

double axe occurs amongst the various *crepundia* attached to a band worn over the shoulder on a statue in the Museo Pio Clementino, as shown by Mr. Rich in his useful "Illustrated Companion to the Latin Dictionary," p. 214. This is in accordance with the observation of Plautus,—“Porro crepundia solebant esse annuli, ensiculi, *securiculæ*, maniculæ, bullæ, siculæ,” &c. There are also in Mr. Barton's cabinet miniature figures of a lion, a wolf, (?) and an eagle with its wings displayed; the last measuring about two inches in length. An eagle, described as of steel, was dug up at Silchester about 1788, and exhibited to the Society of Antiquaries. (*Archæol.*, ix., p. 370.) It was supposed to have been a military ensign.

Amongst the relics of which Mr. D. Maclauchlan has kindly communicated sketches, must also be noticed the base of a column (diam. and height 22 in., diam. of base-mouldings 28 in.), a fragment of a shaft (height 45 in., diam. 14 in.), and the upper portion of a capital, with bold foliated ornaments, but much defaced. Its greatest width, at top, measures 3 ft. 5 in. This is probably the same fragment “of the Corinthian order” noticed by Dr. Beeke in 1804 (*Archæol.*, vol. xv., p. 184), and it is interesting as the indication that some architectural monument, of no ordinary importance, existed at *Calleva*.

A. W.

---

#### REMARKS ON ONE OF THE GREAT SEALS OF EDWARD THE THIRD, HITHERTO UNPUBLISHED.

BY THE REV. W. H. GUNNER, M.A.

THE reign of Edward III. is a period of great importance, both in an historical, and artistic point of view, as regards the annals of the great seal of England. It is historically important because some of the principal events in the French wars of that monarch were followed by an alteration in the design of his great seal. On this point we refer our readers to the very able and lucid notice of the great seals of England, and especially those of Edward III., by the learned Professor Willis, in the Second Vol. of this Journal. It is there stated that Edward III., at various periods of his reign,

INEDITED GREAT SEAL OF EDWARD III.



Preserved among the Muniments, Winchester College.

INEDITED GREAT SEAL OF EDWARD III.



Preserved among the Muniments, Winchester College.

used not less than seven different great seals, which for facility of reference are designated by the letters, A, B, C, D, E, F, G. It is not a little remarkable that impressions of the whole series of the known great seals of our Monarchs have been preserved, with the single exception of one of the most important of those used by this king. It is the one designated by Professor Willis by the letter E; and is a seal of absence,<sup>1</sup> *i. e.* a seal left in England by the king during his absence abroad, “pro regimine regni Anglie.” We have now the pleasure of laying before our readers an engraving of a great seal of Edward III., which has never been published, and which we hope to show can be no other than the desired seal. The drawing has been made from two impressions, each partly imperfect, found in the muniment room of Winchester College. We take this opportunity of expressing our great obligations to the Warden of that society for the ready kindness, with which he permitted these documents to be laid before the Institute, and for many other favours of the same kind. They are both pardons granted, one to John Makehayt, the other to Agnes, widow of Simon le Peke, for acquiring land in Meonstoke,<sup>2</sup> Hants, without the royal license previously obtained. They are both attested by Prince Lionel, then guardian of the realm, and dated at Worcester, October 5th, An. Reg. Ang. 21mo, Fran. 8vo, A.D. 1347.

On comparing this engraving with seal F (see Rymer, vol. iii. p. 596), it will be found to be almost identical in general design. The principal points of difference are, 1st. that in seal F, the platform on which the throne is placed is extended from pillar to pillar, affording room for the lions also to stand on it, whilst in this seal, it is only large enough to receive the throne, and the lions appear to stand on the base of the arcade behind the throne; 2nd. instead of the nondescript figures which surmount the canopies on which the shields are suspended in seal F, there are two small figures of men at arms, standing on the battlements, in which the canopies terminate.

We have now to show that the seal here engraved is the seal E; and in doing so, we shall, though at the risk of

<sup>1</sup> For the distinction between the seal of absence and seal of presence, the reader is referred to Prof. Willis's paper.

