. 3. Notes of Sir G. Croke's Judgment in the case of Ship Money. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 4. Letters relating to the Mission of Sir T. Roe to Gustavus Adolphus, 1629-1630. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 5. Accounts of the Expenditure in building Bodmin Church. Edited by the Rev. J. J. Wilkinson, M.A., Rector of Lanteglos.

15. Letters of Dean Prideaux. Edited by E. Maunde Thompson. The letters contain amusing descriptions of life at Oxford and in the country at the close of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth century. (*Out of print.*)

16. Milton's Common Place Book. Edited by A. J. Horwood. It is unnecessary to point out the interest of Milton's notes and jottings on a variety of subjects, political, social, moral, and literary.

17. Historical Collections of a London Citizen in the Fifteenth Century. Edited by James Gairdner. Printed from a MS. The poem is a very graphic original account of the siege of Rouen by Henry V. The chronicle is unique, ending in the middle of Edward IV.'s reign.

18. Papers relating to the Life of William Prynne, with the Fragment of a Biographical Preface by the late J. Bruce. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D.

19. Christ Church Letters relating to the Priory of Christ Church, Canterbury. Edited by J. B. Sheppard. Mostly of the fifteenth century, and some of political importance, relating to embassies, etc. (*Out of print.*)

20. Wriothesley's Chronicle. Vol. II. (*See* No. 11.) (*Out of print.*)

21. Harpsfield's Treatise of the Pretended Divorce between Henry VIII. and Catherine of Aragon. Edited by the Rev. N. Pocock. An early authority for many facts hitherto considered questionable concerning Henry VIII.'s reign, which are now more generally accepted than they were. (*Out of print.*)

22. Correspondence of the Family of Hatton, 1601-1704. Vol. I. Edited by E. M. Thompson. Full of news and gossip. May be taken as a fair sample of the correspondence of a family of the higher classes in the seventeenth century. (*See* No. 23.) (*Out of print.*)

23. The Hatton Correspondence. Vol. II. (*See* No. 22.) (*Out of print.*)

24. Notes of the Debates in the House of Lords officially taken by H. Elsing, 1624 and 1626. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D.

25. The Œconomy of the Fleete. Edited by Dr. A. Jessopp. An account of the state of the Fleet Prison in the time of James I. (*Out of print.*)

26. Documents relating to St. Paul's Cathedral. Edited by the Rev. W. Sparrow Simpson, D.D., F.S.A. Ranging from the thirteenth to the beginning of the eighteenth century.

27. The Hamilton Papers, 1638-1648. Edited from the Originals at Hamilton Palace by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D. Important for the history both of England and of Scotland during that troubled period. (*Out of print.*)

28. Three Fifteenth Century Chronicles. Edited by James Gairdner. (*Out of print.*)

29. The Puritan Visitation of the University of Oxford. Edited by Professor Montagu Burrows, F.S.A.

30. Catholicon Anglicum. Edited by Sidney J. Herrtage. A Mediæval Latin Glossary of great interest from a philological point of view. (*Out of print.*)

31. The Camden Miscellany, Vol. VIII., containing: Four letters of the Earl of Stafford, and a Poem on his illness. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D. Memoir by Madame de Motteville on the Life of Henrietta Maria. Edited by M. G. Hanotaux. Papers relating to the Delinquency of Thomas Viscount Saville, 1642-1646; Five Letters from Richard Thompson to his brother Henry Thompson, of Escrick, afterwards M.P. for York. Edited by J. J. Cartwright, M.A. Papers relating to Secret Negotiations with Charles I., 1643-1644. Edited by Mrs. B. M. Gardiner. A Letter from the Earl of Manchester on the conduct of Cromwell; Letters addressed to the Earl of Lauderdale. Edited by Osmund Airy. Letters of the Duke of Monmouth. Edited by Sir George Duckett, Bart. Correspondence of the Family of Haddock, 1657-1719. Edited by Edward Maunde Thompson.

32. The Voyage to Cadiz in 1625. Edited by Dr. Grosart.

33. Diary and Letter Book of Gabriel Harvey, 1573-1580. Edited by Edward J. L. Scott, M.A. Thows light upon University life at Cambridge in the age of Elizabeth.

34. Selections from the Papers of the Duke of Lauderdale, temp. Car. II. Edited by Osmund Airy. Three Volumes. Vol. I. 1639-1667. Vol. II. 1667-1673. Vol. III. 1673-1679. Illustrative of the period of the Restoration in Scotland.

