tury, derived from memoirs, diaries, newspapers, and other contemporary sources, and arranged under about fifteen subject headings. It collects a great deal of information which will be useful to historians, both on the social and economic development of the colonies. It does not profess to be more than a popular sketch of the subject; but it is an extremely interesting book, agreeably written, and can be confidently recommended to any reader.

CORRESPONDENCE

LORD MORDAUNT'S RESIGNATION IN 1668

A STATEMENT made by me in an article on John Mordaunt, Baron Mordaunt of Reigate in Surrey, in the 'Dictionary of National Biography,' to the effect that he resigned the office of constable of Windsor Castle, is censured in the *ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW*, July 1894, as inaccurate, on the ground that 'this appointment was revoked 19 Oct. 1668.' From the 'Calendar of State Papers,' 1667-8, p. 608, it appears, however, that on 29 Sept. 1668 the office was granted to Prince Rupert, being then 'void by resignation of Lord Mordaunt.' The subsequent revocation must therefore have been a merely formal act.

J. M. RIGG.

[The following explanation is given by the writer of the portion of the article in question (*ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW*, ix. 592), in which he used the expression: 'This appointment was revoked 19 Oct. 1668, so that Mr. Rigg is not correct in saying that he resigned:—'Mr. Rigg is technically correct in saying that Mordaunt resigned, but the real question is whether his resignation was voluntary or not. In his life of Mordaunt Mr. Rigg states that "for alleged arbitrary acts" done by Mordaunt as constable of Windsor Castle articles of impeachment were exhibited against him in the winter of 1666-7. "A timely dissolution, however, put an end to the proceedings, and before they could be renewed he had received a full pardon from the king. Nevertheless he resigned his office." In the first place the proceedings were interrupted not by the dissolution, but by the prorogation of parliament. The parliament in question was not dissolved till Jan. 1670, twelve years after Mordaunt's impeachment. In his note Mr. Rigg correctly points out that the revocation is only the formal confirmation of an earlier arrangement by which Mordaunt resigned in favour of Rupert. In the passage quoted from his article he apparently represents Mordaunt as resigning of his own free choice. Mordaunt's resignation was not a voluntary act. The king was thinking of meeting parliament again in Nov. 1668, and in order to avoid a fresh dispute about Mordaunt's impeachment obliged him to vacate his office, but allowed him to do so by selling it to some approved person. Prince Rupert paid Mordaunt 3,500*l.* for the post ("Fleming Papers," p. 59). Thus formally Mordaunt resigned, but substantially he was removed. Mr. Rigg himself admits this, for in a later column he speaks of "the very grave charge which led to his dismissal from the command of Windsor Castle."']

EDITOR.]