<sup>2</sup> The manor of Meonstoke was held of

the king *in capite*, by the service of two knights' fees. It is now the property of Winchester College.

being somewhat tedious, trace the history of this seal through all the notices relating to it to be found in Rymer, up to the date of these documents; for it is a matter of the first importance, in elucidating the claim of this seal to be the seal E, to fix dates accurately. The history of the first four seals, A, B, C, D, of Edward III., is concisely stated in Professor Willis's account. We begin then with the seals E and F. The first of these, as mentioned above, was the seal of absence, used for the government of England, while the king was abroad; the latter was the seal of presence, which always accompanied him in his peregrinations; and on his return to England, was delivered to the chancellor, and the seal E, was taken from him, and sealed up, and deposited in the treasury, or committed to such other custody as the king thought fit. It first makes its appearance on the 20th June, 1340; when the Archbishop of Canterbury, on retiring from the Chancellorship, resigned its predecessor (D) into the hands of the king, who caused it to be immediately broken; and delivered a new seal to John de St. Paul, to be kept by him, until the coming of Robert, Bishop of Chichester, who had been appointed Chancellor, and to whom it was transferred on the 12th July;<sup>3</sup> the king having in the meantime gone abroad.<sup>4</sup> He returned on the 30th November; and on the 1st December, within the Tower of London, received from the Chancellor the great seal for the rule of England during his absence, and committed it to William de Kildesby, keeper of the Privy Seal, who carried it on the next Saturday, with another great seal (F), which the king had brought with him from abroad, to the church of All Hallows, Barking, and there sealed certain writs, dated *before* the king's return, with the seal which had been given up by the Chancellor; and two royal charters, which had been made *abroad*, with the seal which the king had brought with him. Both seals were then carried back to the king, in the Tower, who ordered that the seal, which he had brought with him from abroad, should henceforth be used in England.<sup>5</sup>

In 1342 the king again went abroad, and appointed his son Edward, then Duke of Cornwall, to be guardian of the realm. Just before his departure, Sir Robert Parnyng, who had been appointed Chancellor October 28th, 1341, delivered

<sup>3</sup> Rymer, vol. ii., p. 1129.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. 1141.

up the great seal (F) which was committed to the custody of John de Offord, Keeper of the Privy Seal; and received in exchange the seal, "*pro regimine regni Angliæ ipso Rege extra idem regnum existente ordinatum.*"<sup>6</sup> The king returned March 2nd, 1343, and two days after, the usual exchange of seals was made.<sup>7</sup>

In July, 1345, the king went to Flanders, having appointed his son Prince Lionel, guardian of the realm, and returned after a very short absence; on both which occasions the usual exchange is recorded.<sup>8</sup> In the following year, Lionel was again appointed guardian of the realm, by an instrument dated at Portchester Castle, June 25th; and on Sunday, July 2nd, the king being then in the Isle of Wight preparatory to his departure, John de Offord, Dean of Lincoln, then Chancellor, delivered the great seal F, by command of the king, into the hands of John de Thoresby, Keeper of the Privy Seal, in the chancel of the church of Fareham before the high altar; and received from him in exchange the seal E, which he carried with him to the place where he was then sojourning, the house which had been Godfrey de Raunvill's, near Southwick.<sup>9</sup>

We have now traced the seal E into the hands of the Chancellor, John de Offord, with Prince Lionel as guardian of the realm. It is obvious then that any document, sealed with the great seal, and attested by Prince Lionel, within the period of the king's departure in July 1346, and his subsequent return, must have been sealed with the seal E. The documents, to which these impressions are appended, correspond to these conditions, since they are so attested, and are dated October 5th, 1347. On that day the king was still in France, having just completed that glorious campaign, in which Crecy was won, and Calais captured. Instruments were sealed by the king himself, with his seal of presence (F) at Calais, on the 3rd, 5th, and 8th of October.<sup>1</sup> He left France, and landed at Sandwich on Friday, October 12th, and arrived in London on Sunday the 14th, and on the following day John de Offord brought to him the seal, which had been used in England during his absence; and delivered it to the Bishop of Winchester, the Treasurer, to be kept in the Treasury.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Rymer, vol. ii. 1212.    <sup>7</sup> Ibid. 1220.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid. 85.