35. Political Memoranda of the Fifth Duke of Leeds. Edited by Oscar Browning, M.A.

36. The Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. 1667-73. (*See* No. 34.)

37. Papers relating to issue of the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. Edited by the Rev. N. Pocock.

38. The Lauderdale Papers. Vol. III. 1673-79. (*See* Nos. 34 and 36.)

39. Proceedings in the Star Chamber and Court of High Commission in the year 1632. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D.

40. The Correspondence of Sir Edward Nicholas, Secretary of State, and of his son, Sir John Nicholas, Clerk to the Privy Council, Vol. I. Edited by George F. Warner, M.A. Supplementary to correspondence printed in Evelyn's Diary, with matter relating to the Court of Charles II. during his exile.

41. Custumals of Battle Abbey, temp. Edward I., from a Manuscript in the Public Record Office. Edited by S. R. Scargill Bird, F.S.A. Throws light on the tenure of land and manorial customs in the thirteenth century.

42. Bishop Pococke's Travels in England in 1750, etc. Edited by James J. Cartwright, M.A. Vol. I. (*See* No. 44.)

43. Monastic Visitations in the Diocese of Norwich. Edited by the Rev. Augustus Jessopp, D.D. These visitations show the state of monastic life in the diocese of Norwich on the eve of the Reformation.

44. Bishop Pococke's Travels in England. Vol. II. (*See* No. 42.)

45. Papers relating to the Impeachment of the Duke of Buckingham in 1626 Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D.

46. Memoirs relating to Lord Torrington. Edited by John Knox Laughton, M.A., R.N. Illustrative of naval affairs in the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth century.

47. The Essex Papers. Vol. I. Edited by Osmund Airy. Contains new matter relating to the Court of Charles II. and to the government of Ireland in his reign.

48. Visitations of the Collegiate Church of Southwell. Edited by A. F. Leach M.A., F.S.A. A set of visitations differing in character from those in No. 43, and most important to a complete study of clerical life in pre-Reformation times.

49. The Clarke Papers. Vol. I. Edited by C. H. Firth, M.A. More important for the life of Cromwell than any book published since the well-known work of Carlyle.

50. The Nicholas Papers. Vol. II. (*See* Nos. 40, 57, and 63.)

51. Accounts of the Obedientiars of Abingdon Abbey. Edited by R. E. G. Kirk.

52. Wardrobe Accounts of Henry Earl of Derby (afterwards Henry IV.). Edited by Miss Toulmin Smith, with the co-operation of the Historical Society of East Prussia. (*Out of print.*)

3. The Camden Miscellany, Vol. IX., containing: 1. Visitations of Churches in the Patronage of St. Paul's Cathedral. Edited by the Rev. W. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. 2. "The Spousells" of the Princess Mary, daughter of Henry VII., in 1508. Edited by James Gairdner. 3. Original Letters from the Bishops to the Privy Council in 1564. Edited by Miss Mary Bateson. 4. Papers relating to Thomas Wentworth. First Earl of Strafford. Edited by C. H. Firth, M.A. 5. Hamilton Papers, Addenda. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D. 6. Memoirs of Nathaniel, Lord Crewe.

Edited by the Rev. Andrew Clark. 7. The Journal of Major Richard Ferrier, M.P., during a tour in France in 1687. Edited by Richard F. E. and John A. H. Ferrier. (*Out of print.*)

54. The Clarke Papers. Vol. II. (*See* No. 49.)

55. Visitations of Churches belonging to St. Paul's Cathedral in 1297 and in 1458. Edited by W. Sparrow Simpson, D.D., F.S.A. (*Out of print.*)

56. The Archpriest Controversy. Vol. I. Documents relating to the dissensions of the Roman Catholic Clergy, 1597-1602. Edited from the Petyt MSS., by T. G. Law.

57. Nicholas Papers. Vol. III. (*See* Nos. 40 and 50.)

58. The Archpriest Controversy. Vol. II. Edited by T. G. Law. (*See* No. 56.) (*Out of print.*)

59. The Political Correspondence of the Duke of Newcastle, 1765-1767. Edited by Miss Mary Bateson.

60. The Narrative of General Venables, and other Papers relating to the Jamaica Expedition, 1655. Edited by C. H. Firth, M.A.

61. The Clarke Papers. Vol. III. (*See* Nos. 49 and 54.)

62. The Clarke Papers. Vol. IV. (*See* Nos. 49, 54, and 61.)

63. The Nicholas Papers. Vol. IV. (*See* Nos. 40, 50, and 57, and Third Series, No. 31.)

THIRD SERIES.

1. The Cely Papers: a Correspondence between Merchants of the Staple in London and Calais, 1477-1487. Edited by H. E. Malden, M.A.

