a Towne where I first lived when I came into the Kingdome, it is called Tredagh, this bell is never rung but uppon the ennemies comeing, or fire, or some such desperate occasion, presently uppon the ringing, the whole Towne was in armes, being composed of 40 papists for one protestant, the Nunnes, (for their is a Nunnerie their) cryed out that the protestants would have ravished them, the complaint was so eager that the protestants were afraid of a massacre. If it please you to relate these things to my Lord Wharton, I assure myself, that his Lordship will thinke it great pittie that my Lord Lieuft. was given to mistresses and treason, for otherwise we lived securely under him, as I thought. Sir I am afraid I am too bold with you, you did never forbid me, and if my discretion faile, yet my humble duty never shall as to the material part. I humblie beseech you to love and pardon

Your truly thankfull Nephew ever ready to serve you
W^m WANDESFORD.

Dublyn this xxxth of Aug: 1641.

THE ASSESSMENT OF WAGES.

In a short paper on the assessment of wages which appeared in the April number of this Review, an unfortunate slip in writing has led me in one place to misrepresent Professor Thorold Rogers. On p. 310 it is stated that he 'nowhere mentions the justices or the sliding scale until he reaches the statute 5 Eliz. c. 4.' I intended to write 'he nowhere mentions the justices *and* the sliding scale,' for, as I have shown on p. 312, he quotes 13 Ric. II, st. i. c. 8,¹ and mentions the justices, but he does not notice the definite instructions for determining the rates which were laid down by that statute. From what he says elsewhere about the Elizabethan measure,² it seems clear that he cannot have observed that a sliding scale was contemplated by Richard's statute. Curiously enough, however, in his latest published work on the early labour statutes³ Professor Rogers ignores 13 Ric. II, st. i. c. 8 altogether, and, speaking of 2 Hen. VI, c. 18, he says: 'the Statute of Labourers is re-enacted, and a new clause added, one which was hereafter to bear such evil fruit, that the justices in quarter sessions should be empowered to regulate the rate of wages.'⁴ The latest information is not necessarily the truest, and it is more charitable to think that Professor Rogers did not omit 13 Ric. II, st. i. c. 8 intentionally. But my object is not to point out inconsistencies or to defend the dead, but rather to apologise for a slip which may have led to misrepresentation.

ELLEN A. McARTHUR.

¹ *Hist. of Agriculture and Prices* (1882), iv. 116.

² *Econ. Interpretation of Hist.* (1888), p. 41; *ENG. HIST. REVIEW*, ix. 310.

³ *Econ. Interpretation of Hist.* pp. 26-34.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 82.