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. 138.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid. vol. iii., pp. 50, 53.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. 139.



We have been thus minute in pointing out the periods in which the seals in question were respectively in use, up to the date of these documents, because, besides the main object of these remarks, it seemed desirable to draw the attention of those, who may have access to depositories of ancient records, to the times in which the seal E was used in England, in the hope that other impressions of it may yet be brought to light; a thing much to be wished, in confirmation of the claim of this seal to be the missing seal E.<sup>3</sup> For, although according to the dates we have given, there would seem to be no doubt on the point, there is a difficulty in the way, which remains now to be considered. During the long period that elapsed between October 1347, and the treaty of Bretigny in May 1360, the usual exchanges of the great seals took place four times; for though the king appears to have gone abroad only once in that interval, viz., in 1359, he had at the end of October, 1348, made all necessary arrangements and was on the point of embarking at Sandwich, but did not quit England;<sup>4</sup> and on none of those occasions does any new great seal appear to have been used;<sup>5</sup> but it is remarkable that between the 4th and 15th November, 1348, while the king was at Sandwich, both E and F were in use. Pursuant to the terms of that treaty, Edward laid aside the title of king of France, and had accordingly a new great seal made, which was shortly after employed, and has been designated α, by Professor Willis, and on it the word

<sup>3</sup> With this object we have placed at the end of these remarks a tabular view of the dates at which this seal was used, as far as it can be traced in Rymer, rather than weary the reader with any further repetition of the exchanges of the seals, which is not necessary for our subject.

<sup>4</sup> Rymer, iii. pp. 176, 177.

<sup>5</sup> In the memorandum of the exchange on the king's going abroad in Oct., 1359 (Rymer, iii., p. 452), a great Seal was ordered to be delivered to the Chancellor, which was described as "*Magnum Sigillum pro regimine Officii Cancellarii in absentia ipsius Regis deputatum*," and it was delivered to him in a bag sealed with the Seal of John de Offord, formerly Chancellor, but who was then dead; yet on examining the previous memoranda, no good reason is found for believing this to have been any other than the Great Seal "*pro regimine dicti regni Anglie in absentia Domini Regis deputatum*," viz.,

F, which had been deposited in the Treasury by John de Offord on the 17th of Nov., 22 Edw. III., 1348 (Rymer, iii., p. 177), and had continued there till taken out in Oct., 1359. The same Seal, in the memorandum of exchange made in May, 1360, on the king's return, is called "*Magnum Sigillum in absentia dicti Domini Regis pro consignatione brevium usitatum*," and was delivered to the Treasurer, and one of the king's chamberlains, to be kept in the Treasury (Rymer, iii., p. 494), and where, for aught that appears, it remained till the transaction in 1369, which is about to be mentioned. Froissart (ch. 149, Johnes' Translation) has a story replete with romantic incidents, of Edward and the Black Prince having gone over privately to Calais in Dec., 1348, to assist in encountering a party of French whom the Governor had engaged to admit into the place; but no trace of this visit has been discovered in Rymer.

"Francie" did not occur, the circumscription being "Edwardus Dei gracia Rex Anglie Dominus Hibernie et Aquitannie."

"In 1369, the treaty of Bretigny," says Professor Willis, was set aside, and the king resumed the title and arms of King of France.<sup>6</sup> A memorandum in Rymer (Vol. iii., p. 868) sets this forth ; and adds, that the king of England and France caused to be brought to him at Westminster on the 11th of June, all those seals which were kept in his treasury, the circumscription of which had the words "Edwardus Rex Anglie et Francie," or "Francie et Anglie :—" that is to say, as well the seals for the rule of the kingdom of England, as those for the Bench, and for the Exchequer, and for the office of the Privy Seal. Of these he delivered to the Venerable William, Bishop of Winchester, his Chancellor, two great seals, each in two pieces, one of which, E, contained the words "Rex Anglie et Francie," and on the other, F, "Rex Francie et Anglie." Now this would seem fatal to the claim of the seal we have engraved to be the seal E, which, according to this interpretation of Rymer, should read, "Rex Anglie et Francie," instead of "Francie et Anglie." Yet if this were so, it would show that we must add an eighth to the list of great seals used by Edward III. ; and this would be a seal, of which the existence has never been before even suspected.

