XI.—*On the Lord Chancellors and Keepers of the Seal in the Reign of King John.*
By EDWARD FOSS, Esq., F.S.A.

Read 19th November, 1846.

SCARCELY two writers agree either in the names or the succession of the Lord Chancellors of the reign of King John. The earlier compilers of the list of those officers had to rely either on the historians, who were often mistaken, or on their own examination of original documents, which was necessarily limited and unsatisfactory. Since the publications issued by the Record Commission, and subsequently by royal authority, the means of arriving at correctness have been materially increased; and recent authors must be presumed to have used them. Much allowance is therefore to be made for the errors of the former, while the assertions of the latter become a fair subject of critical inquiry; the more especially in John's reign, most of the records of which have been published *in extenso*.

The principal writers who have treated of the Lord Chancellors of this period are:

Francis Thynne, whose "Chancellors of England, collected out of sundrie ancient histories," in his continuation of Holinshed's Chronicle, is a curious but somewhat meagre work;

John Philipot, "Summerset Herald," whose "Catalogue of the Chancellors of England, &c. 1636," is for the most part a servile copy of Thynne's collections, even to the errors which they contain;

Sir Henry Spelman, whose "Series Cancellariorum Angliæ," in his *Glossarium Archaiologicum*, is mainly extracted from Thynne's list;

Sir William Dugdale, in the "Chronica Series," appended to his "Origines Juridiciales, 1666;" and

Mr. Oldmixon, in his "Lives of all the Lord Chancellors, &c. by an impartial hand, 1708."

To these have been added, within the few last years, the "Catalogue of Lord Chancellors, Keepers of the Seal," &c. by Mr. Thomas Duffus Hardy, of whose

learning and industry the Record publications afford unquestionable evidence ; and the able and interesting work of Lord Campbell recently published.

Leaving out the historians, upon whom, in respect of the precise position an individual held in the Court, implicit reliance cannot be placed, the only certain evidence of the names and succession of John's Chancellors is to be collected from the public records of his reign ; and, inasmuch as there are among them few direct entries of the disposition of the Great Seal, similar to those which were introduced in subsequent reigns, such evidence can only be obtained by a careful examination and comparison of dates and facts in the various rolls which have come down to us. The Patent and Close Rolls contain important testimony, and incidental notices appear on the Rotuli de Finibus and other Rolls ; but the principal dependance must be placed on the proofs which the Rotulus Chartarum affords.

The general impression has been, that when a charter is authenticated by the words "Data per manum A. B. or C. D." the person so subscribing was either a Chancellor, or Keeper of the Great Seal, or Vice-Chancellor. This mode of authentication has occasioned the discrepancy in the various lists hitherto published ; some authors designating as Chancellors persons whom others call Keepers or Vice-Chancellors.

It will be the attempt of this paper to remove the confusion thus arising, by fixing with greater certainty the names and order of the Chancellors ; and by considering the real character borne by those who have been thus called Keepers or Vice-Chancellors.

It is not to be presumed however that all the charters of this reign are subscribed in the manner above mentioned. They are attested in all varieties of forms ; sometimes solely by the King himself, and sometimes by him in the presence of a witness or witnesses ; sometimes by one witness alone, and sometimes by several ; and sometimes with and sometimes without the before-mentioned additional authentication, commencing with the words "Data per manum."

Throughout the reign there are comparatively few charters which are so authenticated by the Chancellors themselves. That it was not their positive duty, even when present, to affix their names to this form, is proved by the fact, occurring in multitudinous instances, of a Chancellor being, *eo nomine*, one of the *witnesses*, when the formal authentication has been made by one of the so-called Keepers. In every case, however, where the name of a known Chancellor appears, his title is distinctly added, except in one instance, to be afterwards adverted to ; while, on the contrary, with respect to those who have been denominated Keepers, in no one instance is there

any addition to their names, beyond the clerical dignity they happened to hold at the time.

The question then that first occurs is, What was the official character of those persons who thus authenticated the charters, to whose names the designation of Chancellor was not added ; and whether, even if it be allowed that they were in some way connected with the Great Seal, they have been properly designated as Keepers or Vice-Chancellors ?

