The Genealogist.

THE RED BOOK OF THE EXCHEQUER.[1]

Among the interesting confessions that have lately appeared in the new edition of *Who's Who*, we learn from the Bishop of Oxford that with him a favourite recreation is "making out pedigrees." When one, who is beyond compare our greatest living historian, can own thus frankly the fascination of genealogical research, it may justly claim exemption from the jibes to which it is, even now, at times exposed. But, indeed, as the Bishop has elsewhere observed :—

> The expansion and extension of genealogical study is a very remarkable feature of our own times. Men are apparently awaking to the fact that there are other families besides those described in the peerage, that these families have their records, played their part in history, furnished the bone and sinew of national action and left traces behind them which it behoves their descendants to search out and keep in remembrance. There is nothing in this that need be stigmatised as vain and foolish ; it is a very natural instinct ; and it appears to me to be one of the ways in which a general interest in national history may be expected to grow. It is an increasing pursuit both in America and England.[2]

In this paper, my special object is to call the attention of those who are not familiar with the subject to the work that is now being done for mediæval genealogy.

The so-called "Testa de Nevill," published by the Record Commission (1807), although printed from an often corrupt text (and not, it is said, with great exactitude), mis-described on the title-page, and somewhat imperfectly indexed, has proved to be of the greatest service to the historian of families and of lands. What is now, broadly speaking, being done by the Public Record Office is to continue publication downwards, through the fourteenth century, by those valuable calendars of Patent and Close Rolls, which, with their admirable Indexes, are models of learning and of skill. But, in addition to this, "the Red Book of the Exchequer," published a few months ago, marks an epoch for genealogists, carrying, as it does, the evidences upward to the middle of the twelfth century. It may be desirable briefly to indicate the nature of the information it contains for family history before proceeding to speak critically of its editing and of its preface.

As Domesday Book was a compilation from returns which determined the assessment of "geld," so the Red Book, viewed as a Feodary, was a compilation, chiefly due to Swereford, a well-known Exchequer official, from returns and records relating mainly to knight-service, and employed for the assessment of that feudal taxation which had virtually replaced the "geld." Of these, the most important are the returns of knight-

[1] *The Red Book of the Exchequer*. Edited by Hubert Hall, F.S.A., of the Public Record Office . . . under the direction of the Master of the Rolls.

[2] *Lectures on Mediæval and Modern History*.

service, made by direction of the Crown in 1166. Giving, as they do, the names and holdings of the feudal under-tenants, certified by their lords, the tenants-in-chief, their evidence is of cardinal importance for the history of the English gentry. Moreover, just as Domesday Book records the names of the tenants' predecessors twenty years before, on the eve of the Norman Conquest, so these returns, in a few cases, give us the names of the knights who "held" at the death of Henry I, in 1135. Two of the original returns are preserved at the Public Record Office, but for all the rest we are dependent on the transcripts subsequently made in "the little Black Book" and "the Red Book" of the Exchequer. The former, which are rather the better version, were published by Hearne, in the last century, but—although his text, perhaps, has been somewhat unduly depreciated—the absence of an index to the under-tenants has made his book practically useless. The Black Book and the Red Book versions have been collated for this edition, and as there is, of course, a full Index, genealogists have real cause to welcome this aid to their researches.

One regrets, however, for his readers' sake, that the editor speaks of these lists alternately as "charters" and "certificates," instead of simply terming them "returns," by which their character is best expressed. And I am surprised that he deems them "rather of the nature of certificates than of public instruments," considering that Swereford, whose "minute accuracy" he will not allow one to question, styles them "publica instrumenta."

Next in importance to these returns are the so-called "Inquisitions," or returns to an enquiry into knight-service under King John, of which the special feature is the entry of the localities in which the knightly tenants held their lands. The value of this addition is obviously very great. In connection with these may be mentioned the lists of tenants on the great "Honours," then in the hands of the Crown, and the interesting returns of tenure by serjeanty, a subject which has hardly yet received the attention it deserves. Lastly, connecting all these returns, we have the extracts from the Pipe Rolls, shewing the sums paid to successive "scutages" (or levies of feudal taxation) by the Crown tenants. As the published Pipe Rolls do not extend beyond "the Scutage of Ireland" (for Henry II's expedition), while these extracts take us nearly to the close of John's reign, their evidence is sometimes of value for the student of our early baronage. Such, in brief outline, is the Red Book of the Exchequer as a genealogical quarry.