But the truth is, that the meaning of the memorandum in Rymer, referred to by Professor Willis, is, in regard to the great seals noticed in it, so obscure, that it can hardly be deemed sufficient to overthrow the clear evidence on which the claim of our seal is founded. It appearing probable that some error might have been committed in transcribing that portion of it for the press, the roll itself has been consulted in the hope of clearing away this difficulty ; but it has been found to correspond with the printed copy, except in a few trifling instances. In order that the reader may form his own opinion as to the meaning of the memorandum, it is expedient to set out that part of it which relates to the seals. The previous portion states a resolution of parliament on the 3rd of June, 1369, that the king should resume the name and title of King of England and France, and then in Cayley

<sup>6</sup> The arms of France had not been laid aside ; they were quartered as usual, in the first and fourth quarters, with those of England, on the Seal G.



and Holbroke's edition of Rymer, Vol. iii., p. 868, it proceeds thus :—

Per quod jam Rex Anglie et Francie in cancellaria sua omnia sigilla tam pro regimine Anglie quam pro placeis de utroque Banco et de Scaccario et pro officio privati sigilli in quorum circumscriptione Edwardus Rex Anglie et Francie sive Francie et Anglie imprimitur in thesauraria ipsius Regis existentia per Willielmum de Mulsho et Johannem de Newenham Camerarios Scaccarii ipsius Regis Anglie et Francie apud Westmonasterium die Lune in festo Sancti Barnabe apostoli, viz. undecimo die Junii anno presenti venire fecit ;

Unde Venerabilis pater Willielmus Episcopus Wyntoniensis Cancellarius ipsius Regis duo magna sigilla utrumque eorundem de duabus peciis in quorum uno imprimitur Rex Anglie et Francie et in altero Rex Francie et Anglie consignandi.<sup>7</sup>

Et unum sigillum de duabus peciis Johanni Knyvet Capitali Justiciario de Banco domini Regis pro brevibus ejusdem placee ;

Et unum aliud sigillum de duabus peciis Roberto de Thorp Capitali Justiciario<sup>8</sup> de Communi Banco pro brevibus ejusdem placee ;

Et tertium sigillum de duabus peciis Magistro Willielmo de Askeby Archidiacono Northamptonie cancellario Scaccarii Regis pro brevibus de eodem Scaccario consignandis ;<sup>9</sup>

Et unum aliud sigillum de una pecia pro officio privati sigilli ordinatum Petro de Lacy clerico privati sigilli liberavit ;

Et illud magnum sigillum de duabus peciis in quo Edwardus Rex Anglie Dominus Hibernie et Aquitanie imprimitur et quod juxta pacem prædictam pro regimine Anglie ordinatum fuit, et quatuor alia sigilla pro placeis de bancis, scaccario et pro officio de privato sigillo prædictis de stilo Regis Anglie Domini Hibernie et Acquitanie, quibus post pacem prædictam semper hactenus utebatur, præfatis camerariis retradidit in Thesauraria prædicta custodienda.

Now, the words in the first paragraph, which speak of the circumscriptions of the seals, apply to all the seals alike, and do not necessarily imply that the two great seals differed in their legends ; but may mean that the seals of the Benches differed from each other in that respect, or both of them from that of the Exchequer, and so forth. The next clause, "Unde venerabilis pater," &c., is positively unintelligible ; and, although the only words in it, which have any meaning at all, seem to intimate that there was a difference in the circumscriptions of the two great seals, if the whole passage could be amended, the result might be very different. It can hardly, as it stands, be taken to contradict the direct evidence of the seal we have engraved. The entry of the transaction on the Rolls of Parliament affords us little, if

<sup>7</sup> This on the Roll is "consignand'."

