

between 1565 and the time when Sir Francis acquired it. MR. WEARE replies with the statement that "the evidence of living persons could, if necessary, be obtained to prove that, apparently, the chronicle was in a contemporary, *i. e.*, sixteenth century, style of writing." But are these persons versed in palæography? Do they not know that the time when Sir Francis *lived* was the golden age in Bristol of forged documents in old penmanship?

Barrett's 'History of Bristol' is filled with spurious historical accounts of that description. Nay, we know when, where, and by whom they were fabricated. In the language of Mr. Charles Kent, "whatever information Barrett wanted for his immediate purpose was placed by Chatterton, within a few hours' time, at his command." How are we to distinguish the grain from the chaff, and why should not the MS. quoted by Barrett for his brief account of Cabot's voyage be as fictitious as the rest? There is scarcely any difference in kind and spirit between that entry and others in the pseudo-correspondence between the equally spurious monk Rowley and Canynge. Take these, for instance:—

"1068. Three Brystowe Barks sayled to the isles Hyberne and Scotteland.

"1073. The Brystowe Menne did Trade to the Isles. Haymon with Normannes and Bry-towe Menne dyd despoyle the Londe of Wales. Twa welche Barks menewhyle came to Bristowe, and despoyled part of the Brydge, botte weere forslegen and dryven awaie.

"1231. Trade to Hyberne was begonno to bee made bie the Brystowe Menne," &c.

Nor were those forgeries limited to Barrett's desiderata. I must be permitted to quote again Mr. George Price, the learned City Librarian of