It cannot be denied that its issue has been awaited with some impatience; several years have elapsed since it was announced as "in the Press;" and the title-page, I believe, originally bore the date 1893. We must not, however, complain of the delay, if it has enabled the editor to perfect still further his work. In offering some critical remarks on the way in which he has performed it, I desire not only to warn the student against some pitfalls in his path, but also to discharge the function of an expert in sustaining, by criticism, the high standard now attained in the official editions of our public records. And though I must here confine myself wholly to "the genealogical portion of the MS.," I cannot but mention that historians have even greater cause to be on their guard against the statements found within its covers.

When we approach the great returns of 1166, we find, as I have elsewhere shewn,[1] their history buried in confusion, owing to Swereford's failure to grasp it, and his consequent misleading statements. Mr. Eyton alone, so far as I know, approached the subject independently, and succeeded in throwing fresh light on it. Mr. Hall, however, takes upon himself to correct Mr. Eyton's view under the description of a "general impression" that the returns were made "to the King in person, in time to be brought under consideration at the Great Council of March 13, 1166" (p ccxvii). As no such Great Council is known to history, it is not easy to see how there can exist any "general impression" concerning it. It seems to have been evolved by Mr. Hall out of some confusion, on his part, with the Council of Clarendon. Again, in disputing the views of the late Mr. Eyton and myself, on the Honour of Arundel return in 1166 (a matter of interest to genealogists), Mr. Hall asserts that "the authorities who insist on the earlier date of this Inquest also maintain that the honour of Arundel was granted to William de Albini by Henry I" (p. ccvii). It is really intolerable to be charged by Mr. Hall, whether from carelessness or confusion, with a view which implies an absolute ignorance of the facts of the case, and which was as foreign to Mr. Eyton[2] as it is to myself.[3]

Genealogists have often been misled by Hearne having printed among the returns of 1166, the entries added subsequently, by another hand, in the Black Book. Under the heading "Date of the Black Book proved by later additions," Mr. Hall writes:—

> It is almost certain that the Black Book MS. was written during the early part of the reign of John. The hand is distinctly an official one of that period, and we have the following proofs that it was compiled about the seventh year of the reign . . . . We have the following remarkable evidence from the Barons' certificates themselves:—In the charter of William, son of Richard, an entry occurs, as a later addition, to the effect that William Briwerre holds Chesterfield by the service of one knight (p. 344).

Need I add that, on turning to p. 344, we find the "charter" to be that of Ralf, son of William, *not* of "William, son of Richard," and Chesterfield held by the service of half a knight, *not* "of one knight"? We must, however, proceed.

> The grant of Chesterfield was made in the sixth year of John, and therefore it follows that the MS., in which this addition was made, was written in or before that year (pp. lvi-lvii).

This looks very pretty, and Mr. Hall soon proceeds to build on this foundation:—

> We may now advance to the following definite conclusion, that in or about the year 1206, Swereford . . . compiled the existing Black Book of the Exchequer from the original certificates in the manner described in his Preface to the Scutages (p. lxii.)

But why select the year 1206, when the grant of Chesterfield, to which the compilation must (we learn) be anterior, was made on Sept. 27, 1204? The explanation, apparently, is found in this passage:—

> In the last entry of the charters, Theobald, son of Walter, is given as tenant. He was alive in 1205, but was dead apparently in 1207; therefore, as this entry is a later addition, the date should be between these years (p. lvii).

[1] *Feudal England*, p. 265.
[2] *History of Shropshire*, II, 201.
[3] *Feudal England*, p. 245; *Geoffrey de Mandeville*, p. 322.

Here we see that confusion of thought which is the characteristic of Mr. Hall's work. The dates imply that this entry could not be *later* than "1207" (or rather 14 Feb. 1206, for Theobald was dead before that date,[1] if not before 8 Oct. 1205[2]), or perhaps than (Aug. 4) 1205;[3] but they do not prove how *early* it may have been, and, therefore, do not, in any way, imply that it was between these years. Yet this is clearly Mr. Hall's "proof" that the MS. was compiled "about the seventh year" (May 1205—May 1206).

