

SLAVERY AND SERFDOM IN ENGLAND,*

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO EAST ANGLIA.

People look upon slavery and serfdom in England as things of the past, and so they are, but not of a very distant past ; few people know how long they lingered in fact or in law, how gradually they disappeared, and how many causes and reasons have been suggested for their disappearance.

The subject is a very large one, and can only be cursorily treated here, and that with special reference, where possible, to East Anglia.

We pass over the earliest stages of British history during the Celtic period, and under Roman domination. Slavery existed as an institution under both Celtic and Roman forms of government ; but English history, properly so-called, begins with Anglo-Saxon days.

Before the Conquest, then, we find the following classes of population :—(1) Lords of the Manor, sometimes called thanes, a term which lingered in use in Scotland after it was disused in England. These were free men, except so far as they were under the King, and in theory holding their manors from him were subject to the well-known *trinoda necessitas*, namely, of supporting the king in his military expeditions (*fyrð*), aiding in the building of his castles (*burhbote*), maintaining the bridges (*brigbote*).†

* By slavery, as distinct from serfdom, is meant the condition of "servi" as distinct from that of "villani."

† In a characteristically learned article by W. H. Stevenson, in the *English Historical Review* for Oct., 1914, it is proved that the proper form of the phrase is *trinoda necessitas*, that its wide circulation is due to later lawyers, and that its substance, not the phrase, only occurs in one genuine early charter (pp. 689-702). Mr. Stevenson has kindly revised the translations on pp. 189 and 193, but he has not seen this paper, nor is he responsible for any part of it.

Under the lords of the manors were the population which resided on the manors, and which cultivated the land for their lords, including smiths, farriers, etc., and all other such occupations as were subsidiary to or connected with the cultivation of land. They fell into three classes.

(1) The *gebur*, who in return for his cottage and his land, and for agricultural implements which were supplied, paid *gafol*, that is tribute or rent in money, and also in kind, the amount of which varied in different manors; and week work, that is to say, compulsory and unpaid work for his lord on two or three days in each week.

(2) The *cottier* held, as a rule, less land than the *gebur*, and had harder conditions of work. Though they were not slaves, there was much that was servile about the tenure of the *gebur* and the *cottier*, who in no way represent the tenant farmer and the free labourer of the present day.

(3) The *theows* or *servi*. These were slaves in the full sense of the term. They could be bought or sold, exported or imported. They were the property of their master, against whom they had no redress, for they possessed none of the rights of citizenship.

These slaves were originally mainly captives in war, reduced to slavery, but the children of slaves were slaves *natura*. Their number was continually being added to by marriage, by settlement, by voluntary surrender—for a lord was bound to feed and clothe his slave—so that the position was sometimes sought by the destitute, or forced on people by way of punishment for crime, or even by high-handed injustice.

In Anglo-Norman days similar conditions prevailed, although there was a change of nomenclature.

In the Domesday survey, apart from lords of manors, etc., the following classes of population are mentioned :—

Customary tenants, including—

- (a) *Villani*, c. 110,000.
- (b) *Bordarii*, c. 82,000.
- (c) *Cotarii* and *Cotseti*, c. 7,000.

The distinctions between (a), (b), and (c) became in course of time practically obsolete, and all of them may be reckoned together under the general term of “villani” or “villeins.”

In addition to the above, there were the *servi*, *nativi*, or slaves, 25,000 in number. These were in the fullest sense of the word slaves. There was a limited servile character in the position of the villani, but *servi* were literally the property of their master, they were part of his stock, and could be sold as such with their wives and children. Any damage done to others by a slave the master must make good, as for mischief done by his cattle. The slave had no credibility, no legal rights; wrong done to him was wrong done to his master. On the other hand, his master was bound to feed him and to give him a certain amount of holiday. Both were necessary for the health and, therefore, for the usefulness of a slave. But we may feel sure that in most cases little more than the minimum required by these two considerations would be given. These *servi*, as a class, seem to have disappeared in England in the thirteenth century.

There is also mention of free men in Domesday, 23,000 under the name of *sochmanni*, and 12,000 under

the name of *liberi homines* or *libere tenentes*. They appear exclusively in those parts of England which fell under Danish influence, especially Lincolnshire and East Anglia, and no more can be said about them here, except this, that their origin and position are extremely obscure.

