his plan accordingly. If this had been so, the regiments of the lord general and Colonel Ballard must have been at a considerable distance from the right wing. But, if May may be believed, they were in close proximity to it, so that Essex, at the crisis of the fighting, was able to head and lead up into action his own troop (in Stapleton's regiment) and his regiment of foot successively. Ballard's too is named by Fiennes and May as one of the regiments on which the brunt of the battle fell, in forcing the king's centre. All may, it seems to the present writer (though as a civilian he would only speak on such a matter with entire submission to those qualified to form a professional opinion), be made intelligible by supposing the centre to have been *écheloned* on the *left* brigade, not the right.

c. The third difficulty only arises from this, that two authorities, both present in the battle, seem to place the prince of Wales's regiment of horse on opposite sides of the field. Clarendon, in a cancelled passage of his original manuscript of the history,¹ says that Lord Aubigny was killed in the charge with the left wing of horse, in which he commanded a troop. This troop, if the spy's report (No. 21) may be believed, was in the prince of Wales's regiment. On the other hand, Sir Richard Bulstrode, who tells us (p. 75) that he served in another troop in the same regiment, declares explicitly and circumstantially that the regiment charged with Rupert, i.e. on the right wing. Bulstrode's evidence, as has been intimated already, should be accepted cautiously; still he could not well have been mistaken on such a matter, and unless we set down his authority as absolutely worthless, for which there does not seem sufficient reason, we must conclude that either the spy or Clarendon was mistaken; that is, either Lord Aubigny had no command in the prince of Wales' regiment, or Clarendon is wrong in saying that he charged with the left wing.

T. ARNOLD.

THE SQUIRE PAPERS.

As the owner of the 1627 prayer book containing various entries tending to confirm some of the statements of Carlyle's correspondent, William Squire, I wish to offer a few comments on the use made of its contents by the contributors to the *ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW* on this subject.

Mr. Aldis Wright carefully examined this prayer book before he published the account given at p. 312 of the April number of the *Review*. Finding numerous extracts from authentic sources bound up with the book, he searched chiefly those to confirm the truth of the papers in his hands. Mr. Walter Rye subsequently looked through the book with me, chiefly among the scattered entries, for discrepancies or evidence of what he called forgeries, a term hardly applicable to various extracts obviously brought together for family purposes and not for public use. This view was evidently more conspicuous to the one contributor than to the other. Based on these data, the first account has the advantage of clearness and simplicity. Compare the statement, at p. 312, that Carlyle's correspondent was 'the eldest of the twelve children of Matthew Squire, merchant,

¹ Vol. iii. 286, note q.

of Norwich. . . . His father came from Peterborough and was the son of Lieutenant John Squire, R.N. &c.' with that given in the October number, p. 744, where Mr. Rye writes: 'I find that a William Squire, no doubt the same man, was one of the children of Matthew Squire, . . . said . . . to have been the son of Lient. John Squire, R.N., of Peterborough,' and further on: 'I have ascertained that he was actually descended from a Thomas Squire, born 1682,' &c. This Thomas Squire, of Peterborough, was well known; he is frequently referred to in these memoranda, and his position as well as that of his other descendants is in no way exaggerated or misstated; indeed, Mr. Rye acknowledged to me that many particulars which he had previously doubted were, in his own words, 'proved up to the hilt' by the pages bound up with this prayer book which he now disparages. The inaccuracies into which the compiler of the book now in my hands has fallen, seem to me less in number and importance than those presently to be noticed in the rather one-sided view of the subject given by Mr. Rye, to whose article the following comments are directed.