In the previous reign of Richard I., when the King went to the Holy Land, he left one seal in England to be used by the Chancellor Longchamp, whom he had deputed, with others, to rule the kingdom in his absence ; and he took another seal with him, under the care of an officer, who was called Vice-Chancellor. Roger Malus Catulus was one of those who held this office, and the seal was suspended round his neck when he was unfortunately drowned off the Isle of Cyprus. These officers authenticated the charters that were granted abroad, by adding their names to the words "*Data per manum ;*" but when they did so they almost invariably appended the designation of "*Vice Cancellarius,*" or "*tunc agens vices Cancellarii nostri.*" The constant omission then of this title by the subscribers of the Charters of King John forms a strong presumption that they did not possess it.

Again, the fact already mentioned, that the Chancellor, as Chancellor, is often named as a witness to charters, the formal authentication of which is signed by one of the so-called Keepers, proves that such formal subscriber was not a Keeper appointed, as in Richard's reign, to act merely in the absence of the Chancellor.

In addition to this, there is the converse of the fact ; many instances occurring in which one or other of these officers was a witness to charters authenticated by the Chancellor himself.

Moreover, as will subsequently appear, there were, at the same period of time, two or three and sometimes four individuals performing the same duty of authenticating the charters in this manner.

And, lastly, no document exists evidencing any appointment of Keeper or Vice-Chancellor, unless a single entry with regard to Ralph de Neville may be considered an exception.

It is scarcely too much to say that any one of these facts would be sufficient to ground a presumption that these officers were neither Keepers of the Seal nor Vice-Chancellors.

If then they were not Keepers nor Vice-Chancellors, what character did they really bear ?

There is ample evidence to shew that all of them held situations about the Court,

with other official duties connected with the payment or receipt of the revenue or otherwise, and that some of them were in constant attendance on the king in his perpetual movements from place to place. They were, also, without exception, ecclesiastics, rewarded with benefices, and gradually promoted to various clerical dignities,—canonries, archdeaconries, deaneries, and sometimes bishopricks.

Now there were two classes of officers to whom this description would particularly apply, viz. The Clerks of the Treasury or Chamber of the Exchequer, and the Clerks of the Chancery.

The rolls of subsequent reigns prove that the Great Seal was frequently, if not usually, deposited in the Treasury of the Exchequer; of course under the care of its officers, who were answerable for its safe custody, and when it was required to be used would be in attendance for the purpose of producing it. The Clerks of the Chancery also were high officers, performing certain important functions, forming part of the state of the Chancellor; and when the office was vacant, the Great Seal was secured under the private seals of two or three of the principal among them. Some of them were no doubt in daily attendance on the Lord Chancellor, as is the case now with their representatives the present Masters in Chancery, relieving each other in turns, and at that time probably performing in succession the duty of affixing the formal authentication to the documents sealed in their presence.

A curious confirmation of the presumption that they were no more than officers in attendance on the Lord Chancellor occurs in two instances of charters in 2 John, authenticated in this form by the Chancellor, to which the *only* witnesses are Simon Archdeacon of Wells, John de Gray, Archdeacon of Gloucester, and John de Brancestre, Archdeacon of Worcester; ^a all three of whom are represented as Keepers at this very time, and were then authenticating charters in the same manner.

There is no single fact that tends to contravene the probability that these so-called Keepers or Vice-Chancellors were either officers of the Treasury of the Exchequer or Clerks of the Chancery; and, in pursuing the inquiry into the names of the Chancellors and their deputies, this presumption will appear more probable. Indeed, the dates of the attestation of the officers in question are in such regular succession, as almost to enable us to distinguish the order of their attendance.

All writers agree in making Hubert Walter, Archbishop of Canterbury, the first Chancellor of the reign, and that he was appointed at or soon after the Coronation, which took place on May 27th, 1199. The first document to which his name appears in that character is dated June 6th, 1199.^b The period of his retirement is

^a Rot. Chart. 2 John, vol. i. p. 64.