As a matter of fact, other entries, among these "later additions," refer to even earlier grants than that of Chesterfield. Amauri, the despencer, whose heirs are entered (p. 210) as holding land in Stanley-regis, Gloucestershire,[4] by knight-service, had received a confirmation of it from John, 24 April, 1204,[5] to say nothing of a previous one from Richard I. in 1193. So too, Alan Basset, who appears as tenant at Wycombe in another of these entries, obtained his estate there as early as 16 June 1203,[6] while his estates at Woking and Mapledurwell, of which he is similarly entered as tenant, were given him by Richard I. It was, indeed, under Richard that Theobald Walter had obtained Amounderness, of which he here appears as tenant. Others also are entered as holding "de dono regis Ricardi," while Eustace de Balliol is found in possession of a property his wife had brought him in marriage by 1190. If, therefore, Mr. Hall's argument proves anything, it is that the MS. to which these additions were made, was written in or before 1190! But the truth is that the argument is altogether wrong and proves only that he has yet much to learn in dealing with manuscripts.

Space will only allow of my alluding to the editor's wildly contradictory statements on the second chief item of genealogical interest, the "Inquisitions" under John. He has wholly misconceived the facts,—"but that is another story." I must, however, discuss another bewildering matter.

The fourth section of Mr. Hall's preface is devoted to an elaborate biography of his hero, Alexander de Swereford. It is illustrated by a wealth of references to original manuscript authorities. On p. xxxvii there is a statement of interest to genealogists :—

> In the cartulary of the Monastery of St. Peter there is mention of an Emma de Swereford, who granted two shillings rent "in vico fabrorum" to the Abbey of Tewkesbury (Cart. Mon. St. Peter, Glouc. [Rolls] i, 129). This Emma was possibly his mother, etc.

Such an entry would imply that Swereford's name was inherited; but, alas! there is nothing of the kind to be found on the page cited. Nor—though I have tried the Index under "Swereford," "Emma," "Tewkesbury," and "Gloucester"—have I yet succeeded in finding this important entry in the Cartulary.

Again, we read further on (p. xlv) :—

> "At some date between 1220 and 1230 we find Swereford recorded as the tenant with W. de Ralegh, of a knight's fee in Bix, Oxfordshire." (*Testa*, i, 446 and 471.)

[1] *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, p. 65.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 54.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 44.
[4] Left unidentified by Mr. Hall as "terra de Stanle (co. Hants)."
[5] Rot. Cart. 5 John.
[6] *Ibid.*

Now the date of the lists in the *Testa de Nevill* is a subject of the greatest interest to genealogists, and is one, moreover, with which, as editor of the *Red Book of the Exchequer*, Mr. Hall has had to concern himself. We are not told his reason for assigning the long lists in question[1] to the years 1220-1230, but, on turning to them, our eyes are caught by the words, "Feod' comitis Hereford' et Essex."[2] Now the Earl of Hereford cannot have acquired, at the earliest, the latter title till after the death in "1227" of the last Earl of Essex. A further clue to the date of these lists is afforded by the name of "Roes' de Verdun" (p. 101), for this great heiress did not obtain livery of the Verdun estates till 16 Hen. III (1231-2). So much for the date asserted by the editor. Incidentally, I may observe that Swereford's tenure "de comitissa Oxonie de feodo ejusdem comitis (Marescalli)" takes us back to Domesday itself, for the Countess was the descendant and heiress of that Bolebec who was so great a tenant of the Earl's "antecessor," Walter Giffard, in 1086.

As is justly observed by the editor, "the prominence of the genealogical and topographical information which this text contains" makes the Index and the principles of its construction matters of special importance. It is not, indeed, too much to say that the value, for the genealogist, of such a compilation as this, must largely depend on the editor's treatment of the names its lists contain. Mr. Hall has adopted what he rightly terms the "really scientific system of Record Indexing" adopted for the Record Office Calendars, by which the variants of every name are grouped together, with a cross reference under each form. It needs, however, an editor specially qualified for the work; for an identification, if erroneous, is worse than none at all. Mr. Hall describes thus the system he has adopted :—

> Personal names have been grouped together wherever there was a reasonable prospect of identification, and the numerous variants have been indicated by means of cross-references. The result, though far from complete or satisfactory, is highly instructive, and not a little diverting. A glance at the twenty variants of such a name as De Chaorciis will show the outward dissimilarity of even the best marked forms (p. cclxxvii).