Two questions of interest present themselves :

(1) What were the causes which led to the abolition or cessation of slavery and serfdom in England, and especially in East Anglia ?

(2) What is the date of their disappearance ?

By slavery and serfdom we repeat that we mean not only the complete servitude of the *servi* or slave class, but also the semi-servile or partially servile position of the *villani* or villeins.

Between them these two classes comprised once almost the whole of the labouring population of England.

Various causes have been suggested for their diminution and final extinction, none of them exclusively true, yet all of them possessing some element of truth.

The Christian religion is sometimes credited with the abolition of slavery, but this is only true indirectly and in a general sense. Slavery as an institution is not condemned either in the Old or the New Testament; slaves were owned and employed by ecclesiastical as well as by lay owners. It seems probable that servitude on the demesne of a bishop or an abbey was preferable to servitude under a lay lord, because likely to be more exempt from capricious or malicious treatment.

Thus in a document preserved in the *Codex Diplomaticus** we find that the serfs attached to the royal vill at Bensington were transferred to the land of the Church at Radnor, with their offspring and their posterity for ever.

Again, we find a convent acquiring slaves by deed of gift in the thirteenth century in Suffolk.

The following deed is the property of Sir Rider Haggard, and has been kindly lent by him to the present writer. It was printed by Dr. Raven in the *East Anglian*, new series, Vol. v., p. 193, in a crabbed form, with the contractions unexpanded. As that publication is now extinct, and not easy to get, it seems worth while to reprint it in a full form, and in a more accessible publication. Its interest lies in the fact that it affords evidence that serfdom was in existence in Suffolk at the end of the thirteenth century to such an extent that a married woman and her eldest son could be made over by a deed of gift, along with the holding which they occupied, by its owner to a convent at Bungay.

The original orthography and punctuation have been retained. Both are capricious.

Omnibus christi fidelibus ad quos presens scriptum peruenerit Rogerus de Huntingfeud† salutem. Nouerit vniversitas uestra me dedisse et concessisse et hac Carta mea presenti confirmasse deo et Ecclesie sancte crucis de Bungay et sanctimonialibus ibidem deo seruientibus Alueuam vxorem Rogeri Brunstan‡ et

* We have been unable to verify this reference, but the *Codex Diplomaticus* is in many volumes, and not indexed.

† This is a dialectical form of the modern name Huntingfield. This Roger de Huntingfield succeeded his father in 1283, and died in 1301, between which two dates this deed must be placed.

‡ Roger Brunstan was apparently alive, otherwise Alveva must have been called "vidua," not "uxor."

Thomam filium eius primogenitum cum toto tenemento suo quod de me tenuerunt in uilla de Medefeud (a) ex pertinentiis de Mendham (b) in liberam et puram et perpetuam Elimosinam pro salute anime patris mei et Matris mee et antecessorum et successorum meorum saluo seruicio domini Regis. scilicet ad Wardam 1 denarium per annum ad x. solidos et ad scutagium domini Regis ad xx. solidos, ii. denarios et ad plus plus et ad minus minus. Et ut donacio ista et confirmacio stabilis ac Rata permaneat pro me et heredibus meis sigilli mei munimine corroborauit.

Hiis testibus Willelmo de huntingfeud(c). Waltero Malet. petro Walteri. Roberto de huntingfeud(d). Willelmo le Curtun(e). Huberto Walteri. Alano de Wyresdale(f). Willelmo Cantelu. G[alfrido] de drokes(g). Ada fil[i]o Gaulteri. Waltero rege. Ada sac[erdote](h). Willelmo sac[erdote]. Martino sac[erdote] Godfrido de linburne(i).

Sigillum [Rogeri de] Huntingfeld(j).

(a) Now Metfield. Here we have another instance of the termination "field" being modified as "feud." A reference to W. W. Skeat's *Place Names in Suffolk*, Cambridge, 1913, will supply several more instances.

(b) This expression implies that Metfield was not an independent parish, but was in some way dependent upon Mendham.

(c) This William de Huntingfeud was born in 1281, and was the eldest son of the donor.

(d) Probably a younger son of the donor.

(e) "le" may be a clerical error for "de," and "Curtun" is probably a form of "Corton," though exactly such a form is not known elsewhere. Corton is in the Hundred of Lothingland, and therefore not very far from Bungay.