<sup>8</sup> "Justiciario" is not on the Roll.

<sup>9</sup> This also is "consignand'" on the Roll.

any, assistance for clearing up the obscurity. There, after stating that the bishops and prelates had advised that the king, for the reasons shown, could of right, and with good conscience, resume and use the name of King of France, and mentioning that the parliament concurred, the record is as follows : "Quele noun de Roi de France, le Roi reprist, et le xj jour de Juyn le grant seal le Roi, quel il usa a devant, mys en garde, et un autre seal emprente de noun de France repris, et furent chartres, patentes, et briefs ensealez, et toutz les autres sealx en les autres places le Roi en mesme la manere chaungez le dit jour."<sup>1</sup> It will be observed that this speaks of only one seal with the name of France on it having been taken into use again ; which must be understood of a great seal, for the other seals were changed in the same manner ; but it is evidently a very brief notice of the matter, not purporting to give the particulars of what took place. There is, however, a memorandum occurring later in Rymer, which may help to solve the difficulty, and would seem to afford strong proof that the seal E did not differ in its circumscription from F. The latter having been always used in England during the presence of the king, there can be little reason for doubting that it was this seal (F) which was taken again into use when Edward resumed the title of King of France. The seal G, on which the words "et Francie" did not occur, was on that occasion deposited, as we have seen, in the Treasury, where the seal E still was ; or, at least, there is no record of its having been at that time removed thence, unless the memorandum of 1369 be such, though we shall presently find that both G and E were not long after in the custody of the Bishop of Winchester. Now, on Monday, the 24th<sup>2</sup> March, 1371, the bishop having resigned the office of Chancellor, delivered the great seal to the king, and Sir Robert de Thorpe having been appointed his successor, the great seal was on the 26th given to him, who, in due form, sealed certain writs with it, and on the 28th of the same month the bishop delivered to the king two great seals which the king had lately used,

<sup>1</sup> Rolls of Parl., ii., p. 300.

<sup>2</sup> Prof. Willis says the 14th (following Rymer, iii., p. 911), where the words are, "die Lune, viz. decimo quarto ;" but the 14th of March that year was on Friday. An examined MS. copy of the

same Memorandum has, and no doubt correctly, "die Lune, viz. vicesimo quarto." Hence it appears the Seals given up on the 28th of March had not been retained so long as hitherto supposed.

and which had remained in the custody of the bishop ; the circumscription of one of which was "Edwardus Dei gratia Rex Francie et Anglie et Dominus Hibernie," and on the other, "Edwardus Dei gratia Rex Anglie, Dominus Hibernie et Aquitanie." This latter was certainly *α*, which had been deposited in the Treasury in 1369, and the former must surely have been *ε*, which we think has been shown to have been left in the Treasury at the same time ; a conclusion which is strengthened by the fact that *φ* was certainly used as a seal of presence in 1369, 1371, and 1372, as Professor Willis mentions having discovered impressions of it in those years in Pembroke College.

After a careful examination of the memoranda in Rymer, we believe this transaction of the 28th March, 1371, to have been the last occasion on which the seal *ε* is noticed. Of its final suppression there is no record ; but we infer that it was destroyed not long afterwards, unless the king took a great seal with him during his short absence in 1372 ; for it is remarkable that on the king going abroad, at the end of August in that year, he appointed his grandson, Prince Richard, guardian of the realm ; and the seal which, on the change of great seals, was delivered to the chancellor and ordered to be used during the king's absence, was not *ε*, as theretofore, but *α*, which the circumscription on it, given by Rymer, makes evident,<sup>3</sup> although on that seal, as has been mentioned, the words "et Francie" did not occur ; and, therefore, it was not likely to be used had there been existing another seal with those words upon it. If, however, the seal

