

The third inscription (fig. 3) is now inside the Presbytery, at the base of one of the southern parclooses, and reads thus: "HIC IACET EDMUNDVS REX EPELDREDI REGIS FILIVS." It is of the same age as the older of the two preceding inscriptions; and it was formerly in Bishop Gardiner's chantry. Rudborne, misreading the unfamiliar Anglo Saxon \mathfrak{p} (th), called this Edmund the son of King Alfred; and Milner, who read the character as a \mathfrak{p} (w), accepted this interpretation. On one of the mortuary chests, he is described "*Qui vivente patre regia sceptrā tulit.*" Mr. Petrie, in the Edition of Asser contained in the *Monumenta Historica Britannica*, vol. i. p. 485, has introduced this Edmund into the text as a son of Alfred who died in the lifetime of his father. But not only is it quite plain that the name of the father is Etheldred, and not Alfred; but neither in the Codex Diplomaticus, nor in any other record of authority, does any son of Alfred appear to have been named Edmund, or to have been crowned and to have died in his father's lifetime. The only King Edmund, son of a King Etheldred, was Edmund Ironside. He is said to have been buried at Glastonbury. Can that be an error, and he be the Edmund in question?

Thanks were ordered to be returned for these Exhibitions and Communications.

The Vice-President in the Chair then gave notice that the ordinary meetings of the Society were adjourned over the Vacation to Thursday, November 17th.

ERRATA.

Page 254, line 31, *for* his having alienated certain lands to, *read* the alienation to him of certain lands by.

Page 259, line 37, EDWARD FOSS, Esq. F.S.A. informs us that Sir Nicholas Hare was not Lord Keeper on the accession of Mary, and was buried in the Temple Church, not Westminster Abbey.

END OF VOLUME IV. AND OF THE FIRST SERIES.