Liber qui appellatur landboc.

Vita sancti Brendani et sancti Brigide et sancti David et passio sancti Edwardi Regis et Martiris in uno volumine.

Tractatus magistri Hugonis de archa domini. Idem de ecclesiasticis sacramentis in eodem volumine cum diversis sententiis Anselmi Bernardi Clarevall' abbatis.

Sententie magistri Petri.

Hii libri glosati.

Johannes, Matheus, [M]arcus Psalterium. Item Psalterium. Psalterium imperfectum, in quo etiam scribuntur cantica canticorum. Parabole Salomonis et ecclesiastes in uno volumine. Item parabole Salomonis et ecclesiastes in uno volumine. Duodecim prophete epistole Pauli apocalipsis. Item apocalipsis. Missales vi. Textus evangelorum duo excepto parvo. Epistolare unum. Gradales vi. Processionalia x. Coll[ationarii] ii. Antiphonarii iiiii. Breviaria iiiii. Diurnale i. Lectionarii iii. Troparii x. Psalteria iii. Ymn[alia] ii. Libri consuetudinum iii. Ad sepulturam defunctorum et obsequia egrotantium liber unus libri capituli ii. Passio sancti Thome et miracula ejus.

S. BARFIELD.

NOTE ON CHARLES I AND THE EARL OF GLAMORGAN.

SINCE my article on this subject in the last number of the REVIEW was in type, it has occurred to me that I may have been unjust to Glamorgan in supposing that the word 'primo' inserted in the patent of his dukedom was forged by him or by his instructions in 1660. Is it not possible that it was added in 1645, and that too with the approval of Charles I?

When the warrant directing the law officers of the crown to take the necessary steps for conferring a dukedom upon Glamorgan's father was signed, on 6 Jan. 1645, the old man was not to proceed farther for fear of drawing attention to his son's services in Ireland. The question would then arise as to the relation of the warrant to the patent of dukedom previously granted to Glamorgan. It would not do to destroy it, as if the father died before the warrant was taken to the signet office, there would then be no dukedom at all. On the other hand, upon the hypothesis which I have provisionally adopted, that there had been some ill feeling between the father and son, it is intelligible that the old man would not have been well pleased to know that Glamorgan had in his possession a patent bearing a date eight months before his own warrant, and might therefore produce it as giving him precedence over his father. This last difficulty would be removed by altering the date. If Worcester lived to produce his warrant and to have his patent made out, his son, whose patent was now dated 4 May 1645, could not come

before him ; whereas, if Worcester died before sending his warrant to the signet office, Glamorgan could show his own patent, and it would not be of much consequence to him whether it was dated in 1644 or in 1645. Such a thing might have been done by family arrangement, or it might have been done with the king's assent. That it was so is, of course, only a guess, but it appears to me sufficiently probable to make me wish to withdraw the imputations upon Glamorgan's character which I founded on a different solution of the problem.

Whilst I am upon the subject, I may add that I have recently met with a curious account by a certain Allan Boteler or Butler of an interview with Worcester at Raglan, from which it appears that Worcester, at least, had no doubt that the king's authority to treat in Ireland was genuine. Boteler was employed to take a message from the king at Oxford to Ormond, and he passed through Raglan on the way. His narrative is amongst the Carte MSS. XXX fol. 307. He says that he left Oxford on 22 Feb. 1646, that is to say 1645, as neither was the king any longer at Oxford, or Worcester at Raglan, in 1646.

The extract relating to his conversation with Worcester is as follows :—

'On that I delivered to his Lordship his Ma^{ties} most gracious and comfortable message concerning my lord his sonne, with thanks for their former loyall expressions unto which my Lord Marquisse answered that it was the griefe of his heart that he was inforced to say that the King was wavering and fickle, and that at his Ma^{ties} last being there, he lent him a booke to read in his chamber, the beginning of which he knowes he read, but if he had ended it, it would have shewed him what it was to be a fickle Prince, for was it not enough, said his Lordship, to suffer him the Lord Glamorgan to be unjustly imprisoned by the Lord Marquisse of Ormond for what he had his Ma^{ties} authority for ; but that the King must in print protest against his proceedings and his owne allowance, and not yett recall it ; but I will pray for him, and that he may be more constant to his freinds, saith my Lord.'

The book referred to is known to have been Gower's from a passage in Bayly's 'Golden Apophthegms,' p. 5, and it was no doubt the 'Confessio Amantis.' The photograph of the king's warrant to Glamorgan, from which the facsimile which accompanied my article was made, has since been deposited in the manuscript room of the British Museum.

SAMUEL R. GARDINER.