Glancing, as invited, at this example, we find the following entry :—

> Chaorciis, Chausy, Chauce, Ceaseeha, Ceaseza, Cadurcis, Chauz, Chaosis, Chausie, Cauz, Chaus, Kaos, Kauz, Chaurces, Chaurcis, Chawrcis, Chahurcis, Chawrsis, Causes, Chaurchiis, Cauceis, Jorz, Chawrches.

Out of this "Kaos," as one may term it, we may obviously at once remove "Jorz," which is duly found as a place-name in Normandy, and which is, no less duly, found in the Hundred Rolls as "De Jorz." Even in this very index, we find under "Jorz," not "*see* Chaorchiis," but "*see* Guiz." One need only add that under "Guiz" variants no "Jorz" is to be found (p. 1193)!

Of the remaining forms it will at once be evident that nearly half of them have nothing whatever to do with the family of "De Chaorciis" (*i.e.* de Cahors[3]), but relate to the name "De Caux" in its various Latinized forms. Now observe that the editor's grouping not only

[1] pp. 100 et sq. in the printed *Testa*.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 102.
[3] This is considered, in France, to be its equivalent.

deludes the unwary by teaching them that all these forms are variants of "De Chaorciis," but drives the expert distracted by forcing him to hunt through them all, when he is in search of members of one of the two families. This confusion is the more unpardonable, as Dugdale, in his *Baronage*, treats separately of these distinct families. We have a similar instance in the entry under "Tanie":—

Tanie, Thania, Thanie, Thani, Thany, Tonay, Tany, Taili, Tornai, Tonai, Toany, Toeni, Tony, Touni.

Here we have, in hopeless confusion, the two utterly distinct families treated of by Dugdale under "Tani" and "Toeni." In this case the same criticisms apply as above. Let me be clearly understood. It is always possible, in a corrupt text, that names at all similar should be sometimes confused by a scribe. But this in no way justifies the editor in thus identifying the two. In the vast majority of cases, there can be no question; and the names should be indexed accordingly. In cases of doubt, a cross-reference should be given under both names. If we now return to the editor's own selected instance, we find not only names grouped together when distinct, but indexed apart when the same. There can be, for instance, no question that "Jacobus de Chaus" (p. 179) and "Jacobus de Calce" (p. 563) are one and the same. Yet the former is found under "Chaorciis" and the latter under "Calceo." Graver still is the total separation of entries under "Monte Dublel" from those under "Chaorciis." One would have imagined that the editor was acquainted with their identity, the more so as in the *Cartæ* we read: "dedit Paganus de Mundublel Hugoni de Chaurcis fratri suo." A conjunction, or even a cross-reference would have been of real service.

Those who have followed my remarks on this selected entry will probably agree that the result of its analysis is indeed "highly instructive and not a little diverting."

As a further illustration of the way in which the same individuals or families have been indexed separately as distinct (while others, which are distinct, have been indexed together as identical), we may take such an honour as that of Gloucester. Roger de Meysi, Maysy, or Maisi, who held eight or nine fees of the honour is the same as "Rogerus de Mayli viij milites" (p. 607), who is indexed as a different person. The same is the case with Roger de Reyni (p. 608), who is treated as different from Roger de "Reyli" (p. 559). William de Grafham (p. 610) or Graftham (p. 155) is similarly indexed as distinct from William de "Graphe" (p. 531), and "Elias Aureis testiculis" who held ten fees (p. 288) is not identified, as he should be, with Elias "Orescuil" on p. 223, though the equation is of great interest to the student of nomenclature. Another tenant, Michael de "Portmote" ("Portinote" in text) occurs on p. 608 as Michael "de Pormiun," but is indexed as a separate name (and without the "de"). Conversely, the family of "Clavile" or "Glavile" (pp. 288, 559, 608), large tenants of the honour, are converted (Heaven only knows why!) into Colevilles by the Index. Such is the result of examining the tenants on a single honour, where the variants of their names, obviously, should have presented no difficulty. There are other cases which

present little more. When for instance, we find Thomas "de Goldeburgo" holding the third of a fee from the honour of Lancaster on p. 69,[1] and Thomas "de Elgburgo" doing so on p. 568, it hardly seems to need much time or labour to identify the two, or to discover, further, their identity with Thomas "de Gutburgo" on p. 159, and with Thomas "de Goseburne" on p. 160. And yet these four are all indexed as distinct. I will close with the case of an unfortunate tenant of the honour of Boulogne. Although footnotes are almost proscribed in the Master of the Rolls' Series, Mr. Hall goes out of his way on p. 582 to append to the name "de Keu" the note "*Sic* in MSS., but it should be Keu (*i.e.* le Chien)," while accepting it on pp. 528-9 as "de Kau" without question. The same tenant appears in possession of the same fee on p. 800, but he is there metamorphosed into William "de Kaen[es]"! The same unfortunate man is indexed separately under "Cayo, Cayou," which forms are of special importance as proving the name to be disyllabic and thus tracing it to a fief in the Boulonnais.