Before dwelling on the trivial corrections required, some points with reference to this prayer book should be stated, and the relative value of different entries considered. There is proof in the book itself that it was not rebound before 1849, and some evidence of entries having been made in it after the binding, both subsequent to the then owner's interviews with Carlyle. Inside the cover, under an armorial sketch made by W. Squire about the time of his marriage,¹ and pasted on afterwards, is this note in his later writing: 'I had this Book fresh bound in London & copied the extracts from the family prayer Books and other memoranda W^m Squire;' in two modern fly-leaves are miscellaneous copies from writs of array and burgess rolls in the British Museum, with references to each; then come two inserted leaves of letter paper neatly written and headed: 'copied verbatim from the old prayer Book belonging to My Grandfather Mr. John Squire Lieut. R.N. of Peterboro'.'

After the original fly-leaf, with the paper mark in red, is an inserted leaf, another after 'An Almanacke for XL yeeres' (from 1627 to 1666), two after the 'Proper Lessons,' three before 'The Psalmes of David,' and one before the metrical psalms; this last has some later notes continued on to a loose slip of paper. With this exception the other nine inserted leaves, with nearly seventeen neatly written pages, are filled with family details directly relating to the writer and with nothing else. At the end of the book the two fly-leaves and inside cover of the new binding are disfigured with the later absurdities which Mr. Rye makes sufficiently ridiculous at pp. 754 and 755; these are of small significance, and have nothing to do with the book, of which they formed no part until after the rebinding.

The really important evidence is to be found on the original fly-leaves and in the marginal notes; these are of two kinds, some admittedly old and others in the handwriting of the compiler; some of these seem to show that he had documents before him to copy from. This part of the evidence is confused to an astounding degree at p. 753 of the Review.

¹ It is dated 1840: his marriage took place on 21 April 1840, at St. Anne's, Soho, London.

The note beginning 'Ann Clements' is on the inner side of the first fly-leaf; it is written, in a well-marked woman's hand, with dark ink; below is a further calculation up to 1847, and below that is written 'Mr^s Lawsell was Eliz Squire daughter of Tho^s Squire of Yaxley and Peterboro. Ann Clements married W^m Squire of Westgate Peterboro. G. Son of T. Squire.

It may be added that Mrs. Lawsall was the eldest daughter of the Thomas Squire before mentioned, aunt and godmother to this William Squire to whom she left the book; also that Ann Clements was his second wife, she and two children by his first wife dying before him, and that he was high sheriff of the joint counties of Huntingdon and Cambridge in 1807, that he was half-brother to Lieutenant John Squire, and that he died at Peterborough in 1828. Both were living at Peterborough when the Norwich great-nephew and grandson was at school at Oundle, and had, as he says, access to old books and papers during the holidays he passed with his aged relatives. This, a genuine manuscript, written in 1809, proves the book to have been a family possession before it passed to Norwich. There is also an entry in lighter ink on the outer side of this fly-leaf probably of the eighteenth century, but obscure, and the paper near it discoloured. The fly-leaf at the end of the book is similarly discoloured around the outer edges; it has a watermark the same as the red mark on the first leaf; it is not written upon.

The much-discussed signature 'Samvel Squire Thrapstone' is on the inner side of the middle fly-leaf before the metrical psalms. The paper is the same as all the other leaves of the book; the edges retain some of the original colour, they have not been trimmed or altered in the last binding, and the whole is one book much as it used to be. The signature is in a free round hand in brown ink, showing through at places on to the outer side of the leaf; under it in cramped capitals, with the V-shaped U and in pale brown ink, the name occurs again, and may be an earlier signature. There are two kinds of old writing on the first leaf and two here, one of them undoubtedly old. The marked difference between three of them makes it impossible to speak of them together. Which, then, is the 'genuine manuscript of p. 753? The upper one on the middle fly-leaf seems to be the one allowed. If so, nine marginal notes, two in the body of the book and seven in the metrical psalms, must be allowed to go with it; this is admitted by all who see the book, and was so apparent to Mr. Rye that he frankly told me he was disposed to consider the signature itself a forgery.