(f) Now "Withersdale," formerly a separate parish, now consolidated with the adjoining parishes of Metfield, Linstead Parva, and Mendham.

(g) Only the initial G is given, which may stand for some other name than Galfridus, and "drokes" has not been identified.

(h) The abbreviation in each case is "sac," which stands for "sacerdote." Ada is the mediæval ablative case of Adam.

(i) Linburne, now Lymburn, is a manor in the parish of Homersfield, or South Elmham St. Mary, which belonged to the nuns of Bungay.

(j) The seal of yellow wax is in a state of fair preservation. It shows a mailed knight on horseback, with a drawn sword in his right hand and a shield in his left hand. The inscription round the rim is hardly legible, the rim having been much broken away. Only the opening word "sigillum" and the concluding part of the concluding word are legible. The latter looks like NGFELD, but the reading is not certain.

The Convent at Bungay was founded in 1160 by Roger de Glanville, and the Countess Gundreda, his wife, in honour of God and St. Mary, and the Holy Cross. Nothing of the original building remains. The site and possessions were granted by Henry VIII. to Thomas, Duke of Norfolk, on Dec. 18th in the 29th year of his reign.

[TRANSLATION.]

To all the faithful people of Christ to whom the present writing shall come, Roger of Huntingfield [sendeth] health.

Know all ye that I have given and granted and by this my present charter have confirmed to God and the Church of the Holy Cross at Bungay, and to the nuns serving God in that place, Alveva the wife of Roger Brunstan, and Thomas, her firstborn son, together with the whole of their holding which they have held of me in the hamlet of Metfield, of the appurtenances to Mendham, in free and pure and perpetual almain, for the health of my soul, and of the soul of my father and mother, and [of the souls] of my ancestors and successors, saving the service due to our Lord the King, namely, for ward one penny annually, when the ward is assessed at ten shillings, and for scutage of our Lord the King two pence annually when the ward is assessed at twenty shillings, and more when it is assessed at more, and less when at less. And in order that this gift and its confirmation may remain established and ratified, I have corroborated it by the attestation of my seal for me and my heirs.

In the presence of these witnesses :

William of Huntingfield.	G[oeffrey] of Drokes.
Walter Malet.	Adam Walter.
Peter [son] of Walter.	Walter King.
Robert of Huntingfield.	Adam, priest.
William le Curtun.	William, priest.
Hubert [son] of Walter.	Martin, priest.
Alan of Wyresdale.	Godfrey of Linburne.
William Cantelu.	

The Church therefore cannot be directly credited with the abolition of slavery, but it is true that it laid

down broad principles on the equality and brotherhood of man, which were inconsistent with slavery, and which eventually, though very slowly, led to its suppression in England, as elsewhere.

Prominent opponents of slavery among great Churchmen were St. Wilfrid, who, Bede tells us, baptized and freed 250 slaves in Sussex, attached to his newly founded monastery at Selsey* (681-686). And later on, in the reign of William the Conqueror, the Irish slave trade at Bristol was largely put down by the preaching of St. Wulfstan†, Bishop of Worcester (1062-95).

The achievement of liberty was hastened by the riots, caused by the miserable condition of the bulk of the people, much in the same way as Parliamentary Reform was only won by the riots of 1831-2, and Women's Suffrage was sought to be won, and eventually will be won, by the riotous conduct of women in pursuit of it. Thus the great peasant rising of 1381, immediately caused by the imposition and collection of the poll-tax, Wat Tyler leading the Kentish men, and John Wrawe leading the Suffolk insurgents, was really a revolt against the servile character of villeinage.‡ They demanded, among other things, (a) the abolition of bondage—"quod de cetero nullus foret natus," and (b) the commutation of villein services—"quod nulla acra terrae, quae in bondage vel servitio teneatur, altius quam ad quatuor denarios haberetur."

The demands were granted by the King in the moment of peril, but the grant was afterwards revoked, and its revocation was sanctioned by Parlia-

* H. E. Lib. iv., cap. xiii.

† Wil. of Malmesbury, *Vita S. Wulfstani* (Wharton, H.), *Ang. Sac.* ii., 258.

