PREFACE.

In order to secure uniformity in a series of Calendars extending over more than two centuries, and prepared by different persons, it was necessary that certain definite rules should be laid down with regard to the treatment of proper names, a matter in which there is at present considerable diversity of practice among the most eminent historical writers. A few words will suffice to explain the system which has been adopted, after careful consideration, as the most suitable for an official Calendar.

Ordinary Christian names, whether of Englishmen or of foreigners, are given in the Calendar according to their commonest modern English form. Christian names which are not now in vogue in this country are given according to the form used in the Rolls, the termination of the nominative case being adopted with regard to declinable Latin names.

Surnames, on the other hand, are given according to the form used in the Rolls. Notwithstanding the great diversity in the rendering of some surnames, it appears advisable, on philological and other grounds, to preserve certain inconsistencies of medieval clerks, and not to incur risk of error by attempting to establish an arbitrary uniformity of spelling. The Index, however, frequently supplies a clue to the identification of persons whose names occur under varying forms on different pages of the Calendar.

The Latin preposition de, which so often comes immediately after a Christian name, has been retained there in the Calendar, partly because it was, in its French form, commonly prefixed to certain surnames, and partly because it represents more than one English preposition. When, on the other hand, the preposition comes after a surname, it has generally been rendered “of.” The “de” has been retained in the case of names compounded like “Rolland Simondsquier de Beltoft,” and Simon de Beltoft figures as a separate person in the Index.

Prefixes such as “le,” “the,” “of,” “at” and “atte,” and other French and English words occurring in Latin entries, have been preserved in the Calendar.

In many cases it is practically impossible to distinguish between hereditary surnames and local descriptions of persons. “Thomas filius Willelmi de Brampton” has been rendered in the Calendar “Thomas son of William de Brampton;” but, as he may merely have been a native or an inhabitant of Brampton, he figures twice in the Index—under Brampton, and again under William. The compilers of the Calendar thus avoid the expression of an opinion as to whether Brampton was or was not a surname; or, in the