

Bristol, who, when referring to certain documents of which the local historians have made ample use, says :—

“I have for a long time regarded these writings as exceedingly mischievous, so far at least as they refer to Bristol, and deserving to be classed with the forgeries of Chatterton, who in fact, I have no doubt, was the author of many of them.”

If such suspicion may attach to Barrett's Cabottian entry, the entry in the Fust chronicle must share it, for we have only to compare both to see at a glance that they are near akin, besides being the only sources of information for the statement.

In reply, MR. WEARE says that “Mr. Kerslake, bookseller, of Bristol, who was a very intelligent and painstaking antiquary, during the time, or a portion of the time, the chronicle remained in his possession, had also in his possession genuine and unquestioned specimens of Chatterton's handwriting.” I fail to perceive the cogency of the argument. If the Fust chronicle was “in the style of writing of the sixteenth century,” of what use could be specimens of Chatterton's handwriting? I may add that the young and accomplished forger penned a goodly number of his fabrications in a manner to lead people to believe that the penmanship was contemporary with the events related, as the Chatterton MSS. preserved in the British Museum amply show.

I timidly ventured to suggest that all those anachronisms and indications were calculated to create in the mind of critical historians an impression of doubt regarding the authenticity of the Fust and Barrett excerpts. The word “impression” has provoked the mirth of MR. WEARE, who does not seem to know that the first result of every