‡ A graphic description of this rising has been given by our member, Mr. Edgar Powell in *The Rising in East Anglia in 1381*. Cambridge, 1896. For Suffolk's share in it see pp. 9-25.

ment. But in spite of this failure great results were secured by the villeins and bondsmen. Landlords gradually ceased from demanding unpaid compulsory service, money payments were accepted in the place of forced labour, emancipated labourers were not recalled into serfdom, and their assertions of rights in county courts or manor courts ceased to be contested. But the victory was by no means universal or complete.

In 1536-7 (28 Henry VIII.) the House of Lords discussed and rejected a bill concerning "Manu-missionem servorum vulgariter dictorum Bondsmen." It had come up to them from the House of Commons (Journals of the House of Lords, Vol. I., p. 94). And the emancipation of bondsmen formed one of the demands of the Norfolk rebels under Robert Ket in 1549.

Another cause frequently referred to is connected with the epidemics of the fourteenth century, and especially with the Black Death of 1348. Exact statistics are wanting, but it has been reckoned to have swept off half the population. There were not people enough left to cultivate the land. In consequence of their scarcity, labourers were able to make better terms for themselves, and the original conditions of villeinage became more and more difficult for landlords to enforce.

The Black Death may, therefore, fairly be counted among the causes contributory to the amelioration of the villeins' condition.

But commutation of the *opera*—the compulsory service of *custumarii*—for money payments had begun long before the Black Death, and can only have been accelerated by it, causing the terms of commutation

to be less favourable to the landlords, and therefore more favourable to the *custumarii*.

Lastly, and generally, the abolition of slavery, and of servile labour in its varying forms, was due to the influence of contemporaneous economic and social changes, which cannot be tabulated; the former having reference to the comparative value of servile and free labour, and the latter to a growing sense of the brotherhood and equal rights of men.

Acts of manumission on the part of slave owners were frequent from the earliest times, and the record or certificate of manumission was entered in early days on the fly-leaf or margin of the service books of Cathedral or Conventual Churches. A large number of examples of such entries has been conveniently collected and printed by Kemble (J. M.), *Saxons in England*, Vol. I., pp. 496-501. Among interesting specimens not included there, we would refer to the ninth century Welsh manumission of Bleidiud, in the Gospels of St. Chad, of which the text may be read in Haddan and Stubbs's *Councils, &c.*, Vol. I., p. 206, and a facsimile is given by Lindsay (W. M.), *Early Welsh Script*, Oxford, 1912, p. 47; several ninth century Cornish manumissions in the Bodmin Gospels, printed in full by Haddan and Stubbs, *u.s.*, pp. 676-683; and a batch of little known eleventh century Anglo-Saxon manumissions in the Leofric Missal, of which facsimiles are given before the title page, and the texts and translations on pp. lviii.-lix., 5-6 (edit. F. E. Warren, Oxford, 1883).

Most of these early manumissions were conferred in church, but four in the Leofric Missal were conferred at four cross-ways, all alike being registered in Church books. Later on there was more variety of locality and mode of registration of manumissions,

the entries of such facts being usually made in the manor court rolls.

Two quotations will illustrate Anglo-Norman practice in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

(a) Si qui vero velit servum suum liberum facere, tradat eum vice-comiti per manum dexteram in pleno comitatu, quietum illum clamare debet a jugo servitutis seu per manumissionem, et ostendat ei liberas vias, et tradat illi libera arma, scilicet lanceam et gladium, deinde liber homo efficitur.

Laws of William the Conqueror, carta iii., § 15, in Thorpe (B.), *Ancient Laws*, p. 213.

(b) Qui servum suum liberat in ecclesia vel mercato, vel comitatu, vel hundreto, coram testibus et palam faciat, et liberas ei vias, et portas conscribat apertas, et lanceam et gladium, vel que liberorum arma sunt in manibus ei ponat.—Leges Henrici I., § 78. *Ib.* p. 254.

[TRANSLATION.]

(a) But if anyone willeth to enfranchise his slave, taking him by the right hand he should deliver him to the Sheriff in full county court, and he must proclaim him quit of the yoke of slavery, as it were by manumission; and he should show to him the free roads, and hand to him the arms of freedom, that is to say, a spear and a sword. Thenceforth he is made a free man.

(b) Whoever enfranchiseth his slave in a church, or in a market-place, or in a county court, or in the hundred, should do it before witnesses and openly, and should assign to him free roads and open gates, and should place in his hands both a spear and a sword, or whatever are the arms of free men.