<sup>3</sup> Rymer iii., p. 962. As this Memorandum is unnoticed by Prof. Willis, and is referred to in the Additional Observations by Mr. Walford, which are subjoined to these remarks, it is here set out, so far as relates to the change of the Seals, with the exception only of the witnesses' names. 46 Edw. III (1372). "Memorandum quod Johannes Knyvet Cancellarius domini Regis die Lune, viz. tricesimo die Augusti anno presenti circa horam nonam in portu de Sandwico in quadam navi ipsius Domini Regis vocata La Grace de Dieu in aula ipsius Regis in navi prædicta in presentia Johannis Regis Castelle [and several others, among whom was Richard Le Scrop, the Treasurer] liberavit eidem Domino Regi super viagio suo supra mare tunc esistenti

quoddam magnum sigillum ipsius domini Regis pro regimine regni Anglie dum idem Rex infra idem regnum fuerit deputatum ; Quod quidem sigillum idem Dominus Rex in quadam bursa inclusum sigillo suo de signeto consignavit et sigillum illud præfato Thesaurario liberavit in thesauraria usque reditum ipsius Regis in Angliam custodiendum. Et statim idem Dominus Rex liberavit præfato Cancellario quoddam aliud magnum sigillum cujus circumscriptio est talis, viz. Edwardus Dei gratia Rex Anglie dominus Hibernie et Aquitanie, præcipiens eidem cancellario ut ea que ad officium suum in dicto regno pertinent usque reditum ipsius Regis in Angliam faceret et exerceret."

E were then existing, it was either taken abroad by the king or deposited in the Treasury.

TABLE OF PERIODS IN WHICH SEAL E WAS CERTAINLY IN USE.

	A.D.	A.R.		A.D.	A.R.
From June 22 to Dec. 1	1340	14	From July 2 . . .	1346	20
From Oct. 4 . . .	1342	16	to Oct. 15 . . .	1347	21
to March 4 . . .	1343	17	From Oct. 29 to Nov. 17	1348	22
From July 3 to July 30	1345	19	From Oct. 14 . . .	1359	33
			to May 19 . . .	1360	34

\* \* When the subject of this unpublished great seal of Edward III. was brought before the monthly meeting of the Institute in London, it attracted the attention of W. S. Walford, Esq., who felt that he was obliged to differ from me in some of the conclusions to which, after a careful perusal of the documents relating to it in Rymer, I had arrived. My only object being the elucidation of facts, I requested him to write a statement of his view of the matter, which he readily and courteously consented to do. As that gentleman's knowledge of the subject entitles his opinion to every possible respect, I expressed a wish that he would allow his remarks to be published, and, by his kind permission, they are here submitted to the readers of the Journal. I also desire to take this opportunity of acknowledging my obligations to him for some valuable assistance in my own investigations.

W. H. G.

---



---

#### ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE SAME SUBJECT,

BY W. S. WALFORD, ESQ.

IN investigating the claims of the newly discovered great seal of King Edward III., to be the missing seal E, the memorandum in Rymer, (iii., p. 868,) of what took place respecting the seals on the 11th June, 1369, is certainly an important document, unless the incompleteness of the second paragraph must be regarded as destructive of its credit. Since the examination of the record itself has verified the printed copy, it is evident some words were accidentally omitted by the clerk who entered the memorandum on the roll; and the correction of it by any higher authority is now hopeless. Still, after a careful study of the entire document as it stands, I can but credit it so far as to believe that two great seals were at that time taken out of the treasury, and that their legends differed as there stated. The version of it by Professor Willis does not indicate any defect or obscurity in the original. He, I presume, was content to give what he considered its

import ; for he could not have overlooked that the sentence was incomplete. *Rex in cancellaria sua*, was one of the modes of designating the Court of Chancery, and did not imply the actual presence of the king ; and I would suggest that the omitted words should have followed the word *consignand'* at the end of the second paragraph, which should have terminated thus—“*consignandi gratia brevia et alia de cursu cancellariæ sibi accepit*,” or with words to the like effect. If such words be supplied, the whole becomes intelligible and consistent ; and the general purport of it as regards the seals is, that the Chancellor, sitting officially, caused all the seals in the treasury with either “*Anglie et Francie*,” or “*Francie et Anglie*” upon them to be brought to him ; whereof he took two great seals, with the legends specified, and delivered other seals to the chiefs of the courts of K.B., C.P., and Exchequer, and another to the Clerk of the Privy Seal : and the seals which had been in use since the Peace of Bretigny he sent back to the treasury. The division of the memorandum into paragraphs in the printed copy has added somewhat to the obscurity of it. However, the view I take of the matter does not require any words to be supplied ; for I think, defective as the document is, it suffices to show that two great seals were then taken out of the treasury with “*Anglie et Francie*” and “*Francie et Anglie*” upon them respectively, whatever may have been done with them ; and my only object, in suggesting words to complete the sense, is to point out where the omission occurs, and how little need be supplied.