^b Rymer's Fœd. New Ed. vol. i. p. 75.

variously stated. Philipot terminates his Chancellorship even in the first year, and names "Simon, or rather Hugh, Archdeacon of Wells," as the next Chancellor; and again names Hugh de Wells in the sixth year of the reign; conceiving these two "were all one person," and founding his introduction of their names on their being *witnesses to deeds*, meaning charters, granted by the King in those years.

In the first place the worthy "Summerset Herald" is mistaken in supposing that Simon and Hugh, Archdeacons of Wells were "all one person." The first was Simon Fitz-Robert, otherwise de Wells, Archdeacon of Wells, and afterwards Bishop of Chichester:^a the second was Hugh de Wells, who succeeded him in the archdeaconry, and afterwards became Bishop of Lincoln. The charters referred to are authenticated in the form already noticed; the first by Simon, Archdeacon of Wells, and John de Gray, whom the author entirely omits; and the second by Hugh de Wells, without any addition to his name, he not then having any clerical dignity.^b

Dugdale also introduces Hugh de Wells as Chancellor in the sixth year of John, on the same authority; not adverting to numerous other charters attested in the same manner, which, if he were right in this instance, would equally make Hugh de Wells Chancellor in the second and fifth years, and probably in the third and fourth (the Charter Rolls of which are wanting) as well as in several subsequent years.

It is certain, however, that Hubert, Archbishop of Canterbury, continued Chancellor from his first appointment till the time of his death, July 13, 1205, 7 John. He is so styled in various documents during the whole period; the last charter he signed is dated June 23, 1205; and the next entry on the roll is a conclusive proof

^a Le Neve was evidently not aware that Simon Fitz-Robert, whom he introduces among the archdeacons of Wells, and Simon de Wells, Bishop of Chichester, were one and the same person. Godwin also, and Richardson his editor, in their account of the Bishop, omit all notice of the former name. There is no doubt, however, that they were identical. Two curious charters prove the name of the archdeacon to have been Simon filius Roberti. They are dated respectively the 7th and 22nd of February, 1201, and each of them grants him by that name, as Archdeacon of Wells, certain lands in Somersetshire, which had been estreated in consequence of the felony of Alice, the wife of *Robert de Wattelai*, in killing her husband, for which she was condemned and burnt. He afterwards became Provost of Beverley, and the fact that he was the Bishop of Chichester in question, appears from charters given under his hand, not only as Archdeacon of Wells and Provost of Beverley, (which he held together,) but immediately after his nomination as "elect of Chichester." Possibly he was the son of the above-named *Robert de Wattelai*; and if so, the assumption of the new name of Simon de Wells, from his archdeaconry, according to the clerical practice then very common, might have been influenced by the tragical events recorded in the grants.—Rot. Chart. 2 John, vol. i. pp. 86, 88.

^b Rot. Chart. 1 John, vol. i. p. 40, and 6 John, p. 139.

of the fact: "Hic devenit Cancellaria in manum domini Regis post mortem H. Arch. Cant."

During the earlier part of his tenure of the office his name frequently appears to the charters after the words "Data per manum;" but in the later years his authentication occurs but seldom and at long intervals. To the officers who so signed them when he did not, Mr. Hardy and Lord Campbell give the title of Keepers of the Seal, or Vice-Chancellors. They state them to be Simon Fitz-Robert, Archdeacon of Wells, and John de Gray, Archdeacon of Cleveland, jointly; John de Brancestre, Archdeacon of Worcester; Hugh Wallys, Bishop of Lincoln, (meaning Hugh de Wells, so called from the place of his birth); and Josceline de Wells, whom Lord Campbell by mistake calls a layman, he in fact afterwards becoming Bishop of Bath and Wells:—a goodly assemblage of Keepers during one Chancellorship of only six years' duration!

There is no doubt, however, that these five persons, whatever was the character of their office, performed the duty of authenticating the charters during Hubert's Chancellorship; and the following summary of their signatures will shew that there were no less than seven different modes in which these five deputies acted. From October, 1 John, to June, 2 John, the names of Simon, Archdeacon of Wells, and John de Gray, appear; in general jointly, but on some occasions within these months each of them signs alone. On the elevation of John de Gray to the Bishoprick of Norwich in 2 John, Simon de Wells continued to sign alone, till June, 6 John, when he was appointed Bishop of Chichester. *During the same period* John de Brancestre and Hugh de Wells, for a short time together, and each of them separately, and also Josceline de Wells, subscribed the charters in the same manner. There is one instance also in which John de Brancestre signed alone on the same day on which he had affixed his signature in conjunction with Hugh de Wells.