But in spite of high-sounding language and picturesque ceremonial, the manumitted slave did not in the earliest times become a free man in the full sense of the words, nor did he enter a special class of "freedmen" or "libertini"; he became a villein or villanus, still subject to the necessity of doing so many days work per week, or paying a forced tribute to his territorial lord in lieu thereof. The number of days' work, in *opera*, varied in different manors, and according to the season of the year. And he was subject to various exactions, such as *Reliefs*, or a fine paid by successors on entering a tenement; *heriots*, the surrender of a horse or an ox or some other farm asset, on the death of a tenant; *chevage*, or payment for license to leave the manor; *merchet*, or payment for leave to marry.

Relief from burdens, both those of slavery and villeinage, was obtained very gradually. There was no one Act of Parliament sweeping them all away; it came from the non-enforcement of seignorial rights, from legal decisions obtained in favour of freedom, and in later times, till the sixteenth century, by the permitted purchase of freedom, a third part of a man's property, or its money value, being recognised by the Court of Augmentation as a reasonable payment for a charter of enfranchisement from the bonds of villeinage. Lords of manors became willing to enfranchise, and sometimes made considerable profit from the enfranchisement of such of their dependents as had become sufficiently prosperous to be able to purchase it.

Forced labour on the part of villeins began to disappear at an early date, and the commutation of *opera* for a money equivalent was a common practice both before and after the Black Death in 1348. For

example, from a bailiff's roll of the Manor of Framlingham for the 19th year of Edward II. (1325-6), it appears that its value was*

<i>From—</i>	£	s.	d.
Corn, wood, grass, and stock ..	134	0	0
Rent of Assize	30	17	0
Tallage of <i>Nativi</i>	9	0	0
Farm of mill and fair	23	0	0
Court perquisites	6	14	0
Out manor rents	39	0	0
<i>Opera</i>	23	4	0
	£265 15 0		

The total value of the *opera*, or compulsory services, was then less than one tenth of the total annual value of the manor; it would not be a very difficult task to convert such *opera* into a money equivalent whenever under pressure from the general trend of public opinion against forced labour, such commutation took place.

Again, from an examination of *post-mortem* inquiries of 40 manors in 1333, 22 being in Norfolk, and 18 in Suffolk, it transpires that in 9 the value of *opera* was greater than one half of the rent of assize; in 21 the value of *opera* was between 1-8th and $\frac{1}{2}$ of the rent of assize; in 6 the value was beneath 1-8th of the rent of assize; in 4 there were no *opera* at all.

The *opera* in the two first and heavier classes

* For the following fact we are indebted to an able paper on the commutation of *Villein Services in England before the Black Death*, by H. L. Gray, in the *English Historical Review* for October, 1914. The evidence produced is voluminous; we confine ourselves chiefly to evidence drawn from Suffolk and Norfolk.

in these two counties were more numerous than those in any other county in England, except Essex, while in the northern and western counties of England, and in Kent, *opera* had disappeared entirely, or almost entirely. If full evidence could be collected, it would no doubt be proved that the forced labour of villeins on manorial estates had been gradually disappearing everywhere; and that it ultimately disappeared completely not by any Act of Parliament abolishing or prohibiting it, but under the silent pressure of economic and social considerations.

On the estates of the Bishop of Norwich, whose See was at this time co-extensive with the counties of Suffolk and Norfolk, accounts for the years 18 Edward II. 1324-5 and 44 Edward III. (Jan., 1369—Jan., 1370, old style) show that all the *opera* were commuted, and once commuted we may be certain that they were never re-imposed or revived.

So much for the disappearance of the servile *opera*; but, as we have seen, the villein was subject to other burdens besides *opera*, and he could not get completely and formally free from them except by an act of manumission; though informally he might get freedom by a flight in which he was unsought for or unfound, or by the surceasing of the enforcement of seignorial rights. The latter was unsatisfactory, because unless they were legally surrendered seignorial claims could be vexatiously or capriciously recalled into operation at some later time.

A notable instance of this occurred in 1586, when Lord Stafford claimed R. Cole, then Mayor of Bristol, and his brother, Thomas, as his villeins, a claim which led to a lengthy and costly litigation, and which seems to have terminated in favour of the Mayor, though the final decision has not been actually recorded.