Passing from personal to place names, it may at once be admitted that the task of identifying those in the Red Book is often a difficult and weary one. No one, I think, who has had experience of how arduous that task is would wish to be hard on an editor's occasional failure. But my position is this. It is far better to leave a name frankly unidentified than to positively assert its identity, assuring the reader that this has been verified by special research on its history. Mr. Hall describes his method thus:—

"It is necessary to utter a word of caution herein to those who might take exception to the modernization of many place-names in this Index . . . That many errors must have been committed in this attempted identification was inevitable, but the reader may be assured that no identification has been attempted here without long and anxious investigation. The place-names in this Index have in fact been subjected in turn to a three-fold scrutiny . . . Finally, they were subjected to a new and independent scrutiny by ascertaining whether the tenants or proprietors mentioned in the text agreed with those recorded in Domesday Book and in the various Charters, Feodaries, and Inquisitions of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. This last process naturally proved to be unspeakably laborious, but its results were highly important and instructive, and if it is not too much to say that no identification of early place-names can be regarded as satisfactory without this genealogical test" (p. ccclxxix).

This is, certainly, most impressive, and the conclusion is a sound one. We will now, however, take one of Mr. Hall's instances:—

"Aco, which eluded identification for nearly two years, was found as *Hough-on-the-Hill* in Lincolnshire. Angoteby, which is entered under Yorkshire, is probably the old local name of *Osgodby*, near Rasen" (p. ccclxxxii).

As to this last name, the Red Book places "Turkelby et Angoteby" among the Yorkshire fees of Nigel de Mowbray (p. 734). In the Index to Domesday we find "Ansgotebi," the only name of the kind, under Yorkshire; and in the text (327) we read "CUCVALT . . . Ansgoteby, Turchilebi." Turning accordingly to Coxwold, in the map of Yorkshire, we find Osgodby and Thirkleby, adjoining one another, close to it. Nothing, therefore, could be more certain. And yet Mr. Hall, in defiance of his text, wanders off to Rasen in *Lincolnshire*, in search of some obsolete name. Why?

[1] Compare *Testa de Nevill*, p. 406.

The above identification, I may add, took me just five minutes. As for "Aco," the entry "Abbas de Chereburc [tenet] Aco cum soca" gives the clue at once. One has only to look at Cherbourg in the *Monasticon* index, and about ten minutes' search will prove that Aco represents its "alien priory" at Hough.

Again, on p. 465, we read, "Rogerus Gernet tenet Siswic per serjanteriam forestariæ"; and this place, in the Index, is positively identified as "Syzick." Yet we have only to turn to the recognised parallel text, given in the *Testa de Nevill*, to find this interesting serjeanty given as that of "Fisewic" (p. 409), "Fissewik" (four times), "Fissewyk," and "Fiskewyk"[1] (p. 410), and finally as "Fisewyk" (p. 411). Has then Mr. Hall referred, even in this simple manner, to "the Feodaries and Inquisitions of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries"? No, he has simply made a shot, and a bad shot. The place, of course, is Fishwick, a township of Preston.