The point in which he differs from the authorities at the British Museum is in attributing this writing to the eighteenth instead of the seventeenth century. I have myself some copies of manuscript medical notes dated 1627 with certain letters formed like those in question. On the first leaf of Weber's edition of Beaumont and Fletcher's works (Edin. 1812) are given in *fac-simile* three passages from 'The Faithful Friends': the first is in a clear and very legible writing; the second has the open or German *r*, as in these notes, but in a more cramped writing and with an old form of *e*; the last is in the more open letters and flowing style of the writing in question, and not unlike it except as to the small *r*, and the use of *v* for *u* or *vice versa*. On my copy of the Εἰκὼν βασιλική

(John Williams: 1649) opposite the emblem is an English rhymed explanation written in a flowing open character, closely resembling that in this prayer book; and, by a curious coincidence, on exactly the same paper with a similar watermark to that on the fly-leaf of the prayer book; this mark is a vase or ewer with three trefoil points radiating from it surmounted by a flower and crescent; the crescent is marked on the neck of the ewer in the coloured impress; D B or B is seen on the body of the vase in all of them.

Next comes a most serious error; three out of the nine entries, viz. Nos. 4, 5, 6, given as '*certainly forgeries*,' were specially pointed out to me at the British Museum as undoubtedly by the same hand as the signature, and Nos. 4 and 5 probably of the same date—about 1654; after 1660 no entry in this writing recurs. Three or four marginal notes against the psalms for the day, referring to events at Yaxley from 1665 to 1669, if written by W. Squire are warranted by the extracts from the parish register bound up with the book. He has entered the death of his own wife in 1851 against the day of the month on which she died. This seems to have been an old custom. If he copied a memorandum of Thomas Squire in an older hand, he most likely had an example before him. This is probably the reason why the open *r* appears in the four or five entries referring to Cromwellian encounters; a variation in the spelling, as of 'Nasebie' and 'Siege,' also points to some other copy than the entries in the metrical psalms; moreover, those entries against the psalms for the day are closely written in dark ink, so as to look well on the page, and with no general resemblance to the free and open formation of the old letters, except as to the one evidently considered as characteristic, the object obviously being a mere record and not a forgery. If this charge is to be sustained it must embrace two or three different kinds of attempts, and, as it now stands, implies a pre-existent forger of the name, *circa* 1780. At p. 754 the difference as to 'browner ink' can hardly apply; if it means a light brown ink this might fairly serve to mark the oldest writing, but not that of the note of 1809. A line further on, the use of the old *r* is not correctly stated by Mr. Rye; perhaps the entry adduced from below Psalm lxxxi. is confused with an 'Oliuer' opposite Psalm lxxxix. There are 'genuine' old marks and brackets in two places opposite Psalm lxxxiii. where the open *r* is used; one of them is half concealed in the rebinding; it seems to me the late owner of the book was not fully aware of the value of these marginal marks to the metrical psalms.

All that follows in Mr. Rye's contribution, as of least importance and of the small significance stated at the outset, will be noticed last, after the minor points open to controversy have been mentioned in the order of their occurrence. First, at p. 744, the date of birth is given as that of baptism: a new-born infant would not be taken in November to the parish church. At p. 745, a lad of sixteen or under seventeen years of age is made responsible for a hoax in which several others, one certainly older than himself, are concerned. Mr. Thunder was not his brother-in-law until some years after the occurrence referred to—the sister he married was not ten years old in August 1826. In a footnote it is asserted—and this to disprove the accuracy of W. Squire as to 'the

shadow of a cathedral city'—that his family had not been in Peterborough one hundred years. This assertion is inaccurate; his great-grandfather, second son of Thomas, was born there in 1710; his grandfather died there in 1884. If Oundle, Islip, Yaxley, and Woodstone are to be called in the shadow of that city, the first statement is fairly correct. One Kelham Squire was living at Oundle before 1641. Thomas, of Peterborough, died at Islip, and was buried at Yaxley; my own elder brother was born at Woodstone, nearer to Peterborough than is Yaxley. At p. 746, the date at which an 'intelligent interest' was shown by W. Squire in Cromwellian relics is very nearly that at which the prayer book and other old papers came into his possession. The stirrups are acknowledged, in a footnote, to be of the period supposed. Further on it is considered probable that a young man of one-and-twenty described by 'his friends' (?) on the previous page as associating with the shadiest sporting characters should take home to read from the Norwich library such works as those of Rushworth, Whitelocke, Rapin, Burnet, Guizot, and Lingard.