Such expressions as "bondmen" and "bondwomen" would cover both "villani" and "servi." The latter class, always limited in number, compared with villeins, would naturally disappear first, and did disappear, through manumission, at a very early period; but both classes were bond servants, and both needed enfranchisement, though they stood in very different degrees of servitude.

Mr. Alexander Savine has compiled a list of some seventy manors which are known to have contained bondmen in Tudor times. Of these the following eight were in Norfolk.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Date.</i>	<i>Authority.</i>
Hokham Magna	30 Henry VIII.	Gairdner, J., Letters and Papers of Hen. VIII., Vol. xiii., Pt. 2, No. 1028.
Kenninghall	33 „	East Anglian, new ser. vol. III., pp. 377-8.
Forncett	1563-75	Transactions of Royal Historical Society, XIV., 123-42.
Gimmingham	4 Elizabeth	Hall, Hubert, Society in the Elizabethan Age, p. 158.
Martham	17-18 „	Exchequer, Queen's Remembrancer, Special Commission, No. 1551.
Walpole	18 „	Ditto, No. 1637.
West Walton	18 „	Ditto, No. 1552.
Esterham	18 „	Ditto, Nos. 1554, 1637.
<i>And one in Suffolk.</i>		
Kelsall	31 „	Exch. Queen's Rem. Misc., Vol. 46, f. 246*

* *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, new series, Vol. xvii., p. 281.

To this list may be added East Dereham, Ter-
rington, and Wymondham in Norfolk (Special Com-
mission No. 1550) and Eye, Hitcham, Stradbroke, and
Walton in Suffolk (No. 2151).

This list will no doubt be added to hereafter,
when all manor rolls in private hands shall have been
examined. The most interesting of them is the
Manor of Forncett. Fifteen Forncett Manor Rolls
survive of the date 1272-1307, two rolls of the date of
1376-1378, and a considerable number of the fifteenth
and sixteenth centuries. They are now in the Cam-
bridge University Library. An exhaustive paper,
written by Miss Frances G. Davenport on the Decay
of Villeinage in East Anglia is mainly based upon them.†

They show that the commutation of week-works
for a money payment was proceeding with consider-
able rapidity in the 14th century, and that serfdom
was gradually disappearing.

By 1400	16	families of serfs	were in the Manor.
1500	8	“	“
1525	5	“	“
1550	3	“	“
1575		they had all	disappeared.

There is no reason to doubt that this is typical
of what was going on with unequal rapidity throughout
England.

Serfdom may be said to have disappeared in the
reign of Elizabeth, though a few isolated cases of it
may have survived to the seventeenth century. One
certainly did. In 1617 (15 James I.) serfs are men-
tioned as still existing in the Manor of Falmer, in

† *Transactions of Royal Historical Society*, new series, Vol. xiv., pp. 123-
141.

Sussex. In Norden's MS. Survey of certain Crown Manors it is said :

"There are three bondmen of bloude belonging unto this manor, never known to be anie way manumitted, namely, Thomas, William, John Goringe."*

In 1619 Norden, in a survey of the Forest of Pickering, suspected the existence of bondmen there, and made enquiry about their work ; but in their returns the tenants deny 'the existence of anie bonde or sokemen amongst them.' It has been doubted whether this reply was entirely disinterested and true.†

The last relic of serfdom in the United Kingdom is in the case of the Scottish colliers and salters, whose condition was servile, and who were not emancipated till 1799.‡ by Act of Parliament, 39 George III., cap. 56. *Statutes at Large*, Vol. xlii., p. 247.

F. E. WARREN.

The writer of this paper makes no claim to original work. He has simply collected facts and opinions accumulated or expressed by other people, hoping that their presentation in this form may not be unacceptable to such readers as are not themselves historical experts. Every reference therein, both to MSS. and to printed books, has been verified. He is indebted to Miss Lilian J. Redstone for verifying the last five references in Mr. Savine's list of manors on p. 197. and for the seven names of places in Norfolk and Suffolk added to it.

F. E. W.

* Quoted in *Notes and Queries*, 1st Ser., Vol. i., p. 139.

† Quoted by A. Savine in *Transactions of the Royal Society*, new series Vol. xvii., p. 242.

‡ See Rait (R. S.), *History of Scotland*, 1914, pp. 221-4.