Thus, if these attestations are to be deemed proofs of their being Vice-Chancellors or Keepers, there would be at least three, if not four, enjoying that character at the same time.

The alternation of their attendance will be more strikingly apparent by taking two specific years of Hubert's Chancellorship, the 5th and 6th.

In 5 John the Chancellor only signed in March;

Simon Fitz-Robert, or de Wells, authenticated the charters in the manner described in every month, *except* July and August;

John de Brancestre in *July*, and also in part of May and June; and

Hugh de Wells in *August*, and also in parts of May, July, October, November, and December.

Again, in 6 John, the Chancellor did not sign at all ;
Simon Fitz-Robert signed in June only, being then consecrated bishop ;
Hugh de Wells, in every month except February and March ; and
Josceline de Wells in February and March, and also in April and May.

The question then may be confidently asked, Whether this looks as if these persons held the office of Keeper, with any control of the Seal, or as if they were official subordinate instruments of the Chancellor ?

To return, however, to the death of Archbishop Hubert, when the "Chancery" came into the King's hands : Lord Campbell states that "then the Great Seal remained some time in the custody of John de Brancestre ;" implying that he held it till the appointment of the new Chancellor, Walter de Gray : and Mr. Hardy's arrangement would lead to the same conclusion. The Charter Roll, however, does not support this view. It is true that John de Brancestre's name is attached to the charter next following the entry as to the death of the Archbishop, dated July 24, 1205 : but it is *to that charter alone* ; and he not only never afterwards signs another charter in that character, but the next two charters, dated on the 26th July, are authenticated by another officer. There is nothing to shew that he held it beyond the day on which he signed that single charter ; and if that attestation constitutes him a Keeper, the title would be more justly applicable to Hugh de Wells and Josceline de Wells, under whose hands all the other charters during the intervening months are given. The learned authors however have passed them over at this period, although they mentioned them as Keepers when performing the same duty under Hubert.

The fact is that the Great Seal remained in the King's hands during the whole of the period in question, and was no doubt given out to be used under his orders, as occasion required, by the customary officer of the court. A positive proof of this is recorded on the Patent Roll, where there is the entry of a quittance to Adam de Essex, a chaplain to the king, and a clerk in one of the Chancery offices,^a on his accounting for 87*l.* 3*s.* 8*d.*, the proceeds of the Chancery, *while it was in the King's hands after the Archbishop's death*, viz. from Thursday next after the Feast of St. Mildred (July 13) to Saturday next after the Feast of St. Michael (September 29)

^a I conceive that Adam de Essex was perhaps the Clericus or Magister Scriptorii, or more probably the Scriptor Rotuli Cancellariæ, and kept the duplicate of the Great Roll, called the Chancellor's Roll, of which a specimen, that of 3 John, has been published by the Commissioners of Public Records. Under an entry in the Patent Roll of 6 John, p. 52, the following memorandum appears :

"Non est in Rotulo A. de Essex quia oblit' est."

7 John;^a a period occupying the whole of the interval up to the appointment of Walter de Gray.

There are also two mandates addressed to this Adam de Essex, dated respectively 28th August and 12th September, directing him to pay certain monies “de exitibus Cancellariæ,” shewing that these issues were then in the King’s hands. The first of these mandates likewise pretty plainly proves that neither Hugh de Wells nor John de Brancestre were Keepers of the Seal, but simply clerks in the Chancery, then performing certain duties connected with it. The order is to pay “Archd. Well. et Wigorn. et cerariis de capella nostra [the Clerks of the Wax] duas marcas et 5 sol. pro jure suo de carta burgensium nostrorum de Rupella, et preterea eisdem 25s. pro jure suo de quinque partibus literarum patencium quas idem burgenses habuerunt.” By this it is apparent that the two archdeacons were subordinate officers, a little perhaps above the Clerks of the Wax, with whom they were jointly entitled to a certain portion of the fees on letters patent. What the charter to the Burgesses of Rochelle was does not appear; but possibly some grant to them of the office, or of part of the fees arising from it.^b