After carefully perusing Professor Willis's paper, and the various documents in Rymer which I could find bearing on the subject, and the additional information for which we are indebted to Mr. Gunner, a view of the question, whether the newly discovered seal be E or not, occurred to me, consistent, I think, with all the evidence ; and this I will now proceed to state, distinguishing the Winchester seal as W for facility of reference.

My hypothesis, or I hope I may say inference from all the evidence, is, that between the 20th of June, 1340, and the Peace of Bretigny in May, 1360 (the period during which Professor Willis has assumed there was but one great seal of absence used, viz. E), *either* there were two great seals of absence, viz., W, till October, 1347, and probably later, and afterwards E ; *or* there was only one great seal of absence, viz., originally W ; but which between 1347 and 1360 was converted into E by the inscription being altered from “*Francie et Anglie*” into “*Anglie et Francie*.” For the fact of W having been a seal of absence in 1347, Mr. Gunner has proved beyond question ; and that sometime before May, 1360, there was a great seal of absence with the inscription, “*Anglie et Francie*,” is, I think, also proved, though less conclusively, by the document in Rymer, (iii., p. 868,) seeing that F was certainly a seal of presence.

Of these two alternatives the latter, viz., that there was only one seal (*i. e.* matrix), the inscription of which was altered between 1347 and 1360, seems to me the more probable for the following reasons:—1. Such alterations were not uncommon, as Professor Willis's paper shows, and an alteration would satisfy all that the evidence requires to make it consistent. 2. If it were found expedient to make the difference between F and W more manifest, an alteration like that supposed was well adapted for the purpose. 3. There is no account of any *new* great seal having been made or delivered to the Chancellor during the period. I at first thought the

payment of 3*l.* to W. Moreton in 1356, for making a certain seal for the king's use (Prof. Willis's paper, p. 23, note) might have been for a new great seal; but the sum is perhaps too small, and, supposing it an instalment, I apprehend a great seal would not have been so designated. 4. An alteration of the inscription only was less likely to be noticed in any document than the making of a new seal; and as the payment for it would be trifling, it may have formed part of some item in which it was not specified. I find no good reason to think that such an alteration would lead to a transposition of the arms, so as to place those of England before those of France. 5. In August, 1372, the king went abroad again (Rymer, iii., p. 962), and from his return in October, 1347, till that time, there is no indication of the destruction or loss of any great seal, or of the coexistence of two great seals of absence; and the memorandum on that occasion (which was after G had been made, and before it was altered,) goes very far to show that there were then three great seals, viz., E, F, and G, and no more; and that W and E are to be referred to the same matrix, with different legends. For as the king, whose absence was shorter than he had reason to expect, no doubt took with him one great seal, and most likely F, the seal which was given up by the Chancellor and deposited in the treasury must, I conceive, have been E; and the seal delivered to him for use in the king's absence we know was G. Had E and W been distinct matrices, there would have been *four* seals, and either E or W would in all probability have been left with the Chancellor rather than G, which was singularly inappropriate, since the word "Francie" was not upon it. This will more clearly appear on referring to the memorandum, which is given by Mr. Gunner, p. 254, n. 3.