The unusual christian names, p. 747, might have been increased from those of the transcriber's own family name. Besides Kelham of the Oundle register, 'William sonne of Kelham baptised 31. Oct. 1641,' there are the two Scipios, one of them registered at St. Clement Danes, 1580; Adam of Balliol, 1567; Theophilus and Gabriel, 1660; Rowland and Gaius, Eaton Socon, Beds, 1624–1661; Cornelius and Marmion, St. Neot's, 1710 and 1754.

Again, W. Squire has copied family facts carefully and deliberately; the transcript of the disputed letters might much of it have been ready before he wrote to Carlyle or knew precisely what use to make of it (see first letter, at p. 312); it was on larger paper than the 8 in. × 6 in. on which the family details were written for incorporation with the prayer book. We see, by what of original manuscript is left, that the handwriting he copied from was remarkably clear and bold; not at all like the 'crabbed writing' (p. 747) of the earlier part of the seventeenth century.

At p. 748 the search for any purchase in the four counties named failed to discover that of the manor of Eaton Socon in 1624 by Rowland Squire, and of another in 1640 as stated in Lysons's 'Magna Britannia, 1818, County Histories,' vol. i. part 1; Gaius Squire² enforced the induction of his nominee to the vicarage of Eaton Socon, 1686, by a *quare impedit* against the bishop. Gaius witnessed a deed in the court rolls of the united manors of Eynesbury (? and St. Neot's), 8 Jan. 1679–80; he died in 1691.

A negative is difficult of proof. It would be hard to prove where Cromwell was not at any particular time within certain limits of space; at p. 749 it appears that Cromwell was within eight miles of where the letter is dated on that day. The sister Agnes mentioned at p. 750 was the sixth in the family, and younger than the one already referred to.

² As a further proof that he was not on the high church side, Gaius Squire was named in 1687 as J.P. for the county of Bedford when James II suspended the penal laws against nonconformists—both papists and dissenters. He seems to have inclined to the latter party, and was one of those 'presumably not opposed to the Declaration of Indulgence.'—*John Bunyan, his Life, Times, and Work* (p. 362). By John Brown, B.A. (London, 1885.)

At p. 751 the fact, not proclaimed by, need not have been known to, the writer; his wife's mother became Lady Playters after her daughter's birth, but the property descended to the daughter's children by her first marriage.³

To an objection which follows we may remark that Admiral Squire and Matthew Squire of Norwich were second cousins. The word 'ancestor' was used loosely; the admiral was unmarried. At p. 752 a similarly loose use of 'ancestors' is made. Samuel is shown in the prayer-book not to have been the ancestor of any of the branch the owner took such interest in, and was so intimately acquainted with. All his nearer and more prosperous relatives had settled in Norfolk and Suffolk; some had helped him in his difficulties. On the same page it is said 'he was educated to a great extent abroad;' this is doubtful, while his education at Oundle is certain.

Lastly, we return to the particulars, somewhat irrelevant, dealt with on p. 755. The William Squire of London, to whom a grant of arms is established, had a younger brother Thomas, both sons of a William Squire. His eldest son was named Thomas; it might be from either of these or from a younger son, John, that the Yaxley people claim. The rector of Great Massingham, Norfolk (1790), was, I suppose, a descendant of Thomas of Hinxford; this rector's son John became rector of Lavenham, Suffolk, up to 1760; he was the father of Dr. John Squire, of Ely Place, London, one of the founders of the society for the relief of the widows and orphans of medical men; his son, Lieutenant-colonel John Squire, of the Royal Engineers, lost his life in Spain during the Peninsular war. Thomas's elder brother William had four sons and six daughters: the eldest of these sons was Thomas; the second, Rowland, who settled, 1684, in Bedfordshire close to St. Neot's; the third, John; the fourth, George. They trace through the first William four generations back to Thomas Squire of Heanton-on-Chardon, Devon.⁴