I will now glance at some other identifications. "Goketone," Norfolk, a Heliun manor (p. 601)—the "Gutheketuna" of Domesday, which places it in "Ensford" Hundred—is now Guton in Brandeston. Mr. Hall suggests for it Tuttington (the "Totintona" of Domesday), which never belonged to Heliun, and was not in Eynford Hundred. For "Brichelmstone" (Oxon) Brighton (!) is similarly suggested. It was, of course, the "Bristelmestone" of Domesday, now Brighthampton. But these identifications are only, I repeat, suggested. Mr. Hall feels on surer grounds with "the ward fees of Dover Castle," which cost him prolonged labour (p. ccclxxxii). Among the fees of the Constable himself, whose "honor constabulariæ" is so conspicuous in the Red Book, we find "Bedenestede" entered, under various forms, in no less than six places. In one of these it is identified by the text as "Bedenestede in Essex" (p. 742). This is the "Bedenesteda" of Domesday, of which the name, it is believed, only survives now in Bensted Common. Mr. Hall gives us, for this entry, "Bensted, co. Essex," but for the five others, "Bensted, co. Kent." Why? In two of them it is distinctly entered under Essex and Herts, in the other three there is no clue, but it is obviously the same fee. A precisely similar example is found immediately after it. "Scoleghe in Essexa" (p. 743) is in the same honour, and its tenant is the same Robert de Scales. It is entered under Essex in Domesday, as "Estoleia," and, like "Bedenesteda," had descended as part of the honour. Yet Mr. Hall identifies it positively, in its three other Red Book entries with "Soles" (? Sole Street) in Kent (p. 1302), a manor which can be positively shewn to have belonged to another barony, that of Crevequer (represented in Domesday by Ansfridus), and duly held of it, as one fee, by William "de Soles" in the Red Book! Really, these names present no special difficulty: I have dealt with them on the very principles laid down by the editor himself. Had he but followed them in practice, as he professes to have done, he could not have thus erred, to the lasting confusion of the student.

I will conclude with a crowning instance. We read in a list of the honour of Boulogne: "Robertus filius Rogeri VII milites in Torp,

[1] Compare the "Fiscuic" of Domesday.

Widone, Andagane, Massingham, etc." My suspicions being roused by the resemblance of the second and third place names to Widon' Andagav' (that is "of Guy the Angevin"), I turned to the Boulogne fief in Domesday, and there read: "Hoc totum tenet Wido Angevin[us]." This at once explained the matter. Norfolk was a county rich in Thorpes, and that which was held by the ancestor of the Claverings (for Blomefield is here hopelessly at sea) was distinguished by our forefathers from its Domesday tenant, as the Thorpe "of Guy the Angevin." Yet the editor actually converted his name into two Norfolk villages, and proceeded to scour the county for anything resembling them. The result is seen in the Index, where we find the imaginary "Andagane" positively identified as "Antingham," while the fatal entry "*Witton*, see Widone" is still found on p. 1357. Now as "Andagane" and "Widone" had no existence save in Mr. Hall's imagination, this case is a conclusive test of his method of identification. They were shots, pure and simple. Long after all the text, and indeed when most of the Index, had been printed off, Mr. Hall seems to have discovered the error he had clung to so long, for we find under "Widone" a reference to "Torp," and on p. 1331, "Torp [Widonis Andegavensis]" identified as "Gunthorpe." Yet, strange to say, even here, Mr. Hall contrived to go wrong. For whatever it was, the place clearly could not be Gunthorpe, which is not in Depwade Hundred, and which as "Gunatorp," etc., was not held in 1086 by Count Eustace of Boulogne. The "Torp," which Domesday assigned to him, was not Gunthorpe in the north, but (as is well ascertained) Ashwell Thorpe in the south of the county.

At the risk of wearisome iteration, let me again explain that I am not criticising mere neglect or those occasional mistakes which are, of course, inevitable. What I complain of is the assurance given, as we have seen, to those who consult this work, that the identifications it contains have been subjected to certain tests, to minimise the possibility of error. It is clear that, in the instances cited above, these tests cannot have been applied, and that the searcher must not rely on their being, as alleged, the fruit of "long and anxious investigation." Only those engaged in genealogical enquiry can appreciate the endless trouble that will be caused in future by erroneous identifications, personal and topographical, when given by a responsible editor, in an official publication, with the assurance of proofs, for which proofs, of course, search will be made in vain. I feel, therefore, that I am performing an essential, though painful task, in subjecting to expert scrutiny this important Index, and placing genealogists on their guard.[1]

J. H. Round.

[1] I should mention, perhaps, *carendi causâ*, although most reluctant to allude to the subject, that the "invaluable corrections and suggestions" I am stated by the Editor to have offered "in the preparation of the Index," were limited, not by my willingness to help, but by the restrictions placed on me, and, of course, by the willingness of the responsible Editor to accept them. As to the wider issue, it is obvious that in the present day no self-respecting scholar could consent to hush up or deny, out of sentiment, the grave errors made by Swereford, when they have been placed beyond question.