

I was, I believe, the first to call attention to this error, in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for April 1895, and I may accordingly be allowed to point out that the words of Gregory IX, 'as Theiner prints them,' will not bear Miss Bateson's any better than Mr. Bliss's interpretation. The maternal solicitude she attributes to Gregory disappears in the light of the original as given by Theiner.

Hinc est, quod cum circa Regnum Scotie eo maiorem curam gerere teneamur, quo fortius ecclesia Scoticana Romanam ecclesiam solam matrem et metropolitana nullo medio recognoscit, cupientes, ut que nos singularem patrem in spiritualibus obtinet, specialem a nobis recipiat consolationis effectum, tibi in regno predicto plenum legationis officium duximus committendum, etc.²

Rolls' summarists, it thus appears, are not the only scholars to whom Curial Latin presents insuperable difficulties. *Cum* (which Miss Bateson omits) is to be construed with *teneamur*, and *quod* with *duximus*. Furthermore, had Gregory desired 'to quicken the observation of a short-sighted daughter,' he would have 'taken care of the subjunctive,' and employed *recognoscat*, not *recognoscit*. In other words, *fortius* is the cause, not the consequence, of *maiolem*, and is explained by *nullo medio*. The pope, namely, is bound to exercise about the Scottish realm solicitude all the greater, in proportion as the more strongly, owing to absence of any mediate jurisdiction, the Scottish church recognises the Roman as the mother and metropolitan. Shorter expressions denoting that there was no archbishopric in the Scottish church are used elsewhere: *ecclesia ad Romanam ecclesiam nullo medio pertinet* (Theiner, p. 217); *ecclesie ad Romanam ecclesiam immediate spectantis* (*ib.* p. 239); *ecclesie Romane ecclesie immediate subiecte* (*ib.* p. 309). The anomaly was removed by the elevation of St. Andrews to metropolitan rank by Sixtus IV, in 1472 (*ib.* pp. 465 sq.).

B. MACCARTHY.

Letter attributed to Colonel Blood.

IN the notice of the 'Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1671,' of which I was the editor (*ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW*, above, p. 588), attention is directed to a letter attributed in the preface to the 'Calendar' to the notorious Colonel Blood. From a subsequent comparison, however, of this letter with others which are certainly in Blood's hand I have come to the conclusion that it was not written by him, and that it is a forgery by some other person, probably intended as a joke. This conclusion is supported by Williamson's endorsement on it, 'A foolish letter.'

F. H. BLACKBURNE DANIELL.

² Theiner, *Fœderis Monumenta*, etc., p. 35.