A significant proof may here be given from Mr. Rye's article of how a sagacious critic can shut his eyes to evidence which makes against his own position. On p. 754 he quotes the testimony of experts that the inscriptions on the brasses are 'clumsy forgeries,' and that 'a very superficial knowledge of such inscriptions ought to have enabled William Squire to have produced better examples.' On p. 756 he claims to have given a *coup de grâce* to the inscription by showing that it is a 'verbatim transcript, dates and all,' of a genuine brass. Surely this discovery is a serious blow to the previous testimony of the experts. The clumsy forgery is after all a *verbatim* transcript of a genuine brass of the same date. Its 'knowledge of ancient forms' is by no means 'superficial.' Does not this tend to show that experts are by no means infallible? Does it not weaken Mr. Rye's testimony in other points where he has relied on internal evidence?

In conclusion, it must be admitted that many of the later statements of Carlyle's correspondent are confused, and, where he trusts to memory

³ See *ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW*, i. 312.

⁴ *Harleian Society's Publications*, vol. xix., and *Harl. MS.* 1091. 55, extracted by John Terrius Squire, who refers me to Drake's *Eboracum*, pp. 842, 570, for Squires who were *armigeri* before 1640 elsewhere and besides those mentioned at p. 755.

or impressions, untrustworthy. Yet all that he told Carlyle about his family is confirmed by the book in my possession, and all the entries referring thereto are strictly truthful. Why should he insert notes of false papers amidst so many facts of private interest only and for personal use? Admit that he knew something of coins, and dabbled in archæology, also his inclination to a hoax in his youth, he had not the knowledge or literary skill then or later to forge these letters attributed to Cromwell; and, as a practical joke, two or three letters would have answered that purpose as well as thirty-five. His education was imperfect, his character and conduct far from irreproachable; but the evidence tends to show that he could not have forged these letters had he wished. Carlyle's estimate of him was, generally, a correct one, and particularly in the opinion that 'all manner of truth refracted itself in getting into him, and in getting out of him.'

WILLIAM SQUIRE.

UNPUBLISHED LETTERS OF OLIVER CROMWELL.

SIX of the following letters are from the Egerton MSS. in the British Museum (No. 2620). To these three from newspapers and pamphlets of the period have been added in order to supplement certain of the letters printed by Carlyle, and for convenience of reference. C. H. FIRTH.

I

Mercurius Aulicus for 30 April 1645 describes Cromwell's attempt to storm Farringdon on the morning of 30 April, and states that Cromwell lost 200 killed, a captain, an ensign, and 8 soldiers prisoners, and had a large number of wounded. Under 1 May it prints the following letter, which is in striking contrast to the two printed by Carlyle (letters xxvi. xxvii.)

'Next morning Master Cromwell sent this letter of thanks to Lieutenant Colonell Burgess.

SIR,—There shall be no interruption of your viewing and gathering together the dead bodies, and I doe acknowledge it as a favour, your willingnesse to let me dispose of them. Captaine Cannon is but a Captaine, his Mayor is Smith so farre as I know, but he is a stranger to me, I am confident he is but a Captaine, Master Elmes but an Ancient, I thanke you for your civility to them, you may credit me in this, I rest

Your servant

April 30.

OLIVER CROMWELL

If you accept of equall exchange I shall performe my part.'

II

Letter on behalf of John Lilburne.

'MY LORD,—You heere in what a flame theise westerne partes are, I cannot but minde your Excellency that the enimie are designing to surprise many places, and wee shall still play the aftergame. I thinke it of absolute necessitye that some men bee put into Bristoll, especially since