Whether the seal delivered to Thorpe, Chancellor, on the 26th March, 1371, was E or F, is not clear; for supposing W and E were two distinct matrices, then W may have been the great seal with "Francie et Anglie" upon it, which was delivered up to the king on the 28th March, 1371, and F the seal which had been committed to Thorpe on the 26th of the same month. But the reasons above advanced to show that W and E were one matrix, incline me to coincide with Professor Willis in thinking that E was delivered to Thorpe, and not F; and this anomaly, as it appears, may seem less if we advert to another circumstance not a little singular. In the often mentioned document in Rymer, (iii., p. 868,) we find on the 11th June, 1369, two great seals were taken by or delivered to the Chancellor when we should have expected he would have had only one, and that F. Now as the king did not then contemplate leaving England, I would suggest, by way of explanation of this, that one seal was intended for English, and the other for foreign affairs, which were then likely to require its use; a practice probably then commencing in consequence of the improbability of the king having to go abroad again;<sup>1</sup> and that as F was the seal known abroad, it was best adapted for foreign affairs, and thus E would become a seal for the rule of England even when the king was present. That some change in the use of the seals had taken place is, I think, shown by

<sup>1</sup> Edward was then barely fifty-seven, but he had no reason to anticipate the reverse of fortune which rapidly ensued. The Black Prince was in the zenith of his glory, and though his health was impaired by his Spanish campaign, little, if

any, apprehension was entertained of the malady proving incurable; and his brothers John and Edmund, influenced by his example, had shown no want of ability in military affairs.



the necessity there was of substituting G for E in August, 1372; when, owing to the king having to go abroad again, an emergency arose in regard to them for which he was not prepared. Such alteration in the employment of the seals may explain why E was delivered to Thorpe, and also why F (together with the great seal G, and two privy seals,) had been in the hands of and was retained by the late Chancellor for awhile "ex commissione Regis," and was then redelivered to the king; and it was committed by him to the treasury probably because there was then no immediate occasion for it. However if F only were used for foreign affairs, it was not confined to them; for Professor Willis (p. 26, note) mentions impressions of it at Pembroke College, under the dates of 1369, 1371, and 1372, as if both E and F may have been used, though perhaps not indiscriminately, for English affairs; but there is nothing to lead us to think that any other than F was used for foreign affairs from June, 1369, till G was altered. I am fully aware that, taken by themselves, these Pembroke impressions are *prima facie* evidence of F having been the great seal delivered to Thorpe on the 20th March, 1371; and I regret Professor Willis has not mentioned the exact dates, and the nature of the instruments to which they are appended; for the use of F on those occasions might have been capable of explanation. In 1372, the year in which Thorpe died, Wailly says that F occurs to a document in the French archives, so that it had been taken out of the treasury again if it had been deposited there in March, 1371. That document may possibly have been one sent by the king when he went abroad in August, 1372. These are the circumstances which make me feel not altogether satisfied as to which seal was delivered to Thorpe on the 26th March, 1371. Whether that seal were E or F is, according to my view of the subject, unimportant, except as regards the inquiry whether W and E represent two matrices or one; for if F were delivered to Thorpe at that time, W and E must in all probability have been two matrices; while on the other hand, if they represent one matrix in different states, that matrix, with the E legend on it, was, we may with equal confidence conclude, the seal delivered to Thorpe, because the legend on one of the two great seals retained by the late Chancellor was like that of W and F; while the legend on the other shows it to have been G, which, on some occasion and for some purpose not easily explained, had been placed in his hands.

According to the conclusion at which I have arrived, the seal E, with "Anglie et Francie" upon it, did not come into use before the 29th October, 1348, if so early; and the chances of an impression being discovered are less than they have hitherto appeared; though it is by no means to be despaired of, as it seems to have been in use for three years after June, 1369.

Since the foregoing observations were written, another impression of the undescribed seal of Edward III., to which they relate, has been noticed amongst the muniments of the city of Bristol, which were displayed for the gratification of the members of the Institute, at the recent meeting of the society. The charter, to which it is appended, bears date A.D. 1347, in the absence of Edward from the realm, during the long siege of Calais, and whilst Lionel, Duke of Clarence, was Guardian of England. It concludes as follows; — "Teste Leonello filio nostro carissimo, Custode Anglie, apud Redynges, vicesimo quarto die Aprilis, Anno regni nostri Anglie xxj., Francie octavo". The seal is partly imperfect.