There is no dispute as to the appointment of the next Chancellor, Walter de Gray, who purchased the office for life on October 2, 1205, 7 John, for the sum of 5000 marks: but there is considerable confusion in the accounts of the time when he resigned the office. Philipot is not sufficiently lucid on the point to render discussion available. Dugdale introduces Richard de Marisco as Chancellor in 14 John, on the authority of Matthew of Westminster, and makes him resign the Great Seal in the next year, quoting the Close and Patent Rolls, on both of which there is this entry:—“Nono die Octobris anno regni Domini Regis quinto decimo liberavit Magister Ricardus de Marisco, Archidiaconus Richmondiæ et Northumbriæ, Sigillum Domini Regis apud Osspring.” Hardy, referring to these entries, inserts him only as Keeper; and afterwards properly introduces him as Chancellor in 16 John. In Lord Campbell’s account there is some inadvertence. His lordship states him to be the successor of Walter de Gray, with the marginal date of 1212, which was 14 John, but referring in his note to Rot. Chart. 16 John, m. 7; adding that he twice held the office, meaning once in this, and once in the following reign; and that his first chancellorship ceased when Ralph de Neville was appointed, with a note introducing the above cited entries on the Patent and Close Rolls of 15 John, and another entry on them in the same year, subsequently noticed, relative to Ralph de Neville. His lordship does not again mention Richard de Marisco during

^a Rot. Pat. 8 John, vol. i. p. 70.

^b Rot. Claus. 7 John, vol. i. pp. 48, 49.

John's reign ; he adds, however, that there is "no farther entry in the records on the subject [of the Great Seal] during the rest of this reign ; but there is great reason to believe that it remained in the hands of Ralph de Neville." Thus, according to his lordship's account, it would appear that Richard de Marisco resigned the office in 15 John, being in contradiction to his own reference, which proves that he held it in 16 John. That reference however is a perfectly correct one, and at once overturns his lordship's assertion as to the silence of the records after the supposed appointment of Ralph de Neville in 15 John ; and there are besides nearly one hundred entries afterwards shewing who continued to hold the seal till the last days of the King, and that that person was not Ralph de Neville.

To return, however, to Dugdale's introduction of Richard de Marisco as Chancellor in 14 John. He certainly did not attain to that dignity till two years afterwards. That he did attain to it at all will sufficiently account for the passage in Matthew of Westminster, the historians not being very precise about dates. The entry on the rolls that he delivered the Seal to the King on October 9, 1213, 15 John, has been too readily received as a proof that he was then Chancellor, and that Walter de Gray had previously resigned. This however was not the case. Walter de Gray was still Chancellor ; but, being then about to proceed to Flanders on a temporary mission, he sent the Seal to the King by Richard de Marisco, who appears, by many entries on the Patent Roll,^a to have been a clerk of the Chamber of the Exchequer, which was the place where the Seal was usually deposited ; and he no doubt was the officer responsible for its safe custody, and was naturally employed to deliver it to the King. A royal mandate dated the 10th of October, the very day after, is directed to the Sheriff of Kent, commanding him to provide a vessel for the voyage.^b Not only in that document, but in many subsequent Records, to as late a date as July 7, 16 John, 1214, Walter de Gray is invariably mentioned with the title of Chancellor.^c

Having thus disposed of Richard de Marisco for the present, we must next notice another claimant who is put forward, Ralph de Neville, afterwards Dean of Lichfield and Bishop of Chichester, to whom the seal was delivered on December 22, 1213, 15 John. But this claim is equally untenable. Mr. Hardy calls the King Keeper of the Seal from October 9th, when it was delivered to him at Ospringe, till this date : but his reference, which is merely the entry of that delivery,

^a Rot. Pat. vol. i. pp. 74, 81, 82, 83, 86, 91.

^b Rot. Claus. 15 John, vol. i. p. 156.