2. The Despatches and Correspondence of John 2nd Earl of Buckinghamshire, Ambassador to the Court of Catherine II., 1762-1765. Vol. I. Edited from the originals in the Foreign Office and in family MSS., by Mrs. D'Arcy Collyer.

3. The Earl of Buckinghamshire's Correspondence. Vol. II.

4. The Camden Miscellany. Vol. X.—The Journal of Roger Wilbraham, Master of Requests, temp. Elizabeth and James I. Edited by H. Spencer Scott. The Diary of Sir Philip Hoby, 1547-1560. Edited by Edgar Powell. Prince Rupert at Lisbon. Edited by the late S. R. Gardiner, D.C.L.

5. The Diplomatic Correspondence of William Perwich from Paris, 1669-1677. Edited from the Foreign State Papers by Miss M. B. Curran, formerly of Girton College, Cambridge.

6. Collectanea Anglo-Premonstratensia. Edited from the Bodleian and Additional MSS., by the Right Rev. F. A. Gasquet, D.D. Vol. I.

7. Despatches relating to the Third Coalition against Napoleon, 1804-1805. Edited from the Foreign Office Correspondence, by J. H. Rose, Litt.D.

8. Records of the Presbyterian Movement in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Edited by Roland G. Usher, Ph.D., Harvard.

9. The State Trials of 1289-1290. Edited from the unpublished Records, by Professor T. F. Tout, M.A., and Miss Hilda Johnstone, M.A.

10. Collectanea Anglo-Premonstratensia. Vol. II.

11. The Records of the Eastland Company preserved at York. Edited by Miss Maud Sellers.
12. Collectanea Anglo-Premonstratensia. Vol. III.
13. The Camden Miscellany. Vol. XI.
14. The Relation of the Campaign in Germany (1624-36), by Sydnam Poyntz. Edited from the MS. in the *Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris, by the Rev. A. T. S. Goodrick, M.A., formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford.
15. The Diary of the Rev. Ralph Josselin (1616-1683). Edited by E. Hockliffe, M.A.
16. Despatches from Paris, 1784-1789. Edited from the Foreign Office Correspondence, by Oscar Browning, M.A. Vol. I., 1784-1787.
17. The Bardon Papers: Proceedings against Mary Queen of Scots in 1586. Edited by Conyers Reed, A.M. (Harvard), B.Litt. (Oxon.).
18. The Camden Miscellany. Vol. XII.
19. Despatches from Paris. Vol. II., 1787-1789.
20. John of Gaunt's "Register". Edited from the original MSS. in the Public Record Office, by Sidney Armitage-Smith, M.A. Vol. I.
21. John of Gaunt's "Register". Vol. II.
22. The Official Diary of Lieutenant-General Adam Williamson, Deputy-Lieutenant of the Tower of London, 1722-1747. Edited by J. C. Fox, F.R.Hist.S., Master of the Supreme Court of Judicature.
23. English Merchants and the Spanish Inquisition in the Canaries. Edited by Miss L. de Alberti and Miss A. B. Wallis Chapman, D.Sc., F.R.Hist.S.
24. The Essex Papers, 1675-1677. Edited by the Rev. Clement E. Pike, F.R.Hist.S.
25. The Chronicle of Novgorod, 1016-1471. Translated and Edited by Robert Mitchell, Nevill Forbes, M.A., and C. Raymond Beazley, D.Litt.
26. The Stiffkey Papers; the official papers of Sir Nathaniel Bacon of Stiffkey, Norfolk, 1580-1620. Edited by H. W. Saunders, M.A., F.R.Hist.S.
27. Henry of Bray's Estate Book (Harleston, Northants), 1289-1340. Edited by Miss Dorothy Willis.
28. Memoirs of the Families of Guise and Raymond (Seventeenth-Eighteenth Centuries). Edited by G. Davies, M.A., F.R.Hist.S.
29. The Stonor Family and other Mediæval Papers (Fourteenth-Fifteenth Centuries). Vol. I. Edited by C. L. Kingsford, M.A., F.S.A., F.R.Hist.S.
30. The Stonor Papers. Vol. II.
31. The Nicholas Papers. Vol. IV. (*See* Camden New Series, Vols. 40, 50, 57.)
32. The Camden Miscellany. Vol. XIII. (*In preparation.*)

The Council are not responsible for the accuracy of the foregoing list, but they request that any inaccuracy or omission may be pointed out to the Secretary, and that all changes of address may be notified to him, so that delay in forwarding communications and the Publications of the Society may be avoided.

ABERDEEN: THE UNIVERSITY PRESS