^c Ibid. pp. 161, 162, 168. Rot. Pat. vol. i. p. 105, 108, 109, 111.

contains no proof whatever of the fact; and it will presently appear that there is no foundation for the assertion.

No doubt however can exist, that during Walter de Gray's absence abroad the office of Chancellor was conferred on another individual; but this was not Ralph de Neville. The authority for introducing his name is thus quoted by Dugdale from Rot. Pat. 15 John, p. 1, m. 6. "*Vicesimo secundo die Decembris liberatum fuit Sigillum apud Windlesoram Radulpho de Neville sub Domino Wintoniensi Episcopo deferendum.*" Mr. Hardy at this date inserts Ralph de Neville in his column of Keepers, *but with no Chancellor at the time*; and in his note referring to the above passage he adds to the Bishop of Winchester's name the words, "who was appointed Custos of the Realm during the King's absence abroad;" evidently intending to convey that Ralph de Neville held the Seal as Keeper under the Bishop as Custos or Chief Justiciary. Lord Campbell adopts the same interpretation, but avoids saying whether he was Chancellor or Keeper. These learned authors have however forgotten that the Bishop of Winchester was not appointed to the important station of Chief Justiciary till the following February;^a and that, as the Seal was never placed under the control of that functionary, unless he was acting as regent in the King's absence, the reason they assign is not applicable to its delivery to Ralph de Neville on December 22, 1213. It is rather extraordinary also that each of them should have passed over the natural inference to be drawn from the expression used; which would appear to be, that the person *under whom* the seal was to be held would be himself the Chancellor. Had they not done so, their industry would no doubt have enabled them to discover that such was actually the fact. The Rotulus de Finibus of 15 John, p. 507, 509, contains two records, dated November 21st and 24th, 1213, in which Peter de Rupibus, Bishop of Winchester, is expressly distinguished by the title of Chancellor; and, in addition to this positive evidence, all the charters between October and January, no less than eight in number, are given under his hand; the first of them being dated October 31, 1213, and the last on January 3, 1214.^b To these attestations he does not add the title of Chancellor to his name, being the sole exception to the practice adverted to in a previous page.

The omission is remarkable, as occurring only in his case, and may perhaps have arisen from his dislike to parade a title which he was only holding for a short time during Walter de Gray's absence. But it is a more extraordinary circumstance, that, though others have been introduced solely on the ground of this mode of

^a Rot. Pat. 15 John, m. 4.

^b Rot. Chart. 15 John, pp. 195, 196.

authentication, the name of Peter de Rupibus should have been hitherto omitted in every list, either as a Chancellor or a Keeper. No doubt, however, can be felt, with this unquestionable evidence, that he was Chancellor during Walter de Gray's absence.

Walter de Gray on his return was reinstated in the office. He is denominated Chancellor in a record dated January 12, 1214,^a and the title is appended to his name in various documents up to July 7th.^b The entry on that day is a mandate to the Bishop of Winchester to admit him to full possession of the Bishoprick of Worcester, to which he had been elected. It was certainly, therefore, not till then, and probably not till after his consecration, which did not take place till October 5th, that he resigned the chancellorship. The latter date seems more probable, as his successor was not appointed till the 28th or 29th of October.

Ralph de Neville, however, was clearly not Chancellor till the following reign; and it is somewhat remarkable that, though we have seen the Seal was delivered to him to be held under the Bishop of Winchester, he never authenticated any charter while that prelate was Chancellor: although he afterwards did so under Walter de Gray, and for a short time under Richard de Marisco.

Before Walter de Gray's first resignation the charters were signed by Hugh de Wells till the end of 10 John; and by Richard de Marisco in 14 and 15 John.

The Charter Rolls of 11, 12, and 13 John, are wanting; but Hugh de Wells probably continued to act till he was appointed Bishop of Lincoln in December, 1209, 11 John; after which the duty, no doubt, devolved upon Richard de Marisco, as the Charter Roll of 14 John contains two charters of 12 and 13 John to which his name is so attached.

Walter de Gray's successor was Richard de Marisco; and the date of his appointment may be collected from the Charter Rolls. On October 28, 1214, 16 John, a charter is given under his hand simply as "*Magister Ricardus de Marisco*," as in all those he had previously attested; but to his signature to the next charter, dated on the next day, is added, for the first time, the designation of "*Cancellarius Domini Regis*." In every subsequent charter also, during the remainder of this reign, his name has the same description. It may be presumed therefore that he was appointed either on the 28th or the 29th of October, 1214. He remained in office till the end of the reign: the last record of which, so authenticated by him, is dated October 6, 1216,^c only a few days before the King's death. After that event he was continued Chancellor for several years under Henry III.

^a Rot. Claus. 15 John, vol. i. p. 160.

^b Ibid. 16 John, p. 168.

^c Rot. Pat. 18 John, vol. i. p. 198.

The succession of Chancellors, which has been thus suggested, fills the whole period of the reign, except the short vacancies occasioned by the death of Hubert, Archbishop of Canterbury, and by the second resignation of Walter de Gray. Of those names which have been hitherto comprehended in the list, it excludes Hugh de Wells and Ralph de Neville; it removes Richard de Marisco from the position usually assigned to him, and places him at the end of the reign; and it introduces a new Chancellor in Peter de Rupibus, Bishop of Winchester, who has heretofore been entirely omitted.

The order in which the Chancellors succeeded each other will be more simply shewn in the following tabular view. A second Table is added, exhibiting the names and succession of those officers of the Treasury of the Exchequer, or Clerks of the Chancery, who authenticated the charters, when the Chancellors did not; together with a statement of the time during which each of them acted. A comparison of these dates will make it manifest that these persons were merely official instruments, exercising a formal duty at stated intervals during the same period of time, and that they were not, as they have been called, either Keepers of the Great Seal or Vice-Chancellors.

TABLE I.

LORD CHANCELLORS.

JOHN I.	1199, May	Hubert Walter, Archbishop of Canterbury, was appointed soon after the Coronation. He held the office till his death on July 13, 1205. From this time it was vacant till
VII.	1205, Oct. 2	Walter de Gray, afterwards Bishop of Worcester and Archbishop of York, purchased the place. He held it till he went on the King's business to Flanders, when
XV.	1213, October	Peter de Rupibus, Bishop of Winchester, was temporarily appointed during Walter de Gray's absence.
	1214, Jan. 12	Walter de Gray resumed the office on his return, and continued to hold it, certainly till the 7th of July following, and probably till the 5th of October, the day of his consecration as Bishop of Worcester. After a short vacancy
XVI.	„ Oct. 29	Richard de Marisco, Archdeacon of Richmond and Northumberland, afterwards Bishop of Durham, was appointed, and he continued in the office till the end of the reign.

TABLE II.

OFFICERS AUTHENTICATING THE CHARTERS ; BY SOME CALLED KEEPERS OR
VICE-CHANCELLORS.

JOHN I.	1199, October	Simon Fitz-Robert, or de Wells, Archdeacon of Wells, afterwards Bishop of Chichester ; John de Gray, Archdeacon of Gloucester and Cleveland, afterwards Bishop of Norwich ;	} together, and each of them separately, till June 1200, 2 John ; after which,
II.	1200, June	Simon Fitz-Robert, separately, till June 1204, 6 John. But during the same time, also	
	„ August	John de Brancestre, Archdeacon of Worcester ; and Hugh de Wells, Archdeacon of Wells, afterwards Bishop of Lincoln ;	} together during August and September.
V.	1203, May	John de Brancestre, alone for three months.	
	„ June	Hugh de Wells, alone till April, 1209, 10 John, and probably later.	
VI.	1205, February	Josceline de Wells, afterwards Bishop of Bath and Wells, till September 1205, 7 John.	
VII.	„ July 24	John de Brancestre signs one charter only.	
XII.	1210, March	Richard de Marisco, Archdeacon of Richmond and Northumberland ; afterwards Lord Chancellor and Bishop of Durham ; till October 1213, 15 John ; and once afterwards in October 28, 1214, 16 John.	
XV.	1213, Dec. 22	Ralph de Neville, afterwards Dean of Lichfield and Bishop of Chichester, till May, 1215, 16 John.	

The Charter Rolls of 3, 4, 11, 12, and